

Archived Information

Department of Education

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	A-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	A-2
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	A-4
Obligations by Object Classification.....	A-5
Summary of Changes.....	A-6
Authorizing Legislation.....	A-8
Appropriations History.....	A-10
Significant Items in FY 2008 Appropriations Reports.....	A-11
Summary of Request.....	A-12
Activities:	
Grants to local educational agencies.....	A-16
School improvement grants.....	A-38
Reading first:	
Reading first State grants.....	A-44
Early reading first.....	A-55
Striving readers.....	A-62
Math now.....	A-68
Even start.....	A-72
Literacy through school libraries.....	A-80
Pell grants for kids.....	A-85
State agency programs:	
Migrant.....	A-89
Neglected and delinquent.....	A-97
Comprehensive school reform.....	A-104
Evaluation.....	A-109
Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs.....	A-112
State tables.....	A-120

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For carrying out title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ("ESEA"), section 6201 of the America COMPETES Act,¹ and section 418A of the Higher Education Act of 1965, [~~\$15,755,083,000~~]\$16,617,059,000, of which [~~\$7,639,035,000~~]\$8,409,108,000 shall become available on July 1, [~~2008~~]2009, and shall remain available through September 30, [~~2009~~]2010, and of which \$7,934,756,000 shall become available on October 1, [~~2008~~]2009, and shall remain available through September 30, [~~2009~~]2010, for academic year [~~2008-2009~~]2009-2010.² *Provided*, That [~~\$6,835,271,000~~]\$6,597,946,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124.³ *Provided further*, That up to \$4,000,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education on October 1, [~~2007~~]2008, to obtain annually updated local educational-agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census.⁴ *Provided further*, That \$1,365,031,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A.⁵ *Provided further*, That [~~\$2,967,949,000~~]\$3,373,975,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125.⁶ *Provided further*, That \$2,967,949,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A.⁷ *Provided further*, That [~~\$9,330,000~~]\$9,167,000 shall be to carry out sections 1501 and 1503⁸: *Provided further*, That \$1,634,000 shall be available for a comprehensive school reform clearinghouse].⁹ (Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2008.)

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
¹ ... <u>section 6201 of the America COMPETES Act,</u>	This language, which authorizes the Math Now program, is inserted because funding is requested for the program.
² ... of which [\$7,639,035,000] <u>\$8,409,108,000</u> shall become available on July 1, [2008] <u>2009</u> , and shall remain available through September 30, [2009] <u>2010</u> , and of which \$7,934,756,000 shall become available on October 1, [2008] <u>2009</u> , and shall remain available through September 30, [2009] <u>2010</u> , for academic year [2008-2009] <u>2009-2010</u> :	This language provides for funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for the Title I Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, Education Finance Incentive Grants, School Improvement Grants, Reading First State Grants, and State Agency Migrant and Neglected and Delinquent, and Striving Readers programs. The language also provides that a portion of the funds is available in an advance appropriation that becomes available for obligation on October 1 of the following fiscal year.
³ <i>Provided</i> , That [\$6,835,271,000] <u>\$6,597,946,000</u> shall be for basic grants under section 1124:	This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Basic Grants.
⁴ <i>Provided further</i> , That up to \$4,000,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education on October 1, [2007] <u>2008</u> , to obtain annually updated local educational-agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:	This language makes available, on a current-funded basis, \$4,000,000 from Basic Grant funds to support continued work by the Census Bureau to update LEA-level poverty data.
⁵ <i>Provided further</i> , That \$1,365,031,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A:	This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Concentration Grants.
⁶ <i>Provided further</i> , That [\$2,967,949,000] <u>\$3,373,975,000</u> shall be for targeted grants under section 1125:	This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Targeted Grants.
⁷ <i>Provided further</i> , That \$2,967,949,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A:	This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Education Finance Incentive Grants.
⁸ <i>Provided further</i> , That [\$9,330,000] <u>\$9,167,000</u> shall be to carry out sections 1501 and 1503	This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Evaluation.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Language Provision	Explanation
⁹ [<i>Provided further</i> , That \$1,634,000 shall be available for a comprehensive school reform clearinghouse].	This language, which authorizes and establishes a specific funding level for the Comprehensive School Reform Clearinghouse, is deleted because no funds are included for the program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

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

	2007	2008	2009
Discretionary authority:			
Annual appropriation.....	\$14,725,593	\$15,755,083	\$16,917,059
Across-the-board reduction	<u>0</u>	<u>-265,607</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation.....	14,725,593	15,489,476	16,917,059
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-7,383,301	-7,934,756	-7,934,756
Advance from prior year	<u>7,383,301</u>	<u>7,383,301</u>	<u>7,934,756</u>
Subtotal, budget authority	14,725,593	14,938,021	16,917,059
Unobligated balance, start of year	129,479	265,377	0
Recovery of prior-year obligations	2,027	0	0
Unobligated balance, expiring.....	-325	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	<u>-265,377</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations	14,591,397	15,203,398	16,917,059

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Obligations by Object Classification
(\$000s)

	2007	2008	2009
Printing and reproduction	\$2,522	\$2,832	\$3,200
Other contractual services and supplies:			
Advisory and assistance services	1,662	1,993	3,500
Peer review	150	357	450
Other services	45,492	45,688	52,400
Purchases of good and services from other government accounts	3,437	3,930	4,000
Operation and maintenance of equipment	<u>376</u>	<u>389</u>	<u>450</u>
Subtotal, other contractual services	51,116	52,357	60,800
Grants, subsidies, and contributions	14,537,744	15,148,209	16,853,059
Interest and dividends	<u>14</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations	14,591,397	15,203,398	16,917,059

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes
(\$000s)

2008	\$15,489,476
2009	<u>16,917,059</u>
Net change.....	+1,427,583

	<u>2008 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Increases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase funding for Grants to LEAs for Targeted grants primarily to provide additional funding for high school programs.	\$14,304,901	+\$406,026
Increase funding for Reading First to narrow the achievement gap between students in low-poverty schools and those in high-poverty schools.	\$393,012	+606,988
Increase funding for Striving Readers to develop, implement, and evaluate reading interventions for middle- and high-school students reading significantly below grade level.	\$35,371	+64,629
Initial funding for the new Math Now for Elementary School and Middle School Students program to implement research-based mathematics programs to enable all students to reach or exceed grade-level achievement standards and prepare them to enroll in and pass algebra courses.	0	+95,000
Initial funding for the proposed Pell Grants for Kids program to support local efforts to increase educational options available to low-income students enrolled in persistently low-performing schools.	0	+300,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes
(\$000s)

	<u>2008 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Increases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase funding for Migrant education State programs to support programs promoting coordination of Federal resources for migratory children and providing services that address their unique needs.	\$379,991	+\$20,000
Increase funding for Neglected and Delinquent State programs to serve children and youth in correctional institutions and help them return to school and obtain employment after they are released.	48,927	<u>+3,000</u>
Subtotal, increases		+1,495,643
 Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate funding for Even Start to target funds to other, high-priority programs, including programs that are better focused on achieving the President's literacy goals.	66,454	-66,454
Eliminate funding for Comprehensive School Reform to target funds to other, high-priority programs.	1,605	<u>-1,605</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-68,059
Net change		+1,427,583 ¹

¹ Detail does not add to total due to rounding of FY 2008 amounts.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

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

Activity	2008 Authorized	2008 Estimate	2009 Authorized	2009 Request
Grants to LEAs (<i>ESEA-1-A</i>):				
LEA grants formulas:	\$25,000,000 ¹		To be determined ¹	
Basic Grants (<i>Section 1124</i>)	(2)	\$6,597,946	(2)	\$6,597,946
Concentration Grants (<i>Section 1124A</i>)	(2)	1,365,031	(2)	1,365,031
Targeted Grants (<i>Section 1125</i>)	(2)	2,967,949	(2)	3,373,975
Education Finance Incentive Grants (<i>ESEA I-A-1125A</i>)	Indefinite ¹	2,967,949	To be determined ¹	2,967,949
School improvement grants (<i>ESEA I-1003(g)</i>)	Indefinite ¹	491,265	To be determined ¹	491,265
Reading first State grants (<i>ESEA I-B-1</i>)	Indefinite ^{1,3}	393,012	To be determined ^{1,3}	1,000,000
Early reading first (<i>ESEA I-B-2</i>)	Indefinite ¹	112,549	To be determined ¹	112,549
Striving readers (<i>ESEA I-E-1502</i>)	Indefinite ¹	35,371	To be determined ¹	100,000
Math Now (<i>America COMPETES VI, Part III-B, Sec. 6201</i>)	95,000	0	Indefinite	95,000
Even Start (<i>ESEA I-B-3</i>)	Indefinite ⁴	66,454	0 ⁴	0
Literacy through school libraries (<i>ESEA I-B-4</i>)	Indefinite ¹	19,145	To be determined ¹	19,145
Pell grants for kids (<i>Proposed legislation</i>)	--	--	To be determined	300,000
State agency programs:				
Migrant (<i>ESEA I-C</i>)	Indefinite ¹	379,771	To be determined ¹	399,771
Neglected and delinquent (<i>ESEA I-D</i>)	Indefinite ¹	48,927	To be determined ¹	51,927
Comprehensive school reform (<i>ESEA I-F</i>)	Indefinite ⁴	1,605	0 ⁴	0
Evaluation (<i>ESEA I-E-1501 and 1503</i>)	Indefinite ¹	9,167	To be determined ¹	9,167

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Authorizing Legislation - continued
(\$000s)

Activity	2008 Authorized	2008 Estimate	2009 Authorized	2009 Request
Migrant education (<i>HEA IV-A-418A</i>):				
High school equivalency program	0 ⁵	\$18,226	To be determined ⁵	\$18,226
College assistance migrant program	<u>0⁵</u>	<u>15,108</u>	<u>To be determined⁵</u>	<u>15,108</u>
Total definite authorization	\$25,000,000		\$25,000,000	
Total appropriation		15,849,476		16,917,059
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				16,522,059
Portion of request not authorized				300,000

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought.

² Of the total funds appropriated for Grants to LEAs, an amount equal to the fiscal year 2001 appropriation of \$7,397,690 thousand is to be distributed through the Basic Grants formula. An amount equal to the fiscal year 2001 appropriation of \$1,365,031 thousand is to be distributed through the Concentration Grants formula. Amounts appropriated in excess of the fiscal year 2001 appropriation are to be distributed through the Targeted Grants formula.

³ Beginning in fiscal year 2004, if the amount appropriated for the Reading First State Grants program exceeds the fiscal year 2003 appropriation, the Secretary is required to reserve \$90,000 thousand or 10 percent of the excess amount, whichever is less, for Targeted Assistance Grants to States.

⁴ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

⁵ The authorizing legislation will expire on March 31, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History
(\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2000	\$8,743,920	\$8,417,897	\$8,750,986	\$8,700,986
(2000 Advance for 2001)	(6,148,386)	(6,204,763)	(6,204,763)	(6,204,763)
2001	9,149,500	8,816,986	8,986,800	9,532,621
(2001 Advance for 2002)	(6,204,763)	(6,204,763)	(6,223,342)	(6,758,300)
2002	11,032,621	12,571,400	11,926,400	12,346,900
(2002 Advance for 2003)	0	(6,758,300)	(6,953,300)	(7,383,301)
2003	13,388,330	12,936,900	18,178,400	13,774,039
(2003 Advance for 2004)	(7,383,301)	(6,883,301)	(8,627,301)	(9,027,301)
2003 Amended	0	0	0	2,244,000
(2003 Amended Advance for 2004)	0	0	0	(-2,444,000)
2003 Supplemental	0	0	0	4,353
2004	14,184,000	14,507,000	14,107,356	14,446,343
(2004 Advance for 2005)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)
2005	15,205,168	15,515,735	15,500,684	14,843,974
(2005 Advance for 2006)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)
2006	16,431,473	14,728,735	14,532,785	14,481,161
(2006 Advance for 2007)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)	(7,383,301)
2007	16,469,541	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	14,725,593 ¹
(2007 Advance for 2008)	(7,383,301)			(7,383,301) ¹
2008	16,689,090	15,969,818	15,867,778	15,489,476
(2008 Advance for 2009)	(7,383,301)	(8,136,218)	(8,867,301)	(7,934,756)
2009	16,917,059			
(2009 Advance for 2010)	(7,934,756)			

¹ 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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Significant Items in FY 2008 Appropriations Reports

School Improvement Grants

Senate: When subgranting these funds to LEAs, the Committee strongly urges the Secretary to inform States that they are required to make awards of sufficient size and scope to undertake activities required by sections 1116 and 1117 of NCLB, integrate these grant funds with other resources awarded by the States under this act (particularly, the 4 percent school improvement set-aside), and give priority to those LEAs with the lowest-achieving schools that demonstrate the greatest need for school improvement funding and the strongest commitment to ensuring that such funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable the lowest-performing schools to meet the goals identified in improvement plans, correction action, and restructuring plans under section 1116 of NCLB.

Response: The program's grant application package for FY 2007 funds, which was sent to States in October 2007, incorporated requirements that States make awards of sufficient size and scope, integrate grant funds, and give priority to LEAs most in need.

Senate: The Committee requests that the fiscal year 2009 congressional justification include specific information about the actions taken to support the Committee's intention in providing resources for this program and other school improvement activities and steps the Department will take to collect evidence on the outcomes achieved with school improvement funds.

Response: The program narrative for School Improve Grants includes information responsive to this request.

Early Reading First

House: The Committee understands that the Department may not have been at fault for the omission of several eligible districts. However, once the Department was made aware of the omission, it should have extended the deadline for a reasonable period. The Committee requests that the Department inform it, in writing, prior to the next grant competition of what it believes to be the best practice for determining whether, and for how long, grant deadlines should be extended to accommodate error and thus ensure a fair competition.

Response: The Department will inform the Committee of application deadlines (and of any procedures for extension of the deadlines) prior to the next grant competition.

Conference: The Appropriations Committees expect that the Department will strengthen professional development partnerships for early childhood educators through grants awarded under Early Reading First.

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

(in thousands of dollars)						
Office, Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2007 Annual CR Operating Plan	2008 Appropriation	2009 President's Request	Change from 2008 Appropriation Amount	Percent
Education for the Disadvantaged						
1. Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA I-A):						
(a) LEA grants formulas:						
(1) Basic grants (section 1124)						
Annual appropriation	D	5,454,824	5,964,119	5,964,119	0	0.0%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,353,584	633,827	633,827	0	0.0%
Subtotal		6,808,408	6,597,946	6,597,946	0	0.0%
(2) Concentration grants (section 1124A)						
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,365,031	1,365,031	1,365,031	0	0.0%
Subtotal		1,365,031	1,365,031	1,365,031	0	0.0%
(3) Targeted grants (section 1125)						
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	406,026	406,026	---
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	2,332,343	2,967,949	2,967,949	0	0.0%
Subtotal		2,332,343	2,967,949	3,373,975	406,026	13.7%
(4) Education finance incentive grants formula (section 1125A)						
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	2,332,343	2,967,949	2,967,949	0	0.0%
Subtotal		2,332,343	2,967,949	2,967,949	0	0.0%
Subtotal, LEA grants formulas		12,838,125	13,898,875	14,304,901	406,026	2.9%
Subtotal, Grants to LEAs		12,838,125	13,898,875	14,304,901	406,026	2.9%
Annual appropriation	D	5,454,824	5,964,119	6,370,145	406,026	6.8%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	7,383,301	7,934,756	7,934,756	0	0.0%
2. School improvement grants (ESEA section 1003(g))	D	125,000	491,265	491,265	0	0.0%
3. Reading first:						
(a) Reading first State grants (ESEA I-B-1)						
	D	1,029,234	393,012	1,000,000	606,988	154.4%
(b) Early reading first (ESEA I-B-2)						
	D	117,666	112,549	112,549	0	0.0%
Subtotal, Reading first		1,146,900	505,561	1,112,549	606,988	120.1%
4. Striving readers (ESEA I-E section 1502)	D	31,870	35,371	100,000	64,629	182.7%
5. Math Now (America COMPETES VI, Part III-B, sec. 6201)	D	0	0	95,000	95,000	---

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

Education for the Disadvantaged (continued)

6. Even start (ESEA I-B-3)	D	82,283	66,454	0	(66,454)	-100.0%
7. Literacy through school libraries (ESEA I-B-4)	D	19,485	19,145	19,145	0	0.0%
8. Pell grants for kids (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	300,000	300,000	---
9. State agency programs:						
(a) Migrant (ESEA I-C)	D	386,524	379,771	399,771	20,000	5.3%
(b) Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)	D	<u>49,797</u>	<u>48,927</u>	<u>51,927</u>	<u>3,000</u>	<u>6.1%</u>
Subtotal		436,321	428,698	451,698	23,000	5.4%
10. Comprehensive school reform (ESEA I-F)	D	2,352	1,605	0	(1,605)	-100.0%
11. Evaluation (ESEA sections 1501 and 1503)	D	9,330	9,167	9,167	0	0.0%
12. Migrant education (HEA IV-A-5):						
(a) High school equivalency program	D	18,550	18,226	18,226	0	0.0%
(b) College assistance migrant program	D	<u>15,377</u>	<u>15,108</u>	<u>15,108</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
Subtotal		<u>33,927</u>	<u>33,334</u>	<u>33,334</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
Total, Appropriation	D	14,725,593	15,489,476	16,917,059	1,427,583	9.2%
Total, Budget authority	D	14,725,593	14,938,021	16,917,059	1,979,038	13.2%
Current		7,342,292	7,554,720 ²	8,982,303 ²	1,427,583	18.9%
Prior year's advance		7,383,301	7,383,301	7,934,756	551,455	7.5%
Outlays	D	14,486,936	15,036,258	15,312,523	276,265	1.8%

¹ Excludes an advance appropriation of \$7,383,301 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

² Excludes an advance appropriation of \$7,934,756 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Request

The programs in the Education for the Disadvantaged account are the foundation of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), President Bush's landmark education initiative designed to close achievement gaps and ensure that all children have the opportunity to obtain a high-quality education. The Administration is requesting a total of \$16.9 billion in fiscal year 2009 for the programs in this account, an increase of \$1.4 billion, or 9.2 percent, over the 2008 appropriation level.

Most of the programs in the account are authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and are, therefore, subject to reauthorization in 2008. The budget request assumes that these programs will be implemented in fiscal year 2009 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

The \$14.3 billion request for **Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies** (LEAs), an increase of \$406 million over the 2008 level, would support implementation of a reauthorized program that expands the impact of NCLB accountability reforms at the high school level, provides States with greater flexibility in making adequate yearly progress determinations, makes available more meaningful choice options to students in low-performing schools, and encourages the adoption of fundamental governance and staffing changes in schools identified for restructuring. The 2009 request also includes \$491.3 million, the same as the 2008 appropriation, for the reauthorized **School Improvement Grants** program, which would help build State and local capacity to identify and implement strategies for turning around low-performing schools, including the fundamental staffing and governance changes required in the growing number of schools identified for restructuring.

The request also includes \$300 million for the **Pell Grants for Kids** program. This new program would provide competitive grants to States, municipalities, local educational agencies (LEAs), and public or private nonprofit organizations (including faith-based and community organizations) to develop K-12 scholarship programs for eligible low-income students attending schools that are in restructuring status under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) or have a graduation rate of less than 60 percent. Eligible students would receive scholarships to attend private or out-of-district public schools. These scholarships would supplement aid made available through the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

The request provides \$95 million for the new **Math Now** program, recently created by the America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education, and Science (America COMPETES) Act, which authorizes competitive grants to improve instruction in mathematics for students in kindergarten through 9th grade. Grantees will implement research-based mathematics programs to enable all students to reach or exceed grade-level achievement standards and prepare them to enroll in and pass algebra courses.

In addition, the Administration requests \$1 billion for **Reading First State Grants**, restoring most of the funds cut by the fiscal year 2008 appropriation. The success of the program in raising reading achievement and its centrality to attainment of the goals of No Child Left Behind merit the increase, and the Department has implemented all the recommendations made in Office of Inspector General reports. The request also would seek \$100 million for the **Striving Readers** program, a \$64.6 million increase over the 2008 appropriation, to expand the number

of school districts offering high-quality, research-based reading instruction for middle- and high-school students who are reading below grade level.

Furthermore, the Administration requests \$399.7 million for **Migrant State Grants**, an increase of \$20 million over the 2008 level, and \$51.9 million for **Neglected and Delinquent** programs, an increase of \$3 million over the 2008 level, for fiscal year 2009. These requests are consistent with the Administration's policy of providing increases to selected programs serving disadvantaged populations and programs that have made improvements in program implementation.

The request would level-fund most of the other programs in this account, including \$112.5 million for **Early Reading First**, \$19.1 million for **Literacy Through School Libraries**, \$18.2 million for the **High School Equivalency Program** (HEP), and \$15.1 million for the **College Assistance Migrant Program** (CAMP). The request also would maintain support for **Title I Evaluation** at \$9.2 million.

The Administration is proposing to eliminate funding for **Comprehensive School Reform**, which supports activities that may be funded under the much larger Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program, and for the **Even Start** program, which has been shown through repeated evaluations to have little impact on the achievement of program participants.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined ¹

Budget authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
LEA Grants Formulas:			
Basic grants	\$6,597,946	\$6,597,946	0
Concentration grants	1,365,031	1,365,031	0
Targeted grants	2,967,949	3,373,974	+\$406,026
Education finance incentive grants	<u>2,967,949</u>	<u>2,967,949</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, Grants to LEAs	13,898,875	14,304,901	+406,026
Annual appropriation	5,964,119	6,370,144	+406,026
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	7,934,756	7,934,756	0

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) provide supplemental education funding, especially in high-poverty areas, for local programs that provide extra academic support to help raise the achievement of students at risk of educational failure or, in the case of schoolwide programs, to help all students in high-poverty schools meet challenging State academic standards. The program serves an estimated 20 million students in nearly all school districts and more than half of all public schools—including two-thirds of the Nation’s elementary schools.

Title I Grants to LEAs were first authorized as part of the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), and Congress has invested more than \$220 billion in the program since that time. Annual funding has grown even more rapidly in recent years, more than doubling since 1996.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB Act) reauthorized both Title I and the broader ESEA based on the principles of greater accountability for student achievement, more choices for students and parents, increased flexibility for State and school districts, and the use of instruction drawn from scientifically based research on what works in the classroom.

Title I Grants to LEAs give school districts and schools considerable flexibility in using Federal education dollars to support instructional strategies and methods that best meet local needs.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Title I schools help students reach challenging State standards through one of two models: “targeted assistance” that supplements the regular education program for individual children deemed most in need of special assistance, or a “schoolwide” approach that allows schools to use Title I funds—in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds—to improve the overall instructional program for all children in a school. Schools in which poor children account for at least 40 percent of enrollment are eligible to operate schoolwide programs, and an estimated 30,000 schools, or about 55 percent of all Title I schools, currently operate such programs. In the 2004-2005 school year, these schoolwide programs accounted for an estimated 87 percent of participating students and received two-thirds of the Title I Grants to LEAs funding allocated to schools.

The ESEA, as reauthorized by the NCLB Act, also encourages the use of Title I funds for effective educational practices. Both schoolwide and targeted assistance programs must employ effective methods and instructional strategies grounded in scientifically based research. Schools are required to give primary consideration to instructional arrangements—such as after-school, weekend, and summer programs—through which participating children receive Title I services in addition to, and not instead of, all the regular classroom instruction that other children receive. Schools also must provide ongoing professional development for staff working with disadvantaged students and carry out activities designed to increase parental involvement.

The NCLB Act strengthened the accountability requirements for Title I Grants to LEAs, particularly in the areas of standards and assessments, measuring adequate yearly progress, school improvement, and teacher quality.

Standards and Assessments

Each State was required to create a system of academic standards and aligned assessments, and school districts must integrate these standards into local instruction. The State systems must include challenging content standards that describe what all students should know and be able to do in at least reading and mathematics, and academic achievement standards that describe three levels of proficiency (basic, proficient, and advanced) for meeting the State content standards. In addition, States were required to develop science standards by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The States also were required to create or adopt academic assessments that measure the achievement of all students against their standards. These assessments must be valid and reliable, include measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding of challenging content, and enable achievement results to be disaggregated by major racial and ethnic group, gender, and poverty, disability, English proficiency, and migrant status.

Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, States have been required to administer these assessments annually to all students in grades 3-8 and once in high school in reading and math. States also must annually assess English proficiency for all limited English proficient (LEP) students and must add science assessments by 2007-2008 (testing once in each of three grade spans specified in the law). As of January 2008, 30 States had fully approved assessment systems.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

To provide a uniform benchmark for comparing student achievement gains nationwide, the law requires biennial State participation in the reading and mathematics assessments for 4th- and 8th-graders conducted by the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Adequate Yearly Progress

State assessments are used to hold LEAs and schools accountable for making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward State standards for proficiency in reading and math, with the goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in both subjects by the 2013-2014 school year. The NCLB Act tightened the definition of AYP to require all students, as well as those in specific groups—including economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and LEP students—to meet the same annual statewide measurable objectives for improved achievement. Each student group must meet the statewide achievement goal for a school to make AYP, except that a school can be considered to have made AYP if the percentage of students in a group not reaching the proficient level decreases by at least 10 percent from the previous year.

The Department has recognized the need for some flexibility within the statutory framework for making AYP determinations, while still holding States to the “bright line” principles of the law, including annual assessment, disaggregation of data, and proficiency for all students by 2013-2014. For example, in December 2003, the Department announced a final regulation permitting States, school districts, and schools to include in AYP calculations the “proficient” scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take assessments based on alternate achievement standards. Without this flexibility, those students would have to be measured against grade-level standards and considered “not proficient” when States determine adequate yearly progress. The number of those proficient scores included in AYP determinations may not exceed 1 percent of all students in the grades tested (about 9 percent of students with disabilities).

In early 2004, the Department also announced that States are not required to count in AYP calculations the assessment results for LEP students in their first year of enrollment in U.S. schools. States also may include in the LEP subgroup for up to 2 years those students who were LEP but who have attained English proficiency. These provisions, as well as related flexibility measures for LEP students, were codified in a final regulation published in the *Federal Register* on September 13, 2006.

In early 2005, the Department announced *Raising Achievement: A New Path for No Child Left Behind*. Under this new, common-sense approach to implementing NCLB, States that are raising student achievement and closing achievement gaps will be given additional alternatives and flexibility in such areas as making AYP determinations. States seeking this new flexibility must demonstrate that they are improving student achievement and closing achievement gaps; that their accountability systems include all students and schools and meet NCLB assessment requirements; that parents receive timely information about the performance of their children’s schools and available choice options; and that they have systems in place to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

The first broad-based decision under the *New Path* was to permit States to count for AYP purposes the “proficient” scores of a limited number of students with disabilities who take assessments based on modified achievement standards. The number of such “proficient” scores is capped at 2 percent of all students tested. This decision recognizes that some students with disabilities who are capable of meeting grade-level standards may need more time to do so. Under the final Department regulation codifying the “2 percent rule,” which was published on April 9, 2007, States also are permitted to include in AYP calculations for the students with disabilities subgroup the scores of students previously identified as having disabilities, for up to 2 years, after they no longer receive special education services. These regulations are intended to give schools and teachers credit for raising the achievement of students with disabilities.

In addition to providing greater flexibility on AYP through the regulatory process, the Department launched a pilot program in late 2005 under which it has permitted States to use growth-based accountability models to determine AYP. States must submit proposals for using such models to the Department for approval, and proposals must embody the key principles and requirements of the NCLB Act, such as ensuring that all students are proficient in reading and math by 2014, annual goals to close achievement gaps, the inclusion of all students in testing for grades 3-8, and subgroup accountability. As of January 2008, nine States were participating in the growth model pilot.

Accountability and School Improvement

No Child Left Behind significantly strengthened the Title I accountability and school improvement provisions, requiring progressively tougher improvement measures over time for schools that continue to miss AYP targets, providing additional funding to support district-led improvement efforts, and offering immediate benefits to students through public school choice and supplemental educational services.

LEAs must identify for school improvement any school that does not make AYP for 2 consecutive years. Identified schools must develop 2-year improvement plans incorporating strategies from scientifically based research on how to strengthen instruction in the core academic subjects and addressing the specific issues that caused the school to be identified for improvement. These plans must include the annual reservation of at least 10 percent of the school’s Part A allocation for professional development that directly addresses the problems that led to identification for improvement.

States must reserve 4 percent of their Part A allocations for school improvement purposes and are required to distribute 95 percent of these funds to LEAs with schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. In reserving school improvement funds, States are not permitted to reduce an LEA’s allocation below its prior-year level, a restriction that may prevent a State from reserving the full 4 percent for school improvement.

The law also requires annual State and LEA report cards informing parents about how well their child’s school is performing against State standards. In addition, LEAs must annually notify parents of their right to receive information on the professional qualifications of their child’s teachers.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

In the 2007-2008 school year, States have identified an estimated total 11,500 schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

In addition to helping schools identified for improvement develop and implement improvement plans, LEAs must immediately provide students attending such schools the option of attending another public school, which may include a public charter school, that is not identified for improvement. LEAs must provide or pay for transportation to the new school, though this obligation is limited by the funding available for this purpose, as described below. In school year 2006-07, of more than 5.4 million eligible students, an estimated 120,000 students exercised a public school choice option under NCLB, for a national participation rate of about 2.2 percent.

If a school does not make AYP following 1 year of improvement (3 years of not making AYP), the LEA must permit low-income students remaining in the school to obtain supplemental educational services (SES), such as tutoring, from a State-approved public- or private-sector provider selected by students and their parents, with the LEA paying the cost of the services. As of December 2007, there were more than 3,100 State-approved SES providers nationwide, with nearly 90 percent of them from the private sector. In the 2006-07 school year, an estimated 530,000 students, or 14.5 percent of the more than 3.6 million students who were eligible, obtained supplemental educational services through NCLB.

LEAs must promptly notify the parents of eligible students attending schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring of their option to transfer their child to another public school or to obtain supplemental services. If funding is not available to provide choice or supplemental educational services to all eligible students, LEAs must give priority to low-achieving children from low-income families in making available those options.

In 2005, the Department launched 2 pilot demonstrations related to the choice and SES requirements. The first is a pilot in Virginia permitting 4 LEAs to offer SES in lieu of choice during the first year of improvement. Participating LEAs still must offer both choice and SES beginning in the second year of improvement. The pilot is designed to increase significantly the participation of eligible students in supplemental educational services. In 2006, this pilot was expanded to a limited number of districts in Alaska, Delaware, Indiana, and North Carolina.

The second pilot permits several urban LEAs, including Chicago, New York City, and Boston, to continue to serve as SES providers even though they are identified for improvement. (Title I regulations otherwise prohibit an LEA that has been identified for improvement from serving as an SES provider.) As with the first pilot, this demonstration is intended to ensure that the maximum number of eligible students receive high-quality supplemental educational services, as well as to evaluate the efficacy of allowing LEAs to provide SES while they are going through the improvement process.

The law requires LEAs to use an amount equal to 20 percent of their Part A allocations to pay for the transportation of students exercising the choice option or for supplemental educational services for eligible students. In reserving such funds, LEAs may not reduce allocations to schools identified for corrective action or restructuring by more than 15 percent. The per-child

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

cost of supplemental services is set at the lesser of the LEA's per-child Part A allocation or the cost of services. For fiscal year 2007 (the 2007-2008 school year), that national average per-child Part A allocation for each participating LEA was \$1,439.

Corrective Action

If an identified school does not make AYP for 2 additional years (4 years of not making AYP), the LEA must take corrective action. Corrective actions include measures likely to bring about meaningful change, such as replacing school staff responsible for the continued inability to make AYP, comprehensive implementation of a new curriculum (including professional development), and reorganizing the school internally. LEAs must continue to provide choice and supplemental services options to students in schools identified for corrective action. States identified roughly 1,900 schools for corrective action during the 2007-08 school year.

Restructuring

If a school does not respond to corrective action, the LEA must begin planning for restructuring, which involves making a fundamental change such as closing the school and reopening it as a public charter school, replacing all or most of the school's staff, or turning operation of the school over to a private management company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness. The LEA must implement the restructuring plan no later than the beginning of the following school year if the school still does not make AYP (i.e., 6 years of not making AYP), and must continue to provide choice and supplemental services options to students attending such schools. States identified an estimated 3,900 schools for either the planning or implementation phase of restructuring during school year 2007-08.

Delay, Exit, and Reward

An LEA may delay implementation of the next level of interventions (SES requirements, corrective action, or restructuring) if a school identified for such measures makes AYP for 1 year. If the school makes AYP for a 2nd consecutive year, it is no longer subject to school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. Schools that exceed AYP for 2 or more consecutive years, or that significantly close achievement gaps between groups of students identified for AYP purposes, are eligible for State Academic Achievement Awards, which may include financial compensation.

Qualifications for Teachers and Paraprofessionals

The law requires LEAs to ensure that all Title I teachers hired after the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year are "highly qualified." For new teachers, this means being certified by the State (which may be through an alternative route to certification), holding at least a bachelor's degree, and passing a rigorous State test on subject knowledge and teaching skills. Veteran teachers also must possess a bachelor's degree and be fully certified or licensed by the State, and must either pass the State test on subject matter knowledge or demonstrate subject-matter competency through a high, objective, uniform State standard of evaluation. LEAs must use at least 5 percent of their Part A allocations to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified. States were required to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that would ensure that all

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

teachers teaching in core academic subjects were highly qualified by the end of the 2005-06 school year, and both States and LEAs must report annually on progress toward this goal.

In 2004, the Department provided additional flexibility to States and school districts working to meet the highly qualified teacher (HQT) requirements. First, rural teachers who teach more than one academic subject and who are highly qualified in at least one subject were given 3 more years to become highly qualified in the additional subjects they teach. Second, States may permit science teachers to demonstrate that they are highly qualified either under a general science certification or in an individual field such as biology or chemistry. And third, States may develop a single, streamlined process for determining that veteran multi-subject teachers are highly qualified.

As the deadline approached for meeting the HQT requirements at the end of the 2005-06 school year, the Department announced a new "reasonable implementation" policy in the expectation that some States and school districts, despite their best efforts, might not meet those requirements. States that had met other HQT implementation milestones—such as having a strong definition of a "highly qualified teacher," reporting to parents and the public on classes taught by highly qualified teachers, accurate HQT data, and ensuring that poor and minority students are not taught by unqualified or inexperienced teachers at a greater rate than other students—but had fallen short of having highly qualified teachers in each and every classroom, were given the opportunity to negotiate and implement a revised plan for meeting the HQT goal by the end of the 2006-07 school year. However, in cases where the Department determines that a State is both not in compliance and not making a good-faith effort to meet the HQT requirements, it reserves the right to take appropriate action such as the withholding of funds.

Allocations

Title I, Part A funds are allocated through four separate formulas. All four formulas are based largely on the number of children from low-income families in each LEA, and each formula also includes such factors as the LEA's poverty rate and State per-pupil expenditures for education. Other children counted for allocation purposes ("formula children") include children in families receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (the main Federal-State welfare program), children in foster homes, and children in local institutions for neglected and delinquent children. Eligible LEAs receive funding under one or more of the formulas, but the final outcome of the Federal-State allocation process is a single Title I, Part A award to each qualifying LEA.

Three formulas are based primarily on the number of poor children in each LEA, weighted by State per-pupil expenditures for education. Basic Grants are awarded to school districts with at least 10 poor children who make up more than 2 percent of enrollment and, thus, spread funds thinly across nearly all LEAs. Funding for Basic Grants is statutorily fixed at approximately the 2001 appropriation level.

Concentration Grants provide additional funds to LEAs in which the number of poor children exceeds 6,500 or 15 percent of the total school-age population. Funding for Concentration Grants is statutorily fixed at the 2001 appropriation level.

The Targeted Grants formula weights child counts to make higher payments to school districts with high numbers or percentages of poor students. For example, the number of poor children

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

exceeding 38.24 percent of the school-age population in an LEA is assigned a weighting factor of 4.0, generating a higher per-child award than the 1.0 factor applied when the number of poor children represents 15.58 percent or less of an LEA's school-age population. To be eligible for Targeted Grants, an LEA must have at least 10 formula children counted for Basic Grant purposes, and the count of formula children must equal at least 5 percent of the population aged 5-17. The authorizing statute requires the Targeted Grants formula to be used for allocating all LEA Grant funds in excess of the 2001 appropriation for Basic and Concentration Grants.

In addition to Basic, Concentration, and Targeted Grants, the statute includes a separately authorized and funded Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIG) formula. This formula uses State-level "equity" and "effort" factors to make allocations to States that are intended to encourage States to spend more on education and to improve the equity of State funding systems. Once State allocations are determined, suballocations to the LEA level are based on a modified version of the Targeted Grants formula.

Targeted Grants and Education Finance Incentive Grants were first authorized in 1994, but have been funded only since fiscal year 2002. In practice, the annual appropriations acts have divided all funding in excess of the fiscal year 2001 level equally between the Targeted and EFIG formulas.

In determining allocations under each of the four formulas, the statute requires the use of annually updated Census Bureau estimates of the number of children from low-income families in each local educational agency. There is roughly a 3-year lag between the income year used for LEA poverty estimates and the fiscal year in which those estimates are used to make Title I allocations. For example, the fiscal year 2008 allocations will be based on LEA poverty estimates for 2005. The Department transfers a small amount of funding from the annual Title I appropriation (\$3.9 million in 2008) to the Census Bureau to finance the preparation of these LEA poverty estimates.

LEAs also use poverty data—generally the number of students eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch—to make within-district allocations to schools. LEAs with more than 1,000 students must serve all schools with a poverty rate of 75 percent or more, including middle and high schools, before serving schools with less needy student populations. In addition, LEAs must allocate a minimum amount per poor child unless all schools served have poverty rates above 35 percent.

One percent of the total LEA Grant appropriation is reserved for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Outlying Areas (the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands). From the amount for the Outlying Areas, up to \$5 million is reserved for a program of discretionary grants to LEAs in the Outlying Areas and the Republic of Palau. The other Freely Associated States—the Federated States of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands—have entered into their "Compacts of Free Association" and no longer receive Title I, Part A funds. A Hawaii-based non-profit organization, Pacific Resources for Education and Learning (PREL), administers the competition for this program and provides technical assistance to grantees.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

States must withhold from their Part A allocations amounts generated by annual counts of delinquent children in local institutions in order to operate State-administered projects in LEAs that have the highest dropout rates and are located in areas serving large numbers of children in local correctional facilities. In fiscal year 2007, the 45 States with these counts reserved about \$116 million for this purpose.

In addition, States are permitted to reserve up to 1 percent, or \$400,000, whichever is greater, to cover SEA costs of administering Title I programs and, as noted above, must reserve an additional 4 percent for State school improvement activities. States must distribute 95 percent of school improvement funds to LEAs.

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

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

	<u>Basic Grants</u> (\$000s)	Concentration <u>Grants</u> (\$000s)	Targeted <u>Grants</u> (\$000s)	Education Finance <u>Incentive Grants</u> (\$000s)
2004	\$7,037,591	\$1,365,031	\$1,969,843	\$1,969,843
2005	6,934,854	1,365,031	2,219,843	2,219,843
2006	6,808,408	1,365,031	2,269,843	2,269,843
2007	6,808,408	1,365,031	2,332,343	2,332,343
2008	6,597,946	1,365,031	2,967,949	2,967,949

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2009 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The 2009 request is \$14.3 billion, an increase of \$406 million, or 2.9 percent, over the 2008 level. Consistent with the authorizing statute, the entire increase would be allocated through the Targeted Grants formula.

A growing body of evidence demonstrates that the stronger accountability systems and expanded choices for students and families created by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) are helping to improve student achievement and increase educational opportunity across the Nation. The Title I Grants to LEAs program was evaluated by the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) in 2006, and earned a "Moderately Effective" based on a sound program design, effective management, improved national achievement results, and enhanced transparency of program performance data.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

In June 2007, the Center on Education Policy (CEP) published a study, entitled *Answering the Question that Matters Most: Has Student Achievement Increased Since No Child Left Behind?*, that drew on State-reported assessment results to document significant gains in student achievement since the enactment of NCLB. In particular, the following 3 CEP findings suggest that under NCLB, the Nation's schools are on the right track:

- In most States with 3 or more years of comparable test data, student achievement in reading and math has gone up since NCLB was enacted.
- There is more evidence of achievement gaps between groups of students narrowing since 2002 than of gaps widening, even though these gaps remain unacceptably large.
- In 9 of the 13 States with sufficient data to compare achievement trends before and after the enactment of NCLB, average yearly achievement gains were greater after NCLB took effect than before.

The CEP findings confirm earlier-reported data on reading and math achievement from the National Assessment of Educational Progress that highlighted strong growth in reading achievement in the early grades from 1999-2004, all-time high math scores for 4th- and 8th-graders, and a decline in the achievement gaps in reading and math between African-American and Hispanic students and their white peers to all-time lows.

In addition, a report released by the Department in July 2007 highlighted significant participation and improved outcomes for the supplemental educational services option provided to students in schools identified for improvement under NCLB. This case study of 9 large urban districts showed that roughly one-quarter of eligible elementary school students participated in SES and that participants experienced statistically significant gains in achievement.

The 2009 request for Title I Grants to LEAs reflects both recognition of a program meriting further investment and a commitment to help ensure that States, school districts, and schools have the resources needed to continue moving toward NCLB's 100-percent proficiency goal.

Implementing a Reauthorized NCLB

The \$14.3 billion request would support effective implementation of critical program improvements proposed by the Administration. These proposals include the following:

High School Reform: To help raise the performance of the Nation's high schools, the reauthorization proposal would require assessment in math and in reading or language arts in two additional high school grades, using assessments that are aligned with college and work-ready standards required for high school graduation, including aligned course-level outcomes. These new assessments, which must be in place by the end of the 2012-13 school year and which are funded in part by a \$409 million 2009 request for State Assessments under the School Improvement Programs account, would strengthen the impact of Title I accountability requirements at the high school level by giving parents, teachers, and principals more information on the progress of high school students toward State proficiency standards. They also would let students know if they are on track to graduate from high school prepared to succeed in either college or the workforce. In addition to the new assessments, States would

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

be required, by 2011-12, to use a graduation rate definition that meets the conditions established by the National Governors Association, and would be required to make significant annual improvement in the graduation rate a condition for making AYP.

The reauthorization proposal would provide additional resources at the high school level to help carry out these reforms by realigning Title I funding so that local allocations to high schools more closely reflect the enrollment of students from low-income families in those schools. This would be accomplished by requiring LEAs to ensure that the proportion of their Title I, Part A funds allocated to their high schools is at least 90 percent of the share of low-income students enrolled in those schools. Under current law, the share of Title I dollars reaching the high school level (grades 9-12) has ranged from just 8-10 percent over the past decade, even though during that period high schools enrolled about one-quarter of all elementary and secondary school students and about one-fifth of the low-income K-12 students who are the focus of Title I.

Strengthening Adequate Yearly Progress: In addition to requiring improvement in the graduation rate for high schools to make AYP, the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal would require States to include the results of science assessments in their AYP determinations beginning with the 2008-09 school year. States would set annual measurable objectives for science so that all students are proficient in science by 2020. States also would be permitted to incorporate student academic growth into their AYP definitions so long as they adhere to key No Child Left Behind accountability principles, such as the inclusion of all students, subgroup accountability, and ensuring that all students are proficient in reading and mathematics by 2014.

Expanded Choice Options: The reauthorization proposal would require LEAs to offer both public school choice and supplemental educational services (SES) to students enrolled in schools identified for a first year of improvement; double the per-child SES expenditure cap for students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, and students in rural districts; tighten requirements for use of the 20-percent reservation for choice-related transportation and SES; and permit LEAs to use up to 1 percent of this reservation for parent outreach and assistance aimed at promoting greater participation in public school choice and SES options. The proposal also would increase the number of transfer options under public school choice by permitting schools that miss AYP for only one subgroup to serve as "receiving schools." In addition, LEAs would be required to offer private school choice to students from low-income families who are attending schools that are in restructuring status.

Strengthening Restructuring Provisions: The reauthorization proposal would encourage adoption of more fundamental, far-reaching restructuring strategies by eliminating the "any other major restructuring" option, reducing the impact of collective bargaining agreements on restructuring-related staffing changes, permitting the charter school restructuring option regardless of any State caps on the numbers of charter schools, and authorizing the operation of a school by an elected official, such as a city mayor, as an approved alternative governance arrangement under a restructuring plan.

4-Percent Reservation for School Improvement: The Administration's is proposing to repeal the section 1003(e) "hold-harmless" provision and permit States to withhold the full 4 percent for school improvement even it reduces regular Title I, Part A allocations below the prior-year level.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

This provision often prevents States from withholding the full 4 percent, and occasionally prohibits States from withholding any improvement funding. For example, according to the *Center on Education Policy*, for school year 2007-08, 3 States will not be able to reserve any school improvement funds and 29 States in total will be unable to reserve the full 4 percent.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s, except per-child amounts)

		<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<u>LEA Poverty Rate</u>				
0-15%	# of LEAs	8,001	7,410	7,410
	Dollars	\$2,728,897	\$2,771,341	\$2,871,345
	% of Total \$	21.67	20.32	20.28
	\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,126	\$1,164	\$1,205
15<25%	# of LEAs	4,324	4,353	4,353
	Dollars	\$4,046,518	\$4,259,983	\$4,421,296
	% of Total \$	32.14	31.24	31.23
	\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,333	\$1,377	\$1,429
>25%	# of LEAs	1,702	2,265	2,265
	Dollars	\$5,814,805	\$6,605,996	\$6,865,251
	% of Total \$	46.19	48.44	48.49
	\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,554	\$1,626	\$1,673
LEA Allocation Subtotal		\$12,590,220	\$13,637,320	\$14,157,892
BIA/Outlying Areas		128,347	138,949	143,009
Part D, Subpart 2		116,121	118,676	0 ¹
Census Updates		<u>3,437</u>	<u>3,930</u>	<u>4,000</u>
Grants to LEAs Total		12,838,125	13,898,875	14,304,901
Schools receiving Title I funds		54,600	54,600	54,600
Schoolwide programs		30,300	30,300	30,300
Targeted assistance programs		24,300	24,300	24,300
<u>Students served</u> (in millions)				
In schoolwide programs		17.2	17.2	17.2
In targeted assistance programs		2.5	2.5	2.5
In other programs (non-public, N&D)		<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>
Total		20.0	20.0	20.0

¹ The Administration is proposing to repeal Title I Part D, Subpart 2 as part of its ESEA reauthorization plan.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

The Title I Grants to LEAs program completed the PART process in 2006, receiving a “Moderately Effective” rating. The PART process included the development of new performance measures and targets that replaced earlier measures developed in compliance with the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act. These new measures are based on data submitted annually through the ESEA Consolidated State Performance Reports, which include State and local performance information specified primarily through the annual “report card” requirements described in Section 1111(h) of the ESEA.

These measures are focused on three areas: progress of economically disadvantaged students toward the statutory goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in reading and mathematics by 2014, closing the achievement gaps in reading and mathematics between economically disadvantaged students and the “all students” group, and improving the efficiency of the Department’s monitoring process for Title I Grants to LEAs.

Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Objective: *The performance of low-income students will increase substantially in reading and mathematics.*

Measure: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		49.7
2005		52.6
2006	57.8	55.3
2007	60.9	(September 2008)
2008	66.5	(September 2009)
2009	72.1	(September 2010)

Assessment of progress: The initial baseline (2004) and comparison year (2005) data used all students tested within grades 3-8 during the given year to establish the national percentage of students at least proficient for each year. The data showed a small but significant increase in the reading proficiency of economically disadvantaged students from 2004 to 2005. In 2006, which was the first year States were required to assess all students annually in grades 3-8, the data showed a similar increase but fell short of the initial target. The 2006 assessment results included data for each grade in the 3-8 range for 51 out of 52 States, compared to just 23 out of 52 States that submitted data for the full range of grades in 2005. In particular, the inclusion of additional middle-school grades in the 2006 assessment results helped to limit overall proficiency gains because middle-school proficiency rates generally are lower than those seen

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

in the elementary school grades. Targets for 2007-2009 have been recalculated against the 2006 baseline to support a more accurate comparison of assessment results across all required grades in future years.

