

**Department of Education**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**  
**Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Request**

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations language .....	C-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes .....	C-3
Amounts Available for Obligation .....	C-6
Obligations by Object Classification .....	C-7
Summary of Changes .....	C-8
Authorizing Legislation .....	C-9
Appropriations History .....	C-11
Significant Items in FY 2008 Appropriations Reports.....	C-12
Summary of Request .....	C-15
Improving teacher quality:	
Improving teacher quality State grants.....	C-18
Mathematics and science partnerships .....	C-28
Educational technology State grants .....	C-33
21 <sup>st</sup> Century learning opportunities .....	C-40
Javits gifted and talented education .....	C-48
Foreign language assistance.....	C-52
State assessments .....	C-58
Education for homeless children and youths .....	C-67
Education for Native Hawaiians.....	C-72
Alaska Native education equity.....	C-76
Training and advisory services .....	C-79
Rural education .....	C-84
Supplemental education grants .....	C-92
Comprehensive centers.....	C-95
State Tables.....	C-101

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

For carrying out school improvement activities authorized by parts A and B of title II, part B of title IV, [subparts 6 and]<sup>1</sup> subpart 9 of part D of title V, and parts A and B of title VI[, and parts B and C of title VII] of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ("ESEA"); the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; 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, [\$5,383,119,000] \$4,566,323,000, of which [\$3,763,355,000] \$3,023,879,000 shall become available on July 1, [2008] 2009, and remain available through September 30, [2009] 2010,<sup>2</sup> and of which \$1,435,000,000 shall become available on October 1, [2008] 2009, and shall remain available through September 30, [2009] 2010,<sup>3</sup> for academic year [2008-2009] 2009-2010: *Provided*, That [funds made available to carry out part B of title VII of the ESEA may be used for construction, renovation and modernization of any elementary school, secondary school, or structure related to an elementary school or secondary school, run by the Department of Education of the State of Hawaii, that serves a predominantly Native Hawaiian student body:<sup>4</sup> *Provided further*, That from the funds referred to in the preceding proviso, not less than \$1,250,000 shall be for a grant to the Department of Education of the State of Hawaii for the activities described in such proviso, and \$1,250,000 shall be for a grant to the University of Hawaii School of Law for a Center of Excellence in Native Hawaiian law:<sup>5</sup> *Provided further*, That funds made available to carry out part C of title VII of the ESEA may be used for construction:<sup>6</sup> *Provided further*, That up to 100 percent of the funds available to a State educational agency under part D of title II of the ESEA may be used for subgrants described in section 2412(a)(2)(B) of such Act:<sup>7</sup> *Provided further*,] \$408,732,000 shall be for State assessments and related activities authorized under sections 6111 and 6112 of the ESEA:<sup>8</sup> *Provided further*, That [\$58,129,000] \$57,113,000 shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002:<sup>9</sup> *Provided further*, That [\$33,707,000]

\$25,655,000 shall be available to carry out part D of title V of the ESEA:<sup>10</sup> *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated under this heading may be used to carry out section 5494 under the ESEA:<sup>11</sup> *Provided further*, That [\$18,001,000] \$17,687,000 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>12</sup> *Provided further*, That up to 5 percent of these amounts may be reserved by the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to administer the Supplemental Education Grants programs and to obtain technical assistance, oversight and consultancy services in the administration of these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for such services:<sup>13</sup> *Provided further*, That [\$2,400,000] at least \$7,360,000 of the funds available for the Foreign Language Assistance Program shall be available for 5-year grants to local educational agencies that would work in partnership with one or more institutions of higher education to establish or expand articulated programs of study in languages critical to United States national security that will enable successful students to advance from elementary school through college to achieve a superior level of proficiency in those languages.<sup>14</sup> (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2008.*)

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

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>1</sup>...[subparts 6 and] <u>subpart...</u></p>	<p>This language, which provides funds for Javits Gifted and Talented Education, is deleted because the Administration is not requesting funds for the program.</p>
<p><sup>2</sup>... of which [\$3,763,355,000] <u>\$3,023,879,000</u> shall become available on July 1, [2008] <u>2009</u>, and remain available through September 30, [2009] <u>2010</u>,...</p>	<p>This language provides for a portion of funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Mathematics and Science Partnerships, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Opportunities, State Assessments, Education for Homeless Children and Youths State Grants, and Rural Education.</p>
<p><sup>3</sup> ... and of which \$1,435,000,000 shall become available on October 1, [2008] <u>2009</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2009] <u>2010</u>,...</p>	<p>This language provides that a portion of funds for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants is available on an advance-funded basis.</p>
<p><sup>4</sup> <i>Provided</i>, That [funds made available to carry out part B of title VII of the ESEA may be used for construction, renovation and modernization of any elementary school, secondary school, or structure related to an elementary school or secondary school, run by the Department of Education of the State of Hawaii, that serves a predominantly Native Hawaiian student body:]</p>	<p>This language, which authorizes the use of funds appropriated for the Education for Native Hawaiians program for school construction, renovation, and modernization, is deleted because it is inconsistent with the authorizing legislation and with the Administration's request.</p>
<p><sup>5</sup> [...<i>Provided further</i>, That from the funds referred to in the preceding proviso, not less than \$1,250,000 shall be for a grant to the Department of Education of the State of Hawaii for the activities described in such proviso, and \$1,250,000 shall be for a grant to the University of Hawaii School of Law for a Center of Excellence in Native Hawaiian law:]</p>	<p>This language, which provides a one-time earmark of funds appropriated for the Education for Native Hawaiians program for specified grants, is deleted because it is inconsistent with the authorizing legislation and with the Administration's request.</p>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>6</sup> [...<i>Provided further</i>, That funds made available to carry out part C of title VII of the ESEA may be used for construction:]</p>	<p>This language, which authorizes the use of funds appropriated for the Alaska Native Education Equity program for construction, is deleted because it is inconsistent with the authorizing legislation and with the Administration's request.</p>
<p><sup>7</sup> [<i>Provided further</i>, That up to 100 percent of the funds available to a State educational agency under part D of title II of the ESEA may be used for subgrants described in section 2412(a)(2)(B) of such Act:]</p>	<p>This language allows States to award up to 100 percent of subgrant funds competitively to local educational agencies under the Educational Technology State Grants program in fiscal year 2008. The language is deleted because the Administration is not requesting funds for the program.</p>
<p><sup>8</sup> <u><i>Provided further</i>,] \$408,732,000 shall be for State assessments and related activities authorized under sections 6111 and 6112 of the ESEA:</u></p>	<p>This language earmarks funds for the State Assessments program.</p>
<p><sup>9</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That [\$58,129,000] <u>\$57,113,000</u> shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002:</p>	<p>This language earmarks funds for the Comprehensive Centers program.</p>
<p><sup>10</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That [\$33,707,000] <u>\$25,655,000</u> shall be available to carry out part D of title V of the ESEA:</p>	<p>This language earmarks funds for the Foreign Language Assistance program.</p>
<p><sup>11</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That no funds appropriated under this heading may be used to carry out section 5494 under the ESEA:</p>	<p>This language prohibits funds appropriated for the Foreign Language Assistance program from being used for Elementary School Foreign Language Incentive Grants.</p>
<p><sup>12</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That [\$18,001,000] <u>\$17,687,000</u> shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands:</p>	<p>This language earmarks funds for Supplemental Education Grants to the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.</p>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>13</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That up to 5 percent of these amounts may be reserved by the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to administer the Supplemental Education Grants programs and to obtain technical assistance, oversight and consultancy services in the administration of these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for such services:</p>	<p>This language allows the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to reserve up to 5 percent of their Supplemental Education Grants funds for administration and for technical assistance, oversight, and consultancy services for these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for these services.</p>
<p><sup>14</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That [\$2,400,000] <u>at least \$7,360,000</u> of the funds available for the Foreign Language Assistance Program shall be available for 5-year grants to local educational agencies that would work in partnership with one or more institutions of higher education to establish or expand articulated programs of study in languages critical to United States national security that will enable successful students to advance from elementary school through college to achieve a superior level of proficiency in those languages.</p>	<p>This language provides funding under the Foreign Language Assistance program for 5-year grants to local educational agencies in partnership with institutions of higher education to enable students to study languages critical to United States national and economic security in an articulated program of study that helps students become proficient in those languages.</p>

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

**Amounts Available for Obligation  
(\$000s)**

	2007	2008	2009
Discretionary authority:			
Annual appropriation .....	\$5,255,478	\$5,383,119	\$4,566,323
Across-the board reduction .....	<u>0</u>	<u>-94,043</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation.....	5,255,478	5,289,076	4,566,323
Advance for succeeding fiscal year .....	-1,435,000	-1,435,000	-1,435,000
Advance from prior year .....	<u>1,435,000</u>	<u>1,435,000</u>	<u>1,435,000</u>
Subtotal, comparable budget authority .....	5,255,478	5,289,076	4,566,323
Unobligated balance, start of year .....	45,943	63,445	0
Recovery of prior-year obligations .....	1,027	0	0
Unobligated balance, expiring.....	-125	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year .....	<u>-63,445</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations .....	5,238,878	5,352,521	4,566,323

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

**Obligations by Object Classification**  
(\$000s)

	2007	2008	2009
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services .....	\$10,305	\$9,947	\$9,479
Other services .....	24,334	25,425	21,576
Peer review .....	254	546	150
Purchases of goods and services .....	<u>18</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>16</u>
Subtotal .....	34,911	35,938	31,221
Grants, subsidies, and contributions .....	5,203,966	5,316,582	4,535,101
Interest .....	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Total, direct obligations .....	5,238,878	5,352,521	4,566,323



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Summary of Changes (\$000s)

---

2008 .....	\$5,289,076
2009 .....	<u>4,566,323</u>
Net change.....	-722,753

---

	<u>2008 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<b>Decreases:</b>		
<u>Program:</u>		
Decrease funding for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants to shift funds to the Teacher Incentive Fund program in the Innovation and Improvement account.	\$2,935,248	-\$100,000
Eliminate funding for Educational Technology State Grants because it is a narrow categorical program that has limited impact and for which there is little or no evidence of effectiveness.	267,494	-267,494
Decrease funding for 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Learning Opportunities because there is limited evidence of effectiveness. The Administration's reauthorization proposal will better support and expand ongoing State efforts to improve the academic achievement of disadvantaged students.	1,081,166	-281,166
Eliminate funding for Javits Gifted and Talented Education because it is a small, narrow categorical program that has limited impact and for which there is little or no evidence of effectiveness.	7,463	-7,463
Eliminate funding for Education for Native Hawaiians because it is a narrow categorical program that is duplicative of other programs.	33,315	-33,315
Eliminate funding for Alaska Native Education Equity because it is a narrow categorical program that is duplicative of other programs.	33,315	<u>- 33,315</u>
Net change		-722,753

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Authorizing Legislation (\$000s)

Activity	2008 Authorized	2008 Estimate	2009 Authorized	2009 Request
Improving teacher quality ( <i>ESEA II</i> ):				
Improving teacher quality State grants ( <i>Part A</i> )	Indefinite	\$2,935,248	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	\$2,835,248
Early childhood educator professional development ( <i>Section 2151(e)</i> )	Indefinite	0	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Mathematics and science partnerships ( <i>Part B</i> )	Indefinite	178,978	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	178,978
Educational technology State grants ( <i>ESEA II-D-1 and 2</i> )	Indefinite <sup>3</sup>	267,494	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
21 <sup>st</sup> Century Learning Opportunities ( <i>ESEA IV-B</i> )	Indefinite	1,081,166	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	800,000
State grants for innovative programs ( <i>ESEA V-A</i> )	Indefinite	0	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Javits gifted and talented education ( <i>ESEA V-D-6</i> )	(4)	7,463	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Foreign language assistance ( <i>ESEA V-D-9</i> )	(5)	25,655	To be determined <sup>5</sup>	25,655
State assessments ( <i>ESEA VI-A-1</i> )	Indefinite	408,732	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	408,732
Education for homeless children and youths ( <i>McKinney-Vento Act, Title VII-B</i> )	Indefinite	64,067	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	64,067
Education for Native Hawaiians ( <i>ESEA VII-B</i> )	Indefinite <sup>6</sup>	33,315	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Alaska Native education equity ( <i>ESEA VII-C</i> )	Indefinite <sup>7</sup>	33,315	0 <sup>2</sup>	0
Training and advisory services ( <i>CRA IV</i> )	Indefinite	6,989	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	6,989
Rural education ( <i>ESEA VI-B</i> )	Indefinite <sup>8</sup>	171,854	To be determined <sup>8</sup>	171,854
Supplemental education grants ( <i>Compact of     Free Association Act</i> )	\$19,330 <sup>9</sup>	17,687	\$19,623 <sup>9</sup>	17,687
Comprehensive centers ( <i>Educational Technical     Assistance Act, Section 203</i> )	Indefinite	57,113	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	57,113

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Authorizing Legislation—continued (\$000s)

Activity	2008 Authorized	2008 Estimate	2009 Authorized	2009 Request
<u>Unfunded authorizations:</u>				
National teacher recruitment campaign <i>(ESEA Section 2151(a))</i>	Indefinite	0	0	0
Special education teacher training <i>(ESEA Section 2151(d))</i>	Indefinite	0	0	0
Teacher mobility <i>(ESEA Section 2151(f))</i>	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total definite authorization	\$19,330		\$19,623	
Total annual appropriation		\$5,289,076		\$4,566,323
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				4,484,534

C-10

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

<sup>2</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking legislation.

<sup>3</sup> Section 2404 of the ESEA requires that from the funds appropriated for Subparts 1 and 2 of Part D, at least 98 percent is to be used to carry out Subpart 1 and not more than 2 percent is to be used to carry out Subpart 2. In addition, of the total amount available to carry out Subpart 2 in fiscal years 2002 through 2007, not more than a total of \$15,000 thousand may be used to carry out Section 2421(a).

<sup>4</sup> The GEPA extension for all Title V, Part D activities applies through September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking legislation.

<sup>5</sup> The GEPA extension for all Title V, Part D activities applies through September 30, 2008; however, authorizing legislation is sought.

<sup>6</sup> Of the amount available to carry out Sections 7204 and 7205, \$500 thousand is to be reserved for a direct grant to the Native Hawaiian Education Council to carry out Section 7204.

<sup>7</sup> Of the amount appropriated for Part C, not less than \$7,000 thousand is to be used to support activities specified in Section 7304(d)(2).

<sup>8</sup> The amount appropriated to carry out Title VI, Part B is to be distributed equally between Subparts 1 and 2.

<sup>9</sup> The Compact of Free Association Act authorizes \$12,230 thousand for the Federated States of Micronesia and \$6,100 thousand for the Republic of the Marshall Islands for fiscal year 2005 and an equivalent amount, as adjusted for inflation (calculated as two thirds of the percentage change in the U.S. Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator, or 5 percent, whichever is less in any one year) for each of the succeeding fiscal years through 2023. The 2009 authorization is calculated based on inflation estimates as of February 2007.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Appropriations History (\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2000	\$2,722,534	\$3,115,188	\$2,961,634	\$3,026,884
(2000 Advance for 2001)	0	(1,638,000)	(1,239,750)	(1,515,000)
2000 Rescission	0	0	0	-20,000
2001	3,869,034	3,165,334	4,672,534	4,869,084
(2001 Advance for 2002)	(1,515,000)	(1,515,000)	(2,915,000)	(1,765,000)
2002	6,338,794	7,653,084	8,754,514	7,837,473
(2002 Advance for 2003)	0	(1,960,000)	(1,765,000)	(1,765,000)
2003	6,784,484	7,347,584	7,788,329	8,001,159
(2003 Advance for 2004)	(1,765,000)	(2,265,000)	(1,765,000)	(1,765,000)
2003 Technical amendment	0	0	0	546
2004	5,042,834	5,797,637	5,731,453	5,800,496
(2004 Advance for 2005)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)
2005	5,940,493	5,661,401	5,730,632	5,619,657
(2005 Advance for 2006)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)
2006	5,332,219	5,393,765	5,457,953	5,255,478
(2006 Advance for 2007)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)
2007	4,973,158	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	5,255,478 <sup>1</sup>
(2007 Advance for 2008)	(1,435,000)			(1,435,000)
2008	4,698,276	5,693,668	5,198,525	5,289,076
(2008 Advance for 2009)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)	(1,435,000)
2009	4,566,323			
(2009 Advance for 2010)	(1,435,000)			

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

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Significant Items in FY 2008 Appropriations Reports

#### Early Childhood Educator Professional Development

House: The Committee expects the Department to continue to strengthen professional development partnerships for early childhood educators through grants under Early Reading First.

Response: The Department will ensure that Early Reading First grants include a strong professional development component.

#### Educational Technology State Grants

House: The Committee expects the second report on educational software products to address more than the 16 educational software titles addressed in the first report because there are hundreds of such titles commercially available.

Response: The Department's study, "Effectiveness of Reading and Mathematics Software Products," used an experimental design to assess the effects of 16 educational software products, with teachers randomly assigned to use or not use selected products. The 16 products were selected from 160 submissions that were assessed on (1) prior evidence of effectiveness, (2) whether products could operate on a scale that was suitable for a national study, and (3) whether companies had the capacity to provide training to schools and teachers on the use of their products. The candidate products were then reviewed by two expert panels (one each for reading and math) and based on the panel recommendations, the Department selected 16 products for inclusion in the 2-year study.

As a 2-year random assignment study, the design and integrity of the findings require that the software products being evaluated remain constant from year 1 to year 2 of the study. Thus, at this late point, it is not possible to include additional educational software products in the study design. Further, the second-year data collection is nearly complete and involved teachers who participated in year 1 of the study to examine whether products are more effective when teachers have more experience using them. The Department, in the second-year report, plans to present results separately for each of the 16 products.

House: The Committee expects the second report on educational software products to address how inadequate teacher training impacts the efficacy of software implementation in the classroom.

Response: The second study report will include information on how teacher experience and the quality of training with educational software affects the use and effectiveness of these products within the classroom.

## **SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

### **21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Opportunities**

Conference: The Appropriations Committees intend that the Department encourage States to use 40 percent of their additional allocations over fiscal year 2007, as practicable, to provide supervised and supportive after-school activities to middle- and high-school students.

House: The Committee intends that the Department encourage States to use 40 percent of their additional allocations over fiscal year 2007 (equal to \$50,000,000 across all States), as practicable, to provide supervised and supportive after-school activities to approximately 65,000 middle- and high-school students.

Response: The Department will send State Coordinators an e-mail to encourage them to use 40 percent of the 2008 increase on programs that serve middle and high school.

### **Foreign Language Assistance**

Conference: The Appropriations Committees intend that this set-aside of \$2,400,000 for 5-year grants to local educational agencies and other funds provided for this program be used as outlined in House Report 110-424.

Response: The Department will award funds to local educational agencies (LEAs), in partnership with institutions of higher education, for the establishment or expansion of articulated programs of study in critical-need languages. Other funds for the program will continue to be used to support grants to LEAs and State educational agencies that support the teaching and learning of both critical and other foreign languages.

Senate: The Committee intends for funding available under this program to promote the goal of well-articulated, long-sequence language programs that lead to demonstrable results for all students.

Response: The Department will continue to highlight this concern in all grant application materials.

Senate: The Committee directs the Department not to make grants to schools that are replacing current traditional language programs with critical needs language instruction.

Response: The Department will continue to inform applicants that the purpose of this program is not to replace current traditional language programs with critical-need language programs. The Department will continue to highlight this policy in all grant application notices for the program.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### **Foreign Language Assistance – continued**

Senate: The Committee strongly urges the Department to waive the matching requirement for qualifying schools and to increase awareness of this accommodation among the affected school population.

Response: The Department will continue to make eligible applicants aware of the Secretary's authority to waive the matching requirement for qualifying schools.

### **State Assessments**

Senate: The Committee urges the Department to continue to place a high priority on grant applications that aim to improve the quality of State assessments for students with disabilities and students with limited English proficiency, and to ensure the most accurate means of measuring their performance on these assessments.

Response: The Department has established a competitive preference for grant applications that propose to address the assessment of students with disabilities and limited English proficient students.

### **Alaska Native Education Equity**

Senate: The Committee expects the Department to use some of the construction funds to address the construction needs of rural schools.

Response: The Department is including construction of facilities that support the operation of Alaska Native education programs as a permissible activity in the Notice Inviting Applications for fiscal year 2008.

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2009 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST**

(in thousands of dollars)		Category Code	2007 Annual CR Operating Plan	2008 Appropriation	2009 President's Request	Change from 2008 Appropriation	
Office, Account, Program and Activity						Amount	Percent
<b>School Improvement Programs</b>							
1. Improving teacher quality (ESEA II):							
(a) Improving teacher quality State grants (Part A)							
	Annual appropriation	D	1,452,439	1,500,248	1,400,248	(100,000)	-6.7%
	Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,435,000	1,435,000	1,435,000	0	0.0%
	Subtotal		2,887,439	2,935,248	2,835,248	(100,000)	-3.4%
	(b) Early childhood educator professional development (Part A-5, section 2151(e))	D	14,550	0	0	0	---
	(c) Mathematics and science partnerships (Part B)	D	182,160	178,978	178,978	0	0.0%
	2. Educational technology State grants (ESEA II-D-1 and 2)	D	272,250	267,494	0	(267,494)	-100.0%
	3. 21st century learning opportunities (ESEA IV-B)	D	981,166	1,081,166	800,000	(281,166)	-26.0%
	4. State grants for innovative programs (ESEA V Part A)	D	99,000	0	0	0	---
	5. Javits gifted and talented education (ESEA V-D, subpart 6)	D	7,596	7,463	0	(7,463)	-100.0%
	6. Foreign language assistance (ESEA V-D, subpart 9)	D	23,780	25,655	25,655	0	0.0%
	7. State assessments (ESEA VI-A-1)	D	407,563	408,732	408,732	0	0.0%
	8. Education for homeless children and youths (MVHAA Title VII-B)	D	61,871	64,067	64,067	0	0.0%
	9. Education for Native Hawaiians (ESEA VII-B)	D	33,907	33,315	0	(33,315)	-100.0%
	10. Alaska Native education equity (ESEA VII-C)	D	33,907	33,315	0	(33,315)	-100.0%
	11. Training and advisory services (CRA IV)	D	7,113	6,989	6,989	0	0.0%
	12. Rural education (ESEA VI-B)	D	168,918	171,854	171,854	0	0.0%
	13. Supplemental education grants (Compact of Free Association Act)	D	18,001	17,687	17,687	0	0.0%
	14. Comprehensive centers (ETAA section 203)	D	56,257	57,113	57,113	0	0.0%
	<b>Total, Appropriation</b>	D	5,255,478	5,289,076	4,566,323	(722,753)	-13.7%
	Total, Budget authority	D	5,255,478	5,289,076	4,566,323	(722,753)	-13.7%
	Current		3,820,478 <sup>1</sup>	3,854,076 <sup>1</sup>	3,131,323 <sup>1</sup>	(722,753)	-18.8%
	Prior year's advance		1,435,000	1,435,000	1,435,000	0	0.0%
	Outlays	D	5,483,497	5,372,591	5,232,411	(140,180)	-2.6%

<sup>1</sup> Excludes an advance appropriation of \$1,435,000 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

NOTES: Category Codes are as follows: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program.  
FY 2008 detail may not add to totals due to rounding.



