

# Archived Information

## Department of Education

### SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

#### Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Request

#### CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	F-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	F-2
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	F-4
Obligations by Object Classification.....	F-5
Summary of Changes .....	F-6
Authorizing Legislation.....	F-8
Appropriations History.....	F-10
Significant Items in FY 2008 Appropriations Reports .....	F-11
Summary of Request .....	F-14
Activities:	
Safe and drug-free schools and communities:	
State grants.....	F-17
National programs.....	F-27
Character education.....	F-49
Elementary and secondary school counseling.....	F-55
Physical education program.....	F-59
Civic education.....	F-64
State Tables.....	F-71

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

For carrying out activities authorized by [subpart 3 of part C of title II,]<sup>1</sup> part A of title IV [, and subparts 2, 3, and 10 of part D of title V]<sup>2</sup> of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ("ESEA"), \$705,733,000] \$281,963,000, of which [\$300,000,000] \$100,000,000 shall become available on July 1, [2008] 2009, and remain available through September 30, [2009] 2010<sup>3</sup>: *Provided*, That [\$300,000,000] \$100,000,000 shall be available for subpart 1 of part A of title IV<sup>4</sup> and [\$222,519,000] \$181,963,000 shall be available for subpart 2 of part A of title IV<sup>5</sup>, of which [not less than \$1,500,000] \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the Project School Emergency Response to Violence ("Project SERV") program to provide education-related services to local educational agencies and to institutions of higher education in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis<sup>6</sup>: *Provided further*, That Project SERV funds appropriated in previous fiscal years may be used to provide services to local educational agencies and to institutions of higher education in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis<sup>7</sup>: *Provided further*, That \$150,729,000 shall be available to carry out part D of title V of the ESEA<sup>8</sup>: *Provided further*, That of the funds available to carry out subpart 3 of part C of title II, up to \$12,072,000 may be used to carry out section 2345<sup>9</sup> and \$2,950,000 shall be used by the Center for Civic Education to implement a comprehensive program to improve public knowledge, understanding, and support of the Congress and the State legislatures<sup>10</sup>].

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

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>1</sup> For carrying out activities authorized by [subpart 3 of part C of title II,...of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965...</p>	<p>The citation for subpart 3 of part C of title II of the ESEA in this language is deleted because no funds are requested for the Civic Education program.</p>
<p><sup>2</sup>...[, and subparts 2, 3, and 10 of part D of title V] of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965...</p>	<p>The citations for subparts 2, 3, and 10 of part D of title V of the ESEA in this language are deleted because no funds are requested for the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling, Character Education, or Physical Education programs.</p>
<p><sup>3</sup>...of which [<del>\$300,000,000</del>] <u>\$100,000,000</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 funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grants.</p>
<p><sup>4</sup>...<i>Provided</i>, That [<del>\$300,000,000</del>] <u>\$100,000,000</u> shall be available for subpart 1 of part A of title IV...</p>	<p>This language earmarks funds for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grants (subpart 1 of part A of title IV).</p>
<p><sup>5</sup>...and [<del>\$222,519,000</del>] <u>\$181,963,000</u> shall be available for subpart 2 of part A of title IV...</p>	<p>This language earmarks funds for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Programs (subpart 2 of part A of title IV).</p>
<p><sup>6</sup>...of which [not less than \$1,500,000] <u>\$5,000,000</u>, to remain available until expended, shall be for the Project School Emergency Response to Violence ("Project SERV") program to provide education related services to local educational agencies and to institutions of higher education in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis...</p>	<p>This language earmarks funds for Project SERV (under Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs) and makes these funds available for obligation at the Federal level until they are expended.</p>

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>7</sup>[...: <i>Provided further</i>, That Project SERV funds appropriated in previous fiscal years may be used to provide services to local educational agencies and to institutions of higher education in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis...]</p>	<p>This language allows Project SERV funds appropriated in previous years that remain available for obligation in or after fiscal year 2008 to be used to provide services to institutions of higher education, as well as to provide services to local educational agencies. Prior to enactment of this language, Project SERV funds were limited to providing such services to local educational agencies only.</p>
<p><sup>8</sup>[...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$150,729,000 shall be available to carry out part D of title V of the ESEA...]</p>	<p>This language, which earmarks funds for programs authorized under part D of title V of the ESEA (the Fund for the Improvement of Education), is deleted because the budget request does not include funding for the Character Education, Elementary and Secondary School Counseling, and Physical Education programs.</p>
<p><sup>9</sup>[...<i>Provided further</i>, That of the funds available to carry out subpart 3 of part C of title II, up to \$12,072,000 may be used to carry out section 2345...]</p>	<p>This language earmarks funds under the Civic Education program for the Cooperative Education Exchange. It is deleted because the budget request does not include funding for this activity.</p>
<p><sup>10</sup>[...and \$2,950,000 shall be used by the Center for Civic Education to implement a comprehensive program to improve public knowledge, understanding, and support of the Congress and the State legislatures].</p>	<p>This language earmarks funds under the Civic Education program for a civics education project. It is deleted because the budget request does not include funding for this activity.</p>

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

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

	2007	2008	2009
Discretionary authority:			
Annual appropriation.....	\$729,518	\$705,733	\$281,963
Across-the-board reduction .....	<u>0</u>	<u>-12,329</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation .....	729,518	693,404	281,963
Supplemental (P.L. 110-28)	<u>8,594</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, adjusted discretionary Appropriation	738,112	693,404	281,963
Unobligated balance, start of year .....	5,001	9,901	0
Unobligated balance, expiring.....	-1	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year .....	<u>-9,901</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations .....	733,211	703,305	281,963

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

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

	2007	2008	2009
Printing and reproduction .....	\$587	\$594	\$601
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services .....	3,683	3,729	3,775
Peer review .....	823	1,852	890
Other services .....	11,396	10,426	11,539
Purchases of goods and services from other government accounts .....	<u>2,854</u>	<u>2,889</u>	<u>2,924</u>
Subtotal .....	18,666	18,896	19,128
Grants, subsidies, and contributions .....	713,956	683,815	262,234
Interest and dividends.....	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, obligations.....	733,211	703,305	281,963

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

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

---

2008 .....		\$693,404
2009 .....		281,963
Net change.....		-411,441

---

	<u>2008 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<b>Increases:</b>		
Program:		
Increase for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities to provide direct support to LEAs, in sufficient amounts to make a real difference at the local level, for drug and violence prevention activities where outcomes can be measured and grantees held accountable.	\$137,664	+ <u>\$44,299</u>
Subtotal, increases		+44,299
<b>Decreases:</b>		
Program:		
Decrease in funding for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants because, in contrast to the current program, which provides formula allocations to LEAs, the reauthorized program would focus on building State capacity to assist school districts in creating safe, drug-free schools and a secure school environment.	294,759	-194,759
Eliminate funding for Alcohol Abuse Reduction because it is duplicative of other Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities-funded programs.	32,423	-32,423
Eliminate funding for Mentoring, which has completed its mission.	48,544	-48,544
Eliminate Character Education as a distinct program, because funding for character education activities is requested under Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities.	23,824	-23,824

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Summary of Changes (continued)

	<u>2008 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<b>Decreases:</b>		
Program (continued):		
Eliminate funding for Physical Education, which has no demonstrated evidence of effectiveness, in order to free up scarce resources for other, higher-priority programs.	\$75,655	-\$75,655
Eliminate funding for small, narrowly focused programs that have only indirect or limited effect on improving student outcomes: Elementary and Secondary School Counseling (\$48,617 thousand) and Civic Education (\$31,917 thousand).	\$80,534	<u>-80,534</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-455,739
Net change		-411,441



**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

**Authorizing Legislation  
(\$000s)**

Activity	2008 Authorized	2008 Estimate	2009 Authorized	2009 Request
Safe and drug-free schools and communities ( <i>ESEA-IV-A</i> ):				
State grants ( <i>Subpart 1</i> )	Indefinite	\$294,759	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	\$100,000
National programs ( <i>Subpart 2</i> ):				
National activities ( <i>Sections 4121 and 4122</i> )	Indefinite <sup>2</sup>	137,664	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	181,963
Alcohol abuse reduction ( <i>Section 4129</i> )	Indefinite <sup>2</sup>	32,423	0 <sup>3</sup>	0
Mentoring programs ( <i>Section 4130</i> )	Indefinite <sup>2</sup>	48,544	0 <sup>3</sup>	0
Character education ( <i>ESEA V-D, Subpart 3</i> )	(4)	23,824	0 <sup>3</sup>	0
Elementary and secondary school counseling ( <i>ESEA-V-D, Subpart 2</i> )	(4)	48,617	0 <sup>3</sup>	0
Physical education program ( <i>ESEA-V-D, Subpart 10</i> )	(4)	75,655	0 <sup>3</sup>	0
Civic education ( <i>ESEA II, Part C-3</i> ):				
We the People ( <i>Section 2344</i> )	Indefinite <sup>5</sup>	20,056	0 <sup>3</sup>	0
Cooperative education exchange ( <i>Section 2345</i> )	Indefinite <sup>5</sup>	11,861	0 <sup>3</sup>	0
<u>Unfunded authorizations</u>				
Grants directed at preventing and reducing alcohol abuse at institutions of higher education ( <i>section 2(e)(2) of P.L. 109-422</i> )	\$5,000	0	\$5,000	0
Total definite authorization	5,000		5,000	
Total appropriation (request subject to reauthorization)		693,404		281,963

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

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Authorizing Legislation—continued

<sup>2</sup> Funds appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs in fiscal year 2008 may not be increased above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2007 unless the amount appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants in fiscal year 2008 is at least 10 percent greater than the amount appropriated in 2007.

<sup>3</sup> The GEPA applies through September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

<sup>4</sup> A total of \$675,000 thousand is authorized to carry out all Title V, Part D activities.

<sup>5</sup> Of the amount appropriated for Subpart 3 (Civic Education), not more than 40 percent of the amount appropriated in any fiscal year may be used to carry out Section 2345 (the Cooperative Education Exchange).

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

**Appropriations History**  
(\$000s)

---

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2004 (2004 Advance for 2005)	\$756,250 (330,000)	\$825,068 (330,000)	\$818,547	\$855,775
2005	838,897	801,369	891,460	860,771
2006	396,767	763,870	697,300	729,517
2007 Supplemental (P.L. 110-28)	266,627	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	729,518 8,594
2008	324,248	760,575	697,112	693,404
2009	281,963			

---

<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.

---

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Significant Items in FY 2008 Appropriations Reports

#### Emergency Preparedness for Institutions of Higher Education

- House: The Committee believes that the Department should expand its assistance under the Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools Grants and the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative to colleges and universities to assist them in responding to traumatic events and emergencies within the context and needs of higher education. The Committee intends that the increase in 2008 funding for school emergency preparedness, along with funds provided under the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) in the Department of Health and Human Services, be used for a new initiative of competitive grants, administered jointly by Education and SAMSHA, to assist institutions of higher education (IHEs) in developing and implementing emergency management plans for preventing campus violence (including assessing and addressing the mental health needs of students) and for responding to threats and incidents of violence or natural disasters in a manner that ensures the safety of the campus community. The Committee intends that these funds be available to help colleges and universities plan and prepare for the entire constellation of threats (terrorist attacks, natural disasters, shootings, and gang-related activities).
- Conference: The Committees intend that funding recommended for school emergency preparedness activities be used for new grants awards to IHEs, in addition to school districts currently eligible, to develop and implement emergency management plans for preventing campus violence (including assessing and addressing the mental health needs of students) and for responding to threats and incidents of violence or natural disaster in a manner that ensures the safety of the campus community. The Committees intends that these funds be available to IHEs plan and prepare for the entire constellation of threats (terrorist attacks, natural disasters, shootings, and gang-related activities).
- Response: In 2008 the Department plans to conduct a new grant competition to support the efforts of institutions of higher education to improve and strengthen their readiness and emergency management procedures. We have begun collaborating with SAMSHA on this effort and expect that they will transfer some of their funds to Education to help support these projects.
- House: The Committee requests that the Department and SAMHSA brief the Committee on its plan for the implementation of this initiative within 90 days of enactment of the Labor-HHS-Education 2008 Appropriations Act.
- Response: The Department will brief the Committee by March 25, 2008, on its plans for carrying out this initiative.

## **SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

### **Significant Items in FY 2008 Appropriations Reports (continued)**

#### **Threat Assessments**

Conference: The Committees request that the Department update the 2002 Department of Education and Secret Service guidance titled, "Threat Assessment in Schools: A Guide to Managing Threatening Situations and to Creating Safe School Climates" to reflect the recommendations contained in the report titled "Report to the President on Issues Raised by the Virginia Tech Tragedy" and that within a year the Department disseminate the updated guidance to institutions of higher education and to State departments of education for distribution to all local educational agencies.

Response: In October 2007 the Department posted on its web site, and distributed to each school district and institution of higher education in the country, a document titled "Balancing Student Privacy and School Safety: A Guide to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act." This Guide (customized in separate editions for elementary/secondary schools and for colleges and universities) addressed one of the central issues raised in the Report to the President on Issues Raised by the Virginia Tech Tragedy. As the next step in developing further guidance for IHEs on this topic, representatives of Education, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Secret Service have met to discuss conducting a joint study on targeted shootings at IHEs to delve into this topic in greater depth. Completing the study will take approximately 12 to 18 months. Once the study is completed the Department will issue additional guidance to IHEs on threat assessments that is based on the research findings of the study. In the interim the Department will continue to train law enforcement, mental health, and education officials on basic concepts of threat assessment.