Measure: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		47.6
2005		50.7
2006	56.2	52.3
2007	58.3	(September 2008)
2008	64.2	(September 2009)
2009	70.2	(September 2010)

Assessment of progress: The initial baseline (2004) and comparison year (2005) data used all students tested within grades 3-8 during the given year to establish the national percentage of students at least proficient for each year. The data showed a small but significant increase in the mathematics proficiency of economically disadvantaged students from 2004 to 2005. In 2006, which was the first year States were required to assess all students annually in grades 3-8, the data showed a similar increase but fell short of the initial target. The 2006 assessment results included data for each grade in the 3-8 range for 51 out of 52 States, compared to just 23 out of 52 States that submitted data for the full range of grades in 2005. In particular, the inclusion of additional middle-school grades in the 2006 assessment results helped to limit overall proficiency gains because middle-school proficiency rates generally are lower than those seen in the elementary school grades, especially in mathematics. Targets for 2007-2009 have been recalculated against the 2006 baseline to support a more accurate comparison of assessment results across all required grades in future years.

Measure: The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		13.9
2005		13.2
2006	11.7	13.0
2007	11.4	(September 2008)
2008	9.8	(September 2009)
2009	8.1	(September 2010)

Assessment of progress: The initial baseline (2004) and comparison year (2005) data used all students tested within grades 3-8 during the given year to establish the national percentage of students at least proficient for each year. The data showed a small but significant decrease in the reading achievement gap between economically disadvantaged students and the “all students” group from 2004 to 2005. In 2006, which was the first year States were required to assess all students annually in grades 3-8, the data showed a fractional decrease but fell well short of the initial target. The 2006 assessment results included data for each grade in the 3-8

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

range for 51 out of 52 States, compared to just 23 out of 52 States that submitted data for the full range of grades in 2005. In particular, the inclusion of additional middle-school grades in the 2006 assessment results helped to minimize the reduction in the reading achievement gap because middle-school proficiency rates generally are lower than those seen in the elementary school grades. Targets for 2007-2009 have been recalculated against the 2006 baseline to support a more accurate comparison of assessment results across all required grades in future years.

Measure: The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		13.3
2005		12.8
2006	11.4	12.7
2007	11.1	(September 2008)
2008	9.5	(September 2009)
2009	7.9	(September 2009)

Assessment of progress: The baseline (2004) and comparison year (2005) data used all students tested within grades 3-8 during the given year to establish the national percentage of students at least proficient for each year. The data showed a small but significant decrease in the mathematics achievement gap between economically disadvantaged students and the “all students” group from 2004 to 2005. In 2006, which was the first year States were required to assess all students annually in grades 3-8, the data showed a fractional decrease but fell well short of the initial target. The 2006 assessment results included data for each grade in the 3-8 range for 51 out of 52 States, compared to just 23 out of 52 States that submitted data for the full range of grades in 2005. In particular, the inclusion of additional middle-school grades in the 2006 assessment results helped to minimize the reduction in the mathematics achievement gap because middle-school proficiency rates generally are lower than those seen in the elementary school grades, especially for mathematics. Targets for 2007-2009 have been recalculated against the 2006 baseline to support a more accurate comparison of assessment results across all required grades in future years.

Efficiency Measures

The efficiency measure adopted for this program is the average number of business days required to complete State monitoring reports following the completion of a site visit. For the fiscal year 2005 baseline, the average time to complete State-monitoring reports was 46.3 days. The Department reduced this time to 43.3 days in fiscal year 2006 and set targets of 40.3 days for 2007 and 40.0 days for 2008. However, the 2007 completion time rose to 59.9 days due to several changes in fiscal year 2007 monitoring cycle. First, 2007 monitoring occurred on a compressed cycle, from January 2007 to September 2007, instead of the usual 12-month October to September monitoring schedule. This meant that the percentage of time that staff spent in the field was significantly higher, reducing the time in the office needed to compile, review, and complete monitoring reports. Second, the 2007 cycle included targeted monitoring of public school choice and SES implementation in seven additional States, as well as

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

expanded of choice and SES during regularly scheduled monitoring visits. This expanded monitoring further increased the amount of time spent in the field by monitoring staff and slowed turnaround time on the production of monitoring reports. The Department expects to reduce this turnaround time by returning to a 12-month cycle in 2008, but may have to revisit its efficiency targets due to the increased complexity of the monitoring process in general, and in particular because of increased attention to choice and SES implementation, which requires additional LEA visits in each State monitored.

Other Performance Information

National Assessment of Title I: Final Report

The Department released the National Assessment of Title I (NATI) Final Report in October 2007. Volume I of this report provided a wide range of descriptive information and data on the implementation of No Child Left Behind through the 2004-05 school year. This report is available on the Department of Education's web site at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20084012/>. Highlights of the report include the following:

Program Participants

- Title I funds go to 93 percent of the Nation's school districts and to 56 percent of all public schools. Most Title I funds go to elementary schools, and nearly three-fourths (72 percent) of Title I participants in 2004-05 were in pre-kindergarten through grade 6. Minority students accounted for two-thirds of Title I participants. Private school students account for about 1 percent of Title I participants.
- Fueled by a growing use of Title I schoolwide programs, the number of students counted as Title I participants has tripled over the past decade, rising from 6.7 million in 1994-95 to 20.0 million in 2004-05.

Targeting and Use of Funds

- In 2004-05, about three-fourths (76 percent) of Title I funds went to schools with 50 percent or more students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, while low-poverty schools, which accounted for 14 percent of Title I schools, received 6 percent of Title I funds.
- At the district level, Title I targeting has changed little since 1997-98, despite the allocation of nearly \$3.6 billion in new funding through the Targeted Grants and Education Finance Incentive Grants formulas following the enactment of No Child Left Behind. The share of funds received by the highest-poverty quartile of districts in 2004-05 (52 percent) was similar to their share in 1997-98 (50 percent).
- Title I funding for the highest-poverty schools also remained virtually unchanged since 1997-98, and those schools continued to receive smaller Title I allocations per low-income student than did low-poverty schools. The average Title I allocation in the highest-poverty Title I schools was \$558 per low-income student in 2004-05, compared with \$563 in 1997-98.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Low-poverty schools continued to receive larger Title I allocations per low-income student than did the highest-poverty schools (\$763 vs. \$558).

- Elementary schools received 74 percent of Title I school allocations in 2004-05; the share allocated to middle schools (14 percent) and high schools (10 percent) was less than their share of the Nation's low-income students (20 percent and 22 percent, respectively). Seventy-one percent of elementary schools received Title I funds, compared with 40 percent of middle schools and 27 percent of high schools. The average allocation per low-income student was \$664 in elementary schools, \$502 in middle schools, and \$451 in high schools.
- In the 2004-05 school year, nearly three-fourths (73 percent) of district and school Title I funds were spent on instruction, 16 percent were used for instructional support, and another 11 percent were used for program administration and other support costs such as facilities and transportation. About half (49 percent) of local Title I funds were spent on teacher salaries and benefits, with an additional 11 percent going for teacher aides.

Trends in Student Achievement

- In States that had three-year trend data available from 2002-03 to 2004-05, the percentage of students achieving at or above the State's proficient level rose for most student groups in a majority of the States, but the increases in student proficiency were often small. For example, State reading assessments administered in the 4th grade or an adjacent elementary grade show achievement gains for low-income students in 28 out of 35 States.
- Based on trend data for 36 States, most would not meet the goal of 100 percent proficiency by 2013-14 unless the percentage of students achieving at the proficient level increased at a faster rate. For example, 29 percent of the States with consistent elementary reading assessment data for low-income students would meet the 100 percent goal by 2013-14 for this subgroup if they sustained the same rate of growth that they achieved from 2002-03 to 2004-05
- State assessments provided some indications that achievement gaps between disadvantaged students and other students may be narrowing, but recent changes are small. For example, State assessments showed a slight reduction in the achievement gap between low-income students and all students in most States, typically a reduction of 1 to 3 percentage points.

Assessment Systems

- During the 2005-06 school year, all States administered assessments intended to meet NCLB requirements for reading and mathematics, and as of 2007, 24 State assessment systems had been approved by the Department, through a peer review process, as meeting all NCLB testing requirements. The remaining 28 States fell into one of two categories: approval expected (8), or approval pending (20).
- Most States have met the requirement to assess annually 95 percent or more of their students, including major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

proficient (LEP) students, and low-income students. However, 15 States did not meet the minimum test participation requirement for one or more student subgroups.

AYP and School Improvement

- States identified 12 percent of all schools for improvement for 2005-06. Of these, 9,808 were Title I schools (18 percent of Title I schools), about the same as in 2004-05 but a 51 percent increase over the 6,219 Title I schools identified for 2003-04.
- Schools with high concentrations of poor and minority students were much more likely to be identified than other schools, as were schools located in urban areas. Just over one-third of high-poverty schools (32 percent) and schools with high percentages of minority students (31 percent) were identified schools in 2004-05, compared with 4 percent of schools with low concentrations of these students. Schools in urban areas were more likely to be identified (21 percent) than were suburban and rural schools (9 percent and 7 percent, respectively).
- Schools in States that had set more challenging proficiency standards than other States, as measured relative to NAEP, were less likely to make AYP and had much further to go to reach the NCLB goal of 100 percent proficient.
- Slightly more than half of the States have set “delayed acceleration” trajectories that expect a greater proportion of the required achievement growth to occur after 2009. On average, States expected that 41 percent of the growth needed to reach 100 percent proficiency would occur in the five years from 2004 to 2009, and 59 percent of the needed growth would occur in the five years from 2009 to 2014.
- Schools most commonly missed AYP for the achievement of all students or multiple subgroups; only in a minority of cases did schools miss only one AYP target.
- Schools that were held accountable for more subgroups were less likely to make AYP. Among schools for which AYP was calculated for six or more subgroups, 45 percent did not make AYP, compared with 5 percent of schools for which AYP was calculated based on only one subgroup.
- Almost all States had implemented a statewide system of support for identified schools by fall 2004, and these often involved school support teams (37 States) and individual school improvement specialists (29 States). Most States (42) reported that providing assistance to all schools identified for improvement was a moderate or serious challenge in 2003-04.
- Identified schools were more likely to report needing assistance in a variety of specific areas than non-identified schools, and they also reported receiving more days of assistance than non-identified schools.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

- Title I schools in corrective action status nearly universally experienced the interventions NCLB defines for schools in this stage of improvement. Corrective actions were implemented in 95 percent of Title I schools in corrective action status in 2004-05.
- Nearly one-third (30 percent) of identified elementary schools reported increasing the amount of instructional time in reading by more than 30 minutes per day in 2004-05, and 17 percent reported a similar increase in instructional time for mathematics.

Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

- Although more students were eligible to participate in the Title I school choice option, a larger number actually participated in supplemental educational services (SES). Based on district reports, more than twice as many students were eligible to transfer to another school under the Title I school choice option in 2004-05 (5.2 million) as were eligible to receive supplemental services (2.4 million). However, nearly ten times as many students actually participated in SES (446,000) as participated in the school choice option (48,000) in that year.
- In a case study of nine large urban districts, African-American students had the highest participation rate of all racial and ethnic groups in Title I SES and an above-average participation rate in Title I school choice (16.9 percent and 0.9 percent, respectively). Hispanic students, LEP students, and students with disabilities had relatively high participation rates in SES and relatively low participation rates in school choice.
- In the same nine districts, students participating in SES had average prior-year achievement levels that were lower than those for all eligible students. Students participating in the school choice option had similar prior achievement levels to all eligible students. School choice participants typically transferred from a school with below-average achievement for their district to a school with above-average achievement. Transferring students also tended to choose schools that had lower concentrations of minority students than the schools that they left.
- Most participating students received SES from a private provider, but school districts and public schools also served a substantial share of participants. Private firms accounted for 86 percent of approved providers in May 2007, while school districts and public schools accounted for only 11 percent. However, districts and public schools accounted for 40 percent of student participants in 2003-04, although they comprised 25 percent of approved providers in that year.
- Districts reported spending an average of \$875 per participating student for SES in 2003-04, about 30 percent less than the maximum per-child amount they reported allocating for such services in that year (\$1,225). The maximum per-child amount reported by districts rose to an average of \$1,434 in 2004-05

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

- Based on data from a survey of 125 SES providers in 16 school districts, services were provided both through one-on-one tutoring and through group instruction and were most often provided at the student's school. Services were provided for an average of 57 hours per student per year in those districts, and students attended an average of 78 percent of the sessions.
- Half of all school districts required to offer SES indicated that providers could use district facilities free of charge (based on the nationally representative sample), but only 17 percent of providers in the 16 districts said their contract with the district permitted them to use district facilities free of charge.

Teacher Quality

- The large majority of teachers across the country have been designated as highly qualified under NCLB. According to State-reported data for 50 States, 91 percent of classes were taught by highly qualified teachers in 2004-05.
- Students in schools that had been identified for improvement were more likely to be taught by teachers who said they were not highly qualified than were students in non-identified schools.
- Even among teachers who said they were highly qualified under NCLB, those in high-poverty schools had less experience and were more likely to be teaching out-of-field, compared with their peers in low-poverty schools.
- Most States meet the requirement to test new teachers' content knowledge through the Praxis II subject assessments developed by the Educational Testing Service (41 States).
- All States allowed veteran teachers to demonstrate their subject-matter competency through a high objective uniform State standard of evaluation (HOUSSE), as of November 2006.
- Most teachers reported receiving some professional development in reading and mathematics content and instructional strategies, but fewer than one-quarter of the teachers participated in such training for more than 24 hours over the 2003-04 school year and summer.
- Teachers in high-poverty schools were more likely to participate in professional development focused on reading and mathematics than were teachers in low-poverty schools. For example, 53 percent of secondary English teachers in high-poverty schools reported participating in professional development focused on in-depth study of reading or English compared with 36 percent of their colleagues in low-poverty schools.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Impact of Supplemental Educational Services on Student Achievement

In July 2007, the Department published *State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act: Volume I—Title I School Choice, Supplemental Educational Services, and Student Achievement*, which examined the impact of participation in Title I school choice and supplemental educational services on student achievement, as well as the characteristics of participating students. The key finding of this study of nine large urban school districts was that students participating in supplemental educational services experienced gains in achievement that were statistically significant. The full study is available at <http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/choice/implementation/achievementanalysis.pdf>.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

Title I Grants to LEAs was assessed through the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) process for the first time in 2006, and received a Moderately Effective rating. This rating was based on evidence that the program is well structured to meet its goals, is effectively and efficiently implemented, has established meaningful long-term performance measures and annual targets, and is making moderate progress in increasing achievement among the students served by the program. In particular, the Department has taken major steps to increase the transparency of performance information available to policy-makers and the public, including the posting of performance indicators compiled to meet the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), program performance plans, and State monitoring reports. For example, the Department is posting individual State data on student academic performance that are used for national performance measures under both GPRA and the PART. The Department also will be making available “after action” reports on the outcomes of its monitoring process, with tables showing specific actions taken by States to correct adverse findings.

The PART process also involved developing improvement plans to address management weaknesses identified through the PART. The PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department’s actions to address them.

- *Work with Congress to support the reauthorization of the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies consistent with the Administration's reauthorization proposal.* The Department completed development of legislative proposals for the reauthorization of NCLB, including Title I Grants to LEAs, in 2007 and shared those proposals with Congress. Many of these proposals were included in S. 1775, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2007, which was introduced in the Senate.
- *Improve timeliness and transparency related to the collection and analysis of performance and monitoring data to promote effective use of these data to strengthen program management.* The Department worked with States to transition from paper to electronic submission of Title I performance data collected through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) process, a collaboration that has reduced the time needed to certify such data by 80 percent over the past 3 years. The Department is using CSPR performance data from school years 2004-05 and 2005-06 to prepare for monitoring visits

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

and to develop follow-up recommendations to States to improve outcomes in the Title I Grants to LEAs program.

- *Strengthen support for the LEA and school improvement process, including increased use of Title I public school choice and supplemental educational services options by eligible students.* The Department used program monitoring data to select seven additional States for targeted monitoring reviews during school year 2006-07 on their implementation of public school choice and SES. The Department also developed an application package for first-time funding of the section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants program that emphasized better coordination of State and local improvement activities, the use of research-based improvement practices, and the collection of data on the impact of school improvement dollars. Finally, the Department's Comprehensive Center on Innovation and Improvement is helping expand State capacity to evaluate SES providers, conduct quality outreach activities related to SES, and sponsor short-term studies on SES implementation issues.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Section 1003(g))
FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined ¹

Budget authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$491,265	\$491,265	0

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes a separate State formula grant program making awards to States to provide assistance for local school improvement activities required by section 1116(b) of the ESEA for Title I schools that do not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least 2 consecutive years. Authorized activities include the development and implementation of school improvement plans, professional development for teachers and staff, corrective actions such as instituting a new curriculum, development and implementation of restructuring plans, and the provision of public school choice and supplemental educational service options for students enrolled in schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

Under No Child Left Behind, a school that, for 2 consecutive years, does not make AYP toward the goal of all students achieving at the proficient level in reading/language arts and in mathematics, is identified for improvement and must develop and implement a 2-year improvement plan that addresses the reasons it missed AYP. In the first year of improvement, the local educational agency (LEA) also must offer public school choice options to all students enrolled in the school. If the school continues to miss AYP for a third year, the LEA must make available, in addition to public school choice options, supplemental educational services (SES) to students from low-income families who are enrolled in the identified school.

After 4 years of not making AYP (and 2 years of implementing its improvement plan), the LEA must take corrective action, such as by replacing school staff responsible for the continued inability to make AYP, implementation of a new curriculum, or reorganizing the school internally. If corrective action does not result in the school making AYP, the LEA is required to begin planning for restructuring, which involves making a fundamental change such as closing the school and reopening it as a public charter school, replacing all or most of the school's staff, or turning operation of the school over to a private management company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness. If the school does not make AYP for a 6th year, the LEA must carry out the restructuring plan. The LEA must continue to offer public school choice and SES options to eligible students during corrective action or restructuring.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

A school that makes AYP for 2 consecutive years exits improvement status and is not subject to any further improvement actions.

To receive a School Improvement Grant, States must submit an application describing how funds will be used to assist State and local school improvement efforts, and funds are allocated in proportion to each State's share of funding received under parts A, C, and D of Title I. States must subgrant 95 percent of their allocations to LEAs with schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. The statute requires States to give priority in making awards to LEAs demonstrating the greatest need for school improvement funding and the strongest commitment to providing the resources needed to help their lowest-achieving schools successfully implement their improvement plans. Grants to LEAs must be between \$50,000 and \$500,000 and are renewable for up to 2 years.

States may use up to 5 percent of their allocations for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance activities.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	0
2005.....	0
2006.....	0
2007.....	\$125,000
2008.....	491,265

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$491.3 million for School Improvement Grants, the same as the fiscal year 2008 level. The request reflects the continuing importance of efforts by State and local educational agencies to identify and implement effective LEA and school improvement strategies that will raise student achievement so that all schools meet the academic proficiency goals of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The request would maintain support for more intensive and comprehensive interventions that will be required as increasing numbers of schools are subject to NCLB restructuring requirements.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

School Improvement: A Steep Path to NCLB Proficiency Goals

The 2009 appropriation will fund LEA and school improvement activities in school year 2009-10, the 8th year in the 12-year trajectory established by States under NCLB for ensuring that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics. The most recently available State-reported assessment results suggest that while most States are making progress in improving student achievement in these two core subjects, accelerating that rate of improvement will be a key challenge in meeting the 100 percent proficiency goal by 2014.

For example, assessment results for the 2004-05 school year showed that a national average of 63 percent of students in grades 3-8 scored at the proficient or advanced levels on State assessments in mathematics, while 66 percent were at least proficient in reading/language arts. Proficiency levels for the economically disadvantaged students targeted by most ESEA programs, including the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program, were significantly lower. For example, just 51 percent of poor students scored proficient or better in math, while 53 percent were at least proficient in reading.

More to the point, while many States have been reporting significant increases in their percentages of students proficient or better in reading and math, the national average has been rising at the rate of 2-3 percent a year, well short of the 4-6 percent annual increases needed to reach the 100 percent goal by 2014. The State of Maryland, for example, recently reported that the number of elementary and secondary schools identified for improvement increased from 167 in the 2006-07 school year to 176 for the 2007-08 school year. This increase in identified schools occurred in spite of proficiency levels that, while rising steadily, did not rise as fast as the annual targets required by the statute. The State's proficiency target for reading, for example, rose from 62.5 percent in 2006-07 to 67.5 percent in 2007-08.

A Rising Demand for Restructuring

The total number of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring grew rapidly in the early years of NCLB, rising from 6,266 in the 2003-04 school year to 9,937 in the 2004-05 school year, leveled off at 9,915 in the 2005-06 school year, and climbed more than 16 percent over the next 2 years to a preliminary total of 11,511 in the 2007-08 school year. The latest total represents about 21 percent of participating Title I schools.

While the total number of identified schools has been relatively stable at about one-fifth of participating Title I schools, the proportion of schools identified for the more rigorous restructuring stage of improvement has more than doubled over the past 2 years, from 1,727 schools in the 2005-06 school year to a preliminary count of 3,923 in the 2007-08 school year. Schools identified for restructuring are now more than one-third of all identified schools, and schools identified for corrective action or restructuring now represent just over half of all identified schools. This shift toward the two categories that require more comprehensive improvement measures means that districts are increasingly faced with the challenge of undertaking fundamental, potentially disruptive interventions at many schools while continuing to offer meaningful public school choice and effective supplemental service options to students and their parents.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

These trends also suggest that by fiscal year 2009 (school year 2009-10), if not earlier, more than half of all identified schools will be in the restructuring phase of improvement. In addition to the 3,923 schools in either the planning or implementation stage of restructuring in the 2007-08 school year, there were an estimated 1,932 identified for corrective action, and roughly 2,400 schools identified for a second year of improvement. If only half of the schools identified for a second year of improvement or corrective continue to miss adequate yearly progress targets—a reasonable scenario in view of rising State proficiency goals and the limited reach of current State and local improvement efforts—there could be 6,000 schools in restructuring by fiscal year 2009.

Reauthorization Proposal Addresses State Capacity-Building Needs

Congress did not fund the section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants program during the first 5 years of NCLB implementation, but provided an initial appropriation of \$125 million in fiscal year 2007 and a substantial increase to \$491.3 million in fiscal year 2008. This rapid rise in funding reflects the well-documented need for additional State and local assistance aimed at turning around low-performing schools. The 2009 request would continue funding at \$491.3 million, maintaining the same overall level of school improvement assistance while supporting a reauthorized program that would significantly increase State-level capacity to aid LEA and school improvement efforts.

Current law permits States to reserve just 5 percent of school improvement funding, under both the section 1003(a) 4-percent reservation and the section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants program, to pay for the statewide systems of “intensive and sustained support for and improvement for local educational agencies and schools.” This limitation has meant that few States have been able to deliver on the NCLB promise of meaningful and substantial assistance to LEAs and schools identified for improvement. In particular, the *National Assessment of Title I: Final Report* identified resource limitations as “a moderate or serious challenge” to implementing the school improvement provisions of NCLB.

More specifically, the National Assessment reported that States cited obstacles in the following areas: adequacy of State-level staff size (45 States); adequacy of State-level staff expertise (30 States) adequacy of State funding (40 States); and adequacy of Federal funds allocated for State systems (39 States). These data highlight the importance of capacity-building efforts at the State level.

Other reports have confirmed the need for both additional resources and a stronger State role in the improvement process. For example, a July 2007 report from the Center on Education Policy entitled *Moving Beyond Identification: Assisting Schools in Improvement*, found that more than one-third of districts surveyed reported a lack of capacity to take corrective action and restructuring actions, with the absence of adequate financial resources identified as the primary reason for that lack of capacity. The report noted that half or more of the districts citing capacity constraints stated that a lack of money prevented them from replacing all or most of the school staff or from entering into a contract with a private management company to operate identified schools.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

In addition, the CEP study found that less than one-third of States reported being able to monitor and provide technical assistance “to a great extent” to districts with schools in improvement. Four-fifths of the States reported that a lack of Federal funding was a key obstacle to such monitoring and technical assistance.