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Summary of Request

School Improvement Programs provide essential support for State and local efforts to implement the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB Act), President Bush's signature education reform initiative. More specifically, the activities in this account provide flexible resources to improve teacher quality, support before- and after-school programs, and pay the costs of developing and administering assessments. The account also includes a variety of smaller programs addressing particular educational needs or special populations.

Most of the programs in this account are authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and are, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The budget request assumes that these programs will be implemented in fiscal year 2009 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

The Administration is requesting a total of \$4.6 billion for programs in this account, \$722.8 million less than the 2008 level. The reduction represents requests for the elimination of funding for Educational Technology State Grants, Javits Gifted and Talented Education, Education for Native Hawaiians, and Alaska Native Education Equity programs. The Administration is also requesting decreases in funding for the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants and 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers programs.

The largest activity in the account is the **Improving Teacher Quality State Grants** program, which gives States and local educational agencies flexible resources to select the research-based strategies that best meet their particular needs for improved teaching that will help them raise student achievement in the core academic subjects. In return for this funding and flexibility, local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to demonstrate annual progress in ensuring that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects within the State are highly qualified. The Administration is requesting \$2.8 billion for this program, a \$100 million decrease from the 2008 level. The Administration proposes to move this \$100 million to the Teacher Incentive Fund program (in the Innovation and Improvement account), in order to support additional State and local initiatives to introduce performance-based teacher and principal compensation systems and provide incentives for the most effective teachers to serve in the most challenging schools.

In addition, the Administration is seeking almost \$179 million for **Mathematics and Science Partnerships**, the same amount as the fiscal year 2008 appropriation, to support State and local efforts to improve students' academic achievement in mathematics and science by strengthening the content knowledge and teaching skills of elementary and secondary school teachers. This program will complement other elements of the Administration's mathematics and science initiative, including Math Now (in the Education for the Disadvantaged account).

The Administration requests \$800 million for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Opportunities program, a reduction of \$281 million from the 2008 appropriation. The request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal to transform the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers program into an after-school and summer-school scholarship program, renamed the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Opportunities program, that would give parents greater choices in the selection of extended-learning opportunities for their children and focus the program more precisely on using the time outside of school to improve educational achievement consistent with State standards.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Summary of Request

The Administration requests \$25.7 million for the **Foreign Language Assistance** program, the same as the fiscal year 2008 appropriation. This request would support a new Administration goal of all students learning a second language and is consistent with the Administration's policy of investing in efforts to expand K-12 and postsecondary instruction in critical foreign languages, through the National Security Language Initiative. In fiscal year 2008, Congress provided approximately \$2.36 million for 5-year grants to LEAs, in partnership with institutions of higher education, for the establishment or expansion of articulated programs of study in critical-need languages, and the 2009 request would expand this initiative.

The Administration is also requesting level funding for **Education for Homeless Children and Youths**, at \$64 million, which helps to ensure that all homeless children and youth have equal access to the same free, appropriate public education available to other children, and for **Comprehensive Centers**, at \$57.1 million, which would continue the Administration's policy of supporting funding for a single program dedicated to providing comprehensive technical assistance to grantees under ESEA.

The Administration seeks \$408.7 million for **State Assessments**, the same amount as the fiscal year 2008 level. The request includes \$400 million for State formula grants to support development of new annual assessments in reading and mathematics for two additional high school grades. These assessments, which would have to be aligned with college and work-ready standards, including aligned course-level outcomes, would support implementation of the new high school testing requirements contained in the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal. The remaining \$8.7 million would be used for awards under the Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments program to assist States in improving the quality of their assessments for limited English proficient students and students with disabilities and add to the knowledge base about properly assessing these students.

The Administration also requests \$171.9 million for **Rural Education**, which provides additional resources to rural LEAs and schools that often face unique challenges in implementing the NCLB Act; almost \$7 million for **Training and Advisory Services**; and \$17.7 million for **Supplemental Education Grants**. The request for all three of these programs would continue funding at the fiscal year 2008 level.

The budget includes eliminations aimed at reducing duplication and making resources available for higher-priority activities. Educational Technology State Grants, Javits Gifted and Talented Education, Education for Native Hawaiians, and Alaska Native Education Equity would be eliminated because they are narrowly focused programs that have limited impact.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Improving teacher quality State grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part A)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$1,500,248	\$1,400,248	-\$100,000
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>1,435,000</u>	<u>1,435,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	2,935,248	2,835,248	-100,000

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program provides funds to State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) to develop and support a high-quality teaching force through activities that are grounded in scientifically based research. The program gives States and LEAs a flexible source of funding with which to meet their particular needs in strengthening the skills and knowledge of teachers and administrators to enable them to improve student achievement in the core academic subjects. In return for this flexibility, LEAs are required to demonstrate annual progress in ensuring that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects within the State are highly qualified and that increasing numbers of teachers are receiving high-quality professional development.

Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds are distributed by formula. Each State receives the amount of funds that it received from the antecedent Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants and Class Size Reduction programs in fiscal year 2001. Remaining funds are then allocated to States by formula based 35 percent on States' relative share of the population aged 5 to 17 and 65 percent on States' relative share of poor children aged 5 to 17, with each State receiving at least one-half of 1 percent of these remaining funds. The Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Outlying Areas each receive one-half of 1 percent of the appropriation.

Each State allocates 95 percent of its funds for Subgrants to Local Educational Agencies; 2.5 percent or the State's share of \$125 million, whichever is less, for Subgrants to Eligible Partnerships; and the remainder for State-level activities. States may use their State-level funds for a variety of activities, including the reform of teacher and principal certification or licensing requirements, teacher mentoring, creation or improvement of alternative routes to certification, teacher recruitment and retention programs, tenure reform, professional development for teachers and principals, technical assistance to LEAs, activities to promote reciprocity of teacher and principal certification or licensing, performance-based compensation systems, and pay differentiation programs.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

The State awards Subgrants to Local Educational Agencies using a formula that is similar to the one that the Department uses for State allocations, except that, after LEAs receive the amount equivalent to their 2001 allocations from the Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants and Class Size Reduction programs, remaining funds are then allocated to LEAs by a formula based 20 percent on LEAs' relative share of the population aged 5 to 17 and 80 percent on LEAs' relative share of poor children aged 5 to 17. In addition to using these funds for professional development and class-size reduction, LEAs may use program funds for other activities to improve teacher quality, including teacher and principal recruitment and retention initiatives, signing bonuses and other financial incentives, teacher and principal mentoring, reforming tenure systems, merit pay, teacher testing, and pay differentiation initiatives.

Subgrants to Eligible Partnerships are awarded competitively by the State agency for higher education working in conjunction with the SEA. Eligible partnerships must include an institution of higher education and the division of the institution that prepares teachers and principals, a school of arts and sciences, and a high-need LEA; other entities are allowable members of the partnership. Partnerships that receive a subgrant must use the funds to provide professional development in the core academic subjects to teachers, highly qualified paraprofessionals, and, if appropriate, principals.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) required all SEAs that receive Title I, Part A funds to develop a plan to have all public-school teachers of core academic subjects highly qualified no later than the end of the 2005-2006 school year. "Highly qualified" means that the teacher: (1) has obtained full State certification as a teacher; (2) holds a minimum of a bachelor's degree; and (3) has demonstrated subject-matter competency in each of the academic subjects in which he or she teaches. LEAs have commonly used their Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds to help enable teachers to meet this requirement.

This is a forward-funded program that includes advance appropriations. A portion of the funds becomes available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remains available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year. The remaining funds become available on October 1 of the fiscal year following the appropriations act and remain available for 12 months, expiring at the same time as the forward-funded portion.

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$2,930,126
2005.....	2,916,605
2006.....	2,887,439
2007.....	2,887,439
2008.....	2,935,248

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2009, the Administration is requesting \$2.8 billion for the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program, \$100 million less than the 2008 level. The Administration

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

proposes to move this \$100 million to the Teacher Incentive Fund program (in the Innovation and Improvement account), in order to support additional State and local initiatives to introduce performance-based teacher and principal compensation systems and provide incentives for the most effective teachers to serve in the most challenging schools. Because most teachers are now considered to be highly qualified, it is appropriate to shift a small portion of funds to the Teacher Incentive Fund in order to encourage these important reforms in compensation practices.

Although the budget would move \$100 million to the Teacher Incentive Fund program, it would continue the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program at almost 97 percent of the 2008 level and, thereby, provide a very significant amount of support for educator professional development and the other activities carried out under the program. Using the resources available through this program, States and LEAs can implement high-quality recruitment, professional development, and induction programs and other strategies to ensure that our Nation's schools are staffed with fully qualified teachers who are prepared to help all children succeed academically. The requested funds will help maintain the momentum for ensuring that all children are taught by teachers who have expertise in the subjects they teach and the skills needed to teach effectively.

A 2005 report by the Government Accountability Office found, based on data reported by 47 States, that, during the 2003-2004 school year, nearly all of their core academic classes were being taught by teachers who met the highly qualified teacher requirements. However, challenges remain. Data for most States suggested that core academic classes in low-poverty schools were more likely to be taught by teachers who met the highly qualified teacher requirements than were classes in high-poverty schools. The data also suggested that a higher percentage of elementary school classes were taught by highly qualified teachers than were secondary classes. Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds help to address these concerns by providing funds to LEAs to ensure that teachers all teachers become highly qualified, especially teachers in high-poverty schools.

A recent survey of 800 school districts conducted by the Department revealed that 92.2 percent of classes were taught by a highly qualified teacher in 2005-2006. However, some schools, especially schools in rural areas and schools that are high-poverty, continue to struggle with this requirement. Although 94 percent of elementary-school classes in 2005-06 were taught by a highly qualified teacher, only 90.4 percent of classes were taught by a highly qualified teacher in high-poverty schools, compared to 95.8 percent of classes in low-poverty schools. At the secondary-school level, where 90.9 percent of core academic classes were led by a highly qualified teacher, the percentages were 85.7 percent and 93.8 percent for high-poverty and low-poverty schools, respectively. To help close this gap, the Department has recently focused its work with States and school districts on ensuring that poor and minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than other children.

It is crucial for all students to be taught by highly qualified teachers who are fully credentialed and knowledgeable about the subjects they teach. Research by Eric Hanushek of Stanford University indicates that the quality of classroom teachers is the most important factor under school control that affects student achievement. In addition, value-added assessment studies by William Sanders of the SAS Institute indicate that individual teachers make a significant

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

difference in student achievement. In a 1996 study of two school districts in Tennessee, Sanders found that children assigned to three effective teachers in a row scored at the 83<sup>rd</sup> percentile in mathematics assessments at the end of 5<sup>th</sup> grade, while children assigned to three ineffective teachers in a row scored only at the 29<sup>th</sup> percentile.

The Department continues to work with States and school districts to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified, up to date in their subject areas and effective, especially by encouraging school districts to make high-quality professional development available to their teachers so that they can continue to develop and expand on their knowledge and skills as their careers progress. High-quality professional development is a central and indispensable element of the larger effort to help all students achieve. Research indicates that such professional development can contribute to improvements in teachers' skills and practice and, thereby, raise student achievement.

The Department conducts monitoring visits to ensure that States are implementing the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program correctly and meeting the highly qualified teacher requirement. In 2006, the Department completed a 3-year cycle of monitoring visits to all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Information collected from the visits indicates that States have made changes as a result of the highly qualified teacher requirement, including changing their certification requirements, usually by requiring more content knowledge and having teacher candidates pass a written examination; establishing more alternative certification programs; requiring institutions of higher education to improve their teacher education programs so that more graduates will be highly qualified; requiring secondary-school teachers to have a major in the subjects they teach; allowing fewer emergency teaching certificates; encouraging dual certification, especially elementary certification with certification to teach special education or English as a second language; implementing incentive systems to attract and retain highly qualified teachers; and making teacher recertification requirements more focused on subject-matter knowledge. However, Department staff found that many LEAs have had difficulty ensuring that their special education and secondary mathematics and science teachers are highly qualified, mostly because the supply of those teachers is low. Other groups of teachers for which LEAs have had difficulty meeting the highly qualified teacher requirement have included secondary teachers in rural areas and middle-school teachers.

After reviewing States' progress in meeting the highly qualified teacher requirement in the spring of 2006, the Department asked States to submit revised State plans for reaching the requirement of having all teachers highly qualified. Peer reviewers reviewed these plans, and the Department is using the information found in these plans to inform the second round of monitoring. In June 2007, the Department visited two States to test new protocols for the next round of monitoring; the Department began the new round of monitoring based on the revised State plans in the fall of 2007. In addition to determining whether States continue to make progress in ensuring that all teachers are highly qualified, reviewers are focusing on States' implementation of their equitable distribution plans, which include the steps the SEA is taking to ensure that poor and minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than other children, and on States' actions for holding their LEAs accountable for meeting the highly qualified teacher requirement.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

Another Department strategy is to continue developing the knowledge base on teacher effectiveness. To support this strategy, the Department intends to reserve up to \$14.2 million (one-half of 1 percent) of the fiscal year 2009 appropriation primarily to continue evaluation studies (which are described under Other Performance Information in the Program Performance Information section below). Some evaluation funds may also be used to help disseminate and implement findings from evaluations.

The Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2009 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

Specifically, the Administration's proposal supports adding language that allows an LEA that is considered to be rural under the Rural Education Small, Rural School Achievement program, an institution for neglected or delinquent children and youth, or a community day program that serves neglected or delinquent children and youth to allow teachers who teach multiple subjects in their first 3 years of teaching to be considered a highly qualified teacher so long as those teachers are highly qualified in one of the subjects that they teach. Eligible districts and institutions would have to: (1) ensure that all teachers in core academic subjects are highly qualified in at least one core academic subject they teach; (2) provide high-quality professional development that increases the teachers' content knowledge in the additional subjects they teach; and (3) provide mentoring or a program of intensive supervision that consists of structured guidance and regular, ongoing support so that teachers become highly qualified in the additional core academic subject(s) they teach within the 3-year period. Allowing new teachers in small rural school districts and in alternative settings for neglected and delinquent children and youth additional time to meet the highly qualified teacher requirement would provide relief for LEAs and schools that often have a single teacher teaching multiple subjects because of low enrollment and recruiting issues.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Range of awards to States	\$13,752- 331,226	\$13,987- 333,420	\$13,495- 321,120
Average State grant	54,698	55,603	53,709
Amount for Outlying Areas	14,365	14,603	14,105
Amount for BIA	14,365	14,603	14,105
Evaluation	14,437	14,676	14,176

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2009 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department established performance measures to assess the overall annual performance of the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program. Those measures gauge the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools and by highly qualified teachers in elementary and secondary schools. These data are being collected through ESEA annual State performance reports for the years 2004 through 2006. The Department's "Education Data Exchange Network" (EDEN) began collecting the same data in 2007.

**Goal: To improve teacher and principal quality and increase the number of highly qualified teachers in the classroom and highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools.**

**Objective:** *Show an annual increase in the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of core academic elementary classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2005</b>	Baseline	90
<b>2006</b>	100	90
<b>2007</b>	100	
<b>2008</b>	100	
<b>2009</b>	100	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of core academic middle-school/high-school classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2005</b>	Baseline	84
<b>2006</b>	100	86
<b>2007</b>	100	
<b>2008</b>	100	
<b>2009</b>	100	



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	89	91
2005	90	93
2006	95	94
2007	100	
2008	100	
2009	100	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in secondary schools.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	85	88
2005	85	89
2006	92	91
2007	100	
2008	100	
2009	100	

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report

**Assessment of progress:** The 2007 data, reflecting the 2006-2007 school year, will be available in May.

### Efficiency Measure

The efficiency measure for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants focuses on decreasing the average number of days between the date of the monitoring visit and the date that the Department sends the monitoring report to the State.

<b>Measure:</b> The number of days it takes the Department of Education to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		83
2006	82	37
2007	81	Data not collected
2008	36	
2009	35	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department did not conduct any monitoring visits in fiscal year 2007 because program staff were working with States on the revised State plans and preparing for the second round of monitoring visits. Beginning in 2008, data will reflect the Department's second round of State monitoring.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

#### Other Performance Information

The Department is currently using Improving Teacher Quality State Grants evaluation funds to conduct rigorous impact studies in three major areas. A study of pre-service training will identify different models of teacher training, including models of alternative certification, to compare the performance of students taught by teachers who have received different types of preparation. This study will shed light on the aspects of teacher training that best support student achievement. The report is due this spring. Two separate studies of teacher professional development activities will identify and then test promising approaches to in-service training. One will examine the extent to which particular professional development activities change teaching practices in ways that research suggests are effective in improving student achievement in early reading. An interim report is expected this spring, and the final report should be available in the fall. A second study will test professional development activities that focus on improving student achievement in mathematics. An interim report is expected in the fall of 2009, and the final report in the fall of 2010. Finally, another project will evaluate existing induction programs in order to identify promising teacher retention strategies. The report is due this spring.

The Department is also using evaluation funds to conduct two cross-cutting studies of NCLB implementation that include an examination of how SEAs and LEAs are using Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds and also address the broader question of how States, districts, and schools are implementing the NCLB requirements for improving the qualifications of teachers and paraprofessionals. One of the studies is also collecting data on the professional development experiences of a nationally representative sample of teachers. The Department released an interim report on the implementation of the teacher quality provisions of NCLB based these two studies in the summer of 2007, and the final report will be released in late 2008. Major findings from the interim report, which include data from the 2004-05 school year, include the following:

- Most teachers met their States' requirements to be considered highly qualified under NCLB. However, State policies concerning highly qualified teachers varied greatly, both in the minimum scores that new teachers must meet to demonstrate content knowledge on assessments and in the extent to which State policies gave existing teachers credit for years of prior teaching experience versus emphasizing more direct measures of content knowledge and teaching performance.
- The percentage of teachers who were not highly qualified under NCLB was higher for special education teachers, teachers of students with limited English proficiency, and middle-school teachers, as well as for teachers in high-poverty and high-minority schools. In addition, even among teachers who were considered highly qualified, teachers in high-poverty schools had less experience and were less likely to have a degree in the subject they taught.
- Although nearly all teachers reported taking part in content-focused professional development related to teaching reading or mathematics, a relatively small portion participated in such learning opportunities for an extended period of time. For example, only 20 percent of elementary teachers participated for more than 24 hours in the

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Improving teacher quality State grants

---

previous year in professional development on instructional strategies in reading and only 8 percent received more than 24 hours of professional development on instructional strategies in mathematics.

These studies will produce different kinds of data to measure the program's performance and provide information about the implementation of research-based models to improve teacher quality. The descriptive studies and the NCLB consolidated performance report will provide outcome and implementation data about the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program, and the three impact studies will provide information about research-based models that States and LEAs can use to improve the quality of their teaching force.

### Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

While the first outcome of the program's review with the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), in 2003, was "Results Not Demonstrated," the program underwent a second PART review in 2005 with significantly improved results and a "Moderately Effective" rating. The second review found that the Department had made good progress in administering the program, providing useful technical assistance to help States and districts meet program requirements, and initiating rigorous program evaluations.

The PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address them.

- *Develop a meaningful efficiency measure and setting targets for the new measure.* By the end of 2008, the Department will collect data for the program's efficiency measure that reflect the first year of the Department's second round of State monitoring.
- *Complete the two program studies and utilize those results to assess and improve program performance.* The Department recently released an interim report on the implementation of teacher quality provisions of NCLB based on data collected from two studies – the Study of State Implementation of Accountability and Teacher Quality under No Child Left Behind and the National Longitudinal Study of No Child Left Behind. The interim report was released in the summer of 2007 and the final report will be released in late 2008.
- *In fiscal year 2008, take monitoring, technical assistance, and enforcement actions to ensure that States are reporting accurately on and implementing the requirement that teachers be highly qualified.* The Department began a second round of monitoring for the program in the summer of 2007 and is reviewing and providing feedback on States' efforts to report on and implement the highly qualified teacher requirement. The Department also will address the highly qualified teacher reporting requirement at the program's State directors' meeting in March 2008. By the end of the fiscal year, the Department will decide whether and what additional enforcement actions are needed.
- *In fiscal year 2008, take monitoring, technical assistance, and enforcement actions to ensure that States are reporting accurately on and ensuring an equitable distribution of highly qualified teachers in high- and low-poverty schools.* The Department began a

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### **Improving teacher quality State grants**

---

second round of monitoring for the program in the summer of 2007 and is reviewing and providing feedback on States' efforts to report on and implement the equitable distribution requirement. The Department also will address the requirement at the program's State directors' meeting in March 2008. By the end of the fiscal year, the Department will decide whether and what additional enforcement actions are needed.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Mathematics and science partnerships

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$178,978	\$178,978	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program supports State and local efforts to improve students' academic achievement in mathematics and science by promoting strong teaching skills for elementary and secondary school teachers, including by integrating teaching methods based on scientifically based research and technology into the curriculum. Grantees may also use program funds to develop more rigorous mathematics and science curricula that are aligned with challenging State and local content standards; establish distance learning programs for mathematics and science teachers; and recruit individuals with mathematics, science, and engineering majors into the teaching profession through the use of signing and performance incentives, stipends, and scholarships. Professional development can include summer workshops, or institutes and programs, that bring mathematics and science teachers into contact with working scientists, mathematicians, and engineers in order to expand teachers' subject-matter knowledge.