#### **National Clearinghouse for Educational Building Facilities**

Senate: The Committee expects that the Department will use \$300,000 in fiscal year 2008 Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs funds for the continued operation of the National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities. These funds will be used to address issues related to school safety and healthy school buildings.

Response: The Department will use the 2008 post-rescission appropriation amount of \$294,759 (\$300,000 less the 1.747 percent across-the-board reduction) within Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs to provide a continuation grant award to the National Institute of Building Sciences for this purpose.

## **SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

### **Significant Items in FY 2008 Appropriations Reports (continued)**

#### **Recognition of Model Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Programs in Higher Education**

Conference: The Department is directed to use \$850,000 within the amount provide for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs to identify and provide recognition of promising and model alcohol and drug abuse education programs in higher education.

Response: The Department plans to use the 2008 post-rescission appropriation amount of \$835,150 (\$850,000 less the 1.747 percent across-the-board reduction) within Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs to identify and provide recognition of exemplary, effective, and promising alcohol and drug abuse education programs in higher education.

#### **Alcohol Abuse Reduction**

Senate: The Committee directs the Department and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) in the Department of Health and Human Services to work together on this program.

Response: The Department will continue its Memorandum of Understanding with SAMHSA, under which SAMHSA provides alcohol abuse resources and technical assistance to the Department's grantees under this program.

#### **Physical Education**

House: The Committee directs the Department to work with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to incorporate the CDC's School Health Index assessment tool into the Physical Education program. For fiscal year 2008 awards, the Department shall grant priority to those applications that have completed physical education and nutritional assessments as part of the School Health Index or propose to implement the School Health Index. Awards should support the implementation of science-based curriculum tools to encourage physical education and healthy eating.

Response: In 2008 the Department plans to give priority under the physical education grant competition to applicants that have completed the physical activity and healthy eating modules of the School Health Index that are appropriate for the target population to be served by the grant, and that propose to use those School Health Index findings to develop their proposed physical education projects.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2009 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(in thousands of dollars)		2007 Annual	2008	2009	Change from 2008 Appropriation	
Office, Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	CR Operating Plan	Appropriation	President's Request	Amount	Percent
<b>Safe Schools and Citizenship Education</b>						
1. Safe and drug-free schools and communities (ESEA IV-A):						
(a) State grants (Subpart 1)	D	346,500	294,759	100,000	(194,759)	-66.1%
(b) National programs (Subpart 2):						
(1) National activities (sections 4121 and 4122)	D	149,706 <sup>1</sup>	137,664	181,963	44,299	32.2%
(2) Alcohol abuse reduction (section 4129)	D	32,409	32,423	0	(32,423)	-100.0%
(3) Mentoring program (section 4130)	D	48,814	48,544	0	(48,544)	-100.0%
Subtotal, National programs		230,929	218,632	181,963	(36,669)	-16.8%
Subtotal		577,429	513,391	281,963	(231,428)	-45.1%
2. Character education (ESEA V-D, subpart 3)	D	24,248	23,824	0	(23,824)	-100.0%
3. Elementary and secondary school counseling (ESEA V-D, subpart 2)	D	34,650	48,617	0	(48,617)	-100.0%
4. Physical education program (ESEA V-D, subpart 10)	D	72,674	75,655	0	(75,655)	-100.0%
5. Civic education (ESEA II, Part C-3):						
(a) We the People (section 2344)	D	17,039	20,056	0	(20,056)	-100.0%
(b) Cooperative education exchange (section 2345)	D	12,072	11,861	0	(11,861)	-100.0%
Subtotal		29,111	31,917	0	(31,917)	-100.0%
<b>Total</b>		<b>738,112</b>	<b>693,404</b>	<b>281,963</b>	<b>(411,441)</b>	<b>-59.3%</b>
Outlays	D	754,337	776,333	705,830	(70,503)	-9.1%

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$8,594 thousand for Persistently Dangerous Schools appropriated by section 5502 of P.L. 110-28, the U.S. Troops, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act of 2007, May 25, 2007.

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

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Summary of Request

The programs in the Safe Schools and Citizenship Education account help ensure that our Nation's schools offer a safe, secure, and drug-free environment for learning, and promote strong character and citizenship among our Nation's youth.

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

Teaching and learning to the high standards demanded in the No Child Left Behind Act require that our schools are safe and our students are drug-free. For 2009, the Administration requests \$282 million for programs in the account, a \$411.4 million, or 59 percent, decrease from 2008. The request provides funding for two key programs administered by the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and eliminates funding for the remaining programs in the account, in part to reallocate scarce resources to support higher-priority programs for which funds are requested elsewhere in the Administration's budget.

As part of the ESEA reauthorization, the Administration proposes to restructure the **Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grants** program because the current program is flawed, spreading funding too thinly to support quality interventions and failing to target schools and communities in greatest need of assistance. Under the reauthorized program the Department would instead allocate funds to State educational agencies to increase their capacity to provide school districts with training, technical assistance, and information regarding effective models and strategies for the creation of safe, healthy, and secure schools, and to provide a limited number of subgrants to high-need districts. The budget request includes \$100 million for this more focused program.

To further support positive and safe learning environments through education and prevention activities, the reauthorization proposal would consolidate **SDFSC National Programs** into a single, more flexible discretionary grant program focused on four priority areas: Emergency Planning, Preventing Violence and Drug Use, School Culture and Climate, and Emerging Needs. The 2009 request includes a total of \$182 million for SDFSC National Programs. The largest increases are proposed for activities that provide direct support to LEAs, in sufficient amounts to make a real difference, for targeted projects that address key national concerns and are structured in a manner that permits grantees and independent evaluators to measure progress, hold projects accountable, and determine which interventions are most effective. This request includes:

- \$10 million for grant assistance to LEAs to support the implementation of drug prevention or school safety programs that research has demonstrated to be effective in reducing youth drug use or violence and for implementation and scientifically based evaluation of additional approaches that show promise of effectiveness;
- \$30 million for school emergency preparedness initiatives that the Department is implementing to coincide with the inclusion of the Nation's schools in the Department of Homeland Security's National Infrastructure Protection Plan and \$5 million for a companion initiative in emergency preparedness for institutions of higher education;



## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Summary of Request

- \$77.8 million for grants to LEAs for comprehensive, community-wide “Safe Schools/Healthy Students” drug and violence prevention projects that are coordinated with local law enforcement and also include mental health preventive and treatment services;
- \$11.8 million for school-based drug testing programs for students;
- \$23.8 million for activities to design and implement character education programs in elementary and secondary schools;
- \$6 million to continue providing financial and technical assistance to institutions of higher education (IHEs) for drug prevention and campus safety programs and for a restructured IHE National Recognition Awards program;
- \$5 million for Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence), to ensure that funds are available for the Department, if called upon, to provide emergency response services to LEAs and IHEs in which the learning environment has been disrupted by a violent or traumatic crisis; and
- \$12.5 million for other activities that support and improve drug and violence prevention efforts, such as evaluation, data collection and analysis, joint projects with other Federal agencies, the national clearinghouse for educational facilities, development and dissemination of materials and information, and other forms of technical assistance.

No separate funds are requested for the existing **Character Education** program, because funding for character education activities, which can help create safe and inclusive learning environments that foster student academic achievement along with increased social responsibility and tolerance for others, is included at \$23.8 million within the request for SDFSC National Activities.

No funding is requested for the **Alcohol Abuse Reduction, Mentoring, Physical Education, Elementary School Counseling, or Civic Education** programs, consistent with the Administration’s effort to eliminate small categorical programs that duplicate other programs, are targeted on a narrow group of recipients, have limited impact, have completed the accomplishment of their objectives, or for which there is little or no reliable evidence of effectiveness.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

---

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, 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>
\$294,759	\$100,000	-\$194,759

---

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grants is a State-administered formula grant program intended to help create and maintain drug-free, safe, and orderly environments for learning in and around schools by supporting effective, research-based approaches to drug and violence prevention.

From the total appropriation, 1 percent or \$4.75 million (whichever is greater) is reserved for the Outlying Areas, 1 percent or \$4.75 million (whichever is greater) is reserved for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for programs for Indian youth, and 0.2 percent is reserved for programs for Native Hawaiians. The Department allocates the remaining funds by formula to States, half on the basis of school-aged population and half on the basis of State shares of ESEA Title I Concentration Grants funding for the previous year, provided that no State receives less than the greater of: (1) one-half of 1 percent of the total, or (2) the amount it received under the program in fiscal year 2001. Of each State's allocation, the Governor may elect to administer up to 20 percent of the funds; the remainder is administered by the State educational agency (SEA).

SEAs are authorized to reserve up to 5 percent of their allocations to plan, develop, and implement capacity-building, technical assistance and training, evaluation, program improvement, and coordination activities for local educational agencies (LEAs), community-based organizations, and other public and private entities. These services and activities assist LEAs in developing, implementing, and evaluating comprehensive prevention programs that are consistent with the SDFSC statutory requirements. They may include, but are not limited to, identification, development, evaluation, and dissemination of drug and violence prevention strategies, programs, and activities; training, technical assistance, and demonstration projects to address violence that is associated with prejudice and intolerance; and financial assistance to enhance drug and violence prevention resources available in areas that serve large numbers of low-income children, are sparsely populated, or have other special needs. SEAs may also reserve up to 3 percent for administrative costs but must subgrant at least 93 percent to their

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

---

LEAs. LEA allocations are based 60 percent on Title I Basic and Concentration Grant funding for the preceding year and 40 percent on enrollment.

LEAs participating in the program must use their SDFSC funds to develop, implement, and evaluate comprehensive programs and activities that are coordinated with other school and community-based services and programs and that:

- Are consistent with the SDFSC principles of effectiveness listed below.
- Foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports academic achievement.
- Are designed to: (1) prevent or reduce violence; the use, possession, and distribution of illegal drugs; and delinquency; and (2) create a disciplined environment conducive to learning, including through consultation among teachers, principals, and other school personnel in order to identify early warning signs of drug use and violence and to provide behavioral interventions as part of classroom management efforts.
- Include activities to: (1) promote the involvement of parents in the activity or program; (2) promote coordination with community groups and coalitions, and government agencies; and (3) distribute information to those individuals and organizations about the LEA's needs, goals, and programs funded under the SDFSC Act.

Within these program requirements, LEAs may use their SDFSC funds for a wide variety of activities. However, an LEA may use not more than 20 percent of its SDFSC funds for school security-related activities, other than for hiring and training school security personnel, which may absorb up to 40 percent of the LEA's SDFSC allocation. In addition, not more than 2 percent of an LEA's funding under the program may be used for administrative costs.

Governors may reserve up to 3 percent of their funds for administrative costs, and must use the remainder to award competitive grants and contracts to LEAs, community-based organizations (including community anti-drug coalitions), and other public entities and private organizations. These awards must be used to carry out the State's comprehensive plan submitted to the Department jointly by the chief State school officer and the Governor for the use of funds to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities through programs and activities that complement and support the activities of LEAs. Funds may support activities to prevent and reduce violence associated with prejudice and intolerance; dissemination of information about drug and violence prevention; and development and implementation of community-wide drug and violence prevention planning and organizing.

In making grants and contracts, the Governor must give priority to programs and activities for (1) children and youth who are not normally served by SEAs or LEAs, or (2) populations that need special services or additional resources (such as youth in juvenile detention facilities, runaway or homeless children and youth, pregnant and parenting teenagers, and school dropouts). Governors must also give special consideration to grantees that pursue a comprehensive approach to drug and violence prevention that includes incorporating mental health services within their program.

Principles of Effectiveness. SEAs, LEAs, and Governors' award recipients are required to operate their State Grant programs in a manner consistent with statutory Principles of

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

---

Effectiveness. These Principles require prevention programs to: (1) be based on an assessment of objective data about the drug and violence problems in the schools and communities to be served; (2) be based on performance measures aimed at ensuring that these schools and communities have a safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environment; (3) be grounded in scientifically based research that provides evidence that the program will reduce violence and illegal drug use; (4) be based on an analysis of the prevalence of "risk factors, protective factors, buffers, assets, or other variables," identified through scientifically based research, that exist in the schools and communities in the State; (5) include consultation with and input from parents; and (6) be evaluated periodically against locally selected performance measures and modified over time (based on the evaluation) to refine, improve, and strengthen the program.

Uniform Management Information and Reporting System. The statute requires States to establish and maintain a Uniform Management Information and Reporting System (UMIRS) under which they must provide information on a school-by-school basis to the public on truancy rates and on the frequency, seriousness, and incidence of violence and drug-related offenses resulting in suspensions and expulsions. The UMIRS must also include information, reported publicly, on the types of curricula, programs, and services provided by grantees and on the incidence and prevalence, age of onset, perception of health risk, and perception of social disapproval of drug use and violence by youth. The Department has worked collaboratively with the States to develop a uniform data set that includes the UMIRS elements. States and LEAs must also develop and identify performance measures for their SDFSC-funded drug and violence prevention programs and activities, and assess and publicly report on progress toward meeting those measures.

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 for 15 months through September 30 of the following year.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$440,908
2005.....	437,381
2006.....	346,500
2007.....	346,500
2008.....	294,759

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grant 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. The Administration requests \$100 million for the SDFSC State Grant

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### **Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants**

---

program in fiscal year 2009, under a reauthorization proposal that would significantly change the structure of the program.

A 2002 PART review rated the current program as “Ineffective,” primarily because its structure is fundamentally flawed and the program was unable to demonstrate effectiveness in reducing youth alcohol and drug use and violence. A second PART review, conducted in 2006, rated the program as “Results Not Demonstrated.” The 2006 review again found that the structure of the SDFSC State Grant program is flawed, spreading funding too broadly to support quality interventions and failing to target those schools and communities in greatest need of assistance. SDFSC State Grants provide more than half of local educational agencies (LEAs) with allocations of less than \$10,000, amounts typically too small to mount comprehensive and effective drug and school safety programs. In sum, the program is unable to demonstrate that it is achieving its mission.