The Administration’s reauthorization proposal for School Improvement Grants would address these capacity issues affecting State support for school and LEA improvement by permitting States to reserve up to 50 percent of their allocations under section 1003(g) for State-level efforts to identify and implement effective interventions to turn around low-performing schools and school districts. In combination with the Administration’s proposed repeal of the section 1003(e) hold-harmless provision, which would permit all States to withhold the full 4 percent for school improvement from LEA allocations, the request for School Improvement Grants would help raise the total amount of improvement funding to nearly \$1.1 billion in fiscal year 2009.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Number of awards	57	57	57
Range of awards	\$31-16,646	\$122-65,419	\$122-65,419

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

In December 2007, the Department announced the first round of School Improvement Grant awards, providing more than \$52 million in fiscal year 2007 funding to 21 States. (The Department expects to make additional awards in early 2008.) These awards were based on an application process that closely followed the authorizing statute while emphasizing the importance of obtaining comprehensive data on program performance and outcomes. For example, the States were required to draft plans for using program funds that focused on the following measurable outcomes:

- The number and percentage of students who score proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics in LEAs and schools receiving program funds.
- The number of LEAs and schools receiving program funds that make adequate yearly progress and move out of improvement status.
- The number of LEAs and schools receiving program funds that create systems using data to support continuous feedback and improvement.

The Department is currently developing performance measures for the School Improvement Grants program that will be based on these outcome measures.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School improvement grants

The application also required States to describe how they would combine School Improvement Grant funds with funds reserved under section 1003(a) of the ESEA (the 4 percent reservation) to implement specific improvement strategies, such as building capacity to support school improvement at the local level, using research-based interventions to address academic achievement problems, and creating partnerships to deliver technical assistance and provide professional development.

In addition, the Department is requiring States to report annually the amount of program funds allocated to each participating LEA and school, the academic achievement of students in schools receiving program funds or technical assistance, whether schools receiving program funds or technical assistance make AYP or exit improvement status, and data on which improvement strategies contribute to improved performance by students and schools. The Department will collect these data through the Consolidated State Performance Report process, with initial, baseline data expected to be available in calendar year 2009.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part B, Subpart 1)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$393,012	\$1,000,000	+\$606,988

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Reading First State Grants program provides State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) with funds to implement comprehensive reading instruction for children in kindergarten through third grade that is grounded in scientifically based reading research. Participating LEAs and schools use program funds to provide professional development in reading instruction for teachers and administrators; adopt and use screening, diagnostic, and program monitoring assessments for students in kindergarten through third grade to determine where they need help in learning to read; implement reading curricula that reflect scientifically based reading research; and provide reading interventions for children in the early grades who are not reading at grade level.

The Department awards grants for up to 6 years to States through a formula based on the States' share of children aged 5 to 17 whose families have incomes below the poverty line, after first reserving one-half of 1 percent for the Outlying Areas and one-half of 1 percent for Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. The Department awarded initial Reading First State grants after a peer review panel consisting of experts in reading research and instruction examined applications submitted by States in the first year of the program (fiscal year 2002).

States award at least 80 percent of their funds to eligible LEAs on a competitive basis. Eligible LEAs are those that have the highest numbers or percentages of students in grades kindergarten through 3 who are reading below grade level and that have: (1) part or all of an Empowerment Zone or Enterprise Community in their jurisdiction, (2) a significant number or percentage of schools that have been identified for Title I school improvement, or (3) the highest numbers or percentages of students from low-income families compared to other LEAs in the State. SEAs give priority to eligible LEAs in which at least 15 percent or 6,500 children in the LEA are from families with incomes below the poverty line. In determining the amount of funds that LEAs awarded subgrants will receive, the SEA must give each LEA at least the same percentage of the State's funds as it received from the State's allocation under the Title I, Part A program in the preceding fiscal year. LEAs, in turn, provide funds only to schools that both: (1) have the highest numbers or percentages of students in kindergarten through 3rd grade who are reading below grade level; and (2) are identified for Title I school improvement or have the highest numbers or percentages of students from low-income families.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

With the remaining 20 percent of their funds, States may use up to 65 percent for teacher professional development in reading instruction, up to 25 percent for technical assistance for LEAs, and up to 10 percent for planning, administration, and reporting. States must report to the Department on an annual basis regarding their implementation of the program and must submit a midpoint progress report to the Department at the end of the third year of the grant. The expert peer review panel reviews States' progress reports, and, if the Department determines that a State has made insufficient progress, the Department may withhold program funds from the State.

The Department may reserve not more than \$25 million or 2.5 percent, whichever is less, of the appropriation for national activities, including an evaluation of the program and technical assistance, and must reserve an additional \$5 million for information dissemination activities carried out by the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL).

Beginning in fiscal year 2004, if the amount appropriated for the program exceeds the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2003 (\$993.5 million), the Department is required to reserve \$90 million or 10 percent of the excess amount, whichever is less, for Targeted Assistance Grants (TAGs) to States. For States that successfully compete for those funds, the amount of each State's TAG award is based on its relative share of children counted under the Title I formula. The Department awards these grants to States in which: (1) for 2 consecutive years, an increasing percentage of 3rd graders in specified groups have reached the proficient level in reading; and (2) for those same 2 years, the reading skills of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd graders have improved based on reading assessments in the LEAs and schools being served. SEAs may continue to receive these competitive grants in subsequent years only if they are able to demonstrate that they continue to meet these criteria. States that receive a Targeted Assistance Grant must award 100 percent of the funds competitively to LEAs that meet the same criteria. In September 2005, the Department awarded the first TAG to Massachusetts, the only State that was able to demonstrate that it satisfied the criteria of reading improvement for the 2004 grant year. In September 2006, the Department awarded the second TAG to Tennessee, which was the only State that met the criteria for the 2005 grant year. In September 2007, 3 States – Massachusetts, Tennessee, and Virginia – received TAGs.

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 as follows:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$1,023,923
2005.....	1,041,600
2006.....	1,029,234
2007.....	1,029,234
2008.....	393,012

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2009, the Administration requests \$1 billion for the Reading First State Grants program, a \$607 million increase from the 2008 appropriation. The 2009 request would restore most of the fiscal year 2008 cut, reflecting the success of the program in raising reading achievement and its centrality to attainment of the goals of No Child Left Behind. The Reading First State Grants program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2009 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The Administration is proposing to reauthorize Reading First State Grants with amendments to strengthen the screening process for conflicts of interest, define the types of programs that can be implemented using Reading First funds, increase accountability in large LEAs, improve targeting of program funds to the schools most in need of support, and expand flexibility in the Targeted Assistance Grants program.

Reading First has been one of the Administration's highest priorities for education because of compelling evidence that far too many young people are struggling through school without having mastered reading, the most essential and basic skill. Reading First is a comprehensive, nationwide effort to implement the findings of high-quality scientifically based reading research on classroom reading instruction. The program is one of only five Department of Education programs rated "Effective" through the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) process; this rating reflects the program's early performance data that show clear early reading gains after only a few years of implementation. **Student-level fluency data from Reading First schools show impressive gains across the board, in every grade and every subgroup.** In addition, the percentage of third grade students in Reading First schools who score at or above proficient on State reading assessments is climbing steadily; 42 percent scored at or above proficient in 2004, and almost 49 percent scored at or above proficient in 2006.

The Reading First program is unique in that it relies on a solid research base.

Scientifically based reading research applies rigorous and objective procedures to obtain knowledge about reading development, reading instruction, and reading difficulties in young children. In 2000, the National Reading Panel, after reviewing over 10,000 studies, identified five instructional components that scientifically based reading research indicates are essential to a child's learning to read – phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, fluency, and comprehension. Reading First emphasizes instruction based on these instructional components and, thus, is helping our Nation's schools reach the President's goal of ensuring that every child can read at grade level or above by the end of third grade.

The need for the Reading First program remains high. The 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results show that there is an achievement gap between students in low-poverty schools and those in high-poverty schools. More than half (56 percent) of fourth-grade students in high-poverty schools scored below the basic reading level, compared with

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

only 18 percent in low-poverty schools.¹ Even at the fiscal year 2007 funding level, the Reading First program reaches only a small percentage of the children most at risk for academic failure due to weak reading skills.

The implications of these achievement gaps may be severe. The Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, which follows the academic progress of children from kindergarten through 5th grade, has found, for example, that the differences in children's reading skills and knowledge that are usually seen in later grades appear to be present as children begin school and persist after 1 or 2 years of school. Research also shows that students who fail to read well by fourth grade have a greater likelihood of dropping out and of a lifetime of diminished success. The findings demonstrate the importance of providing consistent, research-based reading instruction in the early grades, before gaps in skills develop and widen, and preventing the need for more costly and difficult interventions, including referrals to special education, later on.

The Department has implemented the recommendations of the Inspector General and fully addressed Congressional concerns. The fiscal year 2008 appropriation reduced funding for Reading First significantly, in response to management problems during the initial implementation of the program that were identified in Office of Inspector General (OIG) reports. The House Committee report that accompanied the 2008 appropriations bill called for the Department to "reform its management of the program, including the removal of individuals, contractors, and subcontractors who have a financial interest in products or services purchased with Reading First funds." The Senate, similarly, noted that its recommended funding cut was in direct response to the management problems identified by OIG, expressed its appreciation for the Department's willingness to correct those problems, and stated that, in the meantime, it would not be appropriate to maintain funding at the previous level.

The Department has now implemented all of the OIG recommendations. For example, the Department assigned new staff to the program, and reanalyzed all Reading First applications approved by the Department to determine whether all funding criteria were met, and worked with the States to resolve any outstanding issues when necessary. In addition, the Department established policies to improve program operations throughout the agency. The Departmental directive *Improving Administration and Management of Department Programs* establishes internal rules on when program officers should consult with the Office of the General Counsel, prohibits staff from directing curriculum and from endorsing specific products, describes requirements related to the use of peer reviewers in formula grant programs, and requires that all staff cooperate with the OIG.

The Administration believes that the problems are now in the past, and that the program is being well managed. In particular, the Department has taken decisive steps to ensure that the program is managed in a manner that does not raise issues or perceptions of conflicts of interest by staff, contractors, or subcontractors. With these changes in place, the Administration strongly believes that past management problems should not obscure the success of this

¹ For the purpose of this analysis, low-poverty schools are defined as those where 25 percent or less of the students were eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch, and high-poverty schools are defined as those where more than 75 percent of the students were eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

program in raising reading achievement or the continuing need for the services it provides to our Nation's neediest students.

Fiscal year 2009 Implementation Plans

As a preliminary plan, the Department would reserve \$25 million of program funds to evaluate the effectiveness of the program and for technical assistance activities. Technical assistance activities supported with fiscal year 2009 funds will continue to address the needs of States, districts, and schools as they build their capacity to implement high-quality reading instruction that reflects scientifically based reading research and meet the challenges of implementing the program. For example, the Department provides technical assistance to States and LEAs through national and regional conferences, institutes, and seminars; training and professional development; on-site, telephone, and e-mail consultations; products and materials; and links to national reading experts. An additional technical assistance project focuses on implementing scientifically based reading instruction in LEAs that do not meet Title I adequate yearly progress goals in reading. These LEAs are likely to be eligible for Reading First State Grant funds, but may lack the knowledge and expertise in scientifically based reading instruction to implement Reading First State Grant subgrants successfully.

Also, as required by statute, the Department would reserve \$5 million for the National Institute for Literacy, and \$650,000 for Targeted Assistance Grants (TAGs), which are competitive grants to States that demonstrate progress in reading achievement.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Range of awards	\$2,463- \$136,987	\$936- \$48,953	\$2,398- \$125,206
Average State grant	\$18,949	\$7,197	\$18,449
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$5,146	\$1,965	\$5,000
Amount for BIA	\$5,146	\$1,965	\$5,000
Evaluation and technical assistance	\$25,000	\$9,825	\$25,000
Information dissemination (National Institute for Literacy)	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
Targeted assistance grants (TAGs)	\$3,573	0	\$650
Peer review of new award applications (for TAGs)	\$36	0	\$6

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

Goal: To improve kindergarten through third grade student achievement in reading by supporting State and local educational agencies in establishing reading programs that are based on scientifically based reading research.

Objective: *To increase the percentage of students who learn to read proficiently by the end of third grade.*

Measure: The percentage of grade 1 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency in reading on Reading First outcome measures of fluency.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		43.0
2005		50.0
2006	45	57.2
2007	52	
2008	54	
2009	61	

Assessment of progress: Performance against this measure improved significantly between 2003 and 2004. The baseline data are from the 29 States that had implemented their Reading First programs and reading assessments to the extent where they could capture this information. In 2004, 33 States reported data for this measure. In 2005 and 2006, the number of States reporting increased to 43. In 2006, 57.2 percent of grade 1 students in Reading First schools met or exceeded proficiency in measures of reading fluency, which exceeded the target of 45 percent.

Measure: The percentage of grade 3 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency in reading on Reading First outcome measures of fluency.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		36.0
2005		39.0
2006	38	42.7
2007	41	
2008	43	
2009	60	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

Assessment of progress: Performance against this indicator improved between 2003 and 2004. The 2004 data are from the 37 States that had implemented their Reading First programs and assessments to the extent where they could capture this information. In 2005, 42 States reported data for this measure. In 2006, the number of States reporting increased to 43. In 2006, 42.7 percent of grade 3 students in Reading First schools met or exceeded proficiency on measures of reading fluency, which exceeded the target of 38 percent.

Measure: The percentage of grade 2 students in Reading First schools that meet or exceed proficiency in reading on Reading First outcome measures of fluency.										
Year	Target					Actual				
	Econ. Disadv.	LEP	African Amer.	Hispan.	Students With Disabil.	Econ. Disadv.	LEP	African Amer.	Hispan.	Students With Disabil.
2004						33.0	27.0	34.0	30.0	17.0
2005						39.0	32.0	37.0	39.0	23.0
2006	35	29	36	32	19	44.2	33.7	43.2	39.5	25.9
2007	41	34	39	41	25					
2008	43	36	41	43	27					
2009	50	39	47	45	30					

Assessment of progress: Performance against this indicator improved markedly between 2003 and 2004 for all the targeted groups. The 2004 data are from the States that had data available for each subgroup; the States that reported data for one subgroup did not necessarily report results for all subgroups. For example, 27 States reported results for limited English proficient (LEP) students in 2004. By 2006, 39 States reported data for the LEP subgroup. As more States moved to full implementation, the number of States reporting for this indicator increase for each subgroup. In 2006, at least 40 States reported data for the other four subgroups (economically disadvantaged, African-American, Hispanic, and students with disabilities). In 2006, the percentage of grade 2 students in Reading First schools that met or exceeded proficiency in measures of fluency increased across every demographic subgroup. All subgroups exceeded the performance targets.

Measure: The number of States reporting an increase in the percentage of grade 3 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency on Reading First measures of reading comprehension.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		7
2005		19
2006	12	19
2007	24	
2008	29	
2009	32	

Assessment of progress: The 2004 performance data are based on information from the 10 States that had 2 consecutive years of reading comprehension data using the same

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

assessment for both years. In 2005, 23 States provided 2 consecutive years of data for this measure through annual State performance reports. In 2006, 19 of 25 States providing 2 consecutive years of data for this measure reported an increase in the percentage of grade 3 students in Reading First schools who met or exceeded proficiency in reading comprehension.

Measure: The number of States reporting an increase in the percentage of grade 2 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency on Reading First measures of reading comprehension.										
Year	Target					Actual				
	Econ. Disadv.	LEP	African Amer.	Hispan.	Students With Disabil.	Econ. Disadv.	LEP	African Amer.	Hispan.	Students With Disabil.
2004						4	5	5	5	2
2005						14	6	16	9	12
2006	7	10	10	10	5	15	15	11	17	17
2007	19	15	21	15	17					
2008	24	20	26	20	22					
2009	26	24	27	25	25					

Assessment of progress: The 2004 data are from the States that had 2 consecutive years of comparable data available for each subgroup. The States that reported 2 consecutive years of data using the same assessment for one subgroup did not necessarily report those results for all subgroups. For example, 5 States reported results for African-American students in 2004, but by 2006, 24 States reported 2 consecutive years of data for that subgroup. As more States moved to full implementation, the number of States reporting for this indicator increased for each subgroup. In 2006, 25 States reported data for the other 4 subgroups (economically disadvantaged, limited English proficient, Hispanic, and students with disabilities). In 2006, more States reported an increase in the percentage of grade 2 students in Reading First schools that met or exceeded proficiency on measures of comprehension increased for students in 4 subgroups (economically disadvantaged, limited English proficient, Hispanic, and students with disabilities) as compared to 2005, and those subgroups exceeded the performance targets. The number of States reporting an increase in the percentage of African-American grade 2 students in Reading First schools who met or exceeded proficiency was lower in 2006 than it was in 2005; however, the subgroup still exceeded the performance target.

Measure: The percentage of third grade students in Reading First schools who score at or above proficient on State reading assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		42
2005		45
2006		49
2007	55	
2008	61	
2009	67	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

Assessment of progress: The 2004, 2005, and 2006 are from the 19 States that reported data for this measure in each of the 3 years. The percentage of third grade students in Reading First schools who scored at or above proficient on State reading assessments in climbing steadily; 42 percent scored at or above proficient in 2004, and almost 49 percent scored at or above proficient in 2006.

Measure: The number of States reporting an increase in the percentage of grade 3 students who score at or above proficient on State assessments in reading.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		21
2005		27
2006	15	21
2007	32	
2008	37	
2009	40	

Assessment of progress: These data were collected through the ED*Facts* system, which is a data collection and reporting tool designed to streamline the Department's data-gathering activities. In 2006, 21 States reported an increase in the percentage of grade 3 students who scored at or above proficient on State reading assessments, which exceeded the target but was a reduction from the 2005 level.

Efficiency Measure

Measure: The number of days that States take to respond in writing to the issues identified during on-site monitoring visits.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		83
2005		65
2006		
2007	55	
2008	50	
2009	45	

Assessment of progress: For fiscal year 2004, the average time between the Department's transmission of a monitoring report and a State's response was 83 days. For fiscal year 2005, the average dropped to 65. Due to a change in the management of the program, data will not be reported for this measure in 2006. Targets of 55, 50, and 45 days have been set for 2007, 2008, and 2009, respectively.

Other Performance Information

Though the PART review was positive (based, in particular, on the program's strong performance data), the Department's Inspector General released a series of reports in late 2006 and early 2007 that raised questions about the implementation of the program. In response to

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

those reports, the Department reassigned staff, spoke to States and other involved parties to solicit feedback on the grant application process, and reviewed all program activities to ensure that the Department responds fully to the concerns raised in the reports.

Two forthcoming evaluations of the Reading First program will provide deeper knowledge on the program's implementation and impact. First, in early 2008, the Institute for Education Sciences will release an interim report of an impact evaluation that uses an experimental design to measure the effects of the Reading First State Grants program on student reading achievement. The final report will be available in early 2009. A second evaluation, conducted by the Department's Policy and Program Studies Service (PPSS), examined Reading First implementation by comparing survey data from Reading First schools with data from non-Reading First Title I schools. The interim report found that teachers in Reading First schools spent more classroom time on reading, that Reading First teachers received more professional development than Title I teachers, and that Reading First schools were more likely to have adopted an intervention program for struggling readers. The Department will release a final report from that study in summer 2008. PPSS also recently awarded a contract to Abt Associates to complete a new study evaluating the implementation of Reading First with a focus on districts and schools. Specifically, the study will describe the practices in Reading First districts and schools where student achievement is highest, and will compare the reading achievement of Reading First students to other Title I students as they complete first through sixth grades. A final report is due in the summer of 2010. Finally, two additional evaluations are exploring: (1) teacher preparation on the essential components of reading instruction; and (2) the impact of Reading First on referrals to special education.

Several external studies of the Reading First State Grants program have been conducted by the nonpartisan Center on Education Policy (CEP). The first study, released in September 2006, found that State and local education officials believe that the program has been effective in raising student achievement. According to the study's survey results, over 90 percent of Reading First-funded school district respondents that reported gains in reading achievement stated that the interventions and assessments implemented with support from the Reading First program have had a direct, positive effect on student achievement in reading. Further, a July 2007 study by CEP, *Moving Beyond Identification: Assisting Schools in Improvement*, reported that States named the professional development, curricula, and materials available through the Reading First program as the most effective ways to improve schools. In October 2007, CEP released *Reading First: Locally Appreciated, Nationally Troubled*, yet another report with findings that demonstrate the high levels of support for Reading First at the State and local levels.

Followup on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Reading First State Grants program was rated "Effective" by the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) during the 2006 rating cycle. The PART rating of "Effective" is a favorable assessment that reflects the program's early performance data that show clear early reading gains after only a few years of implementation. The only significant weakness identified through the PART process was that the Department does not yet have results of a large-scale evaluation that demonstrates that Reading First is effective and achieving results. A survey-based implementation study released by the Department in 2006 showed that the

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading first State grants

characteristics of Reading First schools and teachers are more likely to lead to successful early reading instruction than those of non-Reading First Title I schools. The comprehensive impact evaluation examining student outcomes will provide an interim report in early 2008, and will be completed in 2009.

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

- *Pursue targeted professional development activities during fiscal year 2008 to ensure that all subgroups of students in Reading First schools receive instruction to improve the ability to read on grade level.* The program office increased the amount of professional development that it provides to State and local directors of the Reading First program in order to improve the achievement of subgroups, by: (1) providing presentations at State Directors' meetings in May and October 2007 on serving special education and limited English proficient (LEP) students; (2) increasing the number of sessions at the Summer Institute (July 2007) that focused on special populations; and (3) hosting a conference with the Office of Special Education in December 2007 on "Response to Intervention." The program will continue to include subgroup-specific content in technical assistance events held in 2008.
- *During fiscal year 2008, complete impact evaluation activities and disseminate findings regarding the effectiveness of various instructional techniques that can be used in Reading First and other reading programs.* An interim report of the Reading First impact evaluation being conducted by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) will be released early this year. The Department disseminated to State directors all reports issued by IES and PPSS relating to early reading research, including reports from "Doing What Works" and the What Works Clearinghouse and the IES Practice Guide on the instruction of LEP students.
- *Improve efficiency of the program by fostering rapid response to reports from regular on-site monitoring visits during fiscal year 2008.* The Department established a new monitoring protocol in September 2007 that requires that States receive their monitoring reports within 60 days of the completion of a monitoring visit. The Department redesigned the monitoring report to make it more focused, reduced the document collection burden on the States, and is providing more feedback to States and school districts during the course of the monitoring visit.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part B, Subpart 2)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$112,549	\$112,549	0

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, reauthorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program supports local efforts to enhance the school readiness of young children, particularly those from low-income families, through scientific, research-based strategies and professional development that are designed to enhance the verbal skills, phonological awareness, letter knowledge, and pre-reading skills of children from birth through age 5. Through the understanding and use of an increasingly complex and rich spoken vocabulary, children begin to build a strong foundation for learning to read. Program activities also help to prepare staff in preschool programs, through professional development and other support, to provide high-quality language, literacy, and pre-reading activities, using scientifically based research, for preschool-aged children.

The Early Reading First program provides competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that are eligible to receive a Reading First State Grants subgrant and to public or private organizations or agencies that are located in eligible LEAs. Public or private agencies that apply for an Early Reading First grant must do so on behalf of at least one program that serves preschool-aged children. The Department may award these grants for up to 6 years.

The program's goals are to: (1) provide professional development for teachers, based on scientific research, to enhance children's language, cognitive, and early reading skills; (2) provide preschool-age children with cognitive learning opportunities and high-quality language and literature-rich environments; (3) integrate materials, activities, and instruction that are grounded in scientifically based reading research to support the development of young children's vocabulary, their ability to hear sounds that make up words, their understanding of how print and books work, and their alphabetic knowledge; (4) use screenings and assessments to determine the skills children are learning in order to prevent reading failure; and (5) improve all aspects of an instructional program, including materials, activities, tools, and assessments.