The Department awards 3-year grants directly to partnerships on a competitive basis when the appropriation for the program is less than \$100 million. If the appropriation reaches or exceeds \$100 million, as has been the case since fiscal year 2003, the Department provides grants to States by formula based on the number of children aged 5 to 17 who are from families with incomes below the poverty line; States then award the funds competitively to partnerships. Eligible partnerships must include the State educational agency (if the Department is awarding the grants directly to partnerships); an engineering, mathematics, or science department of an institution of higher education (IHE); and a high-need local educational agency (LEA). In addition, partnerships may include another engineering, mathematics, science, or teacher training department of an IHE; additional LEAs, public charter schools, public or private elementary or secondary schools; a business; or a nonprofit or for-profit organization of demonstrated effectiveness in improving the quality of mathematics and science teachers.

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

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$149,115
2005.....	178,560
2006.....	182,160
2007.....	182,160
2008.....	178,978

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2009, the Administration is requesting almost \$179 million for the Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) program, the same amount as the 2008 level. Funding at the requested level will complement the more targeted mathematics and science education activities in the President's American Competitiveness Initiative – Math Now and the Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate program – and allow funded partnerships to continue actions to improve students' mathematics and science achievement.

Improving American students' achievement in mathematics and science is vital to ensuring the economic wellbeing of our country. For the United States to remain competitive in the global economy, build and maintain a highly skilled workforce, and nourish technological innovation, we must improve mathematics and science teaching and learning. Department of Labor/Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) projections indicate that over 80 percent of the fastest-growing occupations are dependent on knowledge of mathematics and science. BLS data released in 2005 projecting the 10 fastest-growing occupations between 2004 and 2014 indicate that the health care and computer fields (both of which require a strong background in mathematics and science) will experience the most growth in the coming years. In addition, students from many other advanced countries have continued to outperform American students on international assessments, such as on the 2003 Program for International Student Assessment and the 2003 Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study.

A 2007 report from the Department's National Center for Education Statistics, "Advanced Mathematics and Science Coursetaking in the Spring High School Senior Classes of 1982, 1992, and 2004" indicates that high school graduates' completion of mathematics and science courses increased between 1982 and 2004 and that greater percentages of graduates had taken advanced mathematics and science courses in 2004 compared to 1982. However, graduates in the highest socioeconomic status (SES) quartile were consistently more likely than graduates in the lowest SES quartile to have completed advanced-level coursework in mathematics. Moreover, the gap between these quartiles grew between 1982 and 2004; the gap was 18 percentage points in 1982 but 35 percentage points in 2004. In science, graduates in the highest SES quartile also consistently completed the most advanced level of science courses at higher rates than their peers in the other three cohorts.

Mathematics and Science Partnerships helps to address these concerns by focusing on teaching and learning in mathematics and science that is based on scientifically based research. Funding will continue to allow partnerships to offer professional development and

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

curricula that will help prepare American students to compete in the global, high-tech economy.

Annual performance reports from grantees indicate that, in 2005, 64 percent of kindergarten through grade 5 teachers who participated in the program and were assessed in mathematics significantly increased their content knowledge; in science, the percentage was 83 percent.

The Mathematics and Science Partnerships program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. A concern that the Administration is addressing through reauthorization is that the statute does not carefully focus support on teachers from the most needy schools. The law requires that LEAs that participate in the partnerships be high need, but because the statute does not define a high-need LEA, most States use a district's level of poverty or low student achievement to determine if it is high need. Because only the district must be high need, and not the participating schools in the district, the Department is finding that often teachers from the more advantaged schools in the LEA participate in the program, especially because program participation is often voluntary for teachers. While the Department has been encouraging LEAs to focus on the most needy schools, there is no legal authority to require LEA cooperation. The reauthorization proposal would require LEAs to carry out their grant activities in high-need (high-poverty or rural) schools.

In addition, the program statute lacks a requirement for subgrantees to conduct rigorous, scientifically based evaluations. For reauthorization, the Administration is recommending that they be required to do so, to the extent feasible.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Amount distributed to States	\$181,249	\$178,083	\$178,083
Range of State formula grants	\$906- 23,635	\$890- 21,906	\$890- 21,906
Average State formula grant	\$3,237	\$3,180	\$3,180
Evaluation	\$911	\$895	\$895

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

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

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

FY 2009 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department has established the following measures to assess the performance of the program: (1) the percentage of MSP teachers who significantly increase their content knowledge, as reflected in project-level pre- and post-assessments; (2) the percentage of students in classrooms of MSP teachers who score at the basic level or above in State assessments of mathematics or science; (3) the percentage of students in classrooms of MSP teachers who score at the proficient level or above in State assessments of mathematics or science; (4) the percentage of MSP projects that report using an experimental or quasi-experimental design for their evaluations; and (5) the percentage of MSP projects that use an experimental or quasi-experimental design for their evaluations that are conducted successfully and that yield scientifically valid results. Baseline data and targets will be available in the summer of 2008. Data will come from annual performance reports and program evaluations.

#### Efficiency Measure

The Department established one efficiency measure for the Mathematics and Science Partnerships program: the percentage of SEAs that submit complete and accurate data on program performance measures in a timely manner. The baseline and targets for this measure should be available early in 2008.

#### Other Performance Information

The Department is using evaluation funds to collect and analyze annually descriptive data from partnerships supported by the program. Partnerships also provide a narrative description of their activities annually; these narratives contain information about teacher participation, growth in teacher content knowledge, and student learning.

The Department hired a contractor to aggregate data supplied by partnerships. The contractor and Department staff work closely with States and partnerships to help ensure that the data are consistent across States and projects. A particular challenge is aggregating data from projects that vary widely in terms of the length of the professional development provided, the number of teachers served, the grade levels taught by the teachers served, and whether the projects focus on mathematics, science, or a combination of the two.

#### Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Administration completed a PART review of this program in 2006. Although the PART review found that the program generally has a strong purpose and design and is well managed, the lack of baseline data for the program's performance measures and efficiency measure and the lack of a strong evaluation resulted in a rating of "Results Not Demonstrated".

The PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address them:



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Mathematics and science partnerships

---

- *Establish baseline data and ambitious targets for the program's performance measures.* The Department is collecting grantee performance data and will establish baseline data and targets for the performance measures by the summer of 2008.
- *Establish baseline data and ambitious targets for the program's efficiency measure.* The Department is collecting data and will establish baseline data and targets for the performance measure this winter.
- *Post performance data on the program's Web page.* The Department will put performance data on the program Web page once 2006 data are available.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Educational technology State grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part D, Subparts 1 and 2)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1,2</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$267,494	0	-\$267,494

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking legislation.

<sup>2</sup> Section 2404 of the ESEA requires that from the funds appropriated for Subparts 1 and 2 of Part D, at least 98 percent is to be used to carry out Subpart 1 and not more than 2 percent is to be used to carry out Subpart 2. In addition, of the total amount available to carry out Subpart 2 in fiscal years 2002 through 2007, not more than a total of \$15,000 thousand may be used to carry out Section 2421(a).

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Educational Technology State Grants program supports State, district, and school efforts to integrate technology into curricula in order to improve teaching and learning. Local educational agencies (LEAs) use their funds for: (1) professional development to promote the integration of technology into curricula and instruction; (2) public-private partnerships to increase students' and teachers' access to technology; (3) distance learning strategies that deliver academic courses and curricula to areas that otherwise would not have access to those courses and curricula; (4) purchasing effective curricula that use technology; (5) efforts to use technology to improve communication with parents; (6) the preparation of teachers to serve as technology experts in their schools; (7) acquiring and maintaining hardware, software, and connectivity linkages; (8) developing and implementing information technology courses; and (9) using technology to collect, manage, and analyze data. Unless an LEA can demonstrate to the satisfaction of its State educational agency (SEA) that it already provides high-quality professional development on the integration of technology into curricula, it must use at least 25 percent of any formula allocation it receives for that professional development.

Of the total appropriation, the Department first reserves: (1) three-quarters of 1 percent for schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs; (2) one-half of 1 percent for grants to the Outlying Areas; and (3) up to 2 percent for national activities. The remaining funds are allocated to States in proportion to each State's share of funds received that year under Part A of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), except that no State may receive less than one-half of 1 percent of the amount available for all States.

Each SEA must distribute at least 95 percent of its allocation to LEAs. Under the authorizing statute, the SEA uses 50 percent of the amount available to make competitive grants to high-need LEAs (defined as an LEA that (1) has among the highest rates of poverty in the State and (2) operates at least one school identified for improvement under Title I or has a substantial need for assistance in acquiring and using technology) or to partnerships that include at least

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Educational technology State grants

---

one high-need LEA and at least one other entity with expertise in integrating technology effectively into curricula. In making competitive awards, an SEA must give priority to applications from LEAs that receive formula allocations too small to carry out the purposes of the program effectively and must ensure that all awards are of sufficient size and duration to support the purposes of the program effectively. The SEAs distribute the remaining 50 percent to LEAs through a formula based on each LEA's share of funds under ESEA Title I, Part A. However, fiscal year 2006 appropriations language permitted an SEA to award all of the funds competitively, and this flexibility has continued in fiscal year 2007 under the terms of the full-year continuing resolution and under the current 2008 continuing resolution. An SEA may also reserve up to 5 percent of its allocation for administrative expenses, including the costs of conducting the competition, and for State-level activities such as providing technical assistance to grantees and establishing or supporting public-private partnerships to acquire educational technology for high-need LEAs.

To receive funding, each State is required by statute to develop a statewide, long-range educational technology plan. Each plan is required to include descriptions of, among other things: (1) the SEA's goals for using advanced technology to improve student academic achievement; (2) how the SEA will take steps to ensure that all teachers and students in the State have increased access to technology; and (3) the State's strategies for using technology to increase parental involvement.

In addition, the Department may reserve up to 2 percent of the amount appropriated for the program for national activities. The Department has used these funds to conduct a required study on the conditions and practices under which educational technology: (1) is effective in improving student achievement; and (2) increases the ability of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction. Additionally, the Department has used these funds to publish a National Education Technology Plan, host summits on educational technology issues, and support research in the area of educational technology. Lastly, the Department funded awards to 10 States to design, conduct, and publish high-quality evaluations of educational technology programs.

The program is forward funded. 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:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$691,841
2005.....	496,000
2006.....	272,250
2007.....	272,250
2008.....	267,494

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Educational technology State grants

---

#### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Educational Technology State Grants program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The Administration is not recommending reauthorization for this program and, accordingly, the budget provides no funding for it. This request is consistent with the Administration's policy to increase resources for high-priority programs by eliminating categorical programs that have a narrow or limited effect.

Schools today offer a greater level of technology infrastructure than just a few years ago. A recent report from Education Week, *Technology Counts 2007: A Digital Decade*, indicates that the technology landscape in schools has shifted dramatically over the past 10 years, with widespread access to technology and the Internet in schools. Today, nearly all schools have computers with Internet access, and most instructional computers have high-speed Internet connections, as compared to 1997 when only two-thirds had Internet connections of any kind. Further, in 2006, the ratio of students per instructional computer with Internet access in public schools was 3.8 to 1, a decrease from the 12.1 to 1 in 1998. These findings, combined with recent data from the 2005 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) on technology utilization in mathematics instruction, provide evidence of the effective integration of technology in instruction and development of curricula. The 2005 NAEP data indicated that more than 70 percent of 4<sup>th</sup>- and 8<sup>th</sup>-graders had access to computers for mathematics instruction in schools. Further, teachers of 72 percent of 4<sup>th</sup>-graders and 73 percent of 8<sup>th</sup>-graders had access to software, with approximately 20 percent of these teachers having used computers to administer whole-class tests in mathematics.

While many districts continue to have technology-related needs, particularly in training teachers to integrate technology effectively into instruction and in developing curricula, these needs are more appropriately met with other Federal and State resources. The Administration believes that there is no longer a significant need for a Federal formula grant program targeted specifically on (and limited to) education technology. Districts are able to use other Federal program funds to implement education technology and integration activities. For example, under the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program, LEAs may use their funds to implement professional development activities that train teachers and principals to integrate technology into curricula and instruction in order to improve teaching, learning, and technology literacy. Districts may also choose to support the acquisition of technology with funds received under Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies, which provides supplemental education funding to LEAs and schools, particularly those in high-poverty areas, to help raise the achievement of disadvantaged students so that they can meet challenging State academic standards. The flexibility that is available to States, LEAs, and districts under these Federal programs and their ability to meet the emerging technology needs of schools provide additional justification for the Administration's request to eliminate funding for the Educational Technology State Grants program.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Educational technology State grants

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Amount for State grants	\$263,470	\$258,867	0
Range of awards	\$1,317-32,824	\$1,294-30,544	0
Amount for BIE	\$2,001	\$1,966	0
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$1,334	\$1,311	0
National activities set-aside	\$5,445	\$5,350	0

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### **Performance Measures**

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

The primary goal of the Educational Technology State Grants program is to improve the academic achievement of students, particularly students who attend high-poverty or low-performing schools, through the use of technology in schools. The Department established several performance measures to assess the extent to which LEAs receiving substantial amounts of program funds are able to demonstrate that: (1) they have fully and effectively integrated technology into curriculum; (2) teachers have met the State technology standards; and (3) students have met their State's technology literacy standards by the eighth grade. The Department is collecting data for these measures through ED*Facts* data collections, grantee performance reports, and the National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS) surveys. The Department plans to assess the quality and availability of these data in the spring of 2008 to determine the feasibility of establishing baseline and annual performance targets.

**Goal: To facilitate the comprehensive and integrated use of educational technology into instruction and curricula to improve teaching and student achievement.**

**Objective:** *To help ensure that students and teachers in high-poverty, high-need schools have access to educational technology comparable to that of students and teachers in other schools.*

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Educational technology State grants

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage point difference in Internet access between classrooms in high- and low-poverty schools.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	0	5
2006	0	
2007	0	
2008	0	

**Assessment of Progress:** Low-poverty schools are defined as schools with less than 35 percent of their students eligible for free or reduced-price lunches, while high-poverty schools are defined as schools with 75 percent or more of their students eligible. The target for this measure is to have no difference in Internet access between high- and low-poverty schools. Data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) are shown above for 2005. Future performance data, available in early 2008, will be collected through Annual Grantee Performance reports using *EDFacts* and through the NCES survey, *Internet Access in Public Schools and Classrooms*. The Administration is not requesting funding for the Educational Technology State Grant program in fiscal year 2009.

#### Efficiency Measure

The Department developed an efficiency measure to assess the timeliness of the Department's monitoring process, specifically the percentage of monitoring reports that the Department sends within 45 days after a monitoring visit (both on-site and virtual). Baseline data for fiscal year 2007 show that the Department did not issue any monitoring reports within 45 days of an Educational Technology State Grants monitoring visit. The Department has taken steps to initiate a new monitoring protocol that integrates information from five formula grant programs administered by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education into a comprehensive monitoring report. Given that the Department only began to implement this new monitoring protocol in fiscal year 2007, the Educational Technology State Grants program made significant improvement in the time it takes to issue a monitoring report to the States, from 258 days in fiscal year 2006 to 56 days in fiscal year 2007. The Department established a performance target of 50 percent for 2008.

#### Other Performance Information

To assess the implementation of the Educational Technology State Grants program and the extent to which States and districts have created conditions for schools and teachers to use technology effectively in improving teaching and learning, the Department is conducting a national evaluation, the National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS). NETTS is addressing three primary research areas: (1) student and teacher access to technology; (2) teacher preparedness to use technology effectively in their classrooms; and (3) effective integration of technology into curriculum and instruction. The study is also examining the differences in State strategies for the use of program funds, the types of activities supported, and the various approaches that States use to address the needs of low-income children.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### **Educational technology State grants**

---

In early 2007, the Department released a 2-volume report from the study, *National Educational Technology Trends Study: State Strategies and Practices*, which documents State educational technology policies and programs, including the role of the Educational Technology State Grants program in State efforts. Drawing on survey and case study data, the report documents State priorities for educational technology, perceptions of State and district administrators on technology-related needs, and the challenges in the administration of the Educational Technology State Grants program during its first 2 years of operation. The report found that, by 2004, 42 States had student technology standards, with 18 States having “stand-alone” standards, 16 States having technology standards embedded within other academic content standards, and the remaining 8 States having both stand-alone technology standards and embedded standards.

The report also found that a majority of States had not met the second goal of the program, which is to assist students in becoming technologically literate by the end of eighth grade. Only 18 States included student technology literacy as a specific priority for their Educational Technology State Grants and approximately 13 States required applicants to focus specifically on student technology literacy in their competitive grant applications. Further, only two States reported using Statewide assessments of students' proficiency with technology and more than one-third of States reported that they were undecided as to whether, or how, they would assess students' technology literacy in future years. In the area of teachers' use of technology, a majority of States reported having at least minimum standards for teachers' use of technology; yet, few were formally assessing teachers' technology skills at the State level. These data describe only the early phase of implementation, when States were focused on planning and infrastructure development. The Department plans to issue a special data report in spring 2008 to precede the release of the final NETTS evaluation report, which will be available in summer 2008.

The second phase of the NETTS data collection examined district- and school-level data and a second State survey on how the Educational Technology State Grants program works in coordination with other Federal and State educational technology programs and on State programmatic activities, such as professional development, technology integration, and evaluation. Findings from this phase of the data collection and the second survey, along with, trend data and analysis of implementation strategies at the State, district, and school levels, will be included in the final NETTS evaluation report.

Since the NETTS evaluation focused solely on program implementation, it is important to look also at other research that assessed the impacts of technology on student learning and academic achievement. Recently, the Department's Institute of Educational Sciences released first-year findings from a 2-year congressionally mandated study on the effectiveness of educational technology and its impact on student achievement. The study found, on average, after 1 year, no significant differences in standardized-test scores between students who used the selected technology in their classrooms and those who used other methods. For first- and fourth-grade reading products, the study did find several school and classroom characteristics that were correlated with effectiveness, including student-teacher ratios (for first grade) and the amount of time products were used (for fourth grade); however, this same correlation was not found for sixth- grade mathematics or algebra. The second year of the study will examine whether products are more effective when teachers have experience using them and how this

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Educational technology State grants

---

knowledge influences student academic achievement. The final study report will also include separate results for each of the products tested.

#### **Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations**

In 2005, the Educational Technology State Grants program was assessed with the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) and received a rating of "Results Not Demonstrated." The PART review identified several areas in which improvements were needed, such as data collection and evaluation.

The PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address them.

- *Collect data on annual, long-term, and efficiency performance measures and use these data to establish baselines and performance targets.* The Department has established several annual, long-term, and efficiency measures to determine the impact of the program on student achievement and classroom practices. Baseline data are collected from the States through *EDFacts* and the NETTS surveys. The Department plans to assess the quality and availability of data this spring and will determine, at that time, whether it is feasible to establish baseline and annual performance targets.
- *Make program performance information available to the public in a transparent manner.* In early 2007, the Department posted the NCES report *Internet Access in U.S. Public Schools and Classrooms: 1994-2005*, and the 2-volume *State Strategies and Practices for Educational Technology* report on its' website. The Department is also planning to release a special data report on State strategies this spring followed by the release of the final NETTS evaluation report this summer.
- *Work with States to ensure that the program's purpose and goals are understood and data reporting is accurate.* The Department continues to work closely with States through desk and virtual monitoring site visits, and technical assistance calls to ensure that program management expectations and goals are clear and that program, financial, and performance information reported by States is accurate and current. To further support the Department's efforts to strengthen accountability, the Educational Technology State Grants program staff are in the process of drafting guidance, specifically tailored to State-level program staff, on reporting requirements for Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN).

In addition, and also related to the PART findings, the Department, in fiscal year 2004, established a small competitive program to enhance States' capacity to develop and implement rigorous evaluations of educational technology. Through the Evaluating State Educational Technology Programs (ESETP) initiative, 10 States received additional funding, more than \$1 million each over a 3-year period, to conduct rigorous, high-quality State evaluations of educational technology. The ESETP grantees are currently completing final reports and presentations to detail their evaluation process, strategies, and outcomes. The Department plans to disseminate findings from these reports in a series of evaluation case studies in fall 2008.



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning opportunities

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$1,081,166	\$800,000	-\$281,166

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The current 21st Century Community Learning Centers program enables communities to establish or expand centers that provide activities offering extended learning opportunities, such as before- and after-school programs, for students and to provide related services to their families. Centers must target their services primarily to students who attend schools eligible to operate a schoolwide program under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (which are schools with at least a 40 percent child poverty rate) or other schools that serve a high percentage of students from low-income families. In addition to extended learning opportunities, program funds may also be used to provide art and music education activities, recreational activities, telecommunications and technology education programs, expanded library service hours, parental involvement and family literacy programs, and drug and violence prevention activities.

Program funds are allocated by formula to States. Of the total appropriation, the Department reserves: (1) up to 1 percent to carry out national activities; and (2) up to 1 percent for grants to the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and to the Outlying Areas. The Department allocates the remaining funds to States in proportion to each State's share of funds in the previous fiscal year under Part A of Title I. However, no State may receive less than one-half of 1 percent of the total amount available for States.