The Administration has responded to these findings with a reauthorization proposal that would change the structure of the program significantly. Under the new program, the Department would allocate SDFSC State Grant funds by formula to SEAs, which would use the funds to provide school districts direct assistance and financial support for the implementation of effective models (that, to the extent possible, reflect scientifically based research) for the creation of safe, healthy, and secure schools. Examples of such activities could include:

- Provision of training, technical assistance, information, evaluation, local capacity building, coordination activities, and other services to school districts to support their efforts to prepare for, prevent, mitigate, respond to, and recover from crises arising from violent or traumatic events or natural disasters, and to restore the learning environment in the event of a crisis or emergency;
- Financial assistance to enhance drug and violence prevention resources available in areas that serve large numbers of low-income children, are sparsely populated, can demonstrate a significant need as a result of high rates of drug and alcohol abuse or violence, or have other special needs so that they can develop, implement, and evaluate comprehensive drug, alcohol, or violence prevention programs and activities that are coordinated with other school and community-based services and programs and that foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports academic achievement;
- The collection, analysis, and dissemination of data on the extent to which students and schools in the State are free of drugs and violence and prepared to respond appropriately in the event of an emergency.

A key difference between the current and proposed programs is that the current program allocates funds by formula virtually to every school district, whereas the reauthorized program would focus on building State capacity to assist school districts in creating a safe, drug-free school, and secure school environment. While States would be authorized under the revised program to make subgrants to LEAs and other entities, there would be no within-State formula and no expectation that every LEA in the State would receive a grant. As a result, States would be able to target more effectively those schools with a demonstrated need.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

The Administration believes that this more focused objective can be accomplished with less funding than is appropriated for the SDFSC State Grants in 2008, and that a \$100 million request will be sufficient to meet that objective. Additional funding for LEAs is included under the 2009 budget request for SDFSC National Programs, for activities in areas of major national priority.

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Grants to States	\$336,307	\$284,669	\$99,000
Amount for SEAs and LEAs	269,718	228,305	99,000
Amount for Governors	66,589	56,364	0
Average State award	6,467	5,473	1,904
Range of awards	1,682- 41,540	1,423- 35,162	248- 12,833
Set-aside for Outlying Areas	4,750	4,750	500
Set-aside for BIA schools	4,750	4,750	500
Programs for Native Hawaiians	693	590	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 those requested in fiscal year 2009 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

##### **Goal: Develop safe, disciplined, and drug-free learning environments**

**Objective:** *To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of programs that reflect scientifically based research.*

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of drug and violence prevention programs and practices supported with SDFSC State Grant funds that are research-based.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		7.8
2008	11.7	

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

**Measure:** Percentage of SDFSC-funded research-based drug and violence prevention curriculum programs that are implemented with fidelity.

Year	Target	Actual
2005		44.3
2008	50.9	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department collected baseline data for these two performance measures, for the 2004-05 school year, as part of a Study of the Implementation of Research-Based Programs and Practices in Schools to Prevent Youth Substance Abuse and School Crime (which was funded under SDFSC National Programs). An assessment of progress cannot be made until at least 2009, when data for the 2007-08 school year are expected to become available.

**Measure:** The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who were offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		29
2005	28	25
2007	27	
2009	26	

**Measure:** The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who used marijuana one or more times during the past 30 days.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		22
2005	21	20
2007	19	
2009	18	

**Measure:** The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who had five or more drinks of alcohol in a row (that is, within a couple of hours) one or more times during the past 30 days.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		28
2005	27	26
2007	26	
2009	25	

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

**Measure:** The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who were in a physical fight on school property one or more times during the past 12 months.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		12.8
2005	12	13.6
2007	12	
2009	11	

**Measure:** The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property one or more times during the past 30 days.

Year	Target	Actual
2003		6.1
2005	5	6.5
2007	5	
2009	4	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department is using these five measures on the prevalence of drug use and violence as a component of measuring the performance of the SDFSC State Grant program. Data for these measures are collected from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System, conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention every 2 years, using a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12. The 2005 targets for the first three indicators were exceeded. The 2005 targets for the last two indicators were not met. The data show non-statistically significant increases in fights and weapons carrying since 2001.

### Efficiency Measures

To improve the operational efficiency of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants program, the Department developed two measures of efficiency. .

**Measure:** The (average) number of days it takes the Department to send monitoring reports to States after monitoring visits.

Year	Target	Actual
2004		46
2005		46
2006	45	44
2007	43	43
2008	41	
2009	39	



## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

---

**Measure:** The (average) number of days it takes States to respond satisfactorily to findings in the monitoring reports.

Year	Target	Actual
2004		78
2005		78
2006	77	74
2007	75	84
2008	72	
2009	69	

**Assessment of progress:** The average number of days it takes the Department to send monitoring reports to States after monitoring visits decreased from 46 days in 2005 to 44 days in 2006, surpassing the target of 45 days. The average number of days it takes States to respond satisfactorily to findings in the monitoring reports first decreased, from 78 days in 2005 to 74 days in 2006, surpassing the 2006 target of 77 days, but then increased to 84 days and fell short of the 2007 target of 75 days.

#### Other Performance Information

The Department's strategy for assessing whether the current SDFSC State Grant program is making an investment toward positive outcomes uses (1) data on the extent to which recipients of SDFSC State Grant funds are implementing research-based practices, coupled with (2) national survey data on the prevalence of youth drug use and violence. The Department is also carrying out an evaluation using rigorous methodology for measuring the impact of promising interventions (which is discussed in the budget request for SDFSC National Programs), and supporting grants and technical assistance to help States improve the collection, analysis, and use of data to improve the quality, and report the outcomes, of their SDFSC programs.

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

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants was among the programs rated in 2002 and 2006 using the "Program Assessment Rating Tool" (PART). The 2002 PART rated SDFSC State Grants as "Ineffective" and the 2006 PART rated the program as "Results Not Demonstrated." The PART recommendations for the program, along with the Department's response and timeline for implementing those recommendations, are as follows.

- *Collect and report data on the extent to which program funds are being used to support high-quality, research-based strategies at the local level.* The Department has collected data concerning the extent to which program funds are being used to support high-quality, research-based programs. Data for the 2004-05 school year on the extent to which SDFSC State Grant program funds were used to support research-based strategies, and among those strategies, the extent to which curriculum-based programs were implemented with fidelity to the research, are now available and comprise the baseline data for two of the

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

---

Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measures for the program. The Department is now planning a follow-up data collection for the 2007-08 school year.

- *Provide training and technical assistance to States on issues related to data quality and the use of data for program management.* Under SDFSC National Programs, the Department awarded a total of 16 3-year grants in two cohorts (beginning in fiscal years 2004 and 2005, respectively) to support States in their efforts to improve the quality of data collected related to youth drug use and violence and the use of these data in managing youth drug and violence prevention programs in the States. Final funding was awarded to the 2004 cohort of sites in fiscal year 2006, and final funding for the 2005 cohort in fiscal year 2007. Grantees are reporting to the Department on the following GPRA measures for these projects (for which data and targets are provided in the budget justification for SDFSC National Programs):
  - The proportion of local recipients of SDFSC State Grants program funding that are using data related to youth drug and violence to manage youth drug, alcohol, and violence prevention programs by: (1) incorporating these data in needs assessment processes; (2) using the data to develop performance measures for their SDFSC-funded programs; (3) considering the data in selecting schools and, where applicable, community-based interventions for implementation; (4) monitoring the success of interventions in reducing drug and alcohol use and violence and in building stronger communities; and (5) sharing data with their leadership and the public;
  - The proportion of local recipients of SDFSC State Grants program funding that have received training about collecting, analyzing, and using data to manage and improve drug and violence prevention programs; and
  - The proportion of local recipients of SDFSC State Grants program funding that submit complete responses to data collections.

The Department also provided training and technical assistance to States related to these efforts, and will continue to do so, as part of the contract activity described in connection with the following PART recommendation.

- *Implement a project with States to develop a uniform data set that they can use as a model in meeting the requirements of the Uniform Management Information and Reporting System (UMIRS).* During 2005, the Department met with representatives from 49 States and territories to obtain input for a uniform data set that addresses the requirements of the UMIRS. The contractor for the project also interviewed staff in other Federal agencies that collect or use data about youth alcohol and drug use and violence to identify potential common data elements or definitions that could inform this project. Based on this input, the contractor developed a draft uniform data set, which the Department released in final to the States in 2007.

By early 2008, the Department will have hosted four regional meetings for States to “roll out” the data set to State Grants program coordinators and provide technical assistance to States about the measures and computation methods included in it, and to respond to any questions and concerns States may have about its implementation.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

---

Following the regional meetings, the contractor will provide technical assistance to individual States to assist them in efforts to adopt and implement the uniform data set. The contractor is also identifying and documenting some of the “best practices” in data collection and use adopted by the State Data Grant recipients and others, and will develop a compilation of these practices of lessons learned during the delivery of technical assistance.

Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, the Department has asked States to provide data for the ESEA Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) using some of the data elements and definitions contained in the uniform data set. Information from the CSPR and other sources will be used to produce a biennial report to Congress, as required for the SDFSC State Grants program. The first biennial report will be sent to Congress later this year.

- *Post State-level performance data on progress toward meeting performance targets on the program website.* The Department has completed the collection of information from States about their progress toward meeting their performance targets for the 2005-06 school year, and prepared individual State profiles that include this performance information, as well as data about suspensions and expulsions related to drug use or violence and information about parent involvement in prevention efforts. The Department intends to have this information posted on the Department’s web site by August.
- *Work with Congress during the upcoming reauthorization to authorize a more effective vehicle for school-based drug and violence prevention.* The Administration’s reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act includes a significantly revised SDFSC State Grant program that addresses the major flaws identified in the PART review – a program structure that spreads limited funding too thinly to permit recipients to implement research-based interventions and fails to target program beneficiaries in most need of resources.

The reauthorization proposal would eliminate the requirement that States subgrant SDFSC funds to LEAs, as well as the program funding currently designated for the chief executive officer of each State, and shift the focus of the program to one that emphasizes State leadership in providing training and technical assistance in helping LEAs select and implement research-based strategies and programs. The proposal would authorize States to award subgrants to LEAs, but permit States to determine how much funding, if any, will be devoted to subgrants, as well as the criteria that will be used for selecting recipients and award amounts.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

---

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
National activities	\$137,664	\$181,963	+\$44,299
Alcohol abuse reduction	32,423	0	-32,423
Mentoring program	<u>48,544</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-48,544</u>
Total	218,632	181,963	-36,669

---

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Programs statute authorizes funding for several programs and activities to help promote safe and drug-free learning environments for students and address the needs of at-risk youth. These include alcohol abuse reduction, mentoring programs, and other national programs (Federal activities and impact evaluation).

#### **Alcohol Abuse Reduction (Section 4129)**

Under this program, the Department, in consultation with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) in the Department of Health and Human Services, awards competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to develop and implement innovative and effective programs to reduce alcohol abuse in secondary schools. The Department may reserve up to 20 percent of the appropriation to enable SAMHSA to provide alcohol abuse resources and start-up assistance to the LEAs receiving these grants. The Department may also reserve up to 25 percent of the funds to award program grants to low-income and rural LEAs. As a condition of funding, all grantees are required to implement one or more strategies for reducing underage alcohol abuse that SAMHSA has determined are effective.

#### **Mentoring program (Section 4130)**

Under this program, the Department awards grants to LEAs, non-profit community-based organizations, and partnerships of the two to establish and support mentoring programs and activities for children who are at risk of educational failure, dropping out of school, or involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong, positive role models. The

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### **Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs**

---

programs must be designed to link these children (particularly those living in rural areas, high-crime areas, or troubled home environments, or children experiencing educational failure or attending schools with violence problems) with mentors who have received training and support in mentoring and are interested in working with such children. Mentors provide general guidance and emotional support; promote personal and social responsibility; offer academic assistance and encouragement to excel in school and plan for the future; discourage illegal use of drugs and alcohol, violence, and other harmful activity; and encourage participation in community service and community activities. Grant funds must be used for activities that include, but are not limited to, hiring and training mentoring coordinators and support staff; recruiting, screening, and training mentors; and disseminating outreach materials. However, the mentors may not be compensated directly with grant funds. In awarding grants, the Department is required to give priority to projects that propose school-based mentoring programs. The Department may also use funds under this program to provide technical assistance to grantees in implementing their projects effectively.

### **Federal Activities (Section 4121)**

The Department is authorized to carry out a wide variety of discretionary activities designed to prevent the illegal use of drugs and violence among, and promote safety and discipline for, students. These activities may be carried out through grants to or contracts with public and private organizations and individuals, or through agreements with other Federal agencies, and may include, but are not limited to:

- The development and demonstration of innovative strategies for the training of school personnel, parents, and members of the community;
- The development, demonstration, scientifically based evaluation, and dissemination of innovative and high-quality drug and violence prevention programs and activities;
- The provision of information on drug abuse education and prevention to the Department of Health and Human Services for dissemination;
- The provision of information on violence prevention and education and on school safety to the Department of Justice for dissemination;
- Technical assistance to Governors, State agencies, local educational agencies, and other recipients of SDFSC funding to build capacity to develop and implement high-quality, effective drug and violence prevention programs;
- Assistance to school systems that have particularly severe drug and violence problems, including hiring drug prevention and school safety coordinators, or assistance to support appropriate responses to crisis situations;
- The development of education and training programs, curricula, and instructional materials, and professional training and development, for preventing and reducing the incidence of crimes and conflicts motivated by hate in localities most directly affected by hate crimes; and
- Activities in communities designated as empowerment zones or enterprise communities that connect schools to community-wide efforts to reduce drug and violence problems.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

The statute (in section 4124) also establishes a Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee composed of representatives of Federal agencies, State and local governments (including school districts), and researchers and expert practitioners to advise the Secretary of Education and to help coordinate Federal school- and community-based substance abuse and violence prevention programs.