The Department was required to conduct an independent evaluation of this program to determine its effectiveness. The evaluation, for which up to \$3 million is authorized over a 4-

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

year period, examined how grantees are improving the prereading skills of preschool children, the effectiveness of the professional development provided to teachers, how early childhood teachers are being prepared with scientifically based reading research on early reading development, which activities and instructional practices are most effective, and how grantees are integrating instructional materials and activities into preschools. The Department released the evaluation in 2007.

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$94,440
2005.....	104,160
2006.....	103,118
2007.....	117,666
2008.....	112,549

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2009, the Administration requests \$112.5 million for the Early Reading First program, the same as the 2008 appropriation, to fund a new round of competitive grants to LEAs in local communities with high numbers of low-income families and to strengthen professional development for early childhood educators. These grants help improve the pre-reading skills and school readiness of children from birth through age 5. Funds in 2009 will support up to 36 new Early Reading First projects, which focus on providing cognitive learning opportunities for young children to ensure that they are well prepared for kindergarten. Young children need to develop their vocabulary, acquire the ability to hear the sounds that make up words, and learn about how print and books work; Early Reading First projects help them develop these skills.

Research demonstrates the strong relationship between high-quality educational experiences for children before kindergarten and their later success in school. The National Research Council report, *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children* (1998), concluded that the majority of reading problems faced by today's adolescents and adults could have been avoided or resolved in the early years of childhood. The National Center for Early Development and Learning report, *Cost, Quality and Child Outcomes* (1999), concluded that children's cognitive and social competence in the second grade can be predicted by the experiences that they had 4 years previously in child care, even after taking into account kindergarten and first-grade classroom experiences. The report also found that the populations of children that have traditionally been at risk for not doing well in school are more affected by the quality of childcare experiences than are other children.

Additional support for this program is provided by the Department's Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, which follows the academic progress of a nationally representative sample of children from kindergarten through 5th grade and provides information about children's reading achievement in early elementary school. Findings released in October 2007 demonstrate that children's language and literacy knowledge and skills vary significantly based

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

on their families' socioeconomic status. For example, the average overall literacy score for children in the lowest 20 percent of the socioeconomic distribution is more than one standard deviation below that of the children in the highest 20 percent of the socioeconomic distribution. Earlier study findings include that students' reading achievement scores in kindergarten are positively associated with their reading achievement scores in fifth grade. Taken together, these findings suggest that the differences in early literacy skills between children from different socioeconomic groups are significant, and such differences that exist when children begin school may persist throughout the early years of schooling.

Early Reading First grants help to meet the challenges of preparing young children for success in school by funding projects that provide high-quality, research-based experiences in language and early literacy for preschool-age children. These grants improve the instruction and environment provided by programs primarily serving young children living in poverty, including preschool programs supported by the Title I program, Head Start, and publicly funded or subsidized child care. Moreover, the statutorily required evaluation of the Early Reading First program found numerous positive effects, including improvements in children's print and letter knowledge, which justifies continued investment in the program.

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 the reauthorization, the Administration is proposing authorizing language to strengthen partnerships between preschool providers and institutions of higher education that provide professional development to early childhood educators. This change would include terminating the authorization for the separate Early Childhood Educator Professional Development program and restructuring the Early Reading First statute to require that all projects have a strong educator professional development component. These changes will ensure that all the early childhood discretionary grants embody the key attributes of both programs, such as a focus on scientifically based reading readiness and high-quality professional development. In addition, consolidation of the two programs should increase efficiency and strengthen administration, as early childhood programs will no longer have to deal with two separate authorities (with their own application requirements, funding criteria, and accountability mechanisms) and the Department and grantees will be able to focus on obtaining the best results from a single program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
New grants	\$114,972	\$111,424	\$111,424
Number of new grants	32 ¹	30-36 ¹	30-36 ¹
Average new award	\$3,593	\$3,095- \$3,714	\$3,095- \$3,714
Supplemental awards	\$1,517	0	0

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) - continued

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Number of children served	17,881	17,100	17,100
Number of teachers served	2,283	2,184	2,184
Peer review of new award applications	\$1,177	\$1,125	\$1,125

¹The Department funded multi-year projects under this program in fiscal year 2007 entirely from the fiscal year 2007 appropriation; estimates for 2008 and 2009 assume continuation of this policy.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

Goal: To support local efforts to enhance the early language, literacy and prereading development of preschool-aged children through strategies and professional development based on scientifically based reading research.

Objective: *Preschool-aged children will attain the necessary early language, cognitive and prereading skills to enter kindergarten prepared for continued learning, including the age-appropriate development of oral language and alphabet knowledge.*

Measure: The percentage of preschool-aged children participating in Early Reading First (ERF) programs who attain age-appropriate oral language skills as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		56.0
2005	57	67.9
2006	59	66.9
2007	59	
2008	60	
2009	61	

Assessment of progress: The first full year of implementation for the Early Reading First program was the 2003-04 school year, and not all grantees used the specific assessments named in the GPRA measures. Beginning with the 2004 cohort, all grantees have been

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

required to report on the measures in their annual grantee performance reports. In 2006, 66.9 percent of preschool-aged children participating in Early Reading First (ERF) programs attained age-appropriate oral language skills, which exceeded the target. The Department will revise 2008 and 2009 targets based on prior years' data.

Measure: The number of letters ERF children can identify, measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		15
2005	16	16
2006	17	18
2007	18	
2008	19	
2009	19	

Assessment of progress: The first full year of implementation for the Early Reading First program was the 2003-04 school year, and not all grantees used the specific assessments named in the GPRA measures. Beginning with the 2004 cohort, all grantees have been required to report on the measures in their annual grantee performance reports. In 2006, ERF children identified an average of 18 letters as measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask, which exceeded the target.

Measure: The percentage of 4-year-old children participating in Early Reading First programs who achieve a significant learning gain on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III (PPVT-III).		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		62.2
2007	63	
2008	64	
2009	65	

Assessment of progress: Beginning with 2005 grantees, the Department added an impact measure: the percentage of 4-year-old children participating in Early Reading First programs who achieve a significant learning gain on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III (PPVT-III),. In 2006, the first year this measure was used, 62.2 percent of 4-year old children in ERF programs achieved significant learning gains on the PPVT-III. The Department set targets for 2007, 2008, and 2009 based on 2006 performance.

Efficiency Measure

The Department recently established a program efficiency measure to assess the cost per preschool-aged child participating in Early Reading First programs who achieves a significant gain in receptive language on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III. In 2006, the first year this measure was used, the cost per participant achieving a significant gain in receptive language was \$5,234.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

Other Performance Information

The Department conducted a 3-year evaluation, begun in fiscal year 2003, to study the impact of early childhood programs funded by Early Reading First on children's literacy and language skills. The study evaluated the extent to which Early Reading First contributes to literacy, language, and other outcomes for participants relative to non-participants. It also examined whether the impact varies by program, child, and family characteristics. The Department submitted a required interim evaluation report to Congress in January 2005, outlining the evaluation design and status of the data collection activities. The final evaluation was released in May 2007.

The evaluation found that the Early Reading First program had numerous positive impacts on preschool classrooms. Specifically, the ERF program improved elements of the classroom environment, such as materials available, book-reading practices, and the variety of phonological-awareness activities and children's engagement in them. In addition, the program increased the number of hours of professional development provided to teachers, and increased the use of mentoring. The program also demonstrated impacts on children's print and letter knowledge, but did not affect phonological awareness or oral language skills. In addition, the program had no impact on children's social-emotional development.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Early Reading First program was rated "Moderately Effective" by the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) during the 2006 rating cycle. The program received high scores for purpose, planning, and management but weaknesses were cited in program results and accountability measures.

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

- *Collect data for the new performance measures.* The Department required fiscal year 2006 grantees to submit data on the significant gains measure for performance year 2007. Previous cohorts of grantees were strongly encouraged to provide data on the measure if possible, which enabled the Department to report data for performance year 2006. The Department calculated the cost per significant gain measure using the number of participating children, the percentage who achieve significant gains, and the total amount of the grant award per year.
- *Develop a measure of kindergarten readiness.* The Department awarded three supplemental grants in 2007 to grantees receiving a second 3-year award to collect achievement data for former Early Reading First participants currently in kindergarten. The Department is working with the grantees and with early childhood education experts to develop a valid and reliable measure of former participants' performance in kindergarten.
- *Update the grantee performance data on the program's website as data become available.* Grantees submitted 2007 performance year data to the Department in December 2007. By

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Early reading first

May 2008, after the data are analyzed and, when needed, verified, they will be posted on the website.

- *Conduct targeted technical assistance to improve the quality of phonological awareness and oral language instruction.* The Department will develop and provide technical assistance in higher-level phonological awareness and oral language skills at grantee meetings. The National Evaluation of Early Reading First found no program impacts on phonological awareness and oral language skills, which prompted the development of this follow-up action.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$35,371	\$100,000	+\$64,629

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008. The program has been funded under the Title I demonstrations authority. The Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal would give it a specific authorization.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Striving Readers program supports competitive grants to implement and evaluate reading interventions for middle- or high-school students reading significantly below grade level. This program complements the Reading First State Grants program, which provides comprehensive reading instruction for children in kindergarten through third grade that is grounded in scientifically based reading research. Projects focus on the implementation and evaluation of strategies to improve the reading achievement of students reading 2 or more years below grade level, including professional development in reading instruction for secondary-school teachers in the core academic subjects and the implementation of reading curricula that are appropriate for teenage students.

The Department makes awards to local educational agencies (LEAs) eligible to receive funds under Part A of Title I that have one or more high schools or middle schools with significant numbers of students reading below grade level or at risk of not meeting Title I adequate yearly progress requirements. Eligible LEAs may also apply in partnership with institutions of higher education and public or private, nonprofit or for-profit organizations. State educational agencies (SEAs) may apply on behalf of eligible LEAs and in partnership with other entities. Awards are for up to 5 years; recipients conduct rigorous evaluations that include the use of an experimental research design by selected grantees. In addition, conference report language accompanying the Department's fiscal year 2005 appropriation directed the Department to balance grants between projects serving middle schools and projects serving high schools. In 2006, the Department followed that directive in awarding grants to the current grantees.

The Department awarded the first eight grants under the program in February 2006. In conducting the first competition, the Department established two absolute priorities: (1) grantees will use program funds only to serve students who attend schools eligible to receive funds under Part A of Title I and who are in grades 6 through 12; and (2) grantees will (a) implement school-level strategies designed to increase reading achievement by integrating enhanced literacy instruction throughout the curriculum and the entire school, (b) implement an intensive, targeted intervention for students reading at least 2 years below grade level, and (c) carry out a rigorous,

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

independent evaluation of the project that must include an evaluation of the targeted intervention and must use an experimental research design.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	0
2005.....	\$24,800
2006.....	29,700
2007.....	31,870
2008.....	35,371

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$100 million for Striving Readers, a \$64.6 million increase over the 2008 appropriation, in order to enable more schools to test and implement adolescent literacy programs and to increase the number of students served by the program. The Striving Readers program has been funded under the Title I demonstrations authority. For the reauthorization of ESEA, the Administration is pursuing establishment of a specific authority for the program. The Administration is also proposing, through the reauthorization, to give priority to Title I-eligible middle and high schools that have been identified for school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. 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 improvements in student reading achievement observed through the implementation of the Reading First program prove that scientifically based reading programs can have an impact on student outcomes. Unfortunately, however, many students are still arriving in middle and high schools with limited reading skills. About one-fourth of the Nation's 8th-graders who took the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in 2007 could not read at the basic level, roughly the same percentage who performed below the basic level in 2005. Students who perform below the basic achievement level have reading problems that interfere with their ability to complete coursework necessary for college, undermine their motivation to finish high school, and contribute to behavioral and emotional problems.

The 2007 NAEP results also uncovered an achievement gap between students in low-poverty schools and those in high-poverty schools. For the purpose of this analysis, low-poverty schools are defined as those where 25 percent or less of the students were eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch, and high-poverty schools are defined as those where more than 75 percent of the students were eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch. About half of eighth-grade students in high-poverty schools scored below the basic reading level, compared with only 14 percent in low-poverty schools.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

Many of these low-achieving secondary school students are at risk of dropping out of school, in part because of frustration about their poor reading skills. A 1999 study by Andrew Sum, *Literacy in the Labor Force: Results from the Adult Literacy Survey*, underscores the concern about the future of students who drop out of school because they are poor readers. The study found that prose literacy is highly correlated with future earnings and with the probability of earning a high school diploma and earning a higher education degree.

Too many of the Nation's high school students are unable to read at a level that would enable them to meet challenging State academic content and student performance standards. For example, a 2002 study done by researchers at the Johns Hopkins Center for Social Organization of Schools estimates that up to one-third of entering ninth-grade students need additional help in reading. The problem is even worse in high-poverty high schools. The same report found that about half of freshmen students attending regular high school in Philadelphia begin their freshman year 3 or more years behind grade level in reading achievement. Further, in 8 of the 22 high schools studied in Philadelphia, less than 30 percent of the freshmen were within 2 years of the expected grade level in reading.

A 2005 report by ACT, *Reading Between the Lines: What the ACT Reveals about College Readiness in Reading*, demonstrates that the problem is national in scope. According to the report, student performance on the "ACT College Readiness Benchmark for Reading" is at its lowest level in 12 years; only 51 percent of ACT-takers are ready for college-level courses that require high levels of reading, such as psychology and U.S. history. In addition to this troubling finding, the data reveal dramatic differences in reading skills between students in different demographic groups. For example, the data show that 70 percent of test-takers whose families have an annual income of \$100,000 or more are college-ready in reading, while only 33 percent of students with family incomes under \$30,000 are adequately prepared. Further, 59 percent of white students are college-ready in reading, while only 21 percent of African-American students have the required reading skills to be successful in college.

Despite these struggling readers' ongoing need for instructional support, most secondary school students are generally not able to benefit from high-quality literacy instruction. Although the knowledge base on what works at the secondary level is thin compared to what we know about beginning reading, the Nation must make more of an effort to improve the quality of reading instruction at the secondary level and to provide targeted interventions to secondary school students who struggle in reading. Efforts in this area ought to be rigorously evaluated in order to broaden the research base in adolescent literacy, informing strategic investments in adolescent literacy instruction for struggling readers.

Some evidence on promising practices in adolescent literacy instruction is beginning to emerge. The Center on Instruction released a report in 2007: *Academic Literacy Instruction for Adolescents: A Guidance Document from the Center of Instruction*. The report includes numerous recommendations for the improvement of adolescent literacy instruction. For example, several experts recommended that teachers work to improve literacy skills by embedding reading instruction, especially reading comprehension strategies, across content areas such as math and social studies. In addition, several experts suggest that students who are reading significantly below grade level be enrolled in a course to focus on the development

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

of such skills as fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary usage that students need to develop to meet grade-level requirements.

The Department's Institute of Education Sciences (IES) will also be adding to the field of adolescent literacy. Through the What Works Clearinghouse, IES publishes practice guides in education to bring the best available evidence and expertise to bear on the types of challenges that cannot currently be addressed by single interventions or programs. IES practice guides are written by panels of nationally recognized experts and are subjected to rigorous external peer review and consist of a list of discrete recommendations for educators. IES will release an adolescent literacy practice guide early in 2008.

The Striving Readers program itself will also add to the research base. The program is designed to support the implementation of promising adolescent literacy interventions while requiring the collection of participant achievement data, as well as rigorous grantee evaluation of the program's implementation and impacts. In the first year of its implementation, the 2006-07 school year, Striving Readers projects provided literacy instruction to over 36,000 secondary school students, including 4,000 adolescents reading two or more grades below grade level. Independent, third-party evaluations of the eight current Striving Readers projects will enrich the research base on "what works" for adolescents who are struggling to become proficient readers and adolescents who are proficient but must improve proficiency to meet new reading challenges.

The following are examples of the projects funded by the Striving Readers program. The Ohio Department of Youth Services, the agency responsible for operating felony-offender youth prisons, is implementing the "READ 180" program in eight juvenile justice facilities for grades 6-12. Approximately 1,400 students, who began the program reading, on average, more than 4 years below grade level, are receiving literacy instruction. In Illinois, the Chicago Public Schools system is implementing a highly experimental adolescent literacy program that includes the delivery of reading instruction and the monitoring of student progress via handheld devices. Chicago will add important information to the research base on how best to deliver and monitor reading instruction for middle school students. The Department has used subsequent years' funding to support continuations for current grantees and will do so again in 2009.

The 2009 request would also support approximately 18-20 new awards to enable more local school districts to implement and evaluate demonstration reading intervention programs for secondary-school students with difficulties in reading, so that they can catch up to their peers. In addition, the Department would continue to reserve a portion of funds to work with local evaluators in order to ensure that the local evaluations are rigorous and are carried out consistent with the evaluation plan proposed in the application. At the requested level, the Department will also begin an independent evaluation of the program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Amount for local awards	\$31,620	\$35,121	\$98,500
Continuation	\$31,620	\$29,713	\$21,155
New	0	\$5,408	\$77,345
Total number of grants			
Continuation	8	8	9-10
New	0	1-2	18-20
Number of students served			
Whole-school intervention	36,108 ¹	40,106 ¹	112,480 ¹
Targeted intervention	4,058 ¹	4,507 ¹	12,640 ¹
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$54	\$500
Evaluation	\$250	\$250	\$1,000

¹The 2008 and 2009 estimates are based on the actual number of students served with 2006 funds during the 2006-07 school year, which are the most recent data available.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

The objective of the program is to raise the reading achievement levels of middle and high school-aged students in Title I eligible schools with significant numbers of students reading below grade level. The first performance measure is: "The percentage of adolescent students reading significantly below grade level who demonstrate a gain in their reading achievement at a minimum of one grade level or its equivalent after participating in an intensive literacy intervention over an academic year." At the end of the 2006-07 school year, 30 percent of adolescent students participating in the targeted literacy intervention component of the program demonstrated a gain of at least one grade level in reading achievement. These data were aggregated from reports from seven of the eight grantees after one year of implementation, which is the most complete information presently available.

The second performance measure is: "The percentage of students in schools participating in the Striving Readers program who score at or above proficient on the State's assessment in reading/language arts." In spring 2006, prior to the implementation of the program, 59 percent

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Striving readers

of students in Striving Readers schools scored at or above proficient on State reading assessments. The percentage of students in Striving Readers schools who scored at or above proficient on State reading assessments increased to 61 percent in spring 2007, after one year of implementation. These data were, again, aggregated from reports from seven of the eight grantees.

In addition, all grantees are conducting rigorous experimental or quasi-experimental evaluations of their targeted interventions to determine their effectiveness. The Department will release year one reports on the implementation of the targeted and whole school interventions in the later this year. In addition, IES plans to release two cross-site synthesis reports, one in spring 2010 and another in spring 2011. The reports will assess the empirical evidence from the eight local evaluations and provide, where appropriate, summary conclusions about the impact of the interventions.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Math Now

(America COMPETES Act, Title VI, Part III, Subtitle B, Section 6201)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$95,000	+\$95,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Math Now program, recently created by the America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education, and Science (America COMPETES) Act, authorizes competitive grants to improve instruction in mathematics for students in kindergarten through 9th grade. Grantees will implement research-based mathematics programs to enable all students to reach or exceed grade-level achievement standards and prepare them to enroll in and pass algebra courses.

The Department will make 3-year awards on a competitive basis to State educational agencies (SEAs), giving priority to States that will implement statewide strategies for improving mathematics instruction and raising the mathematics achievement of students, particularly those in grades 4 through 8. SEAs that receive a grant must use at least 90 percent of their funds to award competitive grants to eligible local educational agencies (LEAs), which are defined as those with one or more schools: (1) with significant numbers or percentages of students whose mathematics skills are below grade level; (2) that are not making adequate yearly progress under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; or (3) in which students are receiving instruction in mathematics from teachers who do not have mathematical content knowledge or expertise in the teaching of mathematics. SEAs must use the remaining funds (up to 10 percent of the grant) for administrative activities, including reporting on mathematics achievement data on the progress of students participating in Math Now projects, and may use some of these funds to provide technical assistance to LEA grantees.

LEAs must use funds to: (1) implement mathematics programs that are research-based and reflect a demonstrated record of effectiveness; (2) provide professional development to teachers and, if appropriate, administrators and other school staff, on the implementation of mathematics initiatives designed to improve student achievement, improve mathematical content knowledge, increase the use of effective instructional practices, and monitor student progress; and (3) conduct continuous progress monitoring to measure student progress and identify areas in which students need help learning mathematics. LEAs may also use their funds to adopt and use mathematics instructional materials and assessments, implement classroom-based assessments, provide remedial coursework and interventions for students, provide small groups of students with individualized instruction, conduct activities to improve teachers' content knowledge, and collect and report performance data.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Math Now

SEAs that receive a grant must report annually to the Department on the mathematics achievement of students participating in Math Now projects in the State, including the results of State, district, and classroom assessments, and the percentage of students who enroll in and pass algebra courses.

The Department may reserve up to 2.5 percent of program funds to conduct a required evaluation that assesses the impact of the program on student academic achievement and teacher performance and for technical assistance to prospective applicants and grantees.

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2009, the Administration is requesting \$95 million for Math Now, a key component of the President's American Competitiveness Initiative. This program would help ensure that more students are prepared to take and pass challenging mathematics and science courses in high school and college. It is crucial for elementary- and middle-school students to receive a solid education in arithmetic and algebraic concepts so that they are prepared to take challenging mathematics courses in secondary school, beginning with algebra.

Educators have long viewed algebra as a "gateway" course to advanced mathematics and science courses in high school, yet most students do not take algebra in middle school. Students who take the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) are asked background questions about their course taking. In 2004, only 29 percent of 13-year-olds reported that they were enrolled in an algebra course. Although this percentage was higher than in previous years, the number of eighth graders taking algebra is still well below what is needed if the Nation is to graduate a sufficient number of students with high-level mathematics skills. Moreover, students from higher-income families are almost twice as likely as lower-income students to take algebra in middle school and geometry in high school. The Math Now program will address this problem by helping to ensure that more students have the fundamental understanding of arithmetic and algebraic concepts that they will need to begin algebra courses in middle and high school.

American students' performance on international mathematics assessments also provides a compelling rationale for an intensive, targeted initiative to strengthen the mathematics skills of our elementary- and middle-school students, especially low-achieving students. For example, the 2006 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) focused on the performance of 15-year-olds in mathematics literacy and problem solving. Results of that study suggest that American high-school students continue to lag behind students elsewhere in mathematics and that the learning gap between American students and students in other countries is widening. On the PISA assessment, the United States ranked 24th out of 30 countries belonging to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which represents the world's most advanced countries. Furthermore, American students did not improve their mathematics scores on the PISA compared to 2003.

In the 2004 National Assessment of Educational Progress, the percentage of 17-year-olds who successfully performed moderately complex mathematical procedures and reasoning showed no measurable change from 1999 and 2004; also, no change was found for the highest

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Math Now

performance level. On the 2005 mathematics assessment, 39 percent of 12th-grade students performed below the basic level and 77 percent performed below the proficient level in mathematics.

Providing students with additional assistance is particularly important in high-poverty schools, which are the schools that the Math Now program will reach. A 2002 study done by researchers at the Johns Hopkins Center for Social Organization of Schools reports that “In almost every State, there is at least a 35 percentage point difference between the percent of white eighth graders and the percent of eighth graders in the State’s largest minority groups scoring at the basic level in mathematics on the NAEP test.” The same study also reports that about half of all students who attend non-selective public high schools in Philadelphia begin their freshmen year 3 or more years behind grade level in mathematics achievement.

In addition, although No Child Left Behind requires that all teachers of the core academic subjects, including mathematics, be “highly qualified,” some school districts continue to have difficulty recruiting and retaining highly qualified mathematics teachers, particularly at the middle-school level and particularly to teach in high-poverty schools. The teacher professional development that will be provided through Math Now will address this need directly, by providing teachers with content-related professional development that helps them deliver conceptual instruction to their students.