Each State educational agency (SEA) must award at least 95 percent of its allocation competitively to local educational agencies (LEAs), community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, or other public or private entities that can demonstrate experience, or the promise of success, in providing educational and related activities. In making awards, States give priority to applications that: (1) propose to target services to students who attend schools identified as in need of improvement under Title I; and (2) are submitted jointly by at least one LEA that receives funds under Part A of Title I and at least one community-based organization or other public or private entity. States must make awards of at least \$50,000 per year and for a period of 3 to 5 years.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning opportunities

---

An SEA may reserve up to 2 percent of its allocation for administrative expenses, including the costs of conducting its grants competition. In addition, an SEA may reserve up to 3 percent of its allocation for: (1) monitoring of programs; (2) providing technical assistance and training; and (3) evaluating the effectiveness of the program.

This program is forward funded. 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 as follows:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$999,070
2005.....	991,077
2006.....	981,166
2007.....	981,166
2008.....	1,081,166

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2009 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The Administration seeks to transform the program to better support and expand ongoing State efforts to improve the academic achievement of disadvantaged students. The reformed and renamed 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Opportunities program would give parents the opportunity to select from a greater array of high-quality after-school and summer-school providers, including faith-based and community organizations. Operated as a scholarship program for disadvantaged K-12 students, the program would provide direct aid to families seeking extended-learning opportunities for their children. A key reform of the program is ensuring that these out-of-school opportunities are designed to primarily improve educational achievement consistent with State standards. For fiscal year 2009, the Administration requests \$800 million for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Opportunities program.

Under the reauthorized program, the Department would continue to allocate funding by formula to States, which would award competitive grants to public or private nonprofit organizations (including faith-based and community-organizations) to administer scholarships for students from low-income families who attend schools that have been identified for school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA Title I, or who attend schools with a graduation rate of less than 60 percent. In making awards, the Department would require States and their subgrantees to ensure the high quality of the academic component of the after-school programs at which students use their scholarships, and to ensure that those components are aligned with State educational standards. States would also have to explain in their applications how they would both ensure families could choose from a variety of high-quality providers, including faith-based and community organizations, and how they would align activities funded under this program with supplemental

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning opportunities

---

educational services provided under Title I. In addition, States would be required to award a competitive priority to LEAs that have used the full amount equivalent to 20 percent of their Title I allocation to provide school choice and supplemental educational services to eligible students, and continue to have an additional unmet need for after-school learning opportunities. Although local projects could provide additional activities, such as recreation programs and arts, the primary use of Federal funds would be supporting efforts clearly geared toward generating higher academic achievement of disadvantaged students.

The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program in its current form aims to support local communities in providing students, particularly students who attend schools that have been identified as in need of improvement under Title I, with after-school care and enrichment that reinforces classroom learning. However, a national evaluation of the program and the program's more recent performance data cast doubt on whether the program is achieving results.

The evaluation of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program as it operated prior to the No Child Left Behind Act revealed weaknesses in program implementation and outcomes. Program participants did not attain higher levels of achievement as measured by reading test scores or grades in mathematics, science, social studies, and English compared to students in the control group. The study also found that elementary school students who participated in the program were more likely to feel safe after school, but were also more likely to engage in negative behaviors. Although the Department and the States have worked to improve program quality since that time, available performance data indicate that programs' academic outcomes vary widely. This supports a strategy of reforming the program with a greater emphasis on student achievement.

The experience to date of NCLB's supplemental educational services program demonstrates that after-school initiatives geared toward academic achievement can improve student learning significantly. The 2007 study released by the Department, *State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act: Volume I – Title I School Choice, Supplemental Educational Services, and Student Achievement*, found that students participating in supplemental educational services across 7 districts showed gains in math and reading achievement as measured by State assessments. These gains grew as students participated longer in these programs.

At the request level, the Department would reserve a total of \$8 million for national technical assistance and evaluation activities. The national evaluation and technical assistance activities will focus on the identification of practices that may lead to successful academic outcomes in the after-school setting and the collection and reporting of quality program performance data.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Amount distributed to States	\$961,543	\$1,059,543	\$784,000
Average State award	\$18,491	\$20,376	\$15,077
Range of State awards	\$4,808-\$127,685	\$5,298-\$132,000	\$3,920-\$92,505
Reservation for State activities and administration	\$48,563	\$52,977	\$39,200

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning opportunities

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) – continued

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
National activities and evaluation	\$9,812	\$10,812	\$8,000
Amount for Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Outlying Areas	\$9,812	\$10,812	\$8,000
Students served	1,474,752 <sup>1</sup>	1,625,058 <sup>1</sup>	528,000-990,000 <sup>2</sup>
Number of centers supported	8,460 <sup>1</sup>	9,322 <sup>1</sup>	0

<sup>1</sup> The 2007 and 2008 estimates are based on the actual number of centers and students served in 2006, which are the most recent data available. The number of students served includes all students who participated in a program that received 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funding, and, therefore, includes those who may have infrequently attended (and as little as one time). In addition, 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funds are one of many potential funding sources for these centers; the number of students served therefore does not reflect the impact of Federal funds alone.

<sup>2</sup> The Administration estimates that the average scholarship would be between \$800 and \$1,500 based on the current average cost of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers services and supplemental educational services.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2009 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To establish community learning centers that help students in high-poverty, low-performing schools meet academic achievement standards; to offer a broad array of additional services designed to complement the regular academic program; and to offer families of students opportunities for educational development.**

**Objective:** *Participants in 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.*

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning opportunities

**Measure:** The percentage of regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring.

Year	Target			Actual		
	Elementary Math	Middle or High School Math	Total Math	Elementary Math	Middle or High School Math	Total Math
2004	45.0	45.0	45.0	43.00	38.00	41.00
2005	45.0	45.0	45.0	39.65	36.78	38.82
2006	46.0	46.0	46.0	42.00	42.00	42.00
2007	47.0	47.0	47.0			
2008	50.0	50.0	50.0			
2009	50.0	50.0	50.0			

**Measure:** The percentage of regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring.

Year	Target			Actual		
	Elementary English	Middle or High School English	Total English	Elementary English	Middle or High School English	Total English
2004	45.0	45.0	45.0	47.00	41.00	45.00
2005	45.0	45.0	45.0	42.18	39.79	41.47
2006	46.0	46.0	46.0	42.48	41.07	42.52
2007	47.0	47.0	47.0			
2008	50.0	50.0	50.0			
2009	50.0	50.0	50.0			

**Assessment of progress:** A regular participant is defined as a student who attends the program for 30 days or more during the course of the school year. To report data by grade span for this measure, the data system sorts program performance data by analyzing participant demographic information at the center level (as opposed to the individual student level). For this reason, programs that serve youth of all ages are not included in the columns disaggregated by participant age. The methodology used to report for this measure, therefore, partially explains why the 2006 figures for “Total Math” and “Total English” are higher than those figures disaggregated by grade level. According to data States submitted through the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Profile and Performance Information Collection System, the program made some progress toward the 2006 targets of 46 percent, but did not meet the targets.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning opportunities

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above on State assessments.				
Year	Target		Actual	
	Elementary Reading	Middle or High School Math	Elementary Reading	Middle or High School Math
2004				
2005			30.72	27.20
2006			21.00	13.00
2007	24.00	14.00		
2008	24.00	16.00		
2009	26.00	16.00		

**Assessment of progress:** In 2006, 21 percent of regular elementary school-aged participants improved from not proficient to proficient or above on State assessments in reading, while 13 percent of regular participants who are in middle or high school improved from not proficient to proficient or above on State assessments in math. Targets for 2007, 2008, and 2009 were set based on actual performance in 2005 and 2006.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.						
Year	Target			Actual		
	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall
2004	75	75	75	61.20	65.00	64.08
2005				71.48	68.05	71.08
2006	67	67	67	68.12	66.98	67.94
2007	75	75	75			
2008	80	80	80			
2009	85	85	85			

**Assessment of progress:** The Department changed the method of data collection for this measure in 2004, therefore, no targets were set for 2005. According to data that grantees submitted to the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Profile and Performance Information Collection System, the program made progress on this measure in 2006 and met the targets.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department developed 3 new operational efficiency measures for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century program: (1) the percentage of SEAs that submit complete data on 21st Century program performance measures by the deadline; (2) the average number of days it takes the Department to submit a final monitoring report to an SEA after the conclusion of a site visit; and (3) the average number of weeks a State takes to resolve compliance findings in a monitoring visit report. The baselines for these measures will be set in October 2008.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning opportunities

---

#### Other Performance Information

The 21st Century program under the No Child Left Behind Act reauthorization, as opposed to the antecedent authorization, focuses more on promoting students' academic achievement. In 2003, the Department began a rigorous impact evaluation of the new program, supported by national activities funds. This study: (1) developed two after-school interventions (one each in math and reading) that are based on sound theory or that have scientific evidence in a related area; and (2) will test their effectiveness through experimental studies. The first report for this study is expected this spring.

In addition to the impact evaluation, the Department is analyzing data from a nationally representative sample of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs to evaluate State and local program implementation. This study focuses on how, and to what extent, funds support high-quality programs that emphasize academic content. The study also examines project activities to improve academic outcomes and maintain student engagement in programs, and how they link with State and Federal education goals. The report from this evaluation will be available in spring 2008.

#### Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers program was among the programs rated with the PART in 2003. The program received an "Adequate" rating, with high scores for purpose, planning, and management but weaknesses cited in program results and accountability measures. The PART review credited the program's strong evaluation component and provision of technical assistance responding to evaluation findings.

The PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address them.

- *Hold States accountable for meeting program performance goals.* The Department, through a contract with Learning Point Associates, developed a Web-based reporting instrument for monitoring grantee and sub-grantee performance. The program office expects to monitor 10 States (including local projects in those States) in school year 2007-08 and another 5 States in school year 2008-09. The program office will use data collected during monitoring visits to determine whether grantees are meeting program goals and will work with States to develop improvement plans when needed.
- *Support research on after-school models that effectively improve student achievement.* The Department, through a contract with the National Partnership for Quality Afterschool Learning, is evaluating promising after-school programs at three locations. The evaluations are focusing on content-area instruction and linkages with the school day. The Department will release preliminary results in March 2008 and final results in July. In addition, the Institute of Education Sciences is conducting impact evaluations of one math and one reading program implemented in the after-school setting. The interim report of this study will be released in March 2008.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning opportunities

---

- *Develop a meaningful efficiency measure for the program, collect performance information, and set performance targets for the measure.* The Department established three efficiency measures and will set the baselines for the measures in 2008.



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Javits gifted and talented education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 6)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): 0 <sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$7,463	0	-\$7,463

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension for all Title V, Part D activities applies through September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Student Education program supports research, demonstration projects, and other activities designed to build and enhance the ability of elementary and secondary schools to meet the educational needs of gifted and talented students. The Department awards competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), institutions of higher education, and other public and private agencies and organizations.

Grants are awarded under two priorities: (1) research and development and (2) SEA/LEA capacity building. Five-year research and development grants support initiatives to develop and improve model programs serving students who are underrepresented in gifted and talented education. At least half of the applications approved for funding each year must address the priority of serving populations of students who may not be identified as gifted and talented through traditional assessment methods. Three-year SEA and LEA capacity-building grants support State and local efforts to improve services for gifted and talented students. The program statute mandates that funds appropriated in excess of \$7.5 million, the fiscal year 2001 level, be competitively awarded to State educational agencies or one or more local educational agencies to improve services and develop their capacity to serve gifted and talented students more effectively.

The program also supports the National Research Center for the Education of Gifted and Talented Children and Youth. Not more than 30 percent of program funds may be used to support the Center.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Javits gifted and talented education

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$11,111
2005.....	11,022
2006.....	9,596
2007.....	7,596
2008 .....	7,463

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Javits Gifted and Talented Student Education program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The Administration is not recommending reauthorization for this program and, accordingly, the budget provides no funding for it. This recommendation is part of an overall Administration strategy to increase resources for high-priority programs by eliminating small categorical programs that have a narrow or limited effect.

The vast majority of gifted and talented education programs in the United States are carried out without Federal support. There is little evidence that, by annually funding a handful of projects, the Javits program has been effective in advancing gifted and talented education nationally, identifying the most effective practices in gifted and talented education, or bringing about improvements in the field. To the contrary, after almost a decade of operation, the effectiveness of the projects that have been funded in meeting the needs of gifted and talented students remains unknown.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<b>Research and demonstration activities</b>			
Funding for new awards	0	\$2,645	0
Number of new awards	0	6	0
Average new award	0	\$441	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$2,766	\$3,002	0
Number of continuation awards	6	6	0
Average continuation award	\$461	\$500	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$75	0
Research and development center	\$1,741	\$1,741	0

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Javits gifted and talented education

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) – continued

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<b>SEA/LEA capacity-building grants</b>			
Funding for continuation awards	\$3,089	0	0
Number of continuation awards	13	0	0
Average continuation award	\$238	0	0

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

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

The Department has established three measures to assess the impact of the program. These measures focus on the quality of project designs, professional development, and significant academic achievement in targeted student populations. The Department collects data for these measures every 2 years by convening an expert panel of scientists and practitioners to review information from a sample of annual performance reports and self-evaluations prepared by grantees. Baselines for these measures were set in 2005 and 2006.

The Department has established the following goal and performance indicators to assess the impact of the Javits program:

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

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

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Javits Gifted and Talented Education project designs for effective professional development focusing on gifted and talented education with average reviewer ratings for quality of high and above.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2005</b>		90
<b>2006</b>	91	
<b>2007</b>	92	100
<b>2008</b>	93	

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Javits gifted and talented education

---

**Assessment of Progress:** In 2005, the baseline year, 90 percent of the 10 sampled projects received ratings of high or above for effective designs for professional development focusing on gifted and talented education. In 2007, 100 percent of the five sampled projects received such a rating, exceeding the target of 92 percent. The Administration is not requesting funding for the Javits gifted and Talented Education program in fiscal year 2009, so now targets are shown.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of new evidence-based Javits Gifted and Talented Education project designs with average reviewer ratings for quality of high and above.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		70
2006	71	
2007	72	100
2008	73	

**Assessment of Progress:** In 2005, the baseline year, 70 percent of the 10 sampled projects received ratings of high or above for quality of evidence-based project designs. In 2007, 100 percent of the 5 sampled projects received such a rating, exceeding the target of 72 percent. The Administration is not requesting funding for the Javits gifted and Talented Education program in fiscal year 2009, so now targets are shown.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Javits Gifted and Talented Education projects with significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		90
2007	91	100
2008	92	

**Assessment of Progress:** In 2006, the baseline year for this measure, 90 percent of the 10 sampled projects showed significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations. Although the expert panel rated 90 percent of the projects as showing significant gains in student academic achievement, it noted, among other things, that the program needed better empirical measures for judging how high-ability students improve and that most project evaluations were not structured to compare achievement results with a control group. The panel suggested that program staff work with the projects on developing and reporting valid and reliable student achievement data that would help measure the impact of specialized gifted and talented curricula on student learning. In response, the Department conducted site visits and additional monitoring to identify projects in need of technical assistance and is working with projects to ensure the collection of reliable achievement data in accordance with original grant proposals. In 2007, 100 percent of the 5 sampled projects demonstrated significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations, exceeding the target of 91 percent. The Administration is not requesting funding for the Javits gifted and Talented Education program in fiscal year 2009, so no targets are shown.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Foreign language assistance

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 9)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$25,655	\$25,655	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension for all Title V, Part D activities applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Foreign Language Assistance program (FLAP) supports competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) and State educational agencies (SEAs) to increase the quality and quantity of foreign language instruction in the United States. Under this program, the Department makes 3-year grants to SEAs to promote systemic improvement of foreign language instruction in the State and 3-year grants to LEAs for model programs of instruction that exhibit the capability to continue beyond the grant period. At least three-quarters of the appropriation must be used for the expansion of foreign language education in the elementary grades. Grant recipients provide a 50 percent match from non-Federal sources. If an LEA demonstrates sufficient hardship, the Department may waive the matching requirement.

The statute also authorizes the "foreign language incentive" program, to make formula payments to public elementary schools that provide students with a program designed to lead to communicative competency in a foreign language. Schools are to receive payments on the basis of the number of elementary school students enrolled in foreign language classes for 45 minutes a day, at least 4 days a week. Although, by statute, a portion of the annual appropriation for Foreign Language Assistance is to be used for these grants, in most years, at the Administration's request, the Congress has included appropriations language to exclude funding for the incentive program.

For fiscal year 2008, the Congress provided approximately \$2.36 million for 5-year grants to LEAs, in partnership with institutions of higher education (IHEs), for the establishment or expansion of articulated programs of study in critical-need languages. These new grants will be designed to enable students, as they advance through college, to attain a superior level of proficiency in languages critical to U.S. national security and economic prosperity.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Foreign language assistance

---

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$16,546
2005.....	17,856
2006.....	21,780
2007.....	23,780
2008.....	25,655

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$25.7 million for FLAP in fiscal year 2009, the same as the fiscal year 2008 level. This request would support the Administration's goal of all students learning a second language. It also is consistent with the Administration's policy of investing in efforts to expand K-12 and postsecondary instruction in critical foreign languages through the National Security Language Initiative (NSLI). Those are languages most critical for national security and future national economic prosperity.

In many countries outside of the U.S., students are required to study a foreign language and to begin studying them at an earlier age. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) reported, in 2002, that the United States is the only industrialized Nation to routinely graduate students with proficiency in just one language. Only 18 States have any kind of graduation requirement for foreign language study. The 1979 report of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, *Strength Through Wisdom*, concluded that a monolingual society is greatly disadvantaged in dealing with foreign powers, particularly developing Nations. Since the release of that report, being proficient in more than one language, including the less frequently taught or critical languages, has become even more important. This request reflects the need to provide additional support to States and school districts to develop and expand foreign language programs so that all students have an opportunity to learn a second language well, including critical foreign languages.

While the FLAP program would continue to support the teaching of languages traditionally taught in U.S. schools, the Administration's request reflects the need to encourage fluency in the following critical languages: Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Russian, and languages in the Indic, Iranian, and Turkic language families. The Department would continue the policy, begun in 2006, of awarding a competitive priority to applications for projects that would support the teaching and learning of critical foreign languages in order to promote national security and economic development. Grants would be made to LEAs to develop an infrastructure of standards and curriculum for instruction in foreign languages that are critical due to homeland security concerns and globalization of the world economy. Grants would also be made to SEAs to build States' capacity to provide critical foreign language instruction programs. In addition, beginning in fiscal year 2008, the Department will award grants to partnerships of LEAs and IHEs in order to create programs of study that will support students' study of critical foreign languages beginning in the elementary grades through the postsecondary level. The budget request would expand this initiative in 2009.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Foreign language assistance

---

The Administration's emphasis on the teaching and learning of critical foreign languages is especially important because they are not frequently taught in grades K-12, especially in a sequential program that leads to proficiency and fluency. According to a 2002 report, *Foreign Language Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools*, published by ACTFL, in partnership with the National Center for Education Statistics, in 2000 only 44 percent of American high school students were enrolled in foreign language classes. Of those students, 69 percent were enrolled in Spanish, 18 percent in French, 5 percent in German, 3 percent in Latin, 1 percent in Italian, and less than 1 percent each in Japanese and Russian. Chinese, Korean, and Arabic were taken so infrequently that the report did not include enrollment levels for those languages.

By statute, at least three-quarters of FLAP grant funds must be used for the expansion of foreign language education in the elementary grades. According to a national survey of elementary schools by the Center for Applied Linguistics, in 1997, only 31 percent of elementary schools (and 24 percent of public elementary schools) reported teaching foreign languages. Of those schools, 79 percent offered programs to give students an introductory exposure to the language, 21 percent offered programs having overall proficiency as one of the goals, and only 7 percent offered instruction in which fluency was the goal.

As in 2007, the Senate Appropriations Committee report accompanying the fiscal year 2008 bill directs the Department not to make grants to schools that are replacing current traditional language programs with critical-need language instruction. The Department will comply with this directive in 2008 and will implement the same policy in 2009.

The Foreign Language Assistance Program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2009 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

The budget request would continue the policy of not funding the incentive program in fiscal year 2009. The Administration's reauthorization proposal recommends elimination of the Incentive Grants authority. The Administration does not recommend any other significant changes to the program through reauthorization.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<u>SEA Grants</u>			
Number of new grants	0	0	5
Funding for new grants	0	0	\$750
Number of continuing grants	15	4	0
Funding for continuing grants	\$2,020	\$163	0

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Foreign language assistance

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) – continued

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<u>LEA Grants</u>			
Number of new grants	51	0	35
Funding for new grants	\$8,748	0	\$7,214
Number of continuing grants	69	119	62
Funding for continuing grants	\$13,009	\$23,062	\$10,256
<u>LEA-IHE Partnership Grants</u>			
Number of new grants	0	12	25
Funding for new grants	0	\$2,360	\$5,000
Number of continuing grants	0	0	12
Funding for continuing grants	0	0	\$2,360
Peer review of new award applications	\$3	\$70	\$75

#### 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 results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2009 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: Assist local and State educational agencies in establishing, improving, or expanding foreign language study for elementary and secondary school students.**

**Objective:** Increase the percentage of Foreign Language Assistance program projects that report improvements in proficiency in a foreign language for students served in the project, based on project-developed targets.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Foreign Language Assistance projects that report improvements in proficiency in a foreign language for program participants.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		65.0
2005	50	80.0
2006	75	73.5
2007	75	
2008	75	
2009	75	



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Foreign language assistance

---

**Assessment of progress:** In 2003, the Department revised the performance indicator to measure the percentage of projects that report significant improvements in proficiency in a foreign language for three-quarters of participating students. All LEA projects now report data for this measure. Projects typically collect data for this measure through comparisons of pre- and post-tests or through portfolio assessments.

In 2005, the program office encouraged grantees to establish measurable criteria for determining whether or not their program participants had improved during the year. More projects have set such criteria, which may have contributed to the slight decline in project performance in 2006.

### Other Performance Information

In 2004, the Department funded a contract with the Center for Applied Linguistics to produce a report that provides information for current and prospective FLAP grantees to help them write more coherent proposals and follow through with project activities in a manner that will be useful to the profession. The report included: (1) accepted definitions of foreign language program models, so that everyone uses the same terminology, (2) resources on assessment instruments for K-8 language programs to help schools select the most appropriate measures for their needs, (3) student proficiency goals that may be achieved by each instructional model, so that realistic program goals may be set, and (4) a template for an effective program evaluation and a recommended standard format for reporting progress and outcomes in the Annual Performance Report submitted by FLAP grantees.