#### **Impact evaluation (Section 4122)**

The statute authorizes the Department to reserve up to \$2 million in SDFSC National Programs funds to conduct a required biennial evaluation of the impact of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program “and of other recent and new initiatives to combat violence and illegal drug use in schools.” The evaluation is to report on whether community and local educational agency programs funded under SDFSC State Grants: (1) comply with the SDFSC principles of effectiveness set forth in the statute; (2) have appreciably reduced the level of illegal drug, alcohol, and tobacco use, school violence, and the illegal presence of weapons at schools; and (3) have conducted effective parent involvement and training programs.

Section 4122 also requires the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to collect data to determine the incidence and prevalence of illegal drug use and violence in elementary and secondary schools in the States, and for the Secretary, every 2 years, to submit to the President and Congress a report on the findings of the biennial impact evaluation and the NCES data collection, along with data available from other sources on drug use and violence in elementary and secondary schools in the States.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$233,295
2005.....	234,580
2006.....	222,335
2007.....	230,929
2008.....	218,632

#### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Programs is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) 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.

For 2009, the Administration requests \$181.963 million for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs, a decrease of \$36.668 million from 2008. Within the amount requested, no funds are requested for (1) the Mentoring program, which has already completed its mission; and (2) the Alcohol Abuse Reduction program, because it is duplicative of other

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

SDFSC programs for which funds are requested in 2009. The Administration has not proposed that these two programs be reauthorized.

Drug use, violence, and crime continue to be serious problems for school-aged youth. Students cannot be expected to learn to the high standards envisioned by No Child Left Behind in schools where they are threatened drugs or violence. The public also continues to be extremely concerned about school safety, overall, in part because of the tragic school shootings in public schools across the Nation in recent years and also as a result of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States. The April 2007 shooting at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University has sparked similar concerns about safety on our Nation's college campuses.

As part of the ESEA reauthorization, the Administration has proposed to consolidate SDFSC National Programs into a single, flexible discretionary program focused on four priority areas: (1) emergency management planning, (2) preventing violence and drug use, including student drug testing, (3) school culture and climate, including character education, and (4) other needs related to improving students' learning environment to enable those students to meet high academic standards. Grantees would be required, to the extent possible, to implement interventions that reflect scientifically based research.

Because the reauthorization would replace an array of narrowly conceived, but overlapping, authorities with a single program focused on critical areas of national concern, the Department would have greater authority to respond to new and emerging needs in drug prevention and school safety, and potential grantees would have the opportunity to develop more comprehensive proposals rather than piecing together activities from multiple grant streams and responding to multiple application notices, implementation rules, and reporting and accountability requirements. The reauthorized National Programs would explicitly authorize the support of character education activities; therefore, the Administration is not recommending reauthorization of a separate Character Education program.

Major elements of the budget request for SDFSC National Programs follow. The largest increases are provided for activities that provide direct support to LEAs, in sufficient amounts to make a real difference, for targeted projects that address key national concerns and are structured in a manner that permits grantees and independent evaluators to measure progress, hold projects accountable, and determine which interventions are most effective.

- \$10 million for research-based grant assistance to local educational agencies (LEAs) to support the implementation of drug prevention or school safety programs, policies, and strategies that research has demonstrated to be effective in reducing youth drug use or violence and for implementation and scientifically based evaluation of additional approaches that show promise of effectiveness. Under this activity, grantees would be required either to carry out (1) one or more drug or violence prevention programs, practices, or interventions that rigorous evaluation has demonstrated to be effective, or (2) a rigorous evaluation of a promising program, practice, or intervention to test its effectiveness and thereby increase the knowledge base on what works in the field. In making awards, the Department would ensure the equitable distribution of grants among urban, suburban, and rural LEAs.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

An applicant would be required to identify a problem or set of problems, directly related to school safety, the management of emergencies, alcohol or drug use, or violent behavior, and in areas of national concern identified by the Department. Problems to be addressed would have a particularly significant impact on the ability of one or more of the LEA's schools to provide students with high-quality educational services and propose activities, programs, or strategies designed to address the problem. Applicants would be required to (1) provide data related to the identified problem(s) demonstrating that schools or students that are the target of their proposed project are experiencing high rates of youth drug use or violence compared to other schools or students in their State, and (2) select GPRA measures from a list of core outcomes related to youth drug use and violence that most closely match the identified critical need. (A list of core outcomes would be provided by the Department to ensure the use of common definitions, instruments, and protocols so that comparable data will be reported by the States.) Examples of such potential projects could include those designed to mitigate the effects of re-emerging gang activity in certain urban areas, or to reduce unusually high rates of adolescent methamphetamine use in other communities. Another example might involve districts with schools identified as "persistently dangerous" under the Unsafe School Choice Option provision of ESEA, or those included on State-maintained "watch lists" for such a designation.

- \$30 million to continue a variety of school emergency preparedness initiatives that the Department is developing and implementing to coincide with the inclusion of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools in the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS's) National Infrastructure Protection Plan (NIPP).

As part of the Administration's efforts to enhance our national readiness to respond to terrorist threats and other crises, the NIPP involves the identification of vulnerabilities in key "sectors" of the U.S. infrastructure. DHS has incorporated elementary and secondary schools into the government facilities sub-sector of the NIPP. Education and DHS have also identified a number of challenges that continue to face elementary and secondary schools as they prepare to prevent, mitigate, respond to, and recover from crisis events. Those challenges include (1) the lack of expertise in the school community related to terrorism and crisis response; (2) limited available technical assistance capacity for crisis response that is specific to elementary and secondary schools (such as strategies for ensuring the safety of the more than 24 million students who travel to school via school bus each day); (3) lack of resources to develop that expertise and to support appropriate planning and practice simulations; (4) failure of States and communities to include elementary and secondary schools in their planning activities; (5) use of communications equipment by schools that is incompatible with communications devices for first responders; and, (6) lack of procedures or capacity to share credible information about imminent threats and actual crisis incidents. Other challenges specific to preparing schools to deal effectively with crisis situations are related to school governance and organization, including the strong tradition of local control of education, lack of contiguous boundaries between municipal entities and school districts, and lack of needed regional coordination among school districts located in metropolitan areas that include multiple municipalities and school districts.

Funds for this initiative will continue to be used to support a combination of direct grants and technical assistance that respond to the challenges related to elementary and secondary



## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

schools identified in the NIPP vulnerability assessment. The initiative encompasses planning and preparation for the entire constellation of threats (not only terrorist attacks but also natural disasters, shootings, and gang-related activity) that face elementary and secondary schools. Grants provide resources that permit local school districts, in coordination with public health and safety agencies, to help shape their individual crisis planning and response activities to conform with DHS' National Incident Management System (NIMS), helping to ensure that, during crises, schools can communicate and coordinate activities with first responders who have responsibility for assisting them. Grants are supplemented by technical assistance, training activities, and a communications system designed to (1) expand the number of State and local educational agency personnel who are qualified to help schools plan and respond to threats and crises, and (2) support the efficient sharing of accurate information about threats and incidents, especially to the most vulnerable schools and school districts.

- \$5 million for similar initiatives in emergency preparedness for institutions of higher education (IHEs). Consistent with the recommendations in the *Report to the President on Issues Raised by the Virginia Tech Tragedy*, in 2008, the Department plans to develop and disseminate information about emergency management planning tailored to the needs of higher education. We also plan to provide some training, technical assistance, and grant funding to IHEs in 2008 to support the emergency management process on their campuses. The budget request includes funds to build on these efforts in 2009.
- \$77.816 million for the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative, which helps communities create safe, disciplined and drug-free learning environments, promote healthy childhood development, and provide needed mental health services in the communities served. This initiative, which the Department of Education funds jointly with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and administers in collaboration with both HHS and the Department of Justice, supports LEAs and communities in developing and implementing a comprehensive set of programs and services designed to prevent youth drug use and violence, support early childhood development activities, and provide needed student mental health services.

To be eligible for Safe Schools/Healthy Students funding, an LEA must demonstrate agreement in the form of a partnership among the major community systems serving students – schools, the local public mental health authority, law enforcement, and juvenile justice – to work collaboratively to assess needs and provide programs and services in the following five areas: (1) safe school environments and violence prevention; (2) alcohol, tobacco, and other drug prevention; (3) student behavioral, social, and emotional supports; (4) mental health services; and (5) early childhood social and emotional learning programs.

- \$11.813 million for grants to LEAs and public and private entities and other activities to support the development, implementation, or expansion of school-based drug testing programs for students. The drug testing funded by these grants must be part of a comprehensive drug prevention program in the schools served and must provide for the referral to treatment or counseling of students identified as drug users. The projects must also be consistent with recent Supreme Court decisions regarding student drug testing and must ensure the confidentiality of testing results. Within the amount requested, approximately \$679,000 would be used to fund the final contract year of the national impact

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

evaluation of random mandatory drug testing programs that the Department began in 2006, and \$1 million would be used to continue the Student Drug Testing Institute, to be launched in 2008, which will provide training, technical assistance, and outreach to school districts in carrying out student drug testing programs. The remainder would be used for grant continuation awards.

- \$23.824 million for activities to design and implement character education programs in elementary and secondary schools, which will: (1) assist schools in creating a positive school culture and climate that helps students feel connected to their schools and communities, (2) promote social and personal responsibility, and (3) foster a safe environment that is conducive to improved learning and achievement. In fiscal years 2007 and 2008, character education activities are supported under ESEA, Title V, Part D, Subpart 3, the Partnerships in Character Education program authority.
- \$6.017 million to continue to provide financial and technical assistance to institutions of higher education (IHEs) for drug prevention and campus safety programs for students attending such institutions. SDFSC National Programs is the only Department of Education program that provides funding for campus-based drug and violence prevention program at IHEs. The request includes funds for a restructured IHE National Recognition Awards program that would recognize models of exemplary, effective, and promising drug and alcohol prevention programs on college campuses.
- \$5 million for Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence), which, since 2001 has provided education-related services, including increased safety and security, to LEAs in which the learning environment has been disrupted by a violent or traumatic crisis. The 2008 appropriation for Project SERV expands its eligibility to include IHEs, as does the 2009 budget request. The \$5 million request is proposed to ensure that funds are available to provide crisis response services in the event that the Department is called upon to do so.

Consistent with previous appropriations, funds for Project SERV are requested on a no-year basis, to remain available for obligation at the Federal level until expended. In the hoped-for event that there are no school- or college-related crises, the unobligated funds would be carried over into the next fiscal year, preventing the funds from expiring. Examples of services provided include mental health assessments, referrals, and services for victims and witnesses of violence; enhanced school security; technical assistance on developing a short-term and long-term response to the crisis; and training for teachers, faculty, administrators, and staff in implementing the response.

- \$12.493 million for other activities that support and improve drug and violence prevention efforts, such as evaluation, data collection and analysis, joint projects with other Federal agencies, the national clearinghouse for educational facilities, development and dissemination of materials and information, and other forms of technical assistance.

No funds are requested for data management improvement grants because those projects were concluded with fiscal year 2007 funds. Under that activity, begun in 2004, the Department provided resources to States to develop, enhance, or expand the capacity of States and LEAs (and other State agencies and community-based entities currently receiving SDFSC State grant funds) to collect, analyze, and use data to improve the management, and report the outcomes,

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

of drug and violence prevention programs. Examples of these activities include using data to assess needs, establish performance measures, select appropriate interventions, and monitor progress toward established performance targets.

Similarly, no funds are requested for the Grants to LEAs to Address Youth Violence and Related Issues in Persistently Dangerous Schools program, which supports the implementation of programs, activities, and strategies that address youth violence and related issues in LEAs with schools that have been identified as persistently dangerous pursuant to section 9532 of the ESEA. The program received a 1-time appropriation in 2007.

Finally, no funds are requested for the longitudinal Impact Evaluation of a School-Based Violence Prevention Program. This 5-year study, which began in 2004, will determine whether: (1) aggressive and violent behaviors decrease for students in schools that participate in a selected violence prevention program compared to students in schools that do participate in the selected program; (2) the program improves other in-school outcomes, such as truancy, school attendance, and on-time promotion, or results in a reduction in other disruptive and delinquent behaviors, such as vandalism; and (3) the effects of the program vary by students' risk profiles (that is, whether program impacts differ based on whether students are at a high risk or low risk for different outcomes). The evaluation contract will receive its fifth and final year of funding in 2008.