A 2005 study by Thomas M. Smith, Laura M. Desimone, and Koji Ueno, *“Highly Qualified” to Do What? The Relationship Between NCLB Teacher Quality Mandates and the Use of Reform-Oriented Instruction in Middle School Mathematics* found that teacher participation in content-related professional development is positively associated with increased use of conceptual teaching strategies that are more effective than teaching strategies that merely emphasize memorization and computation skills. The authors also note that teachers at the lowest level of mathematics content knowledge are usually the least likely to participate in high-quality professional development activities. Providing teachers with content-related professional development has the potential to increase teachers’ emphasis on conceptual instruction and help close the gap in teaching skills between teachers with and without degrees in mathematics.

The pending release of the National Math Panel report, which is expected in early in 2008, makes this a propitious time to launch the Math Now program. The report will produce findings and make recommendations on curricular content, learning processes, the training and evaluation of teachers, instructional practices, assessment, and research as these topics apply to mathematics in pre-kindergarten through grade 8. The report will also focus on the importance of high-quality algebra courses, as well as concepts in mathematics that are often neglected at the pre-kindergarten through grade 8 levels. It should, thus, provide a highly valuable resource for State and local officials to use in designing and implementing curricular and professional development activities that lead to advances in mathematics achievement.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Math Now

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2009</u>
Number of awards	20-30
Average award	\$3,155 - \$4,733
Peer review of new award applications	\$95
Evaluation	\$238

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Institute for Education Sciences within the Department would contract for an independent, 5-year evaluation of the program. This study would use an experimental design to assess the impact on student achievement by comparing the average difference in achievement outcomes between student participants and non-participants.

The Department has not yet developed specific performance measures for Math Now. However, the law requires grantees to report disaggregated performance data for the program, including data on student achievement in mathematics and the percentage of students in participating LEAs who take and pass algebra courses. The Department will construct performance measures and targets that draw on the data from these reports.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title 1, Part B, Subpart 3)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$66,454	0	-\$66,454

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008. No new authorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Even Start program supports projects that provide educational services to low-income families, including parents eligible for services under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act and their children from birth through age 7. The program aims to improve the educational opportunities of children and their parents in low-income areas by integrating early childhood education, adult education, and parenting education into "family literacy" programs.

The Department allocates Even Start funds to States based on their relative shares of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I, Part A funds. State educational agencies (SEAs) make competitive subgrants to partnerships of local educational agencies and other organizations, giving priority to proposals that target areas designated as empowerment zones or enterprise communities or that propose to serve families in other high-poverty areas.

The statute also requires that subgrantees be representative of urban and rural areas of the State and that local projects assume an increasing share of program costs over the 4-year subgrant period, beginning with 10 percent in the first year and ending with 40 percent in the fourth. For projects receiving subsequent subgrants, the match is 50 percent in years 5 through 8 and 65 percent after 8 years.

An SEA may reserve up to 6 percent of its allocation for providing technical assistance for program improvement and replication through subgrants or contracts; for developing indicators of program quality and monitoring, evaluating, and improving programs based on the State's indicators; and for providing assistance to subgrantees to improve the quality of family literacy services that they provide under the program. An SEA may also use up to half of this reservation for program administration.

Six percent of the annual appropriation is set aside at the national level for programs serving migrant children, the Outlying Areas, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations if the appropriation for the program exceeds \$200 million. When the appropriation is \$200 million or less, the set-aside is 5 percent. The Department is also required to fund a grant for an Even Start project in a women's prison. Up to 3 percent is reserved at the Federal level for evaluation and technical assistance. In addition, in years in which the appropriation exceeds the amount

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

appropriated for the preceding fiscal year, the Department is required to reserve \$2 million, or 50 percent of the excess, whichever is less, for the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL) to carry out scientifically based research on family literacy. When the appropriation is the same as or less than the preceding year's appropriation, the Department may reserve only sufficient funds for NIFL to continue multi-year research projects. The statute also authorizes \$1 million for competitive grants to States for Even Start statewide family literacy initiatives in years when the appropriation increases over the previous year.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$246,910
2005.....	225,095
2006.....	99,000
2007.....	82,283
2008.....	66,454

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Even Start 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. The request continues the Administration's policy to support high-priority early learning programs, such as Reading First State Grants and Early Reading First, that are better focused on achieving the President's literacy goals for young children.

National evaluations of Even Start provide strong justification for terminating the program. Three national evaluations show that Even Start projects did not effectively increase the literacy skills of participating children and their parents. Like the previous evaluations, the final report from the most recent rigorous evaluation of Even Start (Third National Even Start Evaluation: Program Impacts and Implications for Improvement, 2003) concluded that, while Even Start participants made gains, they did not perform better than those in the comparison group that did not receive services. Moreover, the scores of Even Start participants after 1 year of participation in the program were very low. For example, Even Start children scored at the 6th percentile when tested at the end of the program on a measure of vocabulary knowledge, and Even Start parents scored at the 3rd-grade level when tested at the end of the program on a measure of reading comprehension.

The key premise underlying the Even Start program is that the integration of the four core instructional components of adult education, parenting education, parent-child activities, and early childhood education adds value to the individual components. This premise, while

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

appealing, remains unproven. The extent to which family literacy programs can enhance parent literacy and parenting skills is unknown.

Although the Even Start program has increased its focus on providing high-quality, research-based early childhood education, the Reading First State Grants and Early Reading First programs are better structured to implement proven research directly and effectively. For example, the Reading First State Grants program is implementing comprehensive reading instruction using scientifically based reading research for children in kindergarten through third grade. The Early Reading First program aligns closely with the Reading First State Grants program by supporting local efforts to enhance the school readiness of preschool-aged children, through scientific, research-based strategies and professional development that are designed to enhance verbal skills, phonological awareness, letter knowledge, and pre-reading skills. By implementing scientifically based reading instruction for preschool and school-aged children, these programs will, over time, help the Nation's schools move closer to reaching the President's goal of ensuring that every child can read at grade level or above by the end of third grade.

The Administration's request to eliminate funding for this program is also supported by the findings and "Ineffective" rating given the program in the 2002 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) assessment.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Funding:			
Amount distributed to States	\$75,700	\$61,138	0
Average State award	\$1,456	\$1,176	0
Range of State awards	\$378 - \$9,500	\$306 - \$7,214	0
Evaluation and technical assistance	\$2,468	\$1,994	0
Set-aside for migrant children, the			
Outlying Areas, and Indian tribes	\$3,939	\$3,163	0
Women in Prison Literacy Project	\$150	\$150	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$25	\$9	0

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) - continued

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Projects:			
Number of State-awarded projects	377	331	0
Indian tribes projects:			
Continuation	12	5	0
New	0	3	0
Migrant projects:			
Continuation	12	10	0
Women in Prison Literacy Project	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Total projects	402	350	0
Number of children served	22,521 ¹	19,770 ¹	0
Number of adults served	15,882 ¹	13,942 ¹	0

¹The 2007 and 2008 estimates are based on the actual number of children and students served in 2005, which are the most recent data available.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

In 2000, the Literacy Involves Families Together Act amended the Even Start statute to require each SEA to establish indicators of program quality for the Even Start programs operating within the State. Although each State's set of indicators is unique, all States must focus on education outcomes for adult and child participants. For adults, States must include measures of: achievement in the areas of reading, writing, English-language acquisition, problem-solving, and numeracy; secondary school or general equivalency diploma (GED) receipt; and entry into postsecondary education, a job retraining program, or employment or career advancement, including the military. For child participants, States must include measures of: improvement in the ability to read on grade level or reading readiness; school attendance; and grade retention and promotion.

Goal: To help break the cycle of poverty and illiteracy by improving the educational opportunities of the Nation's low-income families through a unified family literacy

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

program that integrates early childhood education, adult literacy and adult basic education, and parenting education.

Objective: The literacy of participating families will improve.

Measure: The percentage of Even Start adults who achieve significant learning gains on measures of reading/English language acquisition, as measured by the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) and the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE).		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	70.7	60.5
2005	71.4	63.8
2006	72.1	66.3
2007	70.9	
2008	71.2	

Assessment of progress: The Department analyzed data collected through the 2004 State Consolidated Performance Report from the 2002-03 school year to establish baselines. However, States used a wide variety of assessment instruments, so very few States submitted data in a format that could be aggregated across States. In the 11 States that reported adult learning gains on measures of English language acquisition for 2003, approximately 70 percent of participating adults showed improvement. In 2004 and 2005, when more States provided data, reported performance decreased. In 2006, 66.3 percent of Even Start adults achieved significant learning gains on measures of reading/English language acquisition, making progress from the previous year, but not meeting the target of 72.1 percent. The 2007 and 2008 targets were reduced based on 2004 and 2005 data that represented more States than the original 2003 baseline. No targets are shown for 2009 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2009.

Measure: The percentage of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	59.6	44.6
2005	60.2	47.2
2006	60.8	77.6
2007	60.8	
2008	61.0	

Assessment of progress: The Department analyzed data collected through the 2004 State Consolidated Performance Report from the 2002-03 school year to establish baselines. Targets are based upon data from the 12 States that provided complete data for 2003. In those States, approximately 59 percent of participating adults were successful. In 2004 and 2005, when more States provided data, reported performance decreased. In 2006, 77.6 percent of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal earned a high school diploma, exceeding the target of 60.8 percent. It is important to note that most participants whose performance is reported under this measure are school-aged parents. In years prior to 2006, States included in the data for this measure parents who were working toward a high school diploma but may not have been

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

eligible to receive a diploma in the reporting year, such as freshmen in high school. The Department clarified the grantee reporting instructions for this measure in 2006, which is likely at least a partial cause of the dramatic increase in the reported rate of adult participant diploma attainment. No targets are shown for 2009 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2009.

Measure: The percentage of Even Start adults with General Equivalency Diploma (GED) attainment goal who earn a GED.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	44.4	80.2
2005	44.9	57.9
2006	45.3	47.3
2007	45.3	
2008	48.0	

Assessment of progress: The Department analyzed data collected through the 2004 State Consolidated Performance Report from the 2002-03 school year to establish baselines. Targets for future years are based upon data from the 12 States that provided complete data on GED attainment in the 2002-03 report. In 2006, 47.3 percent of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal earned a GED, exceeding the target of 45.3 percent, but a decline from the previous year. In years prior to 2006, States included in the data for this measure parents who may not have been eligible to receive a GED. It is important to note that most participants whose performance is reported under this measure are not school-aged parents. No targets are shown for 2009 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2009.

Measure: The percentage of Even Start children who are entering kindergarten achieving significant gains on receptive language, as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT – III).		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		82.9
2005	83.7	79.8
2006	84.6	75.3
2007	84.6	
2008	85.0	

Assessment of progress: The Department analyzed data collected through the 2004 State Consolidated Performance Report from the 2002-03 school year to establish the baseline. However, States utilized a wide variety of assessment instruments and varying definitions of significant gains, so very few States submitted data in a format that could be aggregated across States. In 2005, the Department defined significant gains as a gain of 4 points or more on the PPVT-III. In 2006, 75.3 percent of Even Start children entering kindergarten achieved significant gains on receptive language, falling short of the target of 84.6 percent. No targets are shown for 2009 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2009.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

Measure: The number of letters preschool-aged Even Start children can identify, as measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		15
2007	16	
2008	17	

Assessment of progress: On average, Even Start children could identify 15 letters in 2006, the baseline year for this measure. No targets are shown for 2009 because the Administration is not requesting funding for this program in fiscal year 2009.

In addition, in 2007, the Department added a new measure: “The percentage of preschool-aged children participating in Even Start programs who demonstrate age-appropriate oral language skills as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III, Receptive (PPVT-III, Receptive).” The purpose of this measure is to determine the percentage of preschool-aged Even Start participants who enter kindergarten with sufficient language skills. The Department will report baseline data for performance year 2008.

Other Performance Information

The 2003 report, *State Administration of the Even Start Family Literacy Program: Structure, Process and Practices*, showed very little consistency across States in the measures, standards, and subgroups used in States’ indicators of program quality. In response to this report, the Department is focusing its technical assistance on strengthening each State’s indicators of program quality through the following activities: (1) a peer review of each State’s indicators to ensure that they reflect high standards and use appropriate assessment tools, and that States use their indicators to monitor and improve local Even Start programs and participant literacy achievement results; (2) an overall assessment of the quality of each State’s performance measurement system; and (3) assistance to States in revising performance measures and using indicators to monitor and improve local Even Start programs.

In addition, the statute requires the Department to conduct independent evaluations to determine the performance and effectiveness of Even Start programs. Two of these evaluations employed a rigorous experimental design model in which families who wished to enroll in Even Start were randomly assigned either to participate in the program or to become part of the control group. Both experimental evaluations showed that, although Even Start adult and child participants made gains in literacy assessments and on other measures, these gains were not larger than those achieved by members of the control group. The third national Even Start evaluation found that, while the early childhood classroom experiences provided by Even Start projects in the study were of overall good quality, there was not sufficient emphasis on language acquisition and reasoning to produce measurable impacts on literacy assessments.

In order to learn more about the effectiveness of Even Start instructional services, the Institute of Education Sciences is currently completing the *Even Start Classroom Literacy Interventions and Outcomes (CLIO)* study. The study is testing whether research-based, literacy-focused preschool and parenting education curricula are more effective than existing Even Start

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

instructional services, and the extent to which research-based parenting education curricula focused on child literacy add value to the CLIO preschool curricula. A sample of 120 Even Start programs were randomly assigned to receive one of the CLIO curricula or to participate in a control group of programs that would continue to provide their regular pre-CLIO instructional services. CLIO is assessing children's early literacy skills and parent's literacy and parenting behavior. The final report will be released in early 2008.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

Even Start was among the programs rated in 2002 using the "Program Assessment Rating Tool" (PART). The PART identified Even Start as "Ineffective," based on findings from the three major national evaluations.

The PART also identified other weaknesses in the program, including reliance on output measures (hours of service provided) rather than outcomes (whether children read at grade level). In response to these findings, the Department revised the program performance measures to focus on outcomes. In addition, program staff improved monitoring through implementation of a standardized rubric and now provide regional training sessions on the four program components.

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

- *Support grantees in the delivery of high-quality services through monitoring, including by monitoring 16 States during fiscal year 2008.* The Department visited Colorado, Florida, and Oklahoma, and prepared draft monitoring reports from the visits with Colorado and Florida.
- *Measure outcomes, such as early literacy skills for children and high school completion for adults, and establish ambitious annual and long-term performance targets. Adjust performance targets based on best available data.* The GPRA measures for preschool-aged participants in the Even Start program were revised to be the same as the measures for Early Reading First. During 2008, the Department will consider adjusting performance targets to better reflect consistency across related programs and to account for increased State reporting.
- *Work with Congress to eliminate funding for the program due to program ineffectiveness, and redirect funding to other education programs.* The Congress has reduced funding for the program from \$247 million in fiscal year 2004 to \$66 million in fiscal year 2008.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part B, Subpart 4)

FY 2009 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$19,145	\$19,145	0

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Literacy Through School Libraries program helps local educational agencies (LEAs) provide students with increased access to up-to-date school library materials and professionally certified school library media specialists. LEAs use their funds to: (1) acquire school library media resources; (2) acquire and use technology that can help to develop the information retrieval and critical thinking skills of students; (3) facilitate Internet links and other resource-sharing networks; (4) provide professional development for school library media specialists and activities that foster increased collaboration between school library media specialists, teachers, and administrators; and (5) provide students with access to school libraries during non-school hours.

At appropriation levels of less than \$100 million, the Department makes competitive 1-year awards directly to eligible LEAs. To be eligible for an award, an LEA must have a child-poverty rate of at least 20 percent. If the appropriation is \$100 million or more, funds are allocated to State educational agencies (SEAs) by formula based on each State's share of funds provided under Part A of Title I for the previous year. SEAs then award at least 97 percent of their allocations competitively to eligible LEAs. To be eligible to compete for a grant from its SEA, an LEA would be required to have a child-poverty rate that is at least 15 percent or is greater than the statewide average poverty rate for LEAs.

One-half of 1 percent of the amount appropriated is reserved for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and an equal amount for the Outlying Areas. The Department may use up to 1 percent of the appropriation for evaluation activities.

An LEA receiving assistance under the program is required to report annually on: (1) how it used program funds; and (2) the extent to which the LEA has increased the availability of, and access to, up-to-date school library media resources in its schools. In addition, the Department is required to conduct biennial evaluations of the program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$19,842
2005.....	19,683
2006.....	19,486
2007.....	19,485
2008.....	19,145

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2009, the Administration requests \$19.1 million, the same amount as the 2008 level, for the Literacy Through School Libraries program. The requested level recognizes the strategic role that school libraries can play in making information available to all students, training students and teachers about how to obtain and make use of information, and increasing access for low-income students to technology and information.

This program supports a central goal of the Administration and of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001—enabling all children to read well. Compelling evidence indicates that far too many young people are struggling through school without having mastered reading, the most essential and basic skill. On the 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress, 50 percent of all fourth graders in high-poverty schools scored below the "basic" reading level. Research shows that students who fail to read well by fourth grade have a greater likelihood of dropping out and of a lifetime of diminished success. For these reasons, providing consistent support for reading success from the earliest age has critically important benefits.

The Literacy Through School Libraries program addresses specifically the problem of access to printed materials and high-quality school libraries for schools that serve concentrations of poor students. Children who attend these schools have less access to the types of services and materials that seem to raise student achievement. The 2004 National Center for Education Statistics report, *School Library Media Centers: Selected Results From the Education Longitudinal Study of 2002*, found that high-poverty schools (those in which more than 50 percent of the students are eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch) are more likely than wealthy schools (those with less than 20 percent of students so eligible) to have libraries with fewer than 8,000 books and to have expended no funds for computer hardware for the school library in the 2000-2001 school year.

In 2007, the American Association of School Libraries began an annual survey of school libraries. Although respondents to the survey were self-selected, and it is, therefore, not nationally representative, the survey indicated notable differences between high- and low-poverty schools. For example, school libraries that serve fewer poor students average 32 hours per week of State-certified school library media specialist time, compared to 27 hours in schools with more poor students. In addition, high-poverty schools average fewer total books in the school library than do lower poverty schools (less than 12,000 versus more than 14,000), although poor schools do average more books per student than low-poverty schools (23 versus 20). High-poverty schools average fewer computers in the school library than do low-poverty

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

schools – 19 versus 28 computers, respectively. Although there is no significant difference between high- and low-poverty schools on groups visits (entire classes, small groups) to the school library per week, there is a difference between high- and low-poverty schools in individuals' visits to the school library; high-poverty schools average 236 visits per week, while low-poverty schools average 330. Finally, on average, high-poverty schools spend less on their libraries than low-poverty schools, both in total (\$12,000 in low-poverty schools versus \$8,300 in high-poverty schools) and per student (\$15.15 versus \$13.23).

Several studies have found correlations between significant library investment and improved student achievement in general and with improved literacy in particular. Analyses of national and State assessment data have also found correlations between student performance on those assessments and the use and quality of school library media centers. For example, an analysis of 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress data found that States with reading scores above the national average were more likely to have schools where students had greater access to library media specialists and that those students used library resources more frequently. State-level studies have shown comparable findings. A 2003 analysis of achievement data in North Carolina found that scores on standardized reading and English tests tended to increase when, among other things, libraries in schools: (1) were open more hours during the week; (2) had newer books; and (3) subscribed to online periodical services and CD ROM services. A 2000 study by Keith Curry Lance found that Colorado achievement test scores averaged 10 to 15 percent higher in elementary schools and 18 percent higher in middle schools with well-developed library media programs.

The Literacy Through School Libraries program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The Administration is not proposing major changes in the program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Amount for local awards	\$18,901	\$18,571	\$18,571
Number of new awards	78	74-78	74-78
Number of schools served	600	590	590
Amount for peer review of applications	\$195	\$191	\$191
Amount for evaluation	\$195	\$191	\$191
Amount for the Bureau of Indian Education	\$97	\$96	\$96
Amount for the Outlying Areas	\$97	\$96	\$96

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measure

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

The Department recently revised the program's performance measures to be: (1) the percentage of students in schools served by the Literacy Through School Libraries program who are proficient in reading; (2) the number of books and media resources purchased per student, pre- and post-grant, compared to the national average; and (3) the difference in the number of purchases of school library materials (books and media resources) between schools participating in the Literacy Through School Libraries program and the national average. The Department expects to have baseline data for the new measures in the fall of 2008.

Other Performance Information

In 2005, the Department completed an evaluation of the program to determine: (1) how districts allocate grant funds and target them to schools with the greatest need for improved library resources; (2) how funds are used (e.g., to buy books, improve technology, increase library hours, or provide professional development for library and reading staff); and (3) the effects of the program on staff collaboration and coordination. The study addressed these questions by examining data from grantee performance reports and a school library survey of grantees and matched comparison schools. Key findings of the study include:

- Nineteen (19) percent of grantee schools, but only 11 percent of the matched comparison nongrantee schools, were identified for Title I school improvement, suggesting that school districts are allocating program funds to those schools with the greatest academic need. However, the study also found that 58 percent of school districts receiving grants are providing program funds to all schools in the district.
- Compared to nongrantees, grantees were more likely to identify needs with regard to having up-to-date materials (97 percent of grantees versus 83 percent of nongrantees), having the library open for more hours (68 percent versus 36 percent), and having more time for planning with teachers (61 percent versus 44 percent). Nongrantees did not have any area of need that was greater than grantee need by a statistically significant amount.
- Receipt of the grants appears to have resulted in major changes in the school libraries, bringing them up to a level of equality with, and sometimes helping them to surpass, the nongrantees.
- Grantees showed significant increases in the number of days that the library was open in the summer and an increase in library usage.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Literacy through school libraries

- Grantees started out the grant year with no significant difference from nongrantees in their levels of expenditures, but had much higher expenditures after receiving the grant. Thus, the grants resulted in large increases in expenditure at the school level and did not appear to supplant local spending for school libraries.
- Grantees acquired substantially more books in the grant year than did nongrantees (with means of 1,250 and 730 books, respectively), putting them in a position of rough equality in the size of their book collections.
- Districts that received grants spent 68 percent of the grant money on school library media sources, including books. Districts spent 11 percent of funds on the acquisition of advanced technology and 11 percent on operating the library during nonschool hours.
- Grantees were more likely to implement professional development activities related to school libraries than nongrantees and to cover methods of collaboration as part of their professional development activities.
- Grantees were more likely than nongrantees to report collaboration between library staff and classroom teachers on reading or language arts (70 percent versus 59 percent), though not in other subject areas. Grantees were more likely to work with classroom teachers in curriculum development (67 percent versus 55 percent).

A new 2-year evaluation, covering the same issues, began in the fall of 2005 and data should be available in the spring of 2008.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Pell grants for kids

(Proposed legislation)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
0	\$300,000	+\$300,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

In an effort to improve the educational opportunities available to students from low-income families who are enrolled in persistently low-performing schools, the Administration proposes to include, in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Pell Grants for Kids program.

Pell Grants for Kids would provide competitive grants to support local efforts to increase educational options for low-income K-12 students enrolled in the Nation's most troubled public schools, namely, Title I schools in restructuring status or high schools with significant dropout rates. Eligible students would receive scholarships in order to pay tuition, fees, and other education-related expenses at higher-performing out-of-district public schools or nearby private schools. These scholarships would supplement aid made available through the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Under the Administration's reauthorization proposal for Title I, low-income students attending schools in restructuring status (schools that have not made adequate yearly progress for at least 5 years) would be entitled to transfer to another public or private school, and would be able to use, for tuition and other education-related expenses, the district's per-child allocation for Title I as well as, for a student with disabilities, the per-child allocation under Part B of IDEA. The additional funding from the Pell Grants for Kids program would ensure that eligible students have sufficient resources to attend available out-of-district public or nearby private schools.

This elementary and secondary education program is modeled after two highly successful higher education initiatives. The GI Bill gave World War II veterans scholarships that could be used at any institution of higher education of their choice, be it public or private. Similarly, the Federal Pell Grant program provides low-income students with financial support to attend any of approximately 5,400 public and private postsecondary institutions. Both of these Federal programs expanded the range of high-quality academic opportunities available to individuals by allowing Federal funding to follow the student to the institution of his or her choice.