Additionally, this program has been among the programs that receive help from the Department's Data Quality Initiative (DQI), which provides technical assistance to selected programs to promote and increase the capacity of Department staff and grantees to obtain better outcome information from grant programs. The contractor has been working with the Department to strengthen outcome measures, identify and address data deficiencies, and improve processes and reporting instruments so that the Department can collect uniformly high-quality data from grantees.

The DQI contractor has also been working with the Department to develop measures that are appropriate for SEA projects and more informative for LEA projects than the current, single measure. The following are the four revised objectives and measures for the LEA projects, to be implemented beginning in 2008:

**Objective:** *To expand foreign language study for students served by FLAP.*

The first measure under this objective is the number of students participating in foreign language instruction in the target language(s) in the schools served by FLAP. The second measure under this objective is the number of minutes of foreign language instruction in the target language(s) provided in the schools served by FLAP.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Foreign language assistance

---

**Objective:** *To expand foreign language study in critical languages for students served by FLAP.*

The measure under this objective is the number of students participating in critical languages in the schools served by FLAP.

**Objective:** *To improve the foreign language proficiency of students served by FLAP.*

The measure is the number of students in FLAP projects who meet ambitious project objectives for foreign language proficiency.

The following objective and two measures have been proposed for the SEA projects:

**Objective:** *To improve foreign language teaching.*

The measures are the number of teachers in the State receiving training as a result of the FLAP SEA project and the number of schools that use the assessments, standards, or curriculum developed by the FLAP SEA projects in the State.

Program staff and the contractor are in the process of developing and obtaining OMB approval for a unique annual performance report that includes these measures. The Department will also include these revised measures in the fiscal year 2008 grant competition application.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### State assessments

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$408,732	\$408,732	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB Act), requires States to test all students annually in grades 3 through 8 and once in high school in reading and mathematics, and to develop and administer annual assessments in science for each of three grade spans specified in the law by the end of school year 2007-08. Furthermore, States must assess the English proficiency of all limited English proficient students annually. 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 currently required for the determination of adequate yearly progress.

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, and poverty, disability, English proficiency, and migrant status. The annual assessments also provide a critical diagnostic tool for teachers and parents to use in improving instruction and meet specific student needs.

The Grants for State Assessments program, authorized by Section 6111, provides formula grants to States to pay the costs of developing standards and assessments required by the ESEA and, once a State has put in place such standards and assessments, to pay for the administration of the assessments. Funds also may be used to develop standards and assessments in subjects other than those required by the ESEA and to improve the reliability and validity of assessment systems. Other allowable uses include expanding the range of testing accommodations for students with disabilities and limited English proficient students, professional development aligned with State standards and assessments, and the development of information and reporting systems.

Under the funding formula, 0.5 of 1 percent of the appropriation is reserved for the Bureau of Indian Education and 0.5 of 1 percent goes to the Outlying Areas. From the remaining funds,

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### State assessments

---

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 the Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments program, a competitive grant program that makes 18-month 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 28 awards under the Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments program.

State Assessments 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 as follows:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$390,000
2005.....	411,860
2006.....	407,563
2007.....	407,563
2008.....	408,732

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2009, the Administration requests \$408.7 million for State Assessments, the same as the 2008 level. The State Assessments program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2009 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. Funds for State formula grants would support development of new annual assessments in reading and mathematics for two additional high school grades, extending to the high school level the level of assessment that, in grades three through eight, has been at the center of school accountability under the No Child Left Behind Act. These assessments would have to be aligned with college and work-ready standards, including aligned course-level outcomes. The new high school testing requirements are part of the Administration's proposal for the reauthorization of the ESEA. The requested level of funding would give States resources to implement the additional high school assessments by the end of school year 2012-2013.

In addition to the funds requested above for State Assessments, the Administration is requesting \$10 million under the Fund for the Improvement of Education: Programs of National Significance in the Innovation and Improvement account, to support States' work on assessment systems that are used for accountability purposes and to help improve student performance. That request provides \$5 million to support awards to provide technical

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### State assessments

---

assistance to States to help them improve student assessments. The remaining \$5 million would support a new initiative that would provide competitive grants to LEAs or SEAs in partnership with LEAs, to develop comprehensive assessment systems at the LEA level to improve classroom instruction and encourage and measure student achievement.

#### High School Assessments

The Administration's request for State Assessments includes \$400 million for the development and implementation of annual assessments at the high school level. State assessments have been a key component of the education reform efforts supported by NCLB. The State Assessments program funded the development and implementation of the statewide annual assessments in reading and mathematics of students in every grade from 3<sup>rd</sup> grade through 8<sup>th</sup> grade, and once in high school, and the statewide assessments in science in three grade spans that must be in place by the end of school year 2007-08. The data from those assessments have been key to determining which schools and districts need additional help and resources to enable all children to reach the State's achievement standards. Assessment data have also been used to inform instruction and determine which students need additional assistance to succeed in school.

The proposed high school assessments would also support the call by the National Governors Association and many others to restore value to the high school diploma. In 2007, Achieve, Inc. reported an increase in the number of States that have joined its American Diploma Project (ADP) Network to work on closing the gap between expectations students are held to in high schools and those they will encounter in the workplace and in postsecondary education. A 2005 survey, conducted by Achieve, found that employers, colleges, and students themselves think many students graduate from high school without needed skills. The surveyed employers estimated that 41 percent of high school graduates were not sufficiently prepared in mathematics and 38 percent were not sufficiently prepared in writing. In addition, many high school graduates who enroll in postsecondary education are not ready to for college-level work. The Department's 2004 *Condition of Education* report showed that 28 percent of college students who were freshmen in the fall of 2000 enrolled in remedial courses in reading, writing, or mathematics.

Achieve's 2007 report, *Closing the Expectations Gap*, found that while many States report that they are working to align their high school standards with workplace and college expectations, States are lagging on actually measuring whether students are ready for the demands of life after high school. However, 9 States reported administering college readiness tests to all high school students, and 21 other States reported that they expect to do so in the future. Achieve also reported that 13 States have instituted end-of-course tests at the high school level in order to ensure that students have mastered their academic coursework and that 16 more plan to develop such tests. The report concludes that States need better assessment and data systems to hold high schools accountable for students' work and college readiness.

However, although some States now assess high school students several times during a student's high school career, many States do not, or they do not test enough students to make these high school assessments a true gauge of the achievement of all their students and the performance of all their schools. They do not collect the information needed to hold schools

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### State assessments

---

accountable and address individual student needs at a time when many high school students leave school without the skills they need to succeed in either college or the workplace.

A requirement for States to develop and implement assessments in two additional high school grades in reading/language arts and mathematics is a key element of the Administration's strategy for using the ESEA reauthorization to drive NCLB reforms to the high school level. It complements our proposal to drive additional Title I resources to high schools. Without the additional assessments, high schools would have only a single measure (generally an assessment aligned with only 9<sup>th</sup>- or 10<sup>th</sup>-grade standards) for measuring the achievement of students and targeting additional Title I funds where the needs are greatest. LEAs would have only limited information on the performance and needs of high schools identified for improvement. The additional assessments will provide much richer information, enabling a wiser, more strategic use of the Title I funds.

In addition, States can use fiscal year 2009 funds for other activities authorized in the statute, such as refining their existing assessments for using longitudinal assessment data under a growth-based accountability model or developing ways to increase the validity and reliability of the assessments.

### Enhanced Assessment Instruments

The request includes \$8.7 million to fund Enhanced Assessment Instruments grants that will assist States in improving the quality of their assessments for limited English proficient (LEP) students and students with disabilities and add to the knowledge base about properly assessing these students. The Department would maintain a competitive preference for applications that propose to address the assessment of students with disabilities and limited English proficient students for the fiscal year 2009 competition.

States are still struggling with implementation of high-quality assessment instruments that produce reliable and valid information about all students. A July 2006 report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) noted that, while the majority of States offer some accommodations to try to increase the validity and reliability of assessment results for LEP students, there is limited research on the appropriate use of accommodations with this population. The report also found that many States are facing challenges in establishing the validity and reliability of the English language proficiency assessments they are developing.

Partly in response to that report, the Department launched its "LEP Partnership" initiative to help States improve assessments of English proficiency, reading, and mathematics for LEP students. This initiative, conducted in partnership with the National Council of La Raza, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the Comprehensive Center on Assessment and Accountability, and the National Center on English Language Acquisition, has initiated work on six technical assistance projects to help States improve assessments for LEP students. The projects include a framework for developing high-quality English language proficiency standards and assessments and guides for implementing a range of accommodations for assessing LEP students.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### State assessments

---

Enhanced Assessment Instruments grants funds will also assist States' implementation of modified assessments for students with disabilities. On April 9, 2007, the Department published new rules allowing States to use modified assessments based on modified achievement standards for students with disabilities who are eligible to be assessed in such a manner. The new guidelines reflect the latest scientific research showing that certain students with disabilities—approximately 2 percent of all students—can make progress toward grade-level standards when they receive high-quality instruction and are assessed with alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards; this is a separate policy from the earlier regulation that allows up to 1 percent of all students being tested (those with the most significant cognitive disabilities) to take an alternate assessment. The request for Enhanced Assessment Instruments grants will help support States' efforts in developing these modified assessments based on modified achievement standards.

To date, the Department has supported a wide variety of projects that have addressed the needs of LEP students or students with disabilities, including projects that investigated improved assessments of English proficiency, the validity of accommodations or other strategies, and the technical adequacy of assessment strategies for these two populations.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<b>Grants for State Assessments</b>			
Estimated number of awards	52	52	52
Average award	\$7,615	\$7,615	\$7,615
BIE and Outlying Areas	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
<b>Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments</b>			
Amount for new awards	\$7,488	\$8,657	\$8,657
Number of new awards	6	7	7
Range of awards	\$1,000-\$2,000	\$1,000-2,000	\$1,000-2,000
Peer review of new award applications	\$75	\$75	\$75

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2009 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### State assessments

---

**Goal:** To support States in the development of State assessments.

**Objective:** All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics in grades three through eight and high school, all of which are aligned with their content specific academic content standards.

<b>Measure:</b> The number of States (including DC and PR) that have reading/language arts and mathematics assessments that align with the State's academic content standards for all students in grades three through eight and in high school.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	Set a Baseline	0
2005	18	0
2006	52	52
2007	52	51
2008	52	
2009	52	

**Source of data:** Department of Education, Standards and Assessment External Peer Review Process, Title I review processes, staff recommendations, and decisions by the Secretary. This measure includes only assessments that have full, expected, or pending Department approval as meeting the requirements of No Child Left Behind.

**Assessment of progress:** In 2005, the Department began formal peer reviews of State standards and assessment systems. These reviews determine whether a State has met each of the requirements specified in the authorizing statute. The Department determines whether to approve State assessment systems based on the outcome of those reviews. To date, the Department has conducted reviews of all States and has granted "full approval" to 30 States; full approval means that the State's standards and assessment system meets all requirements. Five States have been categorized as "approval expected"; these are States where the evidence to date suggests that a State is fully compliant with the requirements, but certain minor elements may not have been complete by July 1, 2007, due to the nature of the assessment development process. The Department has placed conditions on the Title I, Part A grant awards for these States, and they must complete their work on the assessments before administering them in school year 2007-08.

The Department also placed conditions on the Title I, Part A grant awards for the remaining States. Sixteen States received "approval pending" status. Eight States are in this category because of significant issues with their alternate assessment based on alternate standards or assessments for LEP students. These States have been placed under mandatory oversight status, which requires the States to formally submit to the Department a timeline detailing what the State will do to come into compliance with the assessment requirements within one year. Eight States received "approval pending" status because of significant issues with assessments and need another two to three years to come into full compliance with the statutory requirements; these States must enter into a compliance agreement with the Department.



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### State assessments

---

One State has been categorized as having “no status.” This State has submitted additional evidence that may be able to address the outstanding issues with its assessment system, but the Department has not yet determined whether the evidence meets that test; for that reason, the Department has not yet assigned an approval status to this State.

**Goal: To support States in the development of State assessments.**

**Objective:** *By school year 2007-2008, all States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (three through five, six through eight, and high school) in science, all of which are aligned with their content specific academic content standards.*

<b>Measure:</b> The number of States (including DC and PR) that have science assessments that align with the State's academic content standards for all students in each grade span (grades 3 through 5, 6 through 8, and high school).		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	18	
2006	15	5
2007	25	5
2008	52	
2009	52	

**Source of data:** Department of Education, Standards and Assessment External Peer Review Process, Title I review processes, staff recommendations, and decisions by the Secretary. This measure includes only assessments that have full, expected, or pending Department approval as meeting the requirements of No Child Left Behind.

<b>Measure:</b> The number of States (including DC and PR) that have completed field-testing of the required assessments in science.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		19
2005		24
2006	20	26
2007	52	51
2008	52	
2009	52	

**Source of data:** Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Reports; State Web sites; monitoring visits.

**Assessment of progress:** The first measure tracks the number of States that have approved science assessments, and the other tracks States' completion of field-testing of the science assessments (a significant milestone toward implementation of those assessments). In 2007, the program fell slightly short of the target of 52 States completing field-testing of the required assessments in science; only 51 States have done the testing. In addition, 5 States had had

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### State assessments

---

their science assessments approved by the Department in 2007, the same number as in 2006 but short of 2007 target of 25. The deadline for completion of science assessments is school year 2007-08.

In 2007 the Department set new measures for the Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments program. Those measures assess the extent that funded projects produce significant research regarding assessments, in particular regarding accommodations and alternate assessments for students with disabilities, and whether grantees disseminate information on advancements in assessments resulting from the Enhanced Assessment Grants. The Department will develop a plan for collecting data for these measures in 2008.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department 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. The target for this measure is 90 business days or less.

Year	Target	Actual
2006	90	60.45
2007	90	56
2008	To be determined	
2009	To be determined	

**Assessment of progress:** The average number of days to issue an initial decision letter to a State decreased between 2006 and 2007, from 60.45 business days to 56, well below the target of 90 business days.

### Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

This program was rated as “Adequate” in the PART review conducted in 2004. The review found that the program has a clear purpose and need, is managed well, provides effective technical assistance to grantees, and collects and uses data to assess whether States are on track to meet the statutory deadlines. However, the review noted that the program’s administration needed to be more transparent and that, because evidence was lacking on the program’s accomplishments, the Department needed to develop milestones to track full implementation of the assessment systems required under NCLB.

The PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department’s actions to address them.

- *Assess whether State data collection systems are adequate for NCLB accountability purposes.* The Department determined that every State is producing the report cards required under NCLB and is making them available to the public. All States are also identifying schools and LEAs in need of improvement. In addition, the Department will require States to report data electronically through the ED*Facts* system as of fiscal year 2008 (with a 2-year transition for States that do not yet have that electronic capability).

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### State assessments

---

- *Issue guidance and provide technical assistance to States on developing, and preparing for peer review, modified assessments for students with disabilities.* The Department is completing guidance for States and peer reviewers to use in evaluating the critical elements of modified assessment systems and plans to provide technical assistance to all interested States by the end of 2008.
- *Conduct additional reviews of State assessment systems in 2007-08 to ensure that science assessments meet NCLB requirements.* The Department will conduct additional reviews of State's science assessments in January, March, and the fall of 2008 and will schedule rolling peer reviews as necessary. The Department will review science assessments following the same process it used to review reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.
- *Identify States that have made substantive changes to elements of their approved assessment system and conduct peer reviews to ensure all elements of their updated assessment system continue to meet NCLB requirements.* The Department plans to identify States that have made substantive changes to their assessment system and need to submit elements of their revised system for peer review. The Department will conduct reviews in 2008 and is currently defining the extent of change necessary to require resubmission for peer review, such as changes to academic or performance standards, changes to approved assessments, and development and implementation of new assessments.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Education for homeless children and youths

(McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$64,067	\$64,067	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

To ensure that all homeless children and youth have equal access to the same free, appropriate public education available to other children, the Education for Homeless Children and Youth program provides assistance to States, Outlying Areas, and the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) to: (1) establish or designate an Office of Coordinator of Education of Homeless Children and Youths; (2) develop and carry out a State plan for the education of homeless children; and (3) make subgrants to local educational agencies to support the education of those children.

The Department allocates funds to States through a formula based on each State's share of Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies. Each State receives a minimum annual award that is the greater of \$150,000, 0.25 percent of the total, or the amount of the State's fiscal year 2001 award. Under a Memorandum of Agreement with the Department, the BIE receives 1 percent of the appropriation to serve homeless children and youth attending schools funded by the Bureau. The Department is also authorized to reserve 0.1 percent of each year's appropriation for grants to the Outlying Areas and to withhold funds sufficient to conduct technical assistance (if requested by a State educational agency (SEA)), evaluation, and dissemination activities.

A State may reserve up to 25 percent (or in the case of States receiving the minimum award, 50 percent) of its formula grant for State-level activities. With the remaining funds, it must make subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs). LEAs have considerable flexibility in using their subgrant funds, and may use them for such activities as providing enriched supplemental instruction, transportation, professional development, referrals to health care, and other services to facilitate the enrollment, attendance, and success in school of homeless children, including preschool-aged children, and youth.

The McKinney-Vento Act explicitly prohibits States that receive program funds from segregating homeless students in separate schools, except for short periods of time for health and safety emergencies or to provide temporary, special, supplementary services. However, it exempts from that prohibition separate schools for homeless children or youth operating in fiscal

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Education for homeless children and youths

---

year 2000 in four counties (San Joaquin, Orange, and San Diego counties in California, and Maricopa County in Arizona) if those schools and their districts meet certain requirements. This 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 through September 30 of the following year.

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$59,646
2005.....	62,496
2006.....	61,871
2007.....	61,871
2008.....	64,067

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2009, the Administration requests \$64.1 million for the Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, the same amount as the 2008 level. The funds help maintain services to an especially disadvantaged population that is difficult to identify and serve. Funds support the activities of State coordinators and State subgrants to LEAs. In addition, from the total amount, \$555,000 would support the continuation of technical assistance, evaluation, and dissemination activities. Currently, the National Center for Homeless Education, which is operated by the SERVE Center at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, receives these set-aside funds to provide assistance to States and LEAs to help them carry out program activities.

This program is an important component of the national effort to end the cycle of homelessness. It also addresses the goals of the No Child Left Behind Act by giving States needed assistance in providing homeless children and youth with learning opportunities that enable them to make significant academic progress. Toward that end, the program facilitates the enrollment of homeless students in school and gives them access to services available to other children, such as preschool programs, special education, gifted and talented programs, and career and technical education. Homeless children face many barriers that impede their educational access and success, such as immunization, transportation, and guardianship requirements. This program helps to reduce and eliminate those barriers.

The Education for Homeless Children and Youth program is authorized by the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and is subject to reauthorization. The request assumes enactment of the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

The Administration is proposing several minor amendments to the program's authorization, including one concerning the percentage of funds that SEAs may reserve for State-level activities. Under the current law, a State that receives an allocation greater than the State minimum (\$150,000) must subgrant competitively to LEAs at least 75 percent of its allocation, but a State that receives the minimum State allocation must subgrant competitively to LEAs only

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Education for homeless children and youths

---

50 percent of its allocation. When the McKinney-Vento Act was reauthorized in 2001, nine States were minimally funded and were, therefore, authorized to reserve 50 percent of their funds for State activities, which include providing for a State coordinator for the homeless education program, providing technical assistance to local districts, training local liaisons, holding competitions and issuing subgrants to LEAs, and conducting compliance monitoring. However, all States now receive more than the \$150,000 minimum and, therefore, some have had to reduce funds for State-level activities. Some States went from having \$75,000 for State-level activities to \$38,000, which greatly affects the SEAs' capacity to provide technical assistance throughout the State. The Administration is proposing an amendment to allow States to retain, for State-level activities, the greater of 25 percent of their allocation or \$85,000.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Average State award	\$1,166	\$1,208	\$1,208
Evaluation and dissemination	555	555	555
Amount to Outlying Areas	62	64	64
Amount to BIE	619	641	641

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2009 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Until 2002, the performance measures for this program focused on increasing the enrollment and attendance of homeless children and youth. Data provided by SEAs to support those measures showed that, in 2001, 87 percent of homeless children and youth were enrolled in school, a significant increase over previous years. In 2003, the Department revised the performance measures to place stronger emphasis on educational outcomes.

**Goal: To ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education as is provided to other children and youth.**

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Education for homeless children and youths

---

**Objective:** Homeless children and youth will have greater access to a free and appropriate public education.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of homeless children and youth, grades three through eight, included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics, as reported by LEA subgrantees.				
Year	Target – Reading	Actual – Reading	Target – Math	Actual – Math
2005	Baseline	50	Baseline	49
2006	53	55	52	54
2007	60		60	
2008	63		63	
2009	66		66	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of homeless students, grades three through eight, who meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics.				
Year	Target – Reading	Actual – Reading	Target – Math	Actual – Math
2004	Baseline	36	Baseline	36
2005	34	42	26	41
2006	43	45	43	45
2007	50		50	
2008	52		52	
2009	55		55	

Source: U.S. Department of Education, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act Annual Report

**Assessment of progress:** In 2006, the targets for all four of the performance measures were exceeded. The 2007 data should be available this spring.

#### Efficiency Measure

The Department established one efficiency measure for the Education for Homeless Children and Youth program: the number of days it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring visits.

Year	Target	Actual
2005	Baseline	46
2006	44	43
2007	41	
2008	40	
2009	40	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department met the 2006 target. The 2007 data should be available early this year.

#### Other Performance Information

The program statute requires States to collect, and submit to the Department, data related to the nature and extent of problems homeless children and youths experience in gaining access

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Education for homeless children and youths

---

to a free, appropriate public education. The Department has been working with States to create uniform standards for data collection. In addition, the Department submitted a report to Congress in 2006 describing the implementation of the program at the Federal, State, and local levels.

### Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

This program went through a PART review in 2006. Although the PART findings indicate that the program is generally well managed and has a good performance data collection system in place, it also identified the lack of an independent evaluation and efficiency data for the program. The program received an "Adequate" rating. The Department has now established baseline data and targets for the program's efficiency measure.

The PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address them.

- *In fiscal year 2008, develop an action plan for improving student assessment participation rates.* Program staff will work with the program's technical assistance provider, the National Center for Homeless Education, and State directors to develop the action plan.
- *Complete monitoring visits to all States and supplementing these monitoring visits with desk monitoring of at least 15 States in fiscal year 2008.* In fiscal year 2007, Department staff completed monitoring visits to 18 States. Department staff anticipate completing monitoring visits to an additional 16 States in fiscal year 2008 and the remaining States in fiscal year 2009.
- *Work with Congress to correct statutory design flaws during the upcoming reauthorization.* The Department has shared the Administration's reauthorization proposal with the congressional authorizing committees. The Department will continue to work with Congress to correct the program's statutory design flaws during the reauthorization process.



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Education for Native Hawaiians

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1,2</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$33,315	0	-\$33,315

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking legislation.

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Education for Native Hawaiians program supports the provision of supplemental education services to the Native Hawaiian population. Competitive grants and contracts 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. In recent years, the appropriation for this program also included earmarked awards for the Hawaii Department of Education (for school construction) and for the University of Hawaii School of Law (for a Center of Excellence in Native Hawaiian Law).

The appropriation 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. The Council receives a minimum award of \$500,000 annually.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$33,302
2005.....	34,224
2006.....	33,908
2007.....	33,907
2008.....	33,315

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Education for Native Hawaiians

---

#### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Education for Native Hawaiians program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The Administration is not requesting reauthorization of this program and, accordingly, the budget provides no funding for it. While the Administration recognizes the importance of ensuring that Native Hawaiian students receive appropriate educational services to enable these students to achieve academically, the request is consistent with the Administration's policy of increasing resources for high-priority programs by eliminating small categorical programs that have narrow or limited effect. In addition, in recent years the Congress has earmarked a significant portion of funding for this program for awards to specific entities. The Administration has consistently opposed earmarks because they support activities that have not gone through the rigor of a competitive process (including expert peer review) and have negligible accountability for results.

School districts that wish to implement programs and services tailored to the educational and cultural needs of Native Hawaiian students are able to use funds provided under other Federal programs. For example, significant funds are provided to Native Hawaiian students through Federal formula grant programs, such as Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies and the Special Education State Grant programs. Under Title I, supplemental education funding is provided to LEAs and schools, particularly those in high-poverty areas, to help raise the achievement of all students in meeting challenging State academic standards. Since Native Hawaiian students are more likely to be living in poverty than their non-Hawaiian peers, they benefit directly from programs supported through Title I, Part A, including the significant increase the Administration is recommending for the program. Further, Native Hawaiian students are also provided support through Special Education State grants, because more than one-third of Native Hawaiian students who attend public school in Hawaii receive special education services, and the Administration is requesting a significant increase for Special Education as well.

In addition to Title I and Special Education, the Administration is requesting major increases or start-up funding for several K-12 education programs designed to help all students meet challenging academic standards that will benefit Native Hawaiian students as well. For example, the Striving Readers program allows middle school students who read below grade level to receive interventions designed to pull them up to grade. The new Math Now program will help strengthen the math curriculum, particularly in schools with concentrations of low-income students, and provide targeted interventions for students who are achieving below grade level in math. The Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate programs will provide for a strengthened high school curriculum (particularly in low-income schools) so that more students are able to enroll and pass advanced courses in math, science, and critical foreign languages. Such programs make it unnecessary to fund a program limited to Native Hawaiian students.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Education for Native Hawaiians

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Amount for new awards	\$3,837	\$9,683	0
Number of new awards	9	23	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$29,494	\$20,600	0
Number of continuation awards	51	32	0
Earmarks in appropriation	0	\$2,456	0
Native Hawaiian Education Council	\$500	\$500	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$76	\$76	0

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

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

**Goal: To support innovative projects to provide supplemental services that address the educational needs of Native Hawaiian children and adults.**

**Objective:** *The percentage of participants who will benefit from the Native Hawaiian Education program will increase.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Native Hawaiian children participating in early education programs who improve on measures of school readiness and literacy.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2005</b>		63.00
<b>2006</b>	68	78.67
<b>2007</b>	84	61.00
<b>2008</b>	89	

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Education for Native Hawaiians

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students participating in the Education for Native Hawaiians program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science, or reading.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		82.00
2006	83.64	67.40
2007	85.31	66.00
2008	87.00	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of teachers involved with professional development activities that address the unique education needs of Native Hawaiians.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		89.30
2006	91.00	90.67
2007	92.82	79.00
2008	94.00	

**Assessment of progress:** In 2005, the Department established measures for this program that focus on tracking increased proficiency in improved school readiness; mathematics, science, or reading; and increases in the number and percentage of teachers receiving professional development that addresses the unique educational needs of program participants. Data collected in 2007 show decreased performance on all three measures from the previous year, and the lowest performance yet for the program on these measures. The measure on proficiency in mathematics, science, or reading decreased significantly in 2006 due to a grantee collecting data for the first time using a State Assessment (on which only 10 percent of its students met or exceeded proficiency standards). The data are self-reported through grantee performance reports. The Department does not conduct any formal verification of these data. Data for 2008 will be available in fall 2008. No targets are included for 2009 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2009.

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

---

**Alaska Native education equity**

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1,2</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$33,315	0	-\$33,315

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking legislation.

<sup>2</sup> Of the amount appropriated for Part C, not less than \$7,000 thousand is to be used to support activities specified in Section 7304(d)(2).

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Alaska Native Education Equity program supports supplemental educational programs and services to Alaska Natives. By statute, the following grants must 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 dropout prevention programs operated by the Cook Inlet Tribal Council’s Partners for Success program.

With the remaining funds, the program awards competitive grants and contracts 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. One million dollars must be used for parenting education activities.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$33,302
2005.....	34,224
2006.....	33,908
2007.....	33,907
2008.....	33,315

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Alaska Native education equity

---

#### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Alaska Native Education Equity program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The Administration is not requesting reauthorization for this program and, accordingly, the budget provides no funding for it. While the Administration recognizes the importance of ensuring that Alaska Native students receive appropriate educational services to enable them to achieve academically, the request is consistent with the Administration's policy of increasing resources for high-priority programs by eliminating small categorical programs that have narrow or limited effect.

School districts that wish to implement programs and services tailored to the educational and cultural needs of Alaska Native students are able to use funds provided under several other Federal programs. The FY 2009 President's Budget request includes approximately \$1 billion in direct support for the education of Indians and Alaska Natives, in addition to significant funds that are provided to Indian and Alaska Native students through broader Federal formula grant programs, such as Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies and Special Education State Grants.

Alaska Native students benefit in particular from the Department's Indian Education programs, for which the Administration is requesting more than \$115 million in formula grants to school districts and competitive grants for demonstration and professional development programs. These programs serve as the Department's principal vehicle for addressing the unique educational and culturally related needs of Indian and Alaska Native students. Specifically, the grant awards supplement the regular school program, helping Indian and Alaska Native students improve their academic skills, raise their self-confidence, and participate in enrichment programs and activities that would otherwise be unavailable. Because Alaska Native students are currently served under both programs, each of which addresses their educational and culturally related needs as Alaska Natives, the two programs are redundant.

Finally, a significant portion of the funding for this program is earmarked for specific entities. The Administration has consistently opposed earmarks, because they support activities that have not gone through the rigor of a competitive process (including expert peer review) and have negligible accountability for results.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Amount for new awards	\$3,515	\$7,591	0
Number of new awards	8	10-18	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$24,292	\$19,524	0
Number of continuation awards	49	43	0
Earmarks	\$6,000	\$6,000	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$100	\$200	0

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Alaska Native education equity

---

#### 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 results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To help meet the unique educational needs of Alaska Natives and to support the development of supplemental educational programs to benefit Alaska Natives.**

*Objective: Support supplemental educational programs to benefit Alaska Natives.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs who improve on measures of school readiness.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		76.4
2006	80	84.2
2007	85	69.0
2008	88	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students participating in the Alaska Native Education Equity program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science, or reading.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		44.0
2006	49	43.5
2007	54	35.0
2008	57	

**Assessment of Progress:** In 2005, the Department developed new measures for this program that focus on measuring improved school readiness and increased proficiency in mathematics, science, or reading. Baseline and performance targets for later years were also established in 2005. Data collected in 2007 show decreased performance on both measures from the previous year, and the lowest performance yet for the program on these measures. The data are self-reported through grantee performance reports. The Department does not conduct any formal verification of these data. Data for 2008 will be available in fall 2008. No targets are included for 2009 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2009.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Training and advisory services

(Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$6,989	\$6,989	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Training and Advisory Services supports efforts to achieve the intent of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act by aiding educators in preparing, adopting, and implementing plans for desegregation of public schools and in 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:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$7,243
2005.....	7,185
2006.....	7,113
2007.....	7,113
2008.....	6,989

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2009, the Administration requests \$7.0 million, the same level as the fiscal year 2008 appropriation, for the Training and Advisory Services program. Funds will support the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of 3-year grants to 10 regional EACs that provide equity assistance to school districts on issues related to discrimination based on race, gender, and national origin.

Ensuring equitable access to quality education and the opportunity for all students to develop strong academic skills in reading, mathematics, and other core subjects is among the Administration's priorities. However, many schools struggle with providing an equal opportunity for all students,



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

especially students from diverse economic, racial, ethnic, and language backgrounds. Many of the schools facing consequences under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are heavily minority high schools in big cities, highlighting additional areas of need nationwide. Other schools are experiencing recent influxes of limited English proficient students and are seeking assistance on how to serve them equitably and effectively. These are some of the current challenges that illuminate the continuing need for EAC services that help school districts address educational inequality in a rapidly evolving society.

To achieve the goal of equal access for all students, the requested funds would provide support to the EACs for such activities as: instructing school officials on how to prevent sexual harassment and combat biases that can lead to hate crimes and bullying; providing training to help educators identify race and sex bias in instructional materials and to help them select appropriate educational programs to meet the needs of limited English proficient students; increasing participation by minorities and females in mathematics and science courses; and working with local educational agencies to ensure that systemic reform and educational restructuring plans consider the needs of all students. The Centers' activities help to ensure that all children have equal access to quality education and the opportunity to develop strong academic skills in reading, mathematics, and other core subject areas.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Amount for continuation awards	\$7,095	0	\$6,971
Number of continuation awards	10	0	10
Amount for new awards	0	\$6,921	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$50	0
Number of new awards	0	10	0
Data collection	\$18	\$18	\$18

### 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 results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2009 and future years, and 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 conducted by the Library of Congress. About 48 percent of the targeted customer group responded to the 2006 survey. With assistance from the Department's Data Quality Initiative (DQI),

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

the Department made revisions to the survey and took steps to increase the response rate in 2007. After these efforts were made, almost 76 percent of the targeted customer group responded to the 2007 survey.

**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.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices in eliminating, reducing, or preventing harassment, conflict, and school violence.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2006</b>		66
<b>2007</b>	67	50
<b>2008</b>	68	
<b>2009</b>	69	

**Assessment of progress:** The percentage decline from 2006 to 2007 may reflect a shift in the needs of the respondents from one year to the next. The more recent response may also more accurately reflect the needs of the target audience, since the response rate increased significantly in 2007. Also, approximately 20 percent of respondents indicated that they did not know whether their organization had developed, implemented, or improved its policies and practices in this area.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices ensuring that students of different race, sex, and national origin have equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2006</b>		71
<b>2007</b>	72	82
<b>2008</b>	73	
<b>2009</b>	74	

**Assessment of progress:** More respondents reported having developed, implemented, or improved their policies and practices in this area in 2007 than in 2006 and the program exceeded the target. Approximately 8 percent of respondents indicated that they did not know whether their organization had developed, implemented, or improved its policies and practices in this area.

<b>Measure:</b> 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
<b>2006</b>		85
<b>2007</b>	86	88
<b>2008</b>	87	
<b>2009</b>	88	

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

**Assessment of progress:** Respondents have responded positively to this measure for 2 years in a row and the program met its target. An additional 11 percent of respondents rated the usefulness of the EAC products and services as of “medium” usefulness in 2007.

In 2007, the survey also collected, for the first time, information on the Department’s fourth measure for the EAC program: the percentage of customers who report that the products and services they received from the EACs are of high quality. In 2007, 92 percent of the respondents rated the quality of the EAC products and services as “high.”

### Efficiency Measures

The Department has implemented a common measure of administrative efficiency to assess the Training and Advisory Services Program and other technical assistance programs. The measure is the percentage of grant funds that each EAC carries over for each year of operations. For both 2006 and 2007, the EACs have carried over less than 1 percent of their grant funds on average. The target for 2007 was 10 percent carryover. The targets for 2008 and 2009 maintain the 2007 goal of 10 percent carryover. The Department established a second efficiency measure for the program as well: the number of working days it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees following a monitoring visit. The program office will implement this new measure and establish a baseline beginning in 2008.

### Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

In 2004, the Training and Advisory Services program received a PART rating of “Results Not Demonstrated.” The PART acknowledged that the program addresses a specific problem and reaches intended beneficiaries, and that some survey data show that beneficiaries were satisfied with the services they received. At the same time, however, the PART identified weaknesses, including a lack of long-term goals and limited evidence of program effectiveness.

The PART review recommended that the Department develop long-term performance goals to assess the program’s effectiveness and conduct a survey to obtain information on the quality, relevance, and usefulness of program services. In response to these recommendations, the Department implemented two new indicators for this program, adapted from a set of common measures developed by the Department. The new measures allow the comparison of this program with other technical assistance programs and assess, among other things, the quality and usefulness of the services provided by the EACs. The Department also implemented a customer survey, which is administered by the Library of Congress. Through the DQI, the EAC program received assistance in revising its survey for 2007 to align it more effectively with the program measures. The DQI was also instrumental in helping the program greatly improve its response rate.

The PART review also called for the Department to implement the program’s efficiency measure and continue work to establish and implement at least one additional efficiency measure. The Department developed the additional efficiency measure, to be implemented beginning in 2008.

The current PART improvement plan steps are presented below, followed by a description of the Department’s actions to address them:

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

- *Revise, as necessary, the follow-up customer satisfaction survey and administer the survey in order to obtain information on the quality, relevance, and usefulness of program services.* Each year the Department administers a customer satisfaction survey to customers of the Equity Assistance Centers. Data resulting from the survey serve to inform the performance measures. The DQI conducted focus groups with program customers in order to make appropriate revisions to the survey.
- *Use the findings from the customer satisfaction survey to identify areas in need of improvement. Incorporate these changes into the monitoring plan, as appropriate, as well as annual plans for delivering technical assistance.* The Department will begin monitoring the current grantees in 2008. Findings from the customer satisfaction survey will be used to update the monitoring plan and plans for technical assistance, as appropriate.
- *Implement the new efficiency measure and collect baseline data.* The Department established a new efficiency measure based on the number of days it takes the Department to issue a monitoring report to grantees following a monitoring visit. The first cycle of monitoring in 2008 will produce baseline data for this measure.

The Administration is planning to conduct a new PART review of the program in 2008.

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

---

**Rural education**

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1,2</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$171,854	\$171,854	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

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

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

Part B of Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) 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 programs differ in the types of local educational agencies (LEAs) targeted for assistance. The Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program provides funds to rural LEAs that serve small numbers of students; the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program provides funds to rural LEAs that serve concentrations of poor students, regardless of the LEA's size. Funds appropriated for the Rural Education program are divided equally between the Small, Rural School Achievement and Rural and Low-Income School 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 meet the State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP). If, after 3 years, an LEA is making AYP, it may continue to participate in the program. If it does not meet the State's definition of 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.

Rural Education 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.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

Funds are allocated by formula 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" (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. The Department makes awards directly to eligible LEAs.

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).

Under the program, eligible LEAs also have the flexibility to consolidate funds they receive from these sources to carry out effective activities under any of the authorized programs.

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

To be eligible for funds under the RLIS program, an LEA 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). Funds are allocated by formula to States based on each State's proportionate share of children in average daily attendance (ADA) in all eligible LEAs. 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 would better target funds to eligible LEAs that serve the highest concentrations of poor students. Currently, however, all States make RLIS awards through the statutory formula. Lastly, the Department reserves one-half of 1 percent of the amount appropriated for the Bureau of Indian Education of the Department of the Interior and an equal amount for the Outlying Areas.

An LEA located within a State that chooses not to participate in the program may apply directly to the Department for assistance, and the Department may award funds to eligible LEAs within non-participating States on a competitive basis or by formula. However, all States with eligible LEAs have agreed, as a part of consolidated State plans submitted to the Department in 2002, to participate in the program.

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).

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$167,831
2005.....	170,624
2006.....	168,918
2007.....	168,918
2008.....	171,854

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is requesting \$171.9 million for the Rural Education program. The request recognizes that rural LEAs face significant challenges in implementing some of the provisions and meeting the objectives of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The program provides rural districts with resources for meeting those challenges.

According to the report *Status of Education in Rural America*, released by the National Center for Education Statistics in July 2007, during the 2003-04 school year, over half of all operating school districts and one-third of the Nation's public schools were located in rural areas, with one-fifth of all public school students enrolled at these schools. The small size of many rural schools and districts presents a different set of problems from those of urban schools and districts. For example, rural schools and districts generally cannot derive the benefits of economies of scale and, thus, face greater per-pupil costs in providing staff or transportation services.

In addition, because of size and location, many small, rural districts face difficulty in meeting the NCLB 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 subjects they teach. Rural teachers are frequently called upon to teach multiple subjects, presenting a challenge for teachers to obtain multiple certifications that, in turn, makes it difficult for many rural teachers to meet the statutory definition of "highly qualified." (A 2003 national survey conducted by the Appalachia Educational Laboratory found that 57 percent of secondary school teachers in rural schools with 250 or fewer students teach multiple subjects.) Rural Education funds can help rural LEAs meet the challenge of recruiting and retaining a staff of highly qualified teachers.

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, in fiscal year 2007, the median total allocation received by districts eligible for SRSA under four current Federal formula grant programs (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Educational Technology State Grants, State Grants for Innovative Programs, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants) was \$17,521.

Recognizing that rural districts frequently receive small allocations from Federal formula grants, the Rural Education statute provides flexibility, through the "alternative uses of funds" authority, to LEAs eligible to receive funds under the SRSA program. This flexibility, commonly referred to

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

as “REAP-Flex,” is important to these districts because it allows them to make more effective use of their small Federal formula allocations. An eligible LEA may use its formula allocations under the covered programs to carry out authorized activities or for activities authorized under Part A of Title I, Title III (Language Instruction), or Part B of Title IV (21st Century Community Learning Centers). Sixty percent of eligible districts notified their respective State of their intention to take advantage of this authority in fiscal year 2006. 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. Rural Education program funds help to make up the difference and assist rural LEAs in financing and implementing approaches to meeting NCLB requirements and addressing the other challenges they face.

The Rural Education program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2009 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration’s reauthorization proposal. In reauthorization, the Administration is proposing to change the SRSA program to a State-administered grant program. The Department currently makes over 4,000 grants to small, rural school districts that have little experience in receiving funds directly from the Department and are more likely to turn to their State educational agency for assistance. In 2002, the first year of the program, approximately 75 percent of districts receiving SRSA grants had never before received funds directly from the Department. State administration of the SRSA program will result in improved efficiency in making awards and administering the program.

In reauthorization, the Administration is also proposing to modify the formula used to calculate allocations to LEAs under the SRSA program. The current formula used to determine SRSA awards often yields allocations that are disproportionate to the size and needs of many LEAs. For example, in fiscal year 2006, an LEA with one student received an allocation of \$20,000, while an LEA with 862 students received \$47. The proposed formula will result in a more equitable distribution of funds among participating districts.

Finally, the Administration is proposing to provide additional flexibility to LEAs eligible to receive funds under the RLIS program by allowing them to consolidate funds using the REAP-Flex authority. This authority will allow larger districts that are, nonetheless, rural and poor to use other Federal formula funds they receive for any purpose authorized under Title I, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants, Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students, and 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers. These larger rural districts often face many of the same challenges that smaller rural districts encounter, and expanding this authority will allow these districts to use limited Federal resources to target their areas of greatest need more effectively.



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<b>Small, rural school achievement</b>			
Total funding	\$84,459	\$85,927	\$85,927
Average LEA grant	\$21	\$21	\$21
Estimated number of LEAs receiving grants	4,088	4,080	4,080
<b>Rural and low-income schools</b>			
Total funding	\$84,459	\$85,927	\$85,927
Range of awards to States	\$21 - 7,512	\$21 - 7,643	\$21 - \$7,652
Average LEA grant	\$67	\$68	\$68
Estimated number of SEAs receiving grants	39	39	39
Estimated number of LEAs receiving grants	1,247	1,247	1,247
Amount for BIA	\$422	\$430	\$430
Amount for outlying areas	\$422	\$430	\$430
Evaluation	\$100	\$100	0

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2009 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

**Objective:** *Local educational agencies (LEAs) participating in Rural Education programs will make AYP after the third year.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of RLIS program participating LEAs that make adequate yearly progress after 3 years.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		58
2006	64	53
2007	70	
2008	76	
2009	82	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of SRSA program participating LEAs that make adequate yearly progress after 3 years.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		95
2006	95	92
2007	96	
2008	96	
2009	97	

**Assessment of Progress:** The initial annual AYP target for both RLIS and SRSA programs was 1 percent over the established baseline. When LEAs reported baseline data in 2005, the Department found that 58 percent of LEAs participating in RLIS and 95 percent of LEAs participating in SRSA made AYP. With the baseline data in place, the Department adjusted the performance targets to reflect a yearly increase of 6 percentage points over the baseline in the number of RLIS LEAs that make AYP, in order to reach 100 percent by the year 2014. Similarly, the Department also adjusted the performance targets for the SRSA program to reflect an increase of 1 percentage point every 2 years over the baseline in the number of LEAs that make AYP.