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<b>National Activities</b>			
<u>Research-Based Grant Assistance to LEAs</u>			
Grant award funds (new)	0	0	\$9,900
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>100</u>
Total budget authority	0	0	10,000
Number of new awards	0	0	28
Average award	0	0	\$354
<u>School Emergency Preparedness Initiative</u>			
LEA grant award funds (new)	\$25,935	\$24,000	\$26,000
LEA grant award funds (prior-year supplement)	812	0	0
IHE grant awards (new)	0	4,000	5,000
Other school safety initiatives	3,731	3,508	3,700
Peer review of new award applications	<u>115</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>300</u>
Total budget authority	30,593	31,808	35,000
Number of new awards	105	93	103
Average award	\$247	\$301	\$301

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

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

(Continued)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<u>Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative</u>			
Grant award funding (new)	\$21,806	\$42,669	\$17,416
Grant award funding (continuations)	57,094	34,747	60,000
Peer review of new award applications	<u>300</u>	<u>400</u>	<u>400</u>
Total budget authority	79,200	77,816	77,816
Number of new awards	27	55	22
Number of continuation awards	59	46	82
Average award	\$917	\$767	\$744
<u>Drug Testing Initiative</u>			
Grant award funding (new)	\$1,647	\$5,806	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	8,224	2,714	\$10,134
Evaluation and data collection	1,794	1,069	679
Student Drug Testing Institute	0	1,000	1,000
Peer review of new award applications	<u>87</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>0</u>
Total budget authority	11,752	10,639	11,813
Number of new awards	15	38	0
Number of continuation awards	64	23	61
Average award	\$125	\$140	\$166
<u>Character Education</u>			
Grant award funds (new)	0	0	\$3,371
Grant award funds (continuations)	0	0	19,222 <sup>1</sup>
Other initiatives	0	0	1,191
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>40</u>
Total budget authority	0 <sup>1</sup>	0 <sup>1</sup>	23,824
Number of new awards	0	0	8
Number of continuation awards	0	0	42
Average award	0	0	\$458

---

<sup>1</sup> Character education activities in fiscal years 2007 and 2008 are supported under ESEA, Title V, Part D, Subpart 3, the Partnerships in Character Education program authority.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

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

(Continued)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<u>Postsecondary Education Drug and Violence Prevention Programs</u>			
Grant award funds (new)	\$2,525	\$211	\$2,441
Number of awards	17	1	17
Grant award funds (continuations)	\$1,605	\$2,545	\$211
Number of awards	12	18	1
Training and technical assistance center	\$2,455	\$2,426	\$2,500
National recognition awards program	\$841	\$815	\$815
Number of new awards	1	5	5
Peer review of new award applications	<u>\$ 26</u>	<u>\$20</u>	<u>\$50</u>
Total budget authority	\$7,452	\$6,017	\$6,017
<u>Project SERV</u>	\$3,000	\$1,474	\$5,000
<u>Data Management Improvement Grants</u>			
Grant award funding (new)	0	0	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	\$2,490	0	0
Technical assistance	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total budget authority	2,490	0	0
Number of continuation awards	6	0	0
Average award	\$415	0	0
<u>Grants to LEAs with Persistently Dangerous Schools</u>			
Grant award funds (new)	\$8,594	0	0
Number of new awards	5	0	0
Average award	\$1,719	0	0
<u>Impact Evaluation (section 4122)</u>	\$1,535	\$1,032	0
<u>Other Activities</u>	\$5,089	\$8,879	\$12,493

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

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

(Continued)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<b>Alcohol Abuse Reduction</b>			
Grant award funding (new)	\$6,243	\$24,500	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	24,221	6,038	0
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)	1,820	1,760	0
Peer review of new award applications	<u>125</u>	<u>125</u>	<u>0</u>
Total budget authority	32,409	32,423	0
Number of new awards	18	70	0
Number of continuation awards	70	18	0
Average award	\$347	\$347	0
<b>Mentoring Program</b>			
Grant award funding (new)	\$30,070	\$16,425	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	16,176	30,410	0
Technical assistance center	1,108	1,109	0
Evaluation	1,300	600	0
Peer review of new award applications	<u>160</u>	<u>0</u> <sup>2</sup>	<u>0</u>
Total budget authority	48,814	48,544	0
Number of new awards	170	110	0
Number of continuation awards	86	170	0
Average award	\$181	\$167	0

---

<sup>2</sup> Peer review will not be needed since the Department plans to fund additional applications from the fiscal year 2007 grant award slate.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

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

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

#### Alcohol Abuse Reduction

**Goal:** To help reduce alcohol abuse among secondary school students.

**Objective:** Support the implementation of research-based alcohol abuse prevention programs in secondary schools.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Alcohol Abuse Reduction grantees whose target students show a measurable decrease in binge drinking.				
Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005				
2006			50	
2007	70			65
2008		75		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Alcohol Abuse Reduction program grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who believe that binge drinking is harmful to their health.				
Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005				
2006			56	
2007	76			70
2008		80		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Alcohol Abuse Reduction program grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who disapprove of alcohol abuse.				
Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005				
2006			67	
2007	87			71
2008		87		

**Assessment of progress:** An assessment of progress cannot be made until 2008, when the Department will have 2007 performance from the 2004 cohort of grantees. No 2006 targets were established for the 2004 cohort, and no 2007 targets are applicable for the 2005 cohort, due to the fact that two years of performance data are necessary in order to establish a baseline (or to assess progress) on these measures. No targets are included for 2009 because the Department is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2009.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

#### Mentoring Program

**Goal: To support mentoring programs and activities for children who are at risk of educational failure, dropping out of school, or involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models.**

Beginning with the 2007 cohort of grants, the Department has revised the performance measures for Mentoring projects as (1) the percentage of student-mentor matches that are sustained by the grantees for a period of 9 months; (2) the percentage of mentored students who demonstrate improvement in core academic subjects as measured by grade point average after 12 months; and (3) the average number of unexcused absences from school per mentored student. Targets for the above measures will not be established until later this year, when the baseline data for these measures become available for the 2007 cohort.

The following performance information is for the two prior cohorts of Mentoring grants.

**Objective:** *Provide grants to community-based organizations and local school districts to support mentoring programs for high-risk youth.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of student-mentor matches that are sustained by the grantees for a period of 12 months.				
Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005				
2006			44.9	
2007	56.1	44.9		36.8
2008		56.1		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of mentored students who demonstrate improvement in core academic subjects as measured by grade point average after 12 months.				
Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005				
2006			49.6	
2007	52.1	49.6		22.0
2008		52.1		

**Assessment of progress:** The 2007 targets for the above measures were not met for the 2005 cohort of grantees. An assessment of progress for the 2004 cohort cannot be made until 2009. (Most grantees from the 2004 cohort received no-cost extensions through the end of fiscal year 2008 to complete their projects, and will then submit their final performance data to the Department in early 2009.) No targets are included for 2009 because the Department is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2009.



## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of mentored students who have unexcused absences from school.				
Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
<b>2005</b>			39.4	
<b>2006</b>	35.5		47.8	44.0
<b>2007</b>	27.6	39.6		28.9
<b>2008</b>		30.8		

**Assessment of progress:** The 2006 target (for the 2004 cohort of grants) was not met but the 2007 target was exceeded for the 2005 cohort. No targets are included for 2009 because the Department is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2009.

#### Safe Schools/Healthy Students

**Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug- and violence-prevention strategies.**

Beginning with the 2007 cohort of grants, the Department has established as performance measures for Safe Schools/Healthy Students projects: (1) Percentage of grantees that experience a decrease in students who did not go to school on one or more days during the past 30 days because they felt unsafe at school, or on their way to and from school; (2) Percentage of grantees that experience a decrease in students who have been in a physical fight on school property in the 12 months prior to the survey; (3) Percentage of grantees that report a decrease in students who report current (30-day) marijuana use; (4) Percentage of grantees that report a decrease in students who report current (30-day) alcohol use; (5) Percentage of grantees that report an increase in the number of students receiving school-based mental health services; and (6) Percentage of grantees that report an increase in the percentage of mental health referrals for students that result in mental health services being provided in the community. Targets for the above measures will not be established until later this year, when the first baseline data become available for the 2007 cohort.

The following performance information is for the three prior cohorts of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grants.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

**Objective:** *Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in improving student behaviors and school environments.*

**Measure:** The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that experience a decrease in the number of violent incidents at schools during the 3-year grant period.

Year	Targets			Actual		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2006				70		
2007	90					
2008	90	80.5				
2009			85			

**Measure:** The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that experience a decrease in substance abuse during the 3-year grant period.

Year	Targets			Actual		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2006				75		
2007	90					
2008	90	86.25				
2009			90			

**Measure:** The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that improve school attendance during the 3-year grant period.

Year	Targets			Actual		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2006				33		
2007	90					
2008	90	38				
2009			43			

**Assessment of progress:** An assessment of progress for these indicators will be made later this year, after the Department has data for the third year of these projects.

#### Student Drug Testing

**Goal:** To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug- and violence-prevention strategies.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

**Objective:** Student drug testing grantees will make substantial progress in reducing substance abuse incidence among target students.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a 5 percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-month drug use by students in the target population.						
Year	Targets			Actual		
	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2006				33		
2007	50	33				
2008		50	33			
2009			50			

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a 5 percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-year drug use by students in the target population.						
Year	Targets			Actual		
	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2006				25		
2007	50	25				
2008		50	25			
2009			50			

**Assessment of progress:** An assessment of progress against the 2007 targets can be made later this year for the 2003 and 2005 grant cohorts. (No 2006 targets were established for these indicators because 2006 was the baseline year for the first cohort of student drug testing grants.) Comparable targets will be established for the 2007 and 2008 cohorts.

#### Emergency Response and Crisis Management

The Department will have baseline data later this year on the following performance measures for the fiscal year 2004 cohort of Emergency Response and Crisis Management grants:

- (1) demonstration by grantees of the number of hazards addressed by the improved school emergency response plan as compared to the baseline plan;
- (2) demonstration of improved response time and quality of response in practice drills and simulated crises; and
- (3) a plan for and commitment to the sustainability and continuous improvement of the school emergency response plan beyond the period of Federal financial assistance signed by all community partners.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

#### Postsecondary Prevention

The Department will have baseline data later this year on the following performance measures for the fiscal year 2005 cohort of postsecondary prevention grants: (1) at the end of these 2-year projects, the percentage of grantees that achieve a 5 percent decrease in high-risk drinking among students served by the project; and (2) at the end of these 2-year projects, the percentage of grantees that achieve a 5 percent decrease in violent behavior among students served by the project.

#### Data Management Improvement

**Measure:** The proportion of local recipients of SDFSCA State Grants program funding that are using data related to youth drug and violence to manage youth drug, alcohol, and violence prevention programs by: (a) incorporating these data in needs assessment processes; (b) using the data to develop performance measures for their SDFSCA-funded programs; (c) considering the data in selecting schools and, where applicable, community-based interventions for implementation; (d) monitoring the success of interventions in reducing drug and alcohol use and violence and in building stronger communities; and (e) sharing data with their leadership and the public.

Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			43	
2006			96	94
2007	97	95		70

**Measure:** The proportion of local recipients of SDFSCA State Grants program funding that have received training about collecting, analyzing, and using data to manage and improve drug and violence prevention programs.

Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			43	
2006			65	77
2007	80	82		73

**Measure:** The proportion of local recipients of SDFSCA State Grants program funding that submit complete responses to data collections.

Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			93	
2006			91	100
2007	95	100		89

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

**Assessment of progress:** No 2005 or 2006 targets were established for these measures, so an assessment of progress cannot be made for those years. The 2007 targets were not met for the 2005 cohort of grants. 2007 data for the 2004 cohort will be available later this year. No targets are included for 2009 because the Department is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2009.

#### Efficiency Measures

The Department has established, and is collecting data, on the following efficiency measures for the Mentoring program:

<b>Measure:</b> The cost per student mentored for each student-mentor match that is sustained for a period of 12 months.				
Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005				
2006			\$1,948	
2007	\$1,851	\$1,948		\$3,116
2008		\$1,851		

**Assessment of progress:** Although the 2007 cost per student, \$3,116, was much higher than the target of \$1,948, the target was mistakenly based on 2006 data (for the 2004 cohort) on the cost per student match for all matches, rather than the cost per student match sustained for 12 months. The Department is re-setting the targets to reflect the new, more accurate data. No targets are included for 2009 because the Department is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2009.

#### Other Performance Information

In addition to collecting data on the above performance measures directly from grantees, the Department is conducting several evaluations to assess the impact of programs and interventions supported with SDFSC National Programs funds. Each of the following evaluations is being funded by SDFSC National Programs funds, except for the Safe Schools/Healthy Students evaluation, which is being funded by the Department of Health and Human Services.

#### Mentoring Program Evaluation

In 2005 the Department began a 4-year evaluation to assess the impact of school-based mentoring programs supported with SDFSC National Programs grant funds and provide information for program improvement. Using a sample of 32 grantees from the 2004 and 2005 cohorts of mentoring projects, under which approximately 2,600 students in grades four through eight were randomly assigned either to be matched or not matched with a mentor, the evaluation will address whether students enrolled in mentoring programs are less likely to engage in risky and dangerous behaviors and whether their academic performance is higher

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

than that of students not enrolled in mentoring programs. The evaluation will also examine how different aspects of school-based mentoring are associated with program impacts. The evaluation is scheduled to be completed in fall 2008.

#### Drug Testing Evaluation

In 2006, the Department launched an impact evaluation, using grants supported with SDFSC National Programs funds, to assess the effectiveness of random mandatory student drug testing. The evaluation is designed to address the following research questions: (1) Do high school students who are subject to mandatory-random drug testing (e.g., athletes, participants in competitive extra-curricular activities) report less use of tobacco, alcohol, and illicit substances compared to students in high schools without drug testing policies? (2) Do students in high schools with mandatory-random drug testing policies, but who are not subject to drug testing, report less use of tobacco, alcohol, and illicit substances compared to students in high schools without drug testing policies? and (3) What are the characteristics of the drug testing policies implemented by participating treatment schools, and what types of other strategies are treatment or control schools using to reduce substance use among students?

This 4-year evaluation involves 36 schools from 7 grantees that received awards under the Department's student drug testing grant competition in 2006. About half of the schools were randomly assigned to begin implementing drug testing immediately (treatment schools), and the other half were assigned to implement drug testing only at the conclusion of the one-year experimental period (control schools). Data collection will include student surveys of reported drug use, interviews with staff at grantee schools, and school records. Results of the evaluation should be available in 2009.