The same flexibility and support offered for students seeking a quality higher education should be offered to low-income students who are enrolled in low-performing schools and seek a quality elementary and secondary education. Under the Pell Grants for Kids program, the Department would make competitive awards to States, municipalities, local educational agencies (LEAs), and public or private nonprofit organizations (including faith-based and

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Pell grants for kids

community organizations) to develop K-12 scholarship programs for eligible low-income students attending schools that are in restructuring status under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) or have a graduation rate of less than 60 percent. In making awards, applications would be evaluated based on (1) the number of low-performing schools within the geographic area to be served; (2) the number of eligible students that the applicant proposes to serve; (3) the number of seats available in higher-performing out-of-district public schools and nearby private schools; and (4) the capacity of the entity to administer a scholarship program with a high degree of accountability. The Department would also provide a priority for applications that propose to augment the Federal scholarships with additional funds in order to ensure that families are able to pay the tuition and fees at the school of their choice. Further, the Department would give preference to applicants demonstrating broad-based community support for the organization and for the scholarship proposal.

Parents of eligible students who choose to send their child to a private or out-of-district public school would receive a scholarship, in addition to, the LEA's Title I per-pupil allocation and, if the student is disabled, the LEA's IDEA per-pupil allocation. The total amount would equal the sum of tuition, fees, and other costs, including necessary transportation costs, for the new school, or the average per-pupil expenditure of public schools in the State where the recipient resides, whichever is less. Scholarship recipients would be required to take their States' assessments or a nationally normed test in each grade and subject required under Title I.

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2009, the Administration requests \$300 million for the proposed Pell Grants for Kids program, an amount sufficient to provide scholarships to approximately 62,000 to 75,000 students from low-income families in grades K-12.

There is significant demand for programs that provide parents the opportunity to send their child to a higher-performing school. Demand can be so high in some areas of the country that public and private scholarship programs are generally able to serve only a small portion of those seeking assistance. For example, in the fourth year of operation of the federally funded Opportunity Scholarship Program (OSP) in the District of Columbia, the Washington Scholarship Fund (WSF), the grantee under the program, received more than 7,100 applications and awarded approximately 1,880 scholarships to date, demonstrating that the demand far exceeds available program resources.

While increasing numbers of low-income students are eligible to transfer to another school under Title I, recent data from the Department's ESEA Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) show that only 2.2 percent of eligible students exercised their choice option in the 2006-07 school year, in many cases because the options available to them have been so limited or lacking in quality. The Department, through the ESEA reauthorization and in the 2009 budget, is making efforts to turn around restructuring schools a high priority. The budget includes an increase of more than \$400 million in Title I funding and nearly \$500 million for Title I School Improvement Grants, much of which would be used to assist schools in restructuring status. However, while improvement and restructuring efforts are underway, the number of students attending these chronically struggling schools—those that have not made

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Pell grants for kids

adequate progress for at least 5 years—continues to grow. Approximately 1,445 schools were identified for restructuring in 2005-06; this number increased dramatically to more than 2,300 schools identified during the 2006-07 school year. By 2009-10, the school year in which fiscal year 2009 appropriated funds will be used, the number of schools in restructuring is expected to approach 5,000. The Administration maintains that students attending persistently low-performing schools deserve the opportunity to pursue other educational opportunities, including the option of attending a higher-performing out-of-district public school or nearby private school, as we work to turn around the restructuring schools.

Along with the rise in the number of schools in restructuring status, a growing body of research suggests that our Nation's high schools are in crisis, with over 1.2 million students failing to graduate from high school each year, more than half of whom are from minority groups. Recent research by the Center for Social Organization of Schools, at Johns Hopkins University, shows that approximately 2,000 of American high schools (or 14 percent) produce more than half of the Nation's dropouts. These "dropout factories" are schools where less than 60 percent of the students entering as freshmen will graduate.

The Pell Grants for Kids program would address several of these challenges by helping tens of thousands of low-income families enroll their children in higher-performing out-of-district public schools or nearby private schools. Research has increasingly suggested that providing parents and students with expanded choice options can improve the academic performance of the students exercising choice and the performance of schools at risk of losing students. For example, studies of choice programs in Arizona, Florida, Michigan, Texas, and Wisconsin have shown that school choice can improve public school performance. More specifically, when public schools must compete for their students with schools that accept vouchers, there is a strong incentive to provide better educational services, since districts do not want to lose students, and the revenue they generate, to private schools. Further, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, *School Vouchers: Characteristics of Privately Funded Programs*, which examined findings from three rigorous evaluations, provides evidence that "African American students who used vouchers to attend private schools showed greater improvements in math and reading than students in the comparison group." Evaluations have also found that parents of voucher users of all racial and ethnic groups have been consistently more satisfied with the quality of their children's education and school environment than parents of comparison group students.

As a preliminary plan, in fiscal year 2009, the Department would reserve approximately \$3 million to carry out an evaluation, using a rigorous scientifically based research design, to determine the effectiveness of this new program.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Pell grants for kids

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2009</u>
Amount for grants	296,750
Number of grants	8-12
Number of students participating	62,000-75,000
Peer review of new award applications	\$250
National evaluation	\$3,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Program performance would be assessed through a national evaluation and annual grantee performance reports. Indicators of the program's success would include the academic achievement, in reading, mathematics, and science, of students who use scholarships. The Department, through its national evaluation, would also assess the timing of parental notification as well as parental satisfaction.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$379,771	\$399,771	+\$20,000

¹The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Migrant Education program (MEP) provides financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs) to establish and improve programs of education for children of migratory farmworkers and fishers. The goal of the MEP is to enable migrant children: (1) to meet the same challenging academic standards as other children; and (2) to graduate from high school or a GED program with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment. To help achieve this objective, program services help migratory children overcome the educational disruption and other problems that result from repeated moves. The program statute encourages activities to promote coordination of needed services across States and encourage greater access for migratory children to services available under the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and other programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), so that MEP funds can be used for services not already available from those programs to meet the unique needs of migrant students. Migratory children who have made a "qualifying move" within the last 3 years are generally eligible to be counted and served by the program. (A move is considered to be a qualifying move if it: (1) crosses school district boundaries; (2) is made for purposes of obtaining work in agriculture or fishing; (3) is a change of residence, but not a permanent one; and (4) was made in the preceding 36 months.)

Beginning with fiscal year 2003, every State receives at least 100 percent of the amount that it received through the program in fiscal year 2002. All funds in excess of \$396 million (the fiscal year 2002 appropriation) are allocated through a statutory formula based on each State's per-pupil expenditure for education, its count of eligible migratory students aged 3 through 21 residing within the State in the previous year, and its count of students who received services in summer or intersession programs provided by the State.

The Department may set aside up to \$10 million from the annual appropriation for contracts and grants to improve inter- and intra-State migrant coordination activities, including academic credit accrual and exchange programs for migrant students. The Department is required to consult with States receiving allocations of \$1 million or less about whether they can increase the cost-effectiveness of their programs by entering into inter-state consortium arrangements. By law, the Department may reserve up to \$3 million a year from coordination funds for incentive grants of not more than \$250,000 to such consortia.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

The Department also developed the Migrant Student Record Exchange System (MSIX) in response to a statutory requirement that the Department assist States in developing effective methods for the electronic transfer of migrant student records. MSIX enables States to exchange migrant student data records efficiently and expeditiously and provide an accurate, unduplicated count of the number of migrant students on a national and Statewide basis. A number of States received access to the system in December 2007; all States will receive access in 2008.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$393,577
2005.....	390,428
2006.....	386,524
2007.....	386,524
2008.....	379,771

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2009, the Administration requests \$399.8 million for the Title I Migrant Education program, an increase of \$20 million over the 2008 level. This request reflects the Administration's policy of providing increases to selected programs serving disadvantaged populations and programs that have made improvements in program management or performance.

Migrant Education funds support programs promoting coordination of Federal resources for migratory children and providing services that address their unique needs. The requested funds would allow States to continue to meet the costs of identifying highly mobile migratory children and youth and provide special support services and learning arrangements that meet the needs of an especially disadvantaged, hard-to-serve population. Data for 2005-06 indicate that the program provided services to 353,402 migrant students during the regular school year and 249,157 during the summer or intersessions. Program funds supported 3,395 projects that operated during the school day, 885 projects that included an extended school day, 2,071 summer projects, and 6,068 year-round projects. Services include supplemental instruction in reading, math, and other academic areas, as well as support services such as counseling, health services, and (especially in the summer) transportation.

The poverty and mobility (and often limited English proficiency) of the migrant student population combine to result in a need for educational services that goes well beyond services traditionally supported with State and local education budgets. Migrant children, by definition, move across school district and State boundaries, and this movement, connected to the production of food distributed in interstate commerce, provides a classic rationale for Federal intervention. Moreover, the Migrant program pays costs not usually covered by regular Title I

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), since no single school district or State is responsible for the education of these most highly mobile children. These special costs include those associated with serving out-of-school teenagers and "emancipated youth" who travel without a parent or guardian to obtain migratory work in the fields and in processing plants.

The 2002 report from the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, *Student Mobility in Rural Communities*, noted that highly mobile students are more likely to be retained in grade and to demonstrate lower academic achievement than their more stable counterparts. Without Federal legislation and support, school districts have historically been unlikely to: (1) find and enroll migrant children; (2) provide the normal range of services to children who live in their communities and attend their schools for brief periods of time; or (3) grapple with the school interruption problems faced by migrant children and their needs for special summer programs.

Schools that serve concentrations of migrant students are among the Nation's highest-need schools. The Department's most recent report on this topic, *The Same High Standards for Migrant Students: Holding Title I Schools Accountable*, published in 2002, found that Title I schools serving medium or high numbers of migrant students were more likely to serve concentrations of poor and minority children than were schools with no or few migrant students. Schools serving medium or high numbers of migrant students were also more likely to serve large concentrations of limited English proficient students and to employ teachers with less teaching experience, according to the Department's report *A Snapshot of Title I Schools Serving Migrant Students: 2000-2001*. Thus, these schools are likely to depend heavily on the receipt of Title I funds to support their program of special services to migrant students.

The Department has instituted aggressive procedures to correct problems of erroneous migrant student counts reported by the Department's Office of Inspector General in 2004 and 2005. Between 2005 and 2007 the Department engaged in a multi-year effort to systematically identify discrepancies in 2002 student counts (which are the basis of allocations from fiscal years 2002 through 2007), adjusted prior year allocations based on those discrepancies, proposed regulations that would require States to establish quality control procedures to ensure the accuracy of the counts of eligible migratory children, and engaged in intensive technical assistance efforts to help States improve their migrant student identification activities.

The results of the 2006 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review of the Migrant Education program and performance data collected by the Department in recent years also support the Administration's funding request. The PART review rated the program as "Adequate," with high scores for purpose, planning, and management. The PART also noted the improvements in program management that addressed the inaccuracies in the identification and counting of eligible migrant students identified by the Inspector General. Further, the performance data collected by the Department for GPRA purposes, as discussed below, indicate that an increasing number of States are meeting targets for the achievement of migrant students in reading and mathematics.

From the 2009 request, \$392.5 million would support the basic State Grants program. In addition, as a preliminary plan, the Department would reserve \$12.5 million for migrant coordination activities, including \$5.5 million for consortium incentive grants, under the Administration's reauthorization proposal that increases set-asides for these activities. Incentive

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

grants must be used for additional direct services to migrant students; State consortia receiving these grants focus on priority areas for improving services to migrant students, such as identifying migrant students or coordinating student assessment systems across States and LEAs to measure the performance of migrant students. Also, as a preliminary plan, the Department plans to use \$5 million of migrant coordination funds in fiscal year 2009 to continue implementation of the Migrant Student Information Exchange.

The remaining 2009 coordination funds would support the first year of a new program evaluation, as well as projects across States to identify and recruit migratory children, and carry out other "networking" and training projects to serve migratory children more effectively and efficiently. For example, the Department would continue a Migrant Education Resource Center, which supports: (1) the provision of technical assistance and support for the identification and recruitment of migrant students; (2) the establishment of a peer-to-peer network to improve the skills of migrant educators; and (3) the creation of a web-based library to enable State and local migrant educators to share locally developed products designed to improve the performance of migrant students.

The Migrant Education program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2009 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The PART noted problems and inefficiencies in the program statute that the Administration's reauthorization proposal addresses, including formula provisions that are cumbersome, difficult to interpret, and based on child counts from fiscal year 2001. The Administration's proposal would improve and simplify the State allocation formula and ensure that allocations respond to shifts in State counts of migrant students. The Administration's proposal would also improve targeting of services to migrant students by strengthening the program purpose language and sharpening the provisions that determine which students receive priority for program services, increase the set-aside for migrant coordination activities (from \$10 million to \$12.5 million), and add a new authority to set aside up to \$5 million of program funds over the life of the authorization for an evaluation of the program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Number of students generating funds	635,719	635,719	635,719
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$376,524	\$369,771	\$385,771
Range of awards	\$82 - \$130,152	\$67 - \$129,009	\$64 - \$140,370
Coordination activities:			
Consortium incentive grants	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$5,500
Migrant student information exchange	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
Other inter- and intra-State activities	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
Evaluation	0	0	\$1,500

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

Goal: To assist all migrant students in meeting challenging academic standards and achieving graduation from high school (or a GED program) with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.

Objective: *Along with other Federal programs and State and local reform efforts, the Migrant Education Program will contribute to improved school performance of migrant children.*

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in reading at the elementary school level for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	14	19
2005	16	23
2006	18	27
2007	20	
2008	22	
2009	24	

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in reading at the middle school level for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	15	10
2005	17	14
2006	19	19
2007	21	
2008	23	
2009	25	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics at the elementary school level for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	18	19
2005	20	26
2006	22	31
2007	24	
2008	26	
2009	28	

Measure: The number of States meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics for middle school migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	12	10
2005	14	14
2006	16	15
2007	18	
2008	20	
2009	22	

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Assessment of progress: The Department established 50 percent as the initial target for the percentage of migrant students performing at the proficient or above level on State reading and mathematics assessments. As more States reach the initial target level, the Department will raise the target accordingly. The number of States reporting at least 50 percent of migrant students performing at the proficient or above level on State reading and mathematics assessments in the elementary and middle school grades increased between fiscal year 2005 and fiscal year 2006. In fiscal year 2006, 27 States met or exceeded the target in reading in the elementary grades; 19 did so for reading in the middle school grades; and 31 did so for mathematics in the elementary grades. States lagged slightly behind the target for mathematics in the middle school grades; while the target was for 16 States to report at least 50 percent of migrant students performing at the proficient or above level on State mathematics assessments in those grades, 15 States did so, an increase from the previous year but short of the goal.

Based on State data, 51.8 percent of migrant 4th-grade students were proficient in reading and 54 percent in math in 2006, up from 51 percent in reading and 52.8 percent in math in 2005. For 8th-grade migrant students, 43 percent were proficient in reading in 2006 and 38.7 percent in math, compared to 40.1 percent in reading and 37.8 percent in math in 2005.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

Measure: The number of states meeting an annually set performance target for dropout rate for migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	Baseline	15
2005	16	23
2006	17	
2007	18	
2008	19	
2009	20	

Measure: The number of states meeting an annually set performance target for high school graduation of migrant students.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	Baseline	13
2005	14	15
2006	15	
2007	16	
2008	17	
2009	18	

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Assessment of progress: The performance target for the dropout rate measure for States is that 50 percent or fewer migrant students drop out of school; the target for the high school graduation rate is that 50 percent or more migrant students graduate from high school. As more States reach the initial target level, the Department will decrease and increase the targets accordingly.

The baseline for the number of States with 50 percent or fewer migrant students dropping out of school was 15 in 2004, and the number increased to 23 States in 2005, surpassing the target of 16 States. The baseline for the number of States with 50 percent or more migrant students graduating from high school was 13 in 2004, and the number increased to 15 in 2005, surpassing the target of 14 States. Data for 2006 will be available in 2008. Note that variation in the calculation of dropout rates may limit the validity of comparisons across the States. This measure will have greater validity and reliability over time as State procedures for calculating and reporting dropout and graduation rates stabilize, include all migrant students appropriately in the calculations, and properly disaggregate and report results.

Efficiency Measures

The Department established an efficiency measure associated with the transfer of migrant student records. The efficiency measure will assess annual changes in the percentage of actively migrating students for which the MSIX system has consolidated records that reflect a complete history of school and health information. The MSIX integrates procedures designed to

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant

achieve efficiencies and cost reductions by linking separate State and local efforts to transfer health and education records into a single system that can be used within and across all States.

The system began collecting data from a number of States in December 2007, but not every State had access to the system at that time. Baseline data will be available in December 2008. The targets for the percentage of migrant student records that are consolidated when school enrollment has occurred in more than one State are 50 percent in 2008, 75 percent in 2009, and 100 percent in 2010.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The 2006 Migrant Education PART review, which rated the program as “Adequate,” found that the program is on track to meet its long-term performance measures.

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

- *Complete the national audit of State child eligibility determinations.* The Department reviewed the reliability and validity of States’ reported defect rates for 44 out of 49 States participating in the program; 5 opted not to participate. Department staff are reviewing the draft report of the review and revising proposed regulations addressing eligibility determinations and quality control procedures. The expected publication date for the final regulations is December 2008.
- *Implement specific corrective actions to eliminate migrant child eligibility problems.* The Department expects to publish new regulations addressing eligibility definitions and determinations late in 2008. The Notice of Proposed Rule-Making was published May 4, 2007. The Department is developing guidance on how to conduct the retrospective and prospective re-interviewing that will be required under the upcoming new regulations. The Department is also developing a new manual to assist States with the proper identification and recruitment of eligible migrant children.
- *Implement and collect performance information for the efficiency measure for the Migrant Student Information Exchange records system (MSIX).* Development of the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) was completed September 2007. Starting December 2007, the system began collecting data from States that have completed the MSIX interconnectivity agreement that allows their State’s system to transmit data to MSIX. In 2008 the Department will work to ensure that all States complete the required interconnectivity agreements and that they submit accurate data to MSIX.
- *Implement a strategy for using performance information from the Department’s EDFacts system to support higher performance.* The Department is developing four products to guide decision-making, hold programs accountable for results, and inform the public on program performance: an annual summary of national program statistics; State profiles showing key demographic and performance statistics on each State; reviews of migrant student achievement data across States, compared against other student groups; and data tables for the public. A number of data tables are already on the website.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and Delinquent

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part D, Subpart 1)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined ¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$48,927	\$51,927	+\$3,000

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program provides financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs) for educational services to neglected and delinquent children and youth through age 21 in local and State-run institutions for neglected and delinquent children, and adult correctional facilities. Funds are allocated to States through a formula based on the number of children in State-operated institutions and per-pupil education expenditures for the State. Each State's N and D allocation is generated by child counts in State institutions that provide at least 20 hours of instruction from non-Federal funds; adult correctional institutions must provide 15 hours a week. State institutions serving children with an average length of stay of at least 30 days are eligible to receive funds. Adult correctional institutions must give priority for services to youth who are likely to be released within a 2-year period.

Like other Title I programs, the N and D program requires institutions receiving funds to gear their services to the high State standards that all children are expected to meet. All juvenile facilities may operate institution-wide education programs in which they use Title I funds in combination with other available Federal and State funds; the institution-wide option allows juvenile institutions to serve a larger proportion of their eligible population and also to align their programs more closely with other education services in order to meet participants' educational and occupational preparation needs. States are required to reserve between 15 and 30 percent of their allocations for projects to help N and D participants make the transition from State institutions to locally operated programs or to support the successful entry of youth offenders into postsecondary and vocational programs.

The Department may reserve up to 2.5 percent of the appropriation for national activities, including the development of a uniform model to evaluate Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs, and technical assistance to help build the capacity of State agency programs.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$48,395
2005.....	49,600
2006.....	49,797
2007.....	49,797
2008.....	48,927

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2009, the Administration requests \$51.9 million, a \$3 million increase from the 2008 funding level, to help an estimated 134,000 Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) students return to and complete school and obtain employment after they are released from State institutions. This reflects a policy to provide funding increases to selected programs serving disadvantaged populations and programs that have made improvements in performance, management, or efficiency, as demonstrated through the PART process.

This program supports the Administration's goal of significantly improving achievement in reading and math for all students. In terms of academic achievement, the youth served by this program are, on average, 3 years behind in grade level and generally lack job skills. A 1996 study conducted by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) found that, while most of the inmates in America's prisons will eventually be paroled, two-thirds do not have the literacy skills needed to function in society. The findings of the ETS report show the importance of educating and preparing neglected and delinquent youth for further education or to enter the workforce. An evaluation of the program (2000) showed that over 80 percent of participating institutions provided reading and math instruction, and data reported by States in ESEA Consolidated State Performance Reports for the 2005-06 school year indicate that approximately 70 percent of students enrolled in an N and D program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days showed improved performance on assessments in reading and math.

Moreover, the population served by this program is extremely disadvantaged and isolated. Most have encountered challenges in school before entering the program and need skills that will help them reenter school or obtain a job after release. An earlier evaluation of the program (1991) showed that: (1) about half of program participants enrolled in school when they left the institution, but many subsequently dropped out; and (2) most participants found jobs after being released, but they were typically low-paying, and about two-thirds of the employed youth had more than one job. According to the Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the number of delinquency cases processed by juvenile courts increased 6 percent between 1993 and 2002.

Finally, the Department has some evidence that the program is producing positive outcomes. Although only early data on the academic proficiency gains of participating students are available, the initial results are promising. States report that approximately 70 percent of N and D students demonstrate gains in reading and math on State-approved pre- and post-assessments. In addition, the percentage of participating students who complete a high school

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

diploma or GED while in an N and D program appears to be increasing. The Department is continuing to provide technical assistance to States to help ensure they are providing effective transition services to help students continue to further schooling or seek employment. The Department is also continuing to develop better means of tracking data on achievement once students leave institutions, including data on high school graduation rates for program participants.

From the 2009 request, the Department would reserve approximately \$1.3 million to continue to provide technical assistance and other activities through the National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for Children who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk. Some of the center's activities include: (1) developing a national model for evaluating the effectiveness of N and D programs; (2) collecting and disseminating information on tools and effective practices that can be used to support N and D youth; and (3) providing technical assistance, using experts and practitioners, to State agencies.

The N and D program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2009 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. That proposal would repeal the N and D Subpart 2 program (which is financed by funds set aside from States' Title I, Part A allocations), but would not change the Subpart 1 program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Number of participating institutions	1,104	1,104	1,104
Estimated number of students served	133,596	133,596	133,596
Average Federal contribution Per child (whole dollars)	\$372	\$366	\$395
National activities	\$1,250	\$1,223	\$1,298

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance measures

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

Goal: To ensure that neglected and delinquent children and youth will have the opportunity to meet the challenging State standards needed to further their education and become productive members of society.

Objective: Neglected or delinquent (N or D) students will improve academic and vocational skills needed to further their education.

Measure: The percentage of neglected or delinquent students obtaining a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent while in the N and D program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		8.0
2004	8.4	Not Collected
2005	8.8	10.5
2006	11.03	11.23
2007	11.58	
2008	12.16	
2009	12.76	

Assessment of progress: The Department is required by statute to collect performance information for the Neglected and Delinquent program no less than once every 3 years. Student counts for this measure are based on the number of long-term N and D students (those enrolled in a participating program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days). The 2003 data shown above come from a sample of six States in which the Department collected performance data during monitoring activities. The Department collected 2005 data through the ESEA Consolidated State Performance Reports from 45 States; in that year the program exceeded the performance target. Data collected in 2005 provided the first universal data collection and established a working baseline for subsequent performance targets. In 2006, 11.23 percent of long-term N and D students received a secondary school diploma or equivalent while participating in the program, exceeding the target. Data for 2007 will be available in June 2008.

Measure: The percentage of neglected or delinquent students earning high school course credits.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		55.95
2006	58.75	47.68
2007	61.68	
2008	64.77	
2009	68.01	

Assessment of progress: The Department collected data in 2005 as the baseline for this indicator; however, grantees reported inconsistent data, including information for adults. In 2006, with improved data collection and reporting, program staff re-assessed information reported in 2005, using counts of the population of students between the ages of 11 and 21 in neglected, juvenile detention, and juvenile correctional institutions. Using these new criteria, the Department determined that approximately 56 percent of N and D students earned high school course credits in 2005 and established targets for subsequent years based on a 5-percent

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

increase from the 2005 baseline. The 2006 target was not met. Data for 2007 will be available in June 2008.