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

**Assessment of Progress:** The Department attempted to compile student achievement data from the 2004-05 school year during 2007 in order to establish baseline data and determine actual performance. Unfortunately, due to the lack of comprehensive data, the variation among subject categories across States, and differences in proficiency standards, the data could not provide a reliable baseline. The Department has now submitted to OMB a revised plan to collect proficiency data that should correct past problems. Initial proficiency data for fiscal year 2007 are expected in August 2008. Once baseline data are available, performance targets for this measure will reflect the Department's goal that 100 percent of students enrolled in districts participating in both the SRSA and RLIS programs will be proficient by 2014.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

**Objective:** *Eligible rural school districts will use the Rural Education program flexibility authority.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of eligible school districts utilizing the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	71	59
2005	65	56
2006	65	60
2007	65	
2008	65	
2009	65	

**Assessment of Progress:** 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 utilize this feature. Since there is little reason to believe notification would be made without taking advantage of this authority, reported intent serves as a reasonable proxy. In fiscal year 2006, 60 percent of eligible districts reported their intent to use the flexibility authority, marking an increase over the previous 2 years.

### Program Efficiency Measures

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of SRSA program grants awarded by August 30 of each fiscal year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		100
2007	80	100
2008	80	
2009	80	

**Assessment of Progress:** The Department has had great success recently for beating its goals and deadlines for the processing of its over 4,000 SRSA grants to LEAs, exceeding its target of obligating 100 percent by August 30 in both 2006 and 2007. In fact, the Department achieved the target on August 15 in 2007, beating the previous year by more than a week.

### 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 have targeted math and 77 percent that have targeted reading.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

#### Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Rural Education program was reviewed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) during the 2006 rating cycle. The program received a rating of "Results Not Demonstrated." The PART review acknowledged the program's strengths in strategic planning and program management and noted that the program is the single Federal mechanism that addresses the disparity between what rural LEAs receive in State and Federal funding and what they need to support quality instruction.

The PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address them.

- *Collect performance data to gauge the program's impact on improving student proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics in rural districts.* The program received low scores for program results and accountability due to lack of student achievement data for the program's annual and long-term performance measures at the time of the PART review. The Department has now determined a means for reporting reliable student achievement data from the 2006-07 school year to establish a baseline, and these data should be available in August 2008.
- *Evaluate the Rural and Low-Income School program to examine the types of activities and academic progress that these funds support.* In addition, the preliminary review noted the need to evaluate the effectiveness of the RLIS program. In the fiscal year 2008, the Department plans to initiate an evaluation that would draw data from a nationally representative sample of eligible LEAs to provide information about how RLIS funds are targeted, the impact of these funds on student achievement, and the types of improvement activities supported by RLIS funds in districts that fail to meet their State's definition of adequate yearly progress. The Department completed a Statement of Work, issued a Request for Proposals, and is scheduled to award the contract in early 2008, using funds from fiscal years 2007 and 2008.
- *Work with Congress on correcting statutory design flaws during the upcoming reauthorization.* The PART also noted statutory design flaws, based on feedback from States, districts, and within the Department. The Department has begun working with Congress to correct these problems through NCLB reauthorization. Modification of the SRSAs formula for a more equitable distribution of funds and State administration of the SRSAs program will be included in these efforts.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Supplemental education grants

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): \$19,623<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$17,687	\$17,687	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The Act authorizes \$12,230 thousand for the Federated States of Micronesia and \$6,100 thousand for the Republic of the Marshall Islands for fiscal year 2005 and an equivalent amount, as adjusted for inflation (calculated as two thirds of the percentage change in the U.S. Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator, or 5 percent, whichever is less in any 1 year) for each of the succeeding fiscal years through 2023. The 2009 authorization is calculated based on inflation estimates as of February 2007.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-188) authorizes supplemental education grants to the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) and the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI). The Act eliminated the participation of the FSM and the RMI in most domestic formula grant programs funded by the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services (HHS), and Labor (DOL). As a replacement, beginning in fiscal year 2005, the Act authorizes supplemental education grants, appropriated to the Department of Education 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 Supplemental Education 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: 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 the Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants and Work Study programs under Part A, Subpart I of Title IV of the Higher Education Act and in ED, HHS, and DOL competitive programs. Also, the Act eliminated FSM and RMI participation under the Adult, Dislocated, and Youth Workforce Investment Act programs (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 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

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Supplemental education grants

---

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 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 RMI may request technical assistance from ED, HHS, or DOL, on a reimbursement basis. Each year’s appropriations act has also permitted the FSM and the RMI to reserve up to 5 percent of their grants for administration and such technical assistance.

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

	(\$000s)
2004..... <sup>(1)</sup>	
2005.....	\$18,183
2006.....	18,001
2007.....	18,001
2008.....	17,687

---

<sup>1</sup> This program was not authorized prior to fiscal year 2005.

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$17.7 million, the same as the fiscal year 2008 level, to maintain funding for Supplemental Education Grants to the RMI and FSM. The request would ensure the continuation of supplementary education services for residents of the RMI and the FSM. Over 40 percent of the funding in FY 2005 and FY 2006 was used to support early childhood education. The RMI and FSM have also used Supplemental Education Grants for education improvement programs, vocational and skills training, and professional development.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Grant to Federated States of Micronesia	\$12,010	\$11,801	\$11,801
Grant to Republic of the Marshall Islands	5,991	5,886	5,886

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Supplemental education grants

---

#### 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 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, is not able to measure progress towards its educational goals because the data the Republic collects are inadequate, inconsistent, and incomplete. Tests to measure achievement were not administered in 2005 and 2006, and some of the tests the Republic has used were not aligned with the curriculum used in the RMI and, thus, are not adequate measures of student achievement. The FSM also lacks consistent performance outcomes and measures; measures and outcomes have been established but constantly change, making it difficult to track progress. Both entities face continuing challenges in improving the quality of education due to a lack of qualified teachers, poor facilities, and a high absentee rate among students and teachers.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Comprehensive centers

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$57,113	\$57,113	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Education Technical Assistance Act authorizes support for not less than 20 comprehensive centers to provide training, technical assistance, and professional development in reading, mathematics, and technology, particularly to local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). 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. 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 increased cost burdens 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.

The Department provided initial grants for 20 new Comprehensive Centers from fiscal year 2005 funds, and a grant for 1 additional center from fiscal year 2006 funds to complete the system of 21 centers. The system includes 16 **regional centers** that work with the State educational agencies (SEAs) within their geographic regions to help them implement No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) school improvement measures and objectives. The regional centers provide technical assistance to SEAs to increase their capacity to assist districts and schools in meeting the key goals of NCLB. These goals call for, among other things, all students to be proficient in reading and math by the 2013-2014 school year; a highly qualified teacher in every classroom; teaching and instruction based on knowledge of what works; and greater parental choice in education.

In addition, instead of requiring each regional center to have in-depth knowledge of all aspects of school improvement – from instruction to teacher quality to assessment design – the Department funded five **content centers**, with one center specializing in each of the following key foci of NCLB: assessment and accountability; instruction; teacher quality; innovation and improvement; and high schools. Each content center is pulling together resources and expertise to provide analyses, information, and materials in its focus area for use by the network of regional centers, SEAs, and other clients.

Each center developed a 5-year plan for carrying out authorized activities. The plan of each regional center addresses the needs of the SEAs in its region to implement NCLB or to meet the student achievement goals of NCLB. The content centers' plans address the priorities



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

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 educational needs of the region (or the needs of the regional centers 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 that the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, a component under the Department's Institute of Education Sciences, provide for an ongoing 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 as follows:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	0
2005.....	\$56,825 <sup>1</sup>
2006.....	56,257
2007.....	56,257
2008.....	57,113

---

<sup>1</sup> The appropriation supported initial grants to 20 new Comprehensive Centers and costs associated with the close-out of the antecedent Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers.

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2009, the Administration requests \$57.1 million, the same as the fiscal year 2008 level, to support the 5<sup>th</sup> year of the Comprehensive Centers program and the final year of funding the cooperative agreements for the 21 currently funded centers. The Administration's fiscal year 2009 request would continue the Administration's policy of supporting funding for a single program dedicated to providing comprehensive technical assistance to grantees under ESEA. Funding for the centers would allow them to provide continued and more intensive assistance in the areas of assessment and data analysis, areas in which States and districts have faced particular challenges in meeting the requirements and pursuing the goals of NCLB.

The current Comprehensive Centers program was first funded in 2005, almost 4 years after States and districts began NCLB implementation. By then, States had begun to focus more intensively on carrying out activities supporting school districts and schools in their efforts to improve student achievement and meet State targets for adequate yearly progress (AYP). For example, SEAs had become concerned with helping districts and schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring, and on helping them to enable students in all of the NCLB subgroups meet AYP targets. SEAs also faced increasing demands for technical assistance in many other areas, such as improving high schools, strengthening or expanding teacher training, both as part of school improvement plans and to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified, and furthering local adoption of instructional methods that have been proven effective through scientifically based research.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

In the 3 years during which the centers have provided States with technical assistance, their activities have been shaped by SEA and Department NCLB priorities. The 16 regional centers focus entirely on assisting SEAs in the implementation of NCLB requirements and helping increase State capacity to assist districts and schools in meeting their student achievement goals. The five content centers identify, organize, and translate key research and provide in-depth knowledge, expertise, and analyses to the regional centers and the States in each of their content areas: assessment and accountability, high schools, innovation and improvement, and teacher quality.

In their first operating year (fiscal year 2005), all centers developed web pages and populated them with resources that included, in many cases, searchable databases and interactive tools. They focused on the most pressing issues for States, including assisting many of them to prepare for two major ESEA hurdles – their peer review of State standards and assessment systems required under ESEA Title I and submission of revised State plans for highly qualified teachers required under ESEA Title II. The centers provided other assistance in that first year, including helping States to decide whether to pursue a “growth model” approach in measuring student achievement; delivering briefing materials on assessments for students with limited English proficiency; providing tools and planning help in the areas of adolescent literacy and special education assessment; and developing strategies for ensuring the presence of highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools. In addition, almost all of the regional centers responded to SEA requests for help in planning professional development and creating or improving State capacity to effectively integrate multiple technical assistance resources.

Beginning in fiscal year 2006, the centers have continued to work on projects begun in year one and also have developed new assistance initiatives, including helping States build infrastructures that support school and district improvement, investigate formative assessment, improve mathematics instruction, and address high school reform issues. All of the centers continue to engage in projects with SEAs that promote systemic improvement and capacity building.

For fiscal year 2009, the centers will continue to work with States to increase their ability to support their districts and schools, providing technical assistance in the following areas:

- Strategies for improving teaching and learning, including assessment of students with disabilities and limited English proficiency, “response to intervention,” and mathematics standards.
- School and district improvement processes and strategies, including working with those in corrective action, supporting best practices in restructuring, and improving the provision and evaluation of supplemental educational services.
- Designing and implementing the statewide systems of support that are required under Title I.
- High school reform issues, including data analysis for program improvement, dropout prevention, curriculum and graduation requirements, and transition from middle school.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

- Support to expand or enhance large-scale State and district data systems, including support in making data more accessible to staff at the State, district, and school levels.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<b>Comprehensive centers</b>			
Number of centers	21	21	21
Center awards	\$53,257	\$55,422	\$57,113
Average award	\$2,536	\$2,639	\$2,720
Evaluation	\$3,000	\$1,691	0

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

In response to deficiencies in the antecedent comprehensive centers that were identified by the PART, the Department placed strong emphasis on creating a performance-based framework for the new centers that included, 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. These measures are designed to analyze the services provided by the centers, the extent to which each of the centers meets the objectives of its respective plan, and whether their services meet the educational needs of the SEAs, LEAs, and schools.

The performance measures for the comprehensive centers are: (1) the percentage of all 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; (2) the percentage of all products and services that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational policy or practice by target audiences; and (3) the percentage of all products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice by target audiences.

As part of the Department's national evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers, initiated in 2006, the contractor is gathering information to inform the measures through panel reviews and surveys conducted in 2007, 2008, and 2009. In addition, the evaluation will assess: (1) the extent to which the centers meet the objectives of their respective technical assistance plans and the educational needs of SEAs, and (2) whether the centers' assistance expands SEAs' capacity to provide technical assistance to help LEAs and schools meet ESEA requirements. Among other things, the evaluation will examine the centers' responses to changing SEA technical assistance needs, 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. The evaluation

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

will include reviews of center documents, meetings and site visits with each center, and surveying center staff and SEA officials. Evaluation findings will be available in an interim report (2009) and a final report (2010), and the contractor may be asked to prepare several case studies to examine certain aspects of center-based technical assistance.

### 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 early September, after Department staff have reviewed data for the previous 12-month budget cycle, and are presented in the table below. The 40 percent carry over in the baseline year is likely the result of the centers receiving their initial grant awards several months into the beginning of the award year. The Department also established a second efficiency measure for the program: the number of working days it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees following a monitoring visit. The program office will implement this new measure and establish a baseline beginning in 2008.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Comprehensive Center grant funds carried over in each year of the project.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		40
2007	30	15
2008	20	
2009	10	

### Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The antecedent Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers program received a PART rating of "Results Not Demonstrated." The PART assessment, conducted in the summer of 2004, acknowledged that the antecedent Centers succeeded in establishing a good customer base and offering services to school districts with high rates of poverty, but noted the lack of any national evaluation findings demonstrating that the program was providing effective technical assistance to those entities. Also, the PART noted that evaluation and customer service surveys were not of sufficient scope and quality to support specific program improvements. The Department completed the initial PART recommendations, which called for embedding new common measures for technical assistance programs into the new program and establishing a second efficiency measure.

The current PART improvement plan steps focus on implementation of the measures in fiscal year 2008 and are presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address them:

- *Establish long-term performance goals, targets, and time frames for the performance measures, based on the results from the national evaluation.* In 2008, the national evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers will begin to produce data that will inform the

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

performance measures and allow the Department to set targets and time frames for those measures.

- *Create a plan for technical assistance and program management, using the data from the national evaluation on the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the technical assistance provided by the Centers.* Starting in 2008, results from the national evaluation will become available and the Department will begin to use those results to address deficiencies in the program.
- *Develop a plan for monitoring the performance of the Comprehensive Centers, and adjust the plan annually, based on findings from monitoring visits of the Centers.* The Department is in the process of developing a monitoring plan to support continuous program improvement.
- *Implement the new efficiency measure, established in November 2007, and collect baseline data for the measure.* Upon completion of the monitoring plan, the Department will begin to collect data and establish a baseline for the new efficiency measure, which was established to measure the length of time it takes the Department to issue a monitoring report to grantees following a monitoring visit.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Improving Teacher Quality State Grants

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	45,923,555	47,006,016	45,342,784	(1,663,232)
Alaska	13,751,559	13,987,032	13,494,505	(492,527)
Arizona	48,405,610	48,507,945	46,417,367	(2,090,578)
Arkansas	27,690,900	28,670,038	27,632,928	(1,037,110)
California	331,226,040	333,420,086	321,120,128	(12,299,958)
Colorado	32,112,137	32,892,206	31,695,515	(1,196,691)
Connecticut	26,564,774	26,702,841	25,905,047	(797,794)
Delaware	13,751,559	13,987,032	13,494,505	(492,527)
District of Columbia	13,751,559	13,987,032	13,494,505	(492,527)
Florida	130,978,835	133,936,727	128,951,876	(4,984,851)
Georgia	77,837,694	79,173,655	76,042,391	(3,131,264)
Hawaii	13,751,559	13,987,032	13,494,505	(492,527)
Idaho	13,751,559	13,987,032	13,494,505	(492,527)
Illinois	118,046,093	117,748,904	114,010,506	(3,738,398)
Indiana	49,204,264	50,341,554	48,514,477	(1,827,077)
Iowa	21,891,201	22,324,519	21,617,986	(706,533)
Kansas	22,433,006	22,708,260	21,993,251	(715,009)
Kentucky	44,084,516	45,089,317	43,656,175	(1,433,142)
Louisiana	63,731,829	65,252,651	63,279,449	(1,973,202)
Maine	13,751,559	13,987,032	13,494,505	(492,527)
Maryland	41,423,963	41,395,716	40,120,937	(1,274,779)
Massachusetts	50,883,786	51,804,753	50,280,101	(1,524,652)
Michigan	109,549,887	112,217,311	109,002,521	(3,214,790)
Minnesota	37,842,237	38,498,920	37,345,835	(1,153,085)
Mississippi	42,061,907	42,777,726	41,436,395	(1,341,331)
Missouri	49,802,764	50,955,648	49,171,954	(1,783,694)
Montana	13,751,559	13,987,032	13,494,505	(492,527)
Nebraska	14,028,502	14,263,975	13,771,448	(492,527)
Nevada	15,347,414	15,446,845	14,773,345	(673,500)
New Hampshire	13,751,559	13,987,032	13,494,505	(492,527)
New Jersey	63,836,154	65,406,850	63,351,160	(2,055,690)
New Mexico	22,498,507	23,097,787	22,314,504	(783,283)
New York	228,363,687	227,826,463	221,790,258	(6,036,205)
North Carolina	65,161,025	67,896,344	65,003,650	(2,892,694)
North Dakota	13,751,559	13,987,032	13,494,505	(492,527)
Ohio	104,981,877	107,856,913	104,426,625	(3,430,288)
Oklahoma	32,691,245	33,966,553	32,758,020	(1,208,533)
Oregon	27,999,418	28,887,575	27,831,503	(1,056,072)
Pennsylvania	113,433,259	115,313,828	111,972,727	(3,341,101)
Rhode Island	13,751,559	13,987,032	13,494,505	(492,527)
South Carolina	37,100,520	37,932,092	36,449,315	(1,482,777)
South Dakota	13,751,559	13,987,032	13,494,505	(492,527)
Tennessee	49,288,352	51,116,465	49,163,202	(1,953,263)
Texas	240,402,734	247,031,503	237,583,687	(9,447,816)
Utah	18,798,869	18,979,159	18,297,082	(682,077)
Vermont	13,751,559	13,987,032	13,494,505	(492,527)
Virginia	51,305,921	52,437,099	50,603,048	(1,834,051)
Washington	47,422,445	48,010,051	46,341,082	(1,668,969)
West Virginia	23,079,361	23,715,508	23,107,294	(608,214)
Wisconsin	46,531,977	46,353,647	44,986,202	(1,367,445)
Wyoming	13,751,559	13,987,032	13,494,505	(492,527)
American Samoa	3,416,101	3,480,950	3,345,308	(135,642)
Guam	5,057,259	5,134,923	4,972,478	(162,445)
Northern Mariana Islands	1,610,598	1,639,057	1,579,531	(59,526)
Puerto Rico	91,535,206	92,571,611	89,370,702	(3,200,909)
Virgin Islands	4,281,051	4,347,931	4,208,042	(139,889)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	14,365,009	14,602,861	14,105,359	(497,502)
Other (non-State allocations)	14,437,194	14,676,242	14,176,240	(500,002)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,887,438,950</b>	<b>2,935,248,441</b>	<b>2,835,248,000</b>	<b>(100,000,441)</b>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Mathematics and Science Partnerships

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	3,100,255	3,149,164	3,149,170	6
Alaska	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
Arizona	4,144,844	3,752,270	3,752,277	7
Arkansas	1,839,344	1,980,113	1,980,116	3
California	23,634,838	21,906,182	21,906,222	40
Colorado	1,820,120	1,861,934	1,861,938	4
Connecticut	1,244,907	1,135,602	1,135,605	3
Delaware	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
District of Columbia	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
Florida	8,622,259	8,676,445	8,676,461	16
Georgia	5,721,011	5,563,620	5,563,630	10
Hawaii	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
Idaho	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
Illinois	7,119,671	6,250,212	6,250,223	11
Indiana	2,998,428	3,039,746	3,039,752	6
Iowa	1,035,102	1,050,636	1,050,638	2
Kansas	1,145,182	1,101,001	1,101,003	2
Kentucky	2,608,570	2,677,458	2,677,463	5
Louisiana	3,894,085	4,033,542	4,033,549	7
Maine	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
Maryland	2,064,536	1,799,682	1,799,685	3
Massachusetts	2,335,579	2,362,518	2,362,522	4
Michigan	5,334,084	5,644,380	5,644,391	11
Minnesota	1,595,121	1,603,816	1,603,819	3
Mississippi	2,739,146	2,718,752	2,718,757	5
Missouri	3,063,427	3,116,959	3,116,964	5
Montana	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
Nebraska	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
Nevada	1,173,526	1,073,276	1,073,278	2
New Hampshire	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
New Jersey	2,860,409	3,018,806	3,018,812	6
New Mexico	1,456,023	1,511,150	1,511,152	2
New York	12,303,936	10,867,365	10,867,385	20
North Carolina	4,866,907	5,265,048	5,265,057	9
North Dakota	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
Ohio	5,559,488	5,902,883	5,902,894	11
Oklahoma	1,995,121	2,209,464	2,209,468	4
Oregon	1,712,181	1,818,976	1,818,979	3
Pennsylvania	5,583,339	5,586,114	5,586,125	11
Rhode Island	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
South Carolina	2,762,092	2,757,962	2,757,967	5
South Dakota	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
Tennessee	3,290,508	3,552,527	3,552,534	7
Texas	17,538,526	17,989,209	17,989,241	32
Utah	1,012,543	942,150	942,152	2
Vermont	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
Virginia	2,764,540	2,805,969	2,805,974	5
Washington	2,782,935	2,658,511	2,658,516	5
West Virginia	1,069,944	1,174,794	1,174,796	2
Wisconsin	2,439,103	2,098,638	2,098,642	4
Wyoming	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
American Samoa	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
Guam	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
Northern Mariana Islands	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
Puerto Rico	7,705,142	7,398,451	7,398,465	14
Virgin Islands	906,246	890,414	890,416	2
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	910,800	894,888	894,890	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>182,160,000</b>	<b>178,977,665</b>	<b>178,978,000</b>	<b>335</b>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Educational Technology State Grants