#### Safe Schools/Healthy Students Evaluation

Two national evaluations of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative are currently underway. The first evaluation is being conducted under a cooperative agreement with the Department of Justice, and the second is being conducted under contract with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services. Both evaluations are being jointly managed by the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Justice. The evaluations seek to document the effectiveness of collaborative community efforts to promote safe schools and provide opportunities for healthy childhood development.

The first evaluation is based on three waves of data collected from 97 sites funded under the initiative spanning fiscal years 1999 through 2004, and a report including analysis of a broad range of data is expected later in 2008. The second evaluation is examining activities being implemented by 86 sites in the fiscal year 2005, 2006, and 2007 cohorts. The second evaluation intends to examine more closely how communities are creating partnerships designed to create safe schools and healthy students. It also seeks to explore the relationship between the quality of community collaboration and student outcomes on measures related to substance use, school safety, and the provision of mental health services. A final report on the second evaluation will be forthcoming in 2010.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

#### Violence Prevention Program Evaluation

The Department is also conducting a longitudinal impact evaluation of a school-based violence prevention program. Specifically, the evaluation is assessing the overall impact of combining “Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways,” a curriculum-based (instructional) program, with “Best Behavior,” a whole-school program that aims to increase the clarity, fairness, and consistency of school enforcement policies and to improve teachers' classroom management skills. Approximately 40 middle schools are taking part in this evaluation, half of which have been randomly assigned to receive the hybrid program, which is being implemented over three consecutive school years. Within each middle school, students are being sampled and their violent and aggressive behaviors measured. Student and teacher surveys, observation of intervention activities, interviews with school administrators, and school records will be used to assess student outcomes in both treatment and control schools as well as to assess the quality of program implementation. A final report on the evaluation is expected in early 2010.

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

The Mentoring program was among the programs rated in 2006 using the “Program Assessment Rating Tool” (PART). The PART rated the Mentoring program as “Results Not Demonstrated.” The PART recommendations for the program, along with the Department’s response and timeline for implementing those recommendations, are as follows.

- *Provide training and technical assistance to grantees to strengthen their program implementation and thereby improve program outcomes.* In 2004 the Department awarded a contract to provide technical assistance to Mentoring program grantees. The Department awarded 170 new Mentoring grants in 2007 and will award an estimated 110 new grants in 2008, and, contingent on the availability of funding, we plan to maintain an active technical assistance contract to support these grant sites through their conclusion.

The contractor will continue to provide training, technical assistance, and resources to grantees on a variety of issues, including building infrastructure for the mentoring programs; sustaining the program after Federal assistance ends; and recruiting, screening, training, and matching mentors. In the past year the contractor held three regional meetings that focused on sustaining projects, reaching more than 500 participants. In addition the contractor and the Department have delivered three online seminars over the Internet to Mentoring grantees. During fiscal year 2008 the contractor will develop and deliver four “webinars”; produce four manuals that capture best practices in mentoring; develop six fact sheets for distribution to grantees via the program’s resource center web site; develop four new case studies around promising prevention practices among mentoring programs; and conduct two regional training sessions.

- *Complete and disseminate nationwide the results of the program evaluation.* A summary description of the Department’s Mentoring program impact evaluation is provided above, under Other Performance Information. Data for the evaluation are being collected from a sample of students on school engagement, academic performance, dropping out, the quality of interpersonal relationships, and involvement with high-risk and delinquent behaviors. To measure program impact, student surveys and student school records are being collected

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

---

both at baseline and at the end of the school year. Data on the nature of mentoring program services are being collected through a survey of the program grantees and mentors to provide context for the impact findings.

The evaluation is scheduled to be completed in October 2008. Once it is completed, the Department will disseminate its findings in a variety of ways, including posting the final evaluation report and a summary of its key findings on the Internet; distributing those findings to Mentoring grantees; presenting the findings at the next Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools national conference; utilizing the Mentoring training and assistance contractor to help local projects implement the findings that are applicable to improving their projects; and sharing the findings with national mentoring organizations for them to disseminate through their web sites, newsletters, and other available means.

- *Revise the GPRA performance measures for the program and continue to collect and report grantee data on outcomes for the program.* In December 2007 the Department revised two of the three measures (effective for the 2007 and 2008 cohorts of grants) to assist grantees in reporting more meaningful data to the Department for the program. New data (on the revised measures for the 2007 cohort and on the previously existing measures for the 2005 cohort) will be reported by grantees to the Department by the end of this year. In early 2009, the Department will post performance data from those individual grantees on the Department's web site, ed.gov.

Grantees from the 2005 cohort of Mentoring projects submitted year two data to the Department on the GPRA measures for the program as part of their 2006 and 2007 annual performance reports. The Department has posted on ed.gov individual grant site data from these reports for all four GPRA measures – number of sustained matches; number of mentored students with unexcused absences; number of mentored students whose grade point average in core academic subjects improved; and the cost per sustained match. Several sites have yet to provide complete data; information for those sites will be added as the data for them are received. The 2004 cohort of grantees generally will be submitting data for these measures in their final reports later this year. Individual grant site data for the 2004 cohort of grantees will be posted on ed.gov in 2009 as well. The web address for the individual mentoring grant site data is:

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/dvpm/mentoring/performance.html>.

In addition to posting GPRA data for individual grant sites as described above, the Department will continue to report, on the Internet, aggregate GPRA data for each cohort of mentoring grantees, both on the ExpectMore.Gov website, as part of the detailed information on the Mentoring program PART assessment, and on ed.gov, as part of the Department's program performance plan information.

- *Work with Congress to eliminate funding for this duplicative program.* The Administration's reauthorization proposal for the ESEA does not include a discrete grant program to support mentoring projects. Rather, the proposal includes a flexible authority that permits the Secretary to develop and implement a broad range of leadership activities designed to support schools in efforts to improve their emergency management capacity; prevent youth drug use and violence; improve school culture and climate; and implement other programs



## **SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

### **Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs**

---

or strategies designed to improve student learning environments to support academic achievement. Mentoring strategies may be included in projects that are eventually proposed under these revised priorities.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

---

### Character education

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$23,824	0 <sup>2</sup>	-\$23,824 <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 3008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

<sup>2</sup> The Department is requesting \$23,824 thousand to support character education activities in FY 2009 under the reauthorized Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs authority.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Character Education program provides support for the design and implementation of character education programs in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. Programs must be: (1) capable of being integrated into classroom instruction, (2) consistent with State academic content standards, and (3) carried out in conjunction with other educational reform efforts. Grantees may select the elements of character that will be taught, and must consider the views of parents and students to be served by the program. The elements of character from which grantees may choose include, but are not limited to caring, civic virtue and citizenship, justice and fairness, respect, responsibility, trustworthiness, and giving. Grants may be awarded for up to 5 years, of which up to 1 year may be for planning and program design. The Department may require matching funds.

State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) are eligible to receive grants. SEAs must form partnerships with one or more LEAs or nonprofit entities, including institutions of higher education (IHEs). LEAs may apply alone or in consortia with other LEAs or nonprofit organizations, including IHEs. The minimum SEA award is \$500,000, and SEAs may not use more than 3 percent of their funds for administrative costs.

Applicants must demonstrate that proposed programs have clear objectives that are grounded in scientifically based research. In addition, they must describe:

- Partnerships and collaborative efforts,
- Program activities, including how parents, students (including those with disabilities), and community members will be involved in the program; the curriculum and instructional practices that will be used or developed; and methods of teacher training and parent education, and

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Character education

---

- How the program will be linked to other efforts to improve academic achievement, including broader education reform efforts and State academic content standards.

SEAs must also describe in their applications how they will provide technical and professional assistance to LEA partners in developing and implementing character education programs, as well as how they will assist other interested LEAs that are not part of the original partnership.

All applicants must describe how they will evaluate the success of their programs and agree to cooperate with any national evaluations. Grantee evaluations must be designed to assess the impact of the project(s) on students, students with disabilities (including those with mental or physical disabilities), teachers, administrators, parents, and others. Applicants must also agree to provide the Department with information that is necessary to determine program effectiveness.

The Department may reserve up to 5 percent of funds for national research, dissemination, and evaluation activities. Allowable activities include:

- Conducting research and development,
- Providing technical assistance to State and local programs, particularly on matters of program evaluation,
- Conducting evaluations of State and local programs receiving program funding, and
- Compiling and disseminating information on model character education programs, high quality character education materials and curricula, research findings, and other information of use to program participants.

The Department is committed to supporting the development and implementation of high-quality character education programs, and testing their effectiveness through rigorous evaluations. Because grantee evaluations play such an important role in measuring the effectiveness of any single character-based intervention strategy, the Department supports a variety of technical assistance activities for all current grantees on evaluation design and implementation. For example, starting in fiscal year 2004, a portion of the annual national activities set-aside is being used to support a National Service Center for Character and Civic Engagement (approximately \$850,000 each year over the course of 1 base year and 4 option years (through fiscal year 2008)). The service center's role, in large part, is to provide ongoing technical assistance to grantees implementing the program's rigorous evaluation requirements.

In fiscal years 2003 and 2004, the Department used a portion of the national activities set-aside to support a "What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Study" that provides a high-quality scientific review of the published and unpublished research literature on character education intervention strategies designed for use in elementary, middle, or high schools with attention to student outcomes related to positive character development, pro-social behavior, and academic performance (see: <http://www.whatworks.ed.gov>). This study provides detailed reviews of 14 character education interventions, including: Building Decisions Skills; Facing History and Ourselves; Heartwood Ethics Curriculum for Children; and Lessons in Character. Results of this

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Character education

---

study will be used to shape the agenda of the proposed national service center, future grant competitions under the program, and future data collections and program measurement strategies.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$24,691
2005.....	24,493
2006.....	24,248
2007.....	24,248
2008.....	23,824

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Character Education program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The Administration is not recommending reauthorization for this program and, accordingly, the budget provides no funding for it. However, the ESEA reauthorization proposal would authorize character education under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs authority. In place of the separate program authorities contained in previous law for character education, physical education, mental health integration, elementary and secondary school counseling, and safe and drug-free schools, the new proposal would authorize one flexible program, to design and carry out grant competitions and other activities in these areas. Under the Administration's fiscal year 2009 proposal, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs supported activities would include the design and implementation of character education programs in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. The Administration intends to allocate approximately \$23.8 million in fiscal year 2009 to support character education activities under the reauthorized National Programs authority, including approximately \$21.2 million for the continuation of Character Education grants made in previous fiscal years.

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Number of new awards:			
LEA partnerships	0	3	0
SEA partnerships	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Sub-total	4	4	0
Number of continuation awards:			
LEA partnerships	36	36	0
SEA partnerships	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>
Sub-total	42	41	0
 Total number of awards	 46	 45	 0

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Character education

---

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

(Continued)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Funding for new awards:			
LEA partnerships	0	\$860	0
SEA partnerships	<u>\$1,999</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>0</u>
Total new awards	1,999	1,360	0 <sup>1</sup>
Funding for continuation awards:			
LEA partnerships	17,751	17,678	0
SEA partnerships	<u>3,286</u>	<u>3,555</u>	<u>0</u>
Total continuation awards	21,037	21,233	0 <sup>1</sup>
Peer review of new award applications	0	40	0
Total award funding	23,036	22,633	0
National activities:			
National Center for Character Education and Civic Engagement	845	845	0
Reports (development, printing, translating)	<u>367</u>	<u>346</u>	<u>0</u>
Total national activities	1,212	1,191	0 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Funding for new awards, continuation awards, and existing contracts in the area of character education in FY 2009 will be supported through the reauthorized Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs authority.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

The Department recently developed two new measures for the Character Education program. These measures will provide data on the percent of Character Education program grantees that conduct evaluations using an experimental or quasi-experimental design, and the percentage of such evaluations that are conducted successfully, and that yield scientifically valid results. Of 39 grantees from the 2002 cohort, 18 are using experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation designs to evaluate the impact of their program. Data for this measures will be collected through a peer review process that will be designed and implemented by the Department. Independent experts will be asked to review grantee interim and final evaluation reports, and relevant accompanying materials, using a rubric and scoring sheet to be developed by the Department. The Department is still developing the data collection timeline, along with an appropriate data collection methodology, with technical input from the Data Quality Initiative.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Character education

---

#### Other Performance Information

The Character Education program contains rigorous evaluation requirements for all grantees. Grantees must reserve a portion of their awards to evaluate the effectiveness of their activities and to disseminate information about their programs. Up to 5 percent of the program's funding may be reserved by the Department to conduct research on the effectiveness of character-related programs and materials, provide technical assistance to grantees on program evaluation, and conduct evaluations of State and local character education programs.

Since fiscal year 2002, a subset of grantees has been using experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation designs to measure the effectiveness of their programs. Preliminary reports from these evaluations were submitted in fiscal year 2004. These reports indicate that several of grantees are starting to demonstrate satisfactory student effects through valid, rigorous evaluations. Many of these grantees are working with independent evaluation experts, and it is likely that some of the evaluations will ultimately yield important insights into the effectiveness of the various character education strategies being supported through this program. However, because most of these grantees exercise the option to use the first full year of their grant as a planning period, preliminary findings from the 2002 cohort of grantees (submitted in 2004) typically include either no data, or baseline data only. Final evaluation reports from this cohort of grantees were submitted by grantees in fall 2007, and are currently being analyzed by a Department contractor.

Examples of preliminary evaluation results provided by grantees include the following:

- The Jefferson County Public School District, located in Kentucky, implemented the Child Development Project (CDP) curriculum for its character education program. CDP is designed to promote academic, social, and ethical growth in all students, and the program's emphasis is on enhancing pro-social characteristics in children, as reflected in attitudes and behaviors. Jefferson County reports that in year 3 of a 4-year intervention there was a significant impact on student attitudes and small, but significant, program effects on student reading test scores. In this quasi-experimental study, data were collected from eight treatment and eight carefully matched control schools (matching was based on demographic, cognitive, and non-cognitive characteristics). The student attitudes questionnaire consisted of five scales: a) student autonomy and influence in the classroom; b) classroom supportiveness; c) liking for school; d) trust and respect for teachers; and e) concern for others.
- The State of Missouri is implementing a 4-year study of the impact of the *Characterplus* program in 64 public K-12 schools. The 64 schools were stratified and randomly selected for participation in the project, and the study utilized a pre-test/post-test control group design with a pre-test administered prior to the intervention in all participating schools. After 3 years, the grantee reports significant positive results for students at the secondary level. More specifically, the evaluation preliminary report demonstrates increases in student feelings of belonging, sense of autonomy and influence, and self-reported altruism in treatment schools compared to control schools in 8<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grades. Student feelings of competence increased significantly for the treatment schools at the 8<sup>th</sup> grade level, and

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Character education

---

student perceptions of parent involvement increased at the 11<sup>th</sup> grade level. There were no significant changes in student achievement for any of the curricular areas tested.

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

---

**Elementary and secondary school counseling**

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 2)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$48,617	0	-\$48,617

---

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

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

This program provides grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to enable them to establish or expand elementary school and secondary school counseling programs. In awarding grants, the Department must give consideration to applications that demonstrate the greatest need for services, propose the most promising and innovative approaches, and show the greatest potential for replication and dissemination. The Department awards grants for up to 3 years that may not exceed \$400,000 and must be used to supplement, not supplant, existing counseling and mental health services. The statute requires that any amount appropriated up to \$40 million for this program in any fiscal year be used for elementary school counseling programs. If the appropriation exceeds \$40 million, the Department must use at least \$40 million to support elementary school counseling programs.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$33,799
2005.....	34,720
2006.....	34,650
2007.....	34,650
2008.....	48,617

**FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Elementary and Secondary School Counseling 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 requests no funding for it.



## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Elementary and secondary school counseling

---

This request is consistent with the Administration's policy of increasing resources for high-priority programs by eliminating small, narrow categorical programs that have limited impact, for which there is little or no evidence of effect, or that do not reflect an appropriate Federal role in education. School counselors are primarily supported with non-Federal funds. In the 2005-06 school year, grants under this program paid the cost of only about 500 counselors and other school mental health professionals (social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists), roughly one-half of 1 percent of the approximately 100,000 elementary and secondary school guidance counselors in the country. A small Federal categorical program can have, at best, a marginal impact on the number of counselors employed in schools or the availability of counseling for students, much less on the quality of the counseling provided. Thus, school counseling is a clear example of an area that has historically been a State and local responsibility and where the addition of Federal dollars has little impact.

In addition, under the 2009 budget request and the ESEA reauthorization proposal, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs includes \$10 million for Research-Based Grants to LEAs for drug and violence prevention programs and \$77.8 million (representing the Department of Education's share of this jointly funded initiative with the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Justice) in grants to LEAs for Safe Schools/Healthy Students projects, which LEAs may use to fund counseling as part of a comprehensive, research-based focus on the school environment.

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Grant award funding (new)	\$11,852	\$17,456	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	\$22,798	\$30,861	0
Peer review of new award applications	0 <sup>1</sup>	\$300	0
Number of new awards	36	50	0
Number of continuation awards	65	87	0
Average award	\$329	\$349	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The Department funded fiscal year 2007 applications from the fiscal year 2006 grant award slate.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Elementary and secondary school counseling

---

**Goal:** To increase the availability of counseling programs and services in elementary schools.

**Objective:** Support the hiring of qualified personnel to expand available counseling services for elementary school students.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of grantees closing the gap between their student/mental health professional ratios and the student/mental health professional ratios recommended by the statute. (2004 cohort)		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		75
2006		60
2007	100	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department expects to have performance data for the three cohorts of grantees available in spring 2008, at which time targets will be established. No targets are included for 2009 because the Administration is not requesting funding for the program in fiscal year 2009.

<b>Measure:</b> The average number of referrals per grant site for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program. (2004 cohort)		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		607
2006		342
2007	257	

**Assessment of progress:** An assessment of progress can be made once 2007 data become available, as 2005 or 2006 targets were not established for this measure. The Department expects to have performance data for the three cohorts available in spring 2008, at which time targets will be established. No targets are included for 2009 because the Administration is not requesting funding for the program in fiscal year 2009.

The Department originally established this measure as the total number (rather than as the average per grant site) of referrals for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the program. In 2007, the Department adjusted the measure to make the data more comparable from 1 year to the next, because not all grantees have reported data annually.

<b>Measure:</b> The average number of suspensions per grant site for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program. (2004 cohort)		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		179
2006		153
2007	138	

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Elementary and secondary school counseling

---

**Assessment of progress:** An assessment of progress can be made once 2007 data become available, as 2005 or 2006 targets were not established for this measure. The Department expects to have performance data for the three cohorts of grantees available in spring 2008, at which time targets will be established. No targets are included for 2009 because the Administration is not requesting funding for the program in fiscal year 2009.

The Department originally established this measure as the total number (rather than as the average per grant site) of suspensions for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the program. In 2007, the Department revised the measure to make the data more comparable from 1 year to the next, because not all grantees have reported data annually. Beginning with the new cohort of grantees in 2006, the Department eliminated the third measure above in order to reduce burden on grantees.

**SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

---

**Physical education program**

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 10)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$75,655	0	-\$75,655

---

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

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

This program provides grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) and community-based organizations to pay the Federal share of the costs of initiating, expanding, and improving physical education programs (including after-school programs) for students in kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade, in order to make progress toward meeting State standards for physical education. Funds may be used to provide equipment and support to enable students to participate actively in physical education activities and for training and education for teachers and staff. Awards are competitive, and the Federal share may not exceed 90 percent of the total program cost for the first year of the project and 75 percent for each subsequent year. Funds must be used to supplement, and may not supplant, other Federal, State, and local funding for physical education activities.

Funding levels for the past 5 years were:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$69,587
2005.....	73,408
2006.....	72,674
2007.....	72,674
2008.....	75,655

**FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Physical Education 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 students engage in healthy behaviors, the request is consistent with the Administration's policy of increasing resources for high-priority programs by eliminating programs that have questionable impact.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Physical education program

---

The effectiveness of the Department's Physical Education program is unknown. In its first few years, it appeared that most of the funding was being spent for equipment. In response, the Department focused on making the grants more effective and is now collecting more and better data on them, but there is, as yet, no evidence that the program is making a difference in terms of youth physical activity, reduction in obesity, or other desired outcomes. In fact, there is no evidence that it is doing more than, in a handful of districts, paying for what States and localities have financed in the past. The Administration believes that continued support for this program is not reasonable because it has not been confirmed as directing resources toward identified needs or projects based on proven interventions.

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Grant award funding (new)	\$45,077	\$33,992	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	27,597	40,685	0
Peer review of new award applications	0 <sup>1</sup>	\$600	0
Evaluation	0	\$378	0
Number of new grant awards	149	103	0
Number of continuation grant awards	144	199	0
Average grant award	\$248	\$237	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The Department funded additional applications from the fiscal year 2006 grant award slate.

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of 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 promote physical activity and healthy lifestyles for students.**

**Objective:** *Support the implementation of effective physical education programs and strategies.*

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Physical education program

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students served by Physical Education Program grants actively participating in physical education activities.				
Year	Target		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			70	
2006			71	73
2007	90	80		
2008		80		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students served by the Physical Education Program grants who make progress toward meeting State standards for physical education.				
Year	Target		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			74	
2006			65	70
2007	90	77		
2008		85		

**Assessment of progress:** The performance data above suggest that 2004 cohort grantees are not making progress toward the 2007 performance targets of 90 percent established for both measures. The measure addressing students actively participating in physical education activities increased by only one percentage point in 2006 to 71 percent, while the measure for students making progress toward State standards actually decreased to 65 percent.

Beginning with the 2006 cohort of grants, the Department established the following new measure for the program: the percentage of students served by the grant who engage in (1) 150 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week (for elementary school students) or (2) 225 minutes per week (for middle and high school students). This measure is more clear and specific than the above measures, and the Department will use it as a replacement for them. Baseline data for the 2006 cohort reveal that 50.5 percent of students served by the program engaged in the prescribed amount of physical activity each week. No targets are included for 2009 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2009.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department developed and is implementing the following efficiency measure: the cost per student who achieves 150 minutes (for elementary school students) or 225 minutes (for middle and high school students) of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week. This measure includes the mandatory non-federal expenditures. The program established a baseline in 2007 for the 2006 cohort of \$291 per student.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Physical education program

---

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

The Physical Education program was among the programs assessed in 2005 using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART). The program received a rating of "Results Not Demonstrated." While the program has an overall strong purpose and design, and is managed well, it has weaknesses with regard to demonstrating results.

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

- *Revise existing performance measures and data collection efforts so that grantees report data that are comparable across sites and provide a better assessment of the program's overall effectiveness.* Although Physical Education program projects often implement a comprehensive range of strategies designed to help students meet State standards, the Department determined that the significant majority of projects focus, at least in part, on increasing the amount and intensity of physical activity for project participants. As a result, we identified a single new GPRA outcome measure for the program that identifies the proportion of students meeting developmentally appropriate targets for moderate to vigorous activity. The Department will be able to aggregate data across projects more meaningfully than was the case with the previous indicators.

The Department established a new measure: the percentage of students served by the grant who engage in (1) 150 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week (for elementary school students) or (2) 225 minutes per week (for middle and high school students). These are the amounts of weekly physical activity recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Applicants that received new awards in 2006 and 2007 are adopting the revised measure. The Department provided these grantees detailed information about this performance measure, including definitions, recommended data collection methods, and directions for reporting results.

- *Refine and implement an efficiency measure for the program.* The Department established the following efficiency measure for this program: the cost, per child, of implementing a physical education program that results in children engaging in the CDC-endorsed amount of weekly physical activity. Beginning with the 2006 cohort of grantees the Department operationalized the efficiency measure for this program as the cost per student who achieves the outcome measure level (150 or 225 minutes per week) of moderate to vigorous physical activity. As grantees provide data annually to the Department on their progress toward the outcome objectives for this program, the Department will be able to calculate the data for the corresponding efficiency measure.
- *Develop options for a national evaluation to identify needed improvements to, and assess the effectiveness of, the program.* The Department is currently examining options for a national evaluation, and plans to conduct the evaluation with the 2008 cohort of grantees.
- *Provide technical assistance to fiscal year 2007 new and continuation grantees to promote the reporting of consistent data for program performance measures.* The Department has given written guidance to fiscal year 2007 grantees on collecting and reporting data for

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Physical education program

---

GPRA measures. Technical assistance efforts are ongoing, and will continue throughout the fiscal year.

- *Post meaningful grantee-level performance data on the program web site.* The Department posted grantee-level performance data for the first year of the fiscal year 2006 cohort. Data for that cohort and upcoming cohorts will be posted as available.
- *Work with Congress to eliminate this separate, categorical program for physical education.* The Administration is not requesting funding for this program, and it is not included in the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal.



## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

---

### Civic education

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

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
We the People	\$20,056	0	-\$20,056
Cooperative Education Exchange	<u>11,861</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-11,861</u>
Total	31,917	0	-31,917

---

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

<sup>2</sup> ESEA section 2343(b)(1) requires that of the total appropriated for Civic education, not more than 40 percent may be used for the Cooperative Education Exchange portion of the program.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Civic Education program supports grants to improve the quality of civics and government education, foster civic competence and responsibility, and improve the quality of civic and economic education through exchange programs with emerging democracies. The program consists of two parts, *We the People* and the *Cooperative Education Exchange*. By statute, not more than 40 percent of the funds appropriated may be used for the *Cooperative Education Exchange* component of the program.

### **We the People**

The statute authorizes a noncompetitive grant to the nonprofit Center for Civic Education in Calabasas, California to support the *We the People* program. *We the People* has two key program components: the *Citizen and the Constitution* and *Project Citizen*.

The *Citizen and the Constitution* project provides teacher training and curricular materials for upper elementary, middle, and high school students. The program curriculum, titled *We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution*, seeks to promote civic competence and responsibility among students, including support for the constitutional rights and civil liberties of dissenting individuals and groups (<http://www.civiced.org/programs.html>). For upper elementary and secondary school students, the program also provides simulated congressional hearings that give students the opportunity to show their understanding of the basic principles of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. For secondary students, these hearings culminate in a national competition in Washington, D.C., where the winning class from each State and their teachers visit members of Congress. The competition serves as a model for assessing higher levels of student learning. Working in teams, students prepare oral responses to questions that test their understanding of facts and concepts, along with their ability to conduct research, think

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Civic education

---

critically, and remain poised under pressure. Public officials and community members serve as judges in the competition.

*Project Citizen*, a program for middle school students, focuses on the role of State and local governments in the American Federal system. *Project Citizen* requires participating students to choose a social problem, evaluate alternative policies to address the problem, and then develop an action plan to encourage implementation of their policy. Students create a portfolio and binder displaying their work, which they present to school and community leaders in simulated legislative hearings.

In fiscal year 2007, for the first time, the Department conducted a competition for projects to improve public knowledge, understanding, and support of the United States Congress and State legislatures. The Department received 48 applications, and awarded a total of \$3 million to Hillsborough County Public Schools (Tampa, Fla.), Yonkers Public Schools (Yonkers, NY), and the Chiesman Foundation for Democracy, Inc (Rapid City, SD). The project period for these awards is 18 months.