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	3,908,204	3,997,387	0	(3,997,387)
Alaska	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
Arizona	5,290,464	4,759,693	0	(4,759,693)
Arkansas	2,428,622	2,698,014	0	(2,698,014)
California	32,823,516	30,544,047	0	(30,544,047)
Colorado	2,468,711	2,526,752	0	(2,526,752)
Connecticut	2,241,756	2,010,996	0	(2,010,996)
Delaware	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
District of Columbia	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
Florida	11,729,221	12,230,158	0	(12,230,158)
Georgia	8,281,479	8,253,706	0	(8,253,706)
Hawaii	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
Idaho	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
Illinois	12,020,637	10,174,097	0	(10,174,097)
Indiana	4,681,836	4,449,816	0	(4,449,816)
Iowa	1,395,741	1,341,030	0	(1,341,030)
Kansas	1,778,982	1,773,338	0	(1,773,338)
Kentucky	3,736,749	3,928,198	0	(3,928,198)
Louisiana	5,556,692	5,761,450	0	(5,761,450)
Maine	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
Maryland	3,815,044	3,404,228	0	(3,404,228)
Massachusetts	4,227,829	4,271,054	0	(4,271,054)
Michigan	9,347,171	9,696,634	0	(9,696,634)
Minnesota	2,314,265	2,296,870	0	(2,296,870)
Mississippi	3,465,803	3,453,202	0	(3,453,202)
Missouri	4,075,709	4,161,200	0	(4,161,200)
Montana	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
Nebraska	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
Nevada	1,632,692	1,504,390	0	(1,504,390)
New Hampshire	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
New Jersey	5,015,552	5,292,610	0	(5,292,610)
New Mexico	1,998,257	2,100,670	0	(2,100,670)
New York	24,561,375	21,738,218	0	(21,738,218)
North Carolina	6,099,869	6,759,383	0	(6,759,383)
North Dakota	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
Ohio	9,123,151	9,487,397	0	(9,487,397)
Oklahoma	2,500,619	2,773,957	0	(2,773,957)
Oregon	2,421,206	2,624,271	0	(2,624,271)
Pennsylvania	10,501,555	10,496,953	0	(10,496,953)
Rhode Island	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
South Carolina	3,822,729	3,847,511	0	(3,847,511)
South Dakota	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
Tennessee	4,160,871	4,551,221	0	(4,551,221)
Texas	23,408,382	23,862,868	0	(23,862,868)
Utah	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
Vermont	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
Virginia	4,118,049	4,256,550	0	(4,256,550)
Washington	3,690,220	3,463,717	0	(3,463,717)
West Virginia	1,684,934	1,851,790	0	(1,851,790)
Wisconsin	4,099,346	3,440,773	0	(3,440,773)
Wyoming	1,317,349	1,294,335	0	(1,294,335)
American Samoa	369,231	335,051	0	(335,051)
Guam	329,259	403,739	0	(403,739)
Northern Mariana Islands	139,381	121,704	0	(121,704)
Puerto Rico	9,282,465	9,667,945	0	(9,667,945)
Virgin Islands	496,154	450,225	0	(450,225)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	2,001,037	1,966,079	0	(1,966,079)
Other (non-State allocations)	5,445,000	5,349,875	0	(5,349,875)
<b>Total</b>	<b>272,250,000</b>	<b>267,493,792</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(267,493,792)</b>



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### 21st Century Community Learning Centers

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	14,799,892	15,716,821	12,106,410	(3,610,411)
Alaska	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
Arizona	19,312,777	21,275,570	14,415,116	(6,860,454)
Arkansas	9,246,706	9,766,690	8,171,154	(1,595,536)
California	127,685,271	131,999,576	92,505,111	(39,494,465)
Colorado	9,545,174	9,927,909	7,652,472	(2,275,437)
Connecticut	7,050,269	9,015,209	6,090,465	(2,924,744)
Delaware	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
District of Columbia	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
Florida	48,863,242	47,168,992	37,040,020	(10,128,972)
Georgia	30,787,858	33,303,918	24,997,015	(8,306,903)
Hawaii	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
Idaho	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
Illinois	40,166,693	48,340,920	30,813,075	(17,527,845)
Indiana	13,740,151	18,827,976	13,476,627	(5,351,349)
Iowa	4,807,715	5,612,966	4,061,418	(1,551,548)
Kansas	5,985,739	7,154,166	5,370,698	(1,783,468)
Kentucky	13,656,071	15,027,316	11,896,864	(3,130,452)
Louisiana	20,942,359	22,346,204	17,449,017	(4,897,187)
Maine	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
Maryland	12,897,299	15,342,177	10,309,979	(5,032,198)
Massachusetts	14,406,511	17,002,191	12,935,232	(4,066,959)
Michigan	31,486,088	37,589,595	29,367,040	(8,222,555)
Minnesota	7,952,424	9,306,805	6,956,256	(2,350,549)
Mississippi	12,251,891	13,937,708	10,458,302	(3,479,406)
Missouri	13,789,699	16,390,440	12,602,531	(3,787,909)
Montana	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
Nebraska	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
Nevada	5,783,321	6,565,862	4,556,166	(2,009,696)
New Hampshire	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
New Jersey	19,230,836	20,170,012	16,029,097	(4,140,915)
New Mexico	8,382,367	8,035,977	6,362,047	(1,673,930)
New York	89,955,104	98,773,426	65,835,947	(32,937,479)
North Carolina	21,953,841	24,530,586	20,471,336	(4,059,250)
North Dakota	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
Ohio	30,630,985	36,688,700	28,733,349	(7,955,351)
Oklahoma	10,379,111	10,056,224	8,401,152	(1,655,072)
Oregon	9,752,332	9,736,866	7,947,818	(1,789,048)
Pennsylvania	36,073,986	42,231,941	31,790,868	(10,441,073)
Rhode Island	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
South Carolina	13,349,772	15,373,083	11,652,497	(3,720,586)
South Dakota	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
Tennessee	15,443,547	16,732,920	13,783,740	(2,949,180)
Texas	87,931,754	94,136,670	72,270,622	(21,866,048)
Utah	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
Vermont	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
Virginia	15,391,238	16,560,710	12,891,306	(3,669,404)
Washington	13,007,033	14,840,197	10,490,146	(4,350,051)
West Virginia	7,341,628	6,775,952	5,608,297	(1,167,655)
Wisconsin	11,315,527	16,485,497	10,420,659	(6,064,838)
Wyoming	4,807,715	5,297,714	3,920,000	(1,377,714)
American Samoa	684,738	758,753	568,870	(189,883)
Guam	829,561	676,611	685,491	8,880
Northern Mariana Islands	248,725	286,421	206,637	(79,784)
Puerto Rico	34,130,970	37,329,381	29,280,151	(8,049,230)
Virgin Islands	920,114	1,019,572	764,418	(255,154)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	7,128,524	8,070,305	5,774,584	(2,295,721)
Other (non-State allocations)	9,811,662	10,811,662	8,000,000	(2,811,662)
<b>Total</b>	<b>981,166,230</b>	<b>1,081,166,187</b>	<b>800,000,000</b>	<b>(281,166,187)</b>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### State Grants for Innovative Programs

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	1,439,564	0	0	0
Alaska	491,535	0	0	0
Arizona	2,027,426	0	0	0
Arkansas	880,239	0	0	0
California	12,108,651	0	0	0
Colorado	1,463,073	0	0	0
Connecticut	1,087,202	0	0	0
Delaware	491,535	0	0	0
District of Columbia	491,535	0	0	0
Florida	5,120,568	0	0	0
Georgia	3,096,475	0	0	0
Hawaii	491,535	0	0	0
Idaho	496,947	0	0	0
Illinois	4,111,777	0	0	0
Indiana	2,025,364	0	0	0
Iowa	915,293	0	0	0
Kansas	886,319	0	0	0
Kentucky	1,278,558	0	0	0
Louisiana	1,393,109	0	0	0
Maine	491,535	0	0	0
Maryland	1,752,956	0	0	0
Massachusetts	1,874,295	0	0	0
Michigan	3,250,647	0	0	0
Minnesota	1,611,074	0	0	0
Mississippi	971,484	0	0	0
Missouri	1,819,214	0	0	0
Montana	491,535	0	0	0
Nebraska	560,631	0	0	0
Nevada	796,572	0	0	0
New Hampshire	491,535	0	0	0
New Jersey	2,703,355	0	0	0
New Mexico	648,237	0	0	0
New York	5,818,633	0	0	0
North Carolina	2,727,967	0	0	0
North Dakota	491,535	0	0	0
Ohio	3,595,360	0	0	0
Oklahoma	1,129,353	0	0	0
Oregon	1,105,121	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	3,674,651	0	0	0
Rhode Island	491,535	0	0	0
South Carolina	1,335,779	0	0	0
South Dakota	491,535	0	0	0
Tennessee	1,844,830	0	0	0
Texas	8,070,735	0	0	0
Utah	959,911	0	0	0
Vermont	491,535	0	0	0
Virginia	2,292,710	0	0	0
Washington	1,975,141	0	0	0
West Virginia	501,875	0	0	0
Wisconsin	1,702,494	0	0	0
Wyoming	491,535	0	0	0
American Samoa	131,372	0	0	0
Guam	282,267	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	88,538	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	1,354,990	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	190,823	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>99,000,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### State Assessments

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	6,616,194	6,616,194	6,616,194	0
Alaska	3,584,250	3,584,250	3,584,250	0
Arizona	8,092,906	8,092,906	8,092,906	0
Arkansas	5,211,165	5,211,165	5,211,165	0
California	33,417,004	33,417,004	33,417,004	0
Colorado	6,675,248	6,675,248	6,675,248	0
Connecticut	5,731,058	5,731,058	5,731,058	0
Delaware	3,650,860	3,650,860	3,650,860	0
District of Columbia	3,354,700	3,354,700	3,354,700	0
Florida	15,862,897	15,862,897	15,862,897	0
Georgia	10,778,365	10,778,365	10,778,365	0
Hawaii	3,935,239	3,935,239	3,935,239	0
Idaho	4,248,333	4,248,333	4,248,333	0
Illinois	13,328,809	13,328,809	13,328,809	0
Indiana	8,087,727	8,087,727	8,087,727	0
Iowa	5,299,222	5,299,222	5,299,222	0
Kansas	5,226,439	5,226,439	5,226,439	0
Kentucky	6,211,746	6,211,746	6,211,746	0
Louisiana	6,499,498	6,499,498	6,499,498	0
Maine	3,935,191	3,935,191	3,935,191	0
Maryland	7,403,435	7,403,435	7,403,435	0
Massachusetts	7,708,240	7,708,240	7,708,240	0
Michigan	11,165,644	11,165,644	11,165,644	0
Minnesota	7,047,027	7,047,027	7,047,027	0
Mississippi	5,440,373	5,440,373	5,440,373	0
Missouri	7,569,876	7,569,876	7,569,876	0
Montana	3,709,692	3,709,692	3,709,692	0
Nebraska	4,408,308	4,408,308	4,408,308	0
Nevada	5,000,994	5,000,994	5,000,994	0
New Hampshire	3,994,213	3,994,213	3,994,213	0
New Jersey	9,790,843	9,790,843	9,790,843	0
New Mexico	4,628,375	4,628,375	4,628,375	0
New York	17,616,440	17,616,440	17,616,440	0
North Carolina	9,852,670	9,852,670	9,852,670	0
North Dakota	3,467,611	3,467,611	3,467,611	0
Ohio	12,031,566	12,031,566	12,031,566	0
Oklahoma	5,836,940	5,836,940	5,836,940	0
Oregon	5,776,072	5,776,072	5,776,072	0
Pennsylvania	12,230,746	12,230,746	12,230,746	0
Rhode Island	3,778,730	3,778,730	3,778,730	0
South Carolina	6,355,484	6,355,484	6,355,484	0
South Dakota	3,620,592	3,620,592	3,620,592	0
Tennessee	7,634,223	7,634,223	7,634,223	0
Texas	23,273,734	23,273,734	23,273,734	0
Utah	5,411,303	5,411,303	5,411,303	0
Vermont	3,446,453	3,446,453	3,446,453	0
Virginia	8,759,302	8,759,302	8,759,302	0
Washington	7,961,566	7,961,566	7,961,566	0
West Virginia	4,260,714	4,260,714	4,260,714	0
Wisconsin	7,276,675	7,276,675	7,276,675	0
Wyoming	3,391,566	3,391,566	3,391,566	0
American Samoa	379,140	379,140	379,140	0
Guam	814,624	814,624	814,624	0
Northern Mariana Islands	255,521	255,521	255,521	0
Puerto Rico	6,403,742	6,403,742	6,403,742	0
Virgin Islands	550,715	550,715	550,715	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	0
Other (non-State allocations)	7,563,200	8,732,480	8,732,000	(480)
<b>Total</b>	<b>407,563,200</b>	<b>408,732,480</b>	<b>408,732,000</b>	<b>(480)</b>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Education for Homeless Children and Youth

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	925,576	997,127	994,864	(2,263)
Alaska	161,901	176,974	177,631	657
Arizona	1,245,604	1,187,280	1,186,794	(486)
Arkansas	575,188	673,005	670,169	(2,836)
California	7,724,532	7,619,046	7,634,166	15,120
Colorado	584,226	630,285	629,198	(1,087)
Connecticut	530,104	501,632	498,797	(2,835)
Delaware	162,722	175,076	175,707	631
District of Columbia	214,961	220,119	221,139	1,020
Florida	2,781,108	3,050,746	3,063,912	13,166
Georgia	1,965,729	2,058,842	2,056,574	(2,268)
Hawaii	175,183	210,284	210,557	273
Idaho	196,533	218,293	218,339	46
Illinois	2,841,103	2,537,873	2,542,065	4,192
Indiana	1,107,809	1,109,982	1,105,325	(4,657)
Iowa	329,630	334,513	332,254	(2,259)
Kansas	420,457	442,350	439,557	(2,793)
Kentucky	885,513	979,868	977,420	(2,448)
Louisiana	1,314,160	1,437,162	1,437,682	520
Maine	206,148	242,465	241,825	(640)
Maryland	903,324	849,166	850,907	1,741
Massachusetts	996,827	1,065,391	1,061,926	(3,465)
Michigan	2,214,220	2,418,773	2,416,798	(1,975)
Minnesota	546,053	572,942	570,249	(2,693)
Mississippi	819,693	861,383	860,202	(1,181)
Missouri	964,834	1,037,989	1,034,609	(3,380)
Montana	177,290	198,876	199,473	597
Nebraska	239,509	282,632	281,587	(1,045)
Nevada	385,283	375,262	377,258	1,996
New Hampshire	163,278	174,567	175,134	567
New Jersey	1,187,655	1,320,213	1,313,739	(6,474)
New Mexico	471,828	524,001	523,381	(620)
New York	5,805,234	5,422,480	5,449,795	27,315
North Carolina	1,445,072	1,686,091	1,684,233	(1,858)
North Dakota	154,678	160,167	160,168	1
Ohio	2,158,194	2,366,580	2,360,076	(6,504)
Oklahoma	592,276	691,948	689,747	(2,201)
Oregon	571,752	654,610	651,612	(2,998)
Pennsylvania	2,478,873	2,618,408	2,615,833	(2,575)
Rhode Island	242,147	235,211	234,777	(434)
South Carolina	905,370	959,741	957,103	(2,638)
South Dakota	177,512	189,672	190,521	849
Tennessee	986,937	1,135,277	1,133,769	(1,508)
Texas	5,526,894	5,952,463	5,962,316	9,853
Utah	277,549	272,421	271,902	(519)
Vermont	154,678	160,167	160,168	1
Virginia	976,107	1,061,773	1,058,888	(2,885)
Washington	870,108	864,005	860,351	(3,654)
West Virginia	397,661	461,919	459,907	(2,012)
Wisconsin	967,932	858,282	856,346	(1,936)
Wyoming	154,678	160,167	160,168	1
American Samoa	17,125	16,377	16,377	0
Guam	15,271	19,734	19,734	0
Northern Mariana Islands	6,464	5,949	5,949	0
Puerto Rico	2,373,826	2,411,616	2,410,345	(1,271)
Virgin Islands	23,011	22,007	22,007	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	618,710	640,669	640,670	1
Other (non-State allocations)	555,000	555,000	555,000	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>61,871,040</b>	<b>64,066,851</b>	<b>64,067,000</b>	<b>149</b>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural and Low-Income Schools Program

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	5,769,468	5,869,888	5,876,785	6,897
Alaska	0	0	0	0
Arizona	1,167,594	1,187,916	1,189,312	1,396
Arkansas	3,639,995	3,703,350	3,707,702	4,352
California	1,244,233	1,265,889	1,267,377	1,488
Colorado	219,607	223,429	223,692	263
Connecticut	0	0	0	0
Delaware	104,850	106,675	106,800	125
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0
Florida	1,448,736	1,473,952	1,475,684	1,732
Georgia	7,258,669	7,385,009	7,393,687	8,678
Hawaii	0	0	0	0
Idaho	21,069	21,436	21,461	25
Illinois	819,909	834,180	835,160	980
Indiana	296,508	301,669	302,023	354
Iowa	0	0	0	0
Kansas	120,193	122,285	122,429	144
Kentucky	5,715,636	5,815,119	5,821,952	6,833
Louisiana	5,902,306	6,005,038	6,012,094	7,056
Maine	2,127,110	2,164,133	2,166,676	2,543
Maryland	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	121,711	123,829	123,975	146
Michigan	929,468	945,646	946,757	1,111
Minnesota	114,793	116,791	116,928	137
Mississippi	7,132,600	7,256,745	7,265,273	8,528
Missouri	2,994,597	3,046,719	3,050,299	3,580
Montana	149,446	152,047	152,226	179
Nebraska	85,176	86,659	86,760	101
Nevada	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	802,420	816,386	817,346	960
New Jersey	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	2,102,800	2,139,400	2,141,914	2,514
New York	1,544,462	1,571,344	1,573,190	1,846
North Carolina	4,636,868	4,717,574	4,723,118	5,544
North Dakota	49,069	49,923	49,982	59
Ohio	1,837,529	1,869,512	1,871,709	2,197
Oklahoma	4,711,471	4,793,476	4,799,108	5,632
Oregon	533,187	542,467	543,105	638
Pennsylvania	484,423	492,855	493,434	579
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	3,733,663	3,798,649	3,803,112	4,463
South Dakota	44,802	45,582	45,635	53
Tennessee	2,759,086	2,807,109	2,810,407	3,298
Texas	7,512,087	7,642,838	7,651,818	8,980
Utah	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0
Virginia	759,829	773,054	773,962	908
Washington	1,001,634	1,019,068	1,020,265	1,197
West Virginia	3,545,678	3,607,392	3,611,631	4,239
Wisconsin	71,610	72,856	72,942	86
Wyoming	0	0	0	0
American Samoa	80,054	81,446	81,446	0
Guam	172,006	174,996	174,996	0
Northern Mariana Islands	53,952	54,890	54,890	0
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	116,282	118,304	118,303	(1)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	422,294	429,636	429,635	(1)
Other (non-State allocations)	100,000	100,000	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>84,458,880</b>	<b>85,927,161</b>	<b>85,927,000</b>	<b>(161)</b>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Small, Rural School Achievement Program

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	0	0	0	0
Alaska	125,883	128,265	128,264	(1)
Arizona	2,117,797	2,157,863	2,157,859	(4)
Arkansas	1,213,395	1,236,351	1,236,349	(2)
California	6,002,612	6,116,175	6,116,163	(12)
Colorado	2,016,064	2,054,206	2,054,202	(4)
Connecticut	1,171,921	1,194,092	1,194,090	(2)
Delaware	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0
Florida	0	0	0	0
Georgia	29,197	29,749	29,749	0
Hawaii	0	0	0	0
Idaho	889,088	905,909	905,907	(2)
Illinois	5,831,246	5,941,567	5,941,556	(11)
Indiana	271,009	276,136	276,136	0
Iowa	4,448,236	4,532,392	4,532,383	(9)
Kansas	3,759,093	3,830,211	3,830,204	(7)
Kentucky	171,400	174,643	174,642	(1)
Louisiana	65,218	66,452	66,452	0
Maine	1,653,885	1,685,175	1,685,172	(3)
Maryland	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	1,378,676	1,404,759	1,404,756	(3)
Michigan	2,718,099	2,769,522	2,769,517	(5)
Minnesota	2,929,922	2,985,353	2,985,347	(6)
Mississippi	54,233	55,259	55,259	0
Missouri	5,233,949	5,332,970	5,332,960	(10)
Montana	4,903,275	4,996,040	4,996,030	(10)
Nebraska	4,257,946	4,338,502	4,338,494	(8)
Nevada	84,299	85,894	85,894	0
New Hampshire	1,255,467	1,279,219	1,279,217	(2)
New Jersey	1,936,669	1,973,309	1,973,305	(4)
New Mexico	578,226	589,165	589,164	(1)
New York	1,824,678	1,859,199	1,859,195	(4)
North Carolina	798,296	813,399	813,397	(2)
North Dakota	648,401	660,668	660,667	(1)
Ohio	2,217,013	2,258,956	2,258,952	(4)
Oklahoma	6,961,136	7,092,833	7,092,820	(13)
Oregon	1,458,930	1,486,531	1,486,529	(2)
Pennsylvania	305,953	311,741	311,741	0
Rhode Island	61,786	62,955	62,955	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	889,815	906,649	906,648	(1)
Tennessee	127,266	129,674	129,673	(1)
Texas	8,405,711	8,564,738	8,564,722	(16)
Utah	259,129	264,031	264,031	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0
Virginia	49,395	50,329	50,329	0
Washington	2,063,747	2,102,791	2,102,787	(4)
West Virginia	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	3,153,590	3,213,252	3,213,246	(6)
Wyoming	10,047	10,237	10,237	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	127,182	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>84,458,880</b>	<b>85,927,161</b>	<b>85,927,000</b>	<b>(161)</b>