### Cooperative Education Exchange

The statute authorizes noncompetitive grants to the nonprofit Center for Civic Education and the National Council on Economic Education to support program activities. Of the funds appropriated for this program, the authorizing statute requires 37.5 percent to be awarded to the Center for Civic Education, and 37.5 percent to the National Council on Economic Education. The remaining 25 percent must be used for competitive awards to organizations experienced in civics, government, and economic education.

Competitive grants under the *Cooperative Education Exchange* program support education exchange activities in civics and economics between the United States and eligible countries in Central and Eastern Europe, the Commonwealth of Independent States, any country that was formerly a republic of the Soviet Union, the Republic of Ireland, the province of Northern Ireland in the United Kingdom, and any developing country that has a democratic form of government.

Grantees facilitate exchange programs for students, educators and leaders that include seminars on the basic principles of U.S. constitutional democracy, visits to school systems and institutions of higher education, and related activities on the culture, governance, and history of eligible countries.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Civic education

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	<u>We The People</u>	<u>Cooperative Education Exchange</u>
	(\$000s)	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$16,790	\$11,852
2005.....	17,211	12,194
2006.....	17,039	12,072
2007.....	17,039	12,072
2008.....	20,056	11,861

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Civic 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 request is consistent with the Administration's policy of increasing resources for higher priority programs by eliminating small categorical programs that have limited impact, and for which there is little or no reliable evidence of effectiveness.

While *We the People* supports worthwhile activities, the program's contribution to the Department's mission is marginal, and additional Federal funding is not necessary for the successful operation of this program. The Center for Civic Education is an established non-profit organization with a broad network of program participants, alumni, volunteers, and financial supporters at the local, State, and national levels. Districts in nearly every State and major urban area participate in *We the People* program activities (see: <http://www.civiced.org/wethepeople.php?link=state>). The Center also has a long history of success raising additional financial support through such vehicles as selling program-related curricular materials, trainings, and workshops (e.g., <http://store.yahoo.com/civiced-store>), partnering with non-profit groups on core activities (see: <http://civiced.org/about.php?link=support>), lobbying, and seeking support from foundations. For example, the Center has received financial support from such organizations as the Pew Charitable Trusts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation, the Lincoln and Therese Filene Foundation, Inc., and an increasing number of State and local entities. Also, with a national board that includes Supreme Court justices and other well-known public figures, the Center will have many opportunities to generate additional support for core program activities.

Likewise, the *Cooperative Education Exchange* program's contribution to the Department's mission to improve the excellence of education in the United States is minimal. The primary purpose of this program is to support democracy and free market economies in foreign countries. While supporting and promoting the foundational principles of democracy and free market economies in foreign countries is an undeniably important mission (particularly in the post-September 11<sup>th</sup> world), the Department of Education is not very well positioned to

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Civic education

---

administer programs that are designed to accomplish this critical goal. Unlike the U.S. Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development, both of which play key roles in promoting democracy in foreign countries by providing billions in support (millions of which actually goes directly to the Center for Civic Education) and critical expertise in everything from revitalizing infrastructure to promoting democratic reforms of education and the media, the Department of Education has limited experience in this area.

The program authority directs that the bulk of funds available through this authority must be awarded to two organizations (the Center for Civic Education and the National Council on Economic Education), both of which already receive significant financial support from alternate sources. For example, among the numerous corporations and private foundations that support the National Council on Economic Education are: 3M, American Express, AT&T, MCI, Moody, the Vanguard Group, Allstate Insurance, Ameritech, Bank of America, the Carson Group, McGraw Hill, Merrill Lynch, State Farm Insurance, UPS, and Wells Fargo (see: <http://www.ncee.net/contributors/>).

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<b>We the People:</b>			
Statutory earmark to Center for Civic Education	\$14,054	\$20,056	0
Competitive awards for understanding representative democracy	\$2,985	0	0
Total funds, We the People	\$17,039	\$20,056	0
Statutory earmarks to:			
Center for Civic Education	\$4,527	\$4,448	0
National Council on Economic Education	<u>4,527</u>	<u>4,448</u>	<u>0</u>
Earmark total	9,054	8,896	0
Number of competitive awards:			
New awards	2	0	0
Continuations	1	3	0
Competitive award funding:			
New awards	\$2,008	0	0
Continuations	<u>1,000</u>	<u>\$2,965</u>	<u>0</u>
Competitive total	3,008	2,965	0

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Civic education

---

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

(continued)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Total funds, Cooperative Education Exchange	\$12,062	\$11,861	0
Peer review	10	0	0
Program Total	29,111	\$31,917	0

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, 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.

**Goal: To educate students about the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.**

**Objective:** *Provide high quality civic education curricula to elementary and secondary school students through the "We the People: Citizen and the Constitution" program.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of teachers participating in training or professional development activities provided as part of the "We the People" program that have demonstrated improved quality of instruction through an evaluation.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2005</b>		92.7
<b>2006</b>		96
<b>2007</b>	94	97
<b>2008</b>	97	

**Assessment of progress:** All data are self-reported by the grantee. Targets are not shown for 2009 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2009.

Working with consultants, the grantee created a 12-question survey to collect data on the extent to which participating teachers report that professional development improved the quality of classroom instruction. The survey was administered after teachers returned to their respective classrooms. In 2005, the survey was provided to 669 teachers who participated in 30 professional development institutes, with approximately 29 percent responding. Of that

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Civic education

---

group, 96 percent reported that the training provided by this program had improved the quality of their classroom instruction. In 2006, the survey was provided to 210 teachers who participated in 11 professional development institutes, with approximately 69 percent responding. While the grantee appears to have exceeded the target of 94 percent for 2007, reliability issues continue to make these data extremely difficult to interpret.

### Other Performance Information

#### We the People

The Department has not conducted any evaluations of this program. The Center for Civic Education has conducted a number of its own studies of *We the People*. While these studies yield some information on the performance of participants in this program, none of the studies or evaluations conducted to date are sufficiently rigorous to yield reliable information on the overall effectiveness or impact of *We the People*. For example, a recent survey analysis (published in April 2005) conducted to gauge the knowledge and attitudes of *We the People* program national competition finalists concludes that “*We the People* finalists are better informed in every aspect of political knowledge measured than national samples of high school seniors, college freshman, and adults.” However, the students included in this survey represent a highly select, non-representative sample of high-achieving students. In another study, conducted in 2001, the Center for Civic Education compared the scores of *We the People* competition finalists to the national sample of students who participated in the 1998 NAEP Civics assessment component. The study finds that *We the People* national finalists outperformed a national sample of students participating in the NAEP Civics component by approximately 24 percent. Since *We the People* national finalists represent only a very select sample of program participants, however, neither study provides reliable information on the impact of the program generally.

In 2003, the Center for Civic Education hired MPR Associates to evaluate certain aspects of the *We the People* program. The findings of this evaluation are not yet available, except for the results of a pilot study conducted on one curriculum, *We the People: the Citizen and the Constitution*. The key purpose of this pilot study was to measure the effectiveness of the instruments to be used in the upcoming evaluation, such as surveys or assessments, and to gauge the relative impacts on treatment and comparison groups. A brief report of the results of a pilot test suggests that the curriculum is well established in the States, and that students participating in *We the People* may demonstrate improvements in specific learning outcomes compared to students who did not participate. This preliminary report suggests that the factors most likely to make a difference in student performance include (ranked in order of effects) AP course enrollment, overall achievement, participation in *We the People*, parent educational level, and ethnicity. However, due to limitations in the sample size and comparison methodology of the pilot study, the extent to which participation in *We the People* may actually affect student performance cannot yet be reliably demonstrated. No timeline has yet been established for completion and publication of this evaluation. MPR planned to conduct data collection for this evaluation during the 2005-06 academic year. Results were originally expected by fall 2007, but are not yet available.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Civic education

---

#### Cooperative Education Exchange

While a number of interesting studies and research papers have been written on various aspects of the Center for Civic Education's Cooperative Education Exchange program, no recent evaluations reliably demonstrate the efficacy of these interventions. A recent evaluation of the *Civitas Latin America* conducted by WestEd identifies some key barriers to effective program implementation, but unfortunately tells us very little about the overall effectiveness of the programs being supported with respect to such key variables as student outcomes and teacher classroom practice.

Program activities implemented by the National Council on Economic Education (NCEE) focus on providing additional training to: a) educators who train economics teachers, or b) classroom economics teachers. Such training is designed to reinforce content knowledge and provide exposure to additional instructional methods. In recent years, NCEE has conducted multiple evaluations of these activities. Unfortunately, most are not of sufficient scope or rigor to provide reliable information on key program outcomes, such as the extent to which teacher classroom practice actually changes as a result of participating in NCEE-supported interventions, or the extent to which students of teachers who participate in NCEE-supported interventions demonstrate improved academic outcomes. One recent evaluation of NCEE-supported teacher training programs in Russia suggests that teachers who participated in NCEE training programs demonstrated a better understanding of the functions and operations of a market economy and a greater ability to teach these concepts than teachers who didn't receive such training. However, the Department is still reviewing the evaluation results, including design, selection methodology, and sample sizes, to determine the extent to which the evaluation results accurately characterize the effects of such training programs.

## SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

### Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	5,116,189	4,330,635	1,486,941	(2,843,694)
Alaska	1,681,535	1,423,348	247,500	(1,175,848)
Arizona	5,561,230	4,707,343	2,094,149	(2,613,194)
Arkansas	3,197,966	2,706,941	909,208	(1,797,733)
California	41,539,958	35,161,795	12,507,148	(22,654,647)
Colorado	3,792,828	3,210,467	1,511,223	(1,699,244)
Connecticut	3,429,259	2,902,721	1,122,982	(1,779,739)
Delaware	1,681,535	1,423,348	267,627	(1,155,721)
District of Columbia	1,681,535	1,423,348	247,500	(1,175,848)
Florida	16,479,849	13,949,486	5,289,086	(8,660,400)
Georgia	9,400,001	7,956,698	3,198,381	(4,758,317)
Hawaii	1,681,535	1,423,348	384,561	(1,038,787)
Idaho	1,681,535	1,423,348	513,301	(910,047)
Illinois	13,804,325	11,684,770	4,247,096	(7,437,674)
Indiana	5,879,751	4,976,958	2,092,019	(2,884,939)
Iowa	2,683,536	2,271,498	945,416	(1,326,082)
Kansas	2,777,819	2,351,305	915,488	(1,435,817)
Kentucky	4,856,913	4,111,169	1,320,636	(2,790,533)
Louisiana	6,605,996	5,591,692	1,438,956	(4,152,736)
Maine	1,681,535	1,423,348	384,540	(1,038,808)
Maryland	5,210,438	4,410,413	1,810,646	(2,599,767)
Massachusetts	6,383,004	5,402,940	1,935,978	(3,466,962)
Michigan	12,756,555	10,797,877	3,357,626	(7,440,251)
Minnesota	4,649,215	3,935,361	1,664,095	(2,271,266)
Mississippi	4,166,529	3,526,788	1,003,456	(2,523,332)
Missouri	6,106,703	5,169,062	1,879,084	(3,289,978)
Montana	1,681,535	1,423,348	291,818	(1,131,530)
Nebraska	1,681,535	1,423,348	579,081	(844,267)
Nevada	1,681,535	1,423,348	822,787	(600,561)
New Hampshire	1,681,535	1,423,348	408,810	(1,014,538)
New Jersey	8,199,705	6,940,699	2,792,322	(4,148,377)
New Mexico	2,629,797	2,226,011	669,571	(1,556,440)
New York	26,349,783	22,303,963	6,010,125	(16,293,838)
North Carolina	7,809,292	6,610,231	2,817,745	(3,792,486)
North Dakota	1,681,535	1,423,348	247,500	(1,175,848)
Ohio	12,407,972	10,502,817	3,713,684	(6,789,133)
Oklahoma	4,132,146	3,497,685	1,166,520	(2,331,165)
Oregon	3,299,708	2,793,062	1,141,491	(1,651,571)
Pennsylvania	13,541,830	11,462,580	3,795,585	(7,666,995)
Rhode Island	1,681,535	1,423,348	320,206	(1,103,142)
South Carolina	4,444,833	3,762,360	1,379,739	(2,382,621)
South Dakota	1,681,535	1,423,348	255,181	(1,168,167)
Tennessee	5,737,796	4,856,799	1,905,543	(2,951,256)
Texas	27,461,832	23,245,264	8,336,343	(14,908,921)
Utah	2,145,458	1,816,039	991,502	(824,537)
Vermont	1,681,535	1,423,348	247,500	(1,175,848)
Virginia	6,414,756	5,429,816	2,368,164	(3,061,652)
Washington	5,591,988	4,733,378	2,040,143	(2,693,235)
West Virginia	2,456,684	2,079,478	518,392	(1,561,086)
Wisconsin	5,661,778	4,792,453	1,758,523	(3,033,930)
Wyoming	1,681,535	1,423,348	247,500	(1,175,848)
American Samoa	900,459	900,459	94,785	(805,674)
Guam	1,934,732	1,934,732	203,656	(1,731,076)
Northern Mariana Islands	606,862	606,862	63,880	(542,982)
Puerto Rico	8,400,553	7,110,708	1,399,582	(5,711,126)
Virgin Islands	1,307,947	1,307,947	137,679	(1,170,268)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	4,750,000	4,750,000	500,000	(4,250,000)
Other (non-State allocations)	693,000	589,518	0	(589,518)
<b>Total</b>	<b>346,500,000</b>	<b>294,759,000</b>	<b>100,000,000</b>	<b>(194,759,000)</b>