Measure: The percentage of long-term neglected or delinquent students who improve reading skills as measured through State-approved assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		72.53
2006	76.16	70.11
2007	79.96	
2008	83.96	
2009	88.16	

Measure: The percentage of long-term neglected or delinquent students who improve mathematics skills as measured through State-approved assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		69.22
2007	72.68	
2008	76.32	
2009	80.13	

Assessment of progress: In 2007, the Department developed two new measures to track improvements in the reading and mathematics skills of N and D participants. Student counts are based on the number of long-term students (those enrolled in a participating program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days) who are in N and D institutions and complete pre- and post-testing in reading and mathematics. These are not the same as the State assessments required under NCLB, and do not necessarily reflect State proficiency levels. Data collected in 2005 and 2006 provided performance baselines for reading and mathematics targets, respectively. In 2006, 70.11 percent of long-term N and D students showed improvement in reading skills as measured through State-approved assessments, and 69.22 percent of long-term N and D students showed improvement in mathematics skills. Data for 2007 will be available in June 2008.

Efficiency Measure

The Department developed an efficiency measure for the N and D program: the cost per high school diploma or equivalent. This measure attempts to determine program cost efficiencies by tracking the ratio of the number of participating students achieving a high school diploma or its equivalent to the cost of the program. In 2005, the first year in which this measure was used, the cost per high school diploma or equivalent was \$5,095. In 2006, this measure decreased to \$4,421.

Other Performance Information

A 1998 study, conducted by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, examined data from seven States to gauge the feasibility of collecting data that could be used to estimate the impact of correctional education services on incarcerated youth. The study determined that,

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

with assistance, some States could provide reliable data on dropout rates, recidivism, diploma and degree completions, and employment. According to a Department study in 2001, 46 State agencies maintained data on the number of GEDs earned by Neglected and Delinquent students but only 20 State agencies maintained data on the number of school credits earned. In addition, the Research Triangle Institute's *Study of Local Agency Activities under the Title I, Part D, Program* (2000) found that although all districts participating in the study made attempts to collect student achievement data, these data were typically incomplete and, because of high student mobility, measures of student gains on test scores are especially difficult for districts to obtain. States' development of longitudinal student data systems and the Department's collection of future years' N and D data through the *EDFacts* electronic data system should improve the quality and consistency of student data.

Follow-Up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The N and D program was evaluated using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) in 2005. Although the PART review noted a significant need for the services and support it provides, the program received a rating of "Results Not Demonstrated," due mainly to the lack of grantee performance data, including data relating to student outcomes, such as on earning high school course credits or attaining a high school diploma or its recognized equivalent.

The 2005 PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address them.

- *Establish ambitious targets for annual performance measures.* The Department created new target values for two existing performance indicators and replaced an indicator that measured the improvement of "academic" skills with two new indicators that are specific to reading and mathematics assessments.
- *Collect grantee data on key student outcomes, such as educational attainment, and use this information for program improvement and targeted technical assistance.* The Department provided individualized State Data Quality Reports and follow-up assistance to States through its national technical assistance center in order to improve overall data collection and reporting.

The program underwent a PART evaluation again in 2007 and, based on improvements in data quality and program accountability, received a rating of "Adequate." The 2007 PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address them.

- *Pursue legislative, regulatory, or administrative changes that would enable the Department to collect data on achievement once students leave institutions, including data on high school completion.* The Department will develop and implement at least one additional outcome measure in order to determine the effectiveness of transition services and the graduation rate of students who have been in N or D institutions.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Neglected and delinquent

- *Enhance technical assistance to States to help ensure that they are providing the required services to help students transition successfully to further schooling or employment.* The Department's annual National Meeting in 2007 highlighted newly available State data on transition outcomes and provided States with tools to make the data useful for program improvement purposes. The technical assistance center also began running bi-monthly "ND Community" calls for State Part D coordinators. Transition is the topic of two upcoming calls. The Department will continue updating the Transition Library and the At-Risk pages of its technical assistance center's website.
- *Use performance data to target services and monitoring on areas of greatest need.* The Department is working with its technical assistance center to improve the collection and quality of data on service delivery and program performance.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive school reform

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$1,605	0	-\$1,605

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) program provides schools with funding to develop or adopt, and implement, comprehensive school reforms, grounded in scientifically based research and effective practices, that will help enable children in participating schools to meet challenging State standards. These reforms must be structured to address 11 critical elements included in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). The elements establish, among other things, that each participating school must base its proposed reforms on a comprehensive design that employs innovative strategies and methods based on reliable research and practice, aligns reforms with the school's regular program and a school needs assessment, and uses high-quality external technical support and assistance from entities with experience and expertise in schoolwide reform and improvement.

If funds are appropriated for CSR grants to States, as last occurred in fiscal year 2005, the Department allocates those funds based on the States' relative shares of the previous year's Title I Basic Grants funds. Each State educational agency (SEA) may reserve up to 5 percent of its allocation for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance. The SEA must use at least 95 percent of its allocation to make competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) eligible for funds under Title I, Part A, which then use these funds to implement comprehensive school reform programs in schools with Title I programs. The amount of an award must be at least \$50,000 for each school. Grants are renewable for up to 3 years.

In making awards, SEAs are required to give priority to LEAs that: (1) propose to use program funds in schools identified for improvement or corrective action under Title I; and (2) demonstrate a commitment to helping schools effectively implement and sustain the comprehensive reforms. In applying to SEAs for funds, LEA applicants must identify the Title I-eligible schools to be served and the levels of funding they would receive, and describe the reforms to be implemented and how the LEA will provide technical assistance and evaluate reform implementation and results.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive school reform

The Department may reserve up to 1 percent of the appropriation for grants to Bureau of Indian Education schools and the Outlying Areas and up to 1 percent to conduct national evaluation activities. The Department also may reserve up to \$7.05 million to carry out “quality initiatives.” The quality initiatives authorized are: (1) a public-private effort to assist States, LEAs, and schools in making informed decisions in approving or selecting providers of comprehensive school reform; and (2) activities to (a) foster the development of comprehensive school reform models; and (b) provide effective capacity building for comprehensive school reform providers so that they can expand their work in more schools, ensure quality, and promote financial stability. For the last 3 years, the Congress funded only this portion of the program, including a Comprehensive School Reform Clearinghouse, which is the only activity funded in fiscal year 2008.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$233,613
2005.....	205,344
2006.....	7,920
2007.....	2,352
2008.....	1,605

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) program in 2009. Beginning in fiscal year 2006, by providing funding only for the quality initiatives and the CSR Clearinghouse, the Congress essentially initiated a phase-out of the CSR program while ensuring that school districts (as they spend down the funds remaining from previous years) would have access to technical assistance resources to help them achieve the best results through their projects. In fiscal year 2009, the school districts will have concluded their grant activities and, thus, this technical assistance will no longer be needed. Moreover, the final year of the contract for the Comprehensive School Reform Clearinghouse will be financed with the 2008 appropriation.

In addition, the outcome of the program’s review with the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) supports the policy of redirecting resources to more promising programs, such as Title I Grants to LEAs. Although the program received a PART rating of “Adequate” in 2002, the assessment found the program to be redundant with the Title I Grants to LEAs program because CSR provides duplicative support for activities that LEAs can carry out with their Title I, Part A funds.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive school reform

The Comprehensive School Reform 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.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Quality initiatives	\$845	0	0
CSR Clearinghouse	1,507	\$1,605	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

Goal: To enable low-performing students to improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Objective: *Student achievement in core academic subjects generally will show marked improvement in CSR program schools.*

Measure: The percentage of schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made annual yearly progress (AYP) in mathematics.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	70	64
2006	70	
2007	70	
2008	NA	

Measure: The percentage of schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in reading/language arts.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	68	62
2006	68	
2007	68	
2008	NA	

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive school reform

Assessment of progress: 2006 data for the first two measures will be available in the spring of 2008. No targets are included for 2009 because the Administration is not requesting funding for the CSR program in fiscal year 2009.

Other Performance Information

Little rigorous evaluation evidence is available to document that comprehensive school reforms are effective interventions for improving student achievement. The 1999 study by the American Institutes for Research, *An Educators' Guide To Schoolwide Reform*, found that only 3 of 24 comprehensive approaches had "strong evidence of positive effects on student achievement." (For the *Educators' Guide* study, a "comprehensive reform approach" was defined as one for which at least four studies of the approach, using rigorous methodologies, reported some positive effects on student achievement, with at least three of the studies showing effects that were educationally (or statistically) significant.)

The November 2002 report, *Comprehensive School Reform and Student Achievement: A Meta-Analysis*, produced by the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk, found that only 3 of the 29 most widely implemented comprehensive reforms could be included in the category "strongest evidence of effectiveness." This category was limited to reforms in which, in a large number of studies that used comparison groups or third-party comparison designs and that took place in schools and States across the Nation, the reform demonstrated statistically significant and positive achievement.

The Department's national evaluation of the (pre-No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)) CSR Demonstration program, begun in 1999, addressed three research questions to assess the effectiveness of the program: (1) whether CSR targeted funds to schools with the greatest need; (2) how CSR schools implemented the nine components of comprehensive reform outlined in the appropriations report establishing the program; and (3) whether student achievement improved in the schools receiving program funds.

The data from this evaluation indicated that CSR funds were well targeted. Schools receiving CSR funds were more likely to serve concentrations of low-income, minority, or limited English proficient students than schools not receiving program funds and also were more likely than non-CSR schools to be identified for improvement under ESEA Title I. However, the program was found to be less successful in getting local administrators to implement effectively the nine program components called for in the initial legislation. For example, while CSR schools were more likely than schools not receiving CSR funds to adopt an external reform model, CSR and non-CSR schools were equally likely to have implemented other elements of a comprehensive reform program identified in the CSR statute (such as establishment of a school reform plan, establishment of measurable goals, and coordination of resources). In addition, case studies in 18 CSR sites conducted from 2000 to 2002 showed varying degrees of success in implementing the nine components. In one-third of the schools studied, implementation was uneven or faltering, and in three other schools the implementation was minimal or stalled completely. Further, fidelity to the model, as judged by the model developer, was considered "high" in less than half of the schools.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive school reform

The final report of the national evaluation of the pre-NCLB CSR program, *Implementation and Early Outcomes of the CSR Program* (2004), found no evidence of a relationship between CSR funding and improved student achievement. While CSR schools made gains in reading and mathematics in about one-quarter of the States, States with significant improvement in student achievement for CSR schools also had significant growth in achievement for non-CSR schools. However, the report also noted that the time frame covered by this achievement analysis was too short (only 1-2 years) to expect large effects from the CSR program and that further research was needed.

A second evaluation, begun in 2002, is collecting data over a 5-year period to examine program implementation and student achievement trends in schools receiving CSR grants awarded since enactment of the NCLB Act. The first report from this evaluation, the *Longitudinal Assessment of Comprehensive School Reform Implementation and Outcomes*, found that CSR funds are strongly targeted to high-poverty and low-performing schools. CSR schools were more likely than other schools to report implementing several reform components; for instance, CSR schools reported that they provided more professional development opportunities for their teachers than did non-CSR schools. However, CSR schools were also less likely than non-CSR schools to receive district support for school reform efforts, discretionary district and State funds to support school reform, or district-funded professional development. CSR schools did receive more support from reform program developers, and it appears that districts may have chosen to focus their own assistance on non-CSR schools that may lack this external support. The Department expects to release the final report of this study in the fall of 2008.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Comprehensive School Reform program was among the programs rated in 2002 with the PART. While the program received a rating of "Adequate," the PART identified several weaknesses, including lack of positive national evaluation findings demonstrating program effectiveness in raising student achievement in schools receiving support. The PART also found the CSR program to be redundant of Title I LEA Grants. The findings of that PART assessment are still applicable.

The PART improvement plan recommendation is presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address it.

- *Work with Congress to redirect program funding to the Title I Grants for Local Educational Agencies program to reduce program duplication and administrative burden.* The Administration is requesting no funding for the CSR program for fiscal year 2009. Through fiscal year 2008, the Congress has phased out almost all funding for the program, and the Department will have no grant continuations for the program after 2008.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Sections 1501 and 1503)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined ¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$9,167	\$9,167	0

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; reauthorizing language is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes a separate appropriation for evaluation of Title I programs. The Department uses these funds to carry out objective measurement and systematic analyses of Title I, the Federal Government's largest investment in elementary and secondary education. These evaluations compare actual results with program objectives and provide the data needed to make sound decisions on program policies and resources and guide program improvement in the field.

Mandated evaluation activities include a National Assessment of Title I that examines how well schools, school districts, and States are implementing the Title I Grants to LEAs program, as well as the program's impact on improving student achievement. A longitudinal study to track the progress of schools is a major component of this National Assessment.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB Act), which reauthorized Title I evaluation activities under Section 1501 of the ESEA, provided detailed requirements for the scope of the National Assessment, particularly in the areas of accountability and school improvement. For example, the statute requires the National Assessment to examine the following:

- The impact of Title I programs on student academic achievement;
- The implementation of the new standards and assessments required by the new law, including the development of assessments for students in grades 3 through 8;
- Each State's definition of adequate yearly progress, and the impact of applying these definitions at the State, LEA, and school levels; and
- The implementation of the school improvement provisions under Section 1116, including the impact of the new choice and supplemental service options.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

In accordance with the authorizing statute, the Department submitted National Assessment reports to the Congress in April 2006 and October 2007. Key findings from the October 2007 report may be found under the request in this account for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies, and the full report is available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20084012/>. A third report, which will provide updates of key NCLB implementation issues through the 2006-2007 school year, is scheduled for completion in mid-2008.

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$8,790
2005.....	9,424
2006.....	9,330
2007.....	9,330
2008.....	9,167

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department requests \$9.2 million for Title I evaluation in fiscal year 2009, the same as the 2008 level. Most funds would be used to launch the next National Assessment of Title I, consistent with the requirements of the forthcoming reauthorization. Title I Evaluation is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2009 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal. However, the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal does not include any substantive changes to the Title I evaluation authority.

The request also includes \$800,000 to complete the report and data file for the Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Math Curricula, a 4-year study, begun in 2005, that is examining the impact of selected commercially available math curricula on student achievement. The final report is scheduled for publication in spring 2010.

In addition, the 2009 request would continue to fund quick-turnaround support and other analyses related to the implementation and effectiveness of Title I.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Evaluation

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<u>New National Assessment of Title I</u>	0	0	\$7,767
<u>Impact Studies</u>			
Technical Support for the Independent Review Panel	\$50	\$50	160
Impact Evaluation of Reading Comprehension Interventions	4,000	1,765	0
Impact Evaluation of Math Curricula	3,916	4,775	800
Impact Study of Supplemental Service Providers	538	1,480	0
<u>Implementation Studies</u>			
Evaluation of Achievement Outcomes for SES Waiver Districts	86	0	0
Evaluation of Growth Model Pilot	378	400	0
National Longitudinal Study of NCLB	125	240	0
Study of State Implementation of Accountability and Teacher Quality	132	0	0
Smaller studies	75	417	400
Printing	<u>30</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>40</u>
 Total	 9,330	 9,167	 9,167

NOTE: Reflects preliminary estimates for fiscal years 2008-2009 pending final approval of Evaluation spending plans.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs (Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 5, Section 418A)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
High school equivalency program	\$18,226	\$18,226	0
College assistance migrant program	<u>15,108</u>	<u>15,108</u>	<u>0</u>
Total program funds	33,334	33,334	0

¹The authorizing legislation will expire on March 31, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

These programs provide 5-year grants to institutions of higher education (IHEs) and to private nonprofit organizations to support educational programs designed for students who are engaged in, or whose families are engaged in, migrant and other seasonal farmwork. In making awards under both programs, the Department is required to consider applicants' prior experience in operating HEP and CAMP projects.

Projects funded under the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) recruit migrant students aged 16 and over and provide academic and support services (including counseling, health services, stipends, and placement) to help those students obtain a high school equivalency certificate and subsequently to gain employment or admission to a postsecondary institution or training program.

Projects funded by the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) provide tutoring, academic assistance, and counseling services, as well as stipends, tuition, and room and board, to first-year, undergraduate migrant students and assist those students in obtaining student financial aid for their remaining undergraduate years.

HEP projects, located in college or university settings, operate residential and commuter programs of instructional services for out-of-school migrant youth; some HEP projects employ a commuter model in which students attend GED classes after work. All CAMP projects use an on-campus residential design and provide a high level of support services in order to assist participants, virtually all of whom have had no prior contact with a college campus, to adjust to life at an institution of higher education.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs

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

	<u>HEP</u> (\$000s)	<u>CAMP</u> (\$000s)
2004.....	\$18,888	\$15,657
2005.....	18,737	15,532
2006.....	18,550	15,377
2007.....	18,550	15,377
2008.....	18,226	15,108

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2009, the Administration requests a total of \$33.3 million for the High School Equivalency (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant (CAMP) programs, the same as the 2008 level. The requested funds would provide sufficient funding to cover all HEP and CAMP continuation grants and to fund a number of new projects.

Migrant youth are particularly at risk of not receiving an education that will help them attain high-wage jobs or succeed in postsecondary education. In addition to the risk factors usually present in the migrant community, such as poverty, mobility, limited English proficiency, and lack of health care, migrant youth often enter the farm labor market on their own, without parents or guardians accompanying them. Additionally, the dropout rate for this subgroup of the migrant population is high. The 2002-03 National Agricultural Workers Survey found that 87 percent of school-age migrant workers had dropped out of school in either the U.S. or their country of origin. Of the remaining 13 percent, 10 percent were behind in school and only 3 percent were in school and performing at grade level.

HEP and CAMP focus on finding and assisting migrant youth who have potential but who have not been able—due to lack of positive role models, lack of outreach on the part of local school authorities, interrupted schooling, or other obstacles—to complete high school or go on to postsecondary education. HEP and CAMP emphasize services to out-of-school-youth by conducting extensive outreach in locations where these youth live and work (e.g., farms, production facilities, and labor camps) and providing services at locations and times that meet the needs of an out-of-school, working population.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
HEP:			
Number of students served	7,406	7,406	7,406
Number of awards:			
First year	4	0	19
Second year	11	4	0

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) - continued

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Third year	11	11	4
Fourth year	18	11	11
Fifth year	<u>0</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>11</u>
Total	44	44	45
Funding:			
New awards	\$1,584	0	\$7,143
Peer review of new award applications	80	0	85
Continuation awards	16,886	\$18,226	10,998
Average grant award	420	422	422
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)			
	\$2,494	\$2,505	\$2,505
CAMP:			
Number of students served	1,943	1,943	1,943
Number of awards:			
First year	9	0	15
Second year	8	9	0
Third year	7	8	9
Fourth year	14	7	8
Fifth year	<u>0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>7</u>
Total	38	38	39
Funding:			
New awards	\$3,615	0	\$5,338
Peer review of new award applications	45	0	50
Continuation awards	11,717	\$15,108	9,720
Average grant award	404	405	405
Average Federal contribution per student (whole dollars)			
	\$7,891	\$7,914	\$7,914

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs

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

Goal: To assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students in obtaining the equivalent of a high school diploma, and, subsequently, to begin postsecondary education, enter military service, or obtain employment.

Objective: *An increasing percentage of HEP participants will complete the program and receive a GED.*

Measure: The percentage of High School Equivalency Program (HEP) participants receiving a General Educational Development (GED) credential.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	60	65
2005	65	66
2006	66	63
2007	67	
2008	68	
2009	69	

Source: Grantee Performance Reports

Assessment of progress: The percentage of HEP students who received a GED decreased slightly between 2005 and 2006 and fell slightly short of the target of 66 percent. Data collected for fiscal year 2007 will be available in late 2008.

Objective: *An increasing percentage of HEP recipients of the GED will enter postsecondary education programs, upgraded employment, or the military.*

Measure: The percentage of HEP GED credential recipients who enter postsecondary educational programs, upgraded employment, or the military.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	Baseline	76
2005	77	81
2006	78	89
2007	79	
2008	80	
2009	81	

Assessment of progress: The percentage of HEP participants who received a GED and then entered postsecondary education programs, upgraded employment, or the military increased between 2005 and 2006, and surpassed the target of 78 percent. However, data for this measure are highly unreliable, as they are based on projections rather than actual placement after receipt of a GED credential. The Department has developed a new reporting format that will require grantees to follow up students after they receive their GED credential and report

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs

placement data in a consistent manner. The new reporting requirements will be implemented in 2008, and the Department will reset the baseline at that time.

Goal: Assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students to successfully complete their first academic year of college and to continue their postsecondary education.

Objective: All CAMP students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.

Measure: The percentage of College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) participants completing the first year of their postsecondary program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	83	84
2005	85	91
2006	86	86
2007	86	
2008	86	
2009	86	

Source: Grantee Performance Reports.

Assessment of progress: The percentage of CAMP participants who completed the first year of their program decreased between 2005 and 2006, but met the target of 86 percent. Note that, because projects are funded in the fall, after the school year may have already started, data for projects completing their first year of implementation are not included in any given year. Thus, the measure reflects the percentage of participants completing the first year of their postsecondary program between the second and fifth year of the project. Data for 2007 will be available in late 2008.

Objective: A majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first year of college will continue in postsecondary education.

Measure: The percentage of College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) participants who, after completing first year of college, continue their postsecondary education.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	79	96
2005	80	93
2006	81	93
2007	82	
2008	83	
2009	84	

Source: Grantee Performance Reports.

Assessment of progress: The percentage of CAMP participants who continued their postsecondary education after completing their first year of college increased did not change

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs

between 2005 and 2006 but surpassed the 2006 target of 81 percent. Data for 2007 will be available in late 2008. However, data for this measure are highly unreliable, as grantees do not collect these data in a uniform manner. The Department plans to develop a new reporting format to address this problem, and the Department will reset the baseline at that time.

Efficiency Measures

The Department established a cost-per-participant outcome measure to assess program efficiency for HEP and CAMP. For HEP, the measure is the cost per participant earning a GED credential and, for CAMP, it is the cost per participant who completes his or her first year of postsecondary education and then continues that postsecondary education. The Department plans to establish targets for the efficiency measures in 2008.

Year	HEP Cost per participant earning a GED	CAMP Cost per participant completing first year of postsecondary education and continuing postsecondary education
2004	\$4,912	\$9,302
2005	\$7,223	\$7,804
2006	\$8,814	\$9,506

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

In 2004, the HEP and CAMP programs received PART ratings of “Results Not Demonstrated.” While the PART acknowledged the strong management of the programs, it contained a number of recommendations focusing on program accountability and goals that address broad long-term education and employment outcomes for participants, after program services conclude.

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

HEP Program:

- *Develop a strategy for addressing impediments that discourage new applicants, including consideration of legislative strategies.* The Department notified grantees through written communications and presentations at grantee meetings that it instituted procedures to weigh lack of compliance in reporting, not spending funds in a timely manner, and the grantees’ poor performance on GPRA objectives against the priority points experienced grantees receive when applying for program funds. The Department also trained staff to implement these procedures.
- *Develop targets for its newly adopted efficiency measure, and use the measure to analyze costs relative to the costs of other GED attainment or drop-out prevention programs.* The Department developed a baseline and is working to develop targets. In developing efficiency targets, the Department will identify differences in costs between commuter and

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs

residential HEP projects. The Department will also consider the overall performance of HEP projects relative to the performance of other GED attainment or drop-out prevention programs.

- *Set and gather data on long-term goals that address outcomes achieved once participants complete the program, specifically, the extent to which they go to college or obtain better employment. These goals should be indexed against the performance of other disadvantaged populations or non-participating migrants, and not just provide “before and after” snapshots.* The Department developed a new annual performance report that will be required for all grantees as of December 2008. This new report uses clearly defined data elements for post-program outcomes, specifies how long exiting students must be followed, and collects information on the grantees’ success in tracking students that have left the program. Baseline data will be available January 2009, and targets will be set after 2 years of data are collected.
- *Develop a more effective method of using outcome data to hold grantees accountable.* The Department is using existing monitoring strategies, including designating grantees as “low-performing” and “high-risk” recipients, to improve program performance and accountability. Further, the Department will produce individual grantee project profiles containing grantee performance data and disseminate those profiles among all program grantees in 2008.
- *Develop a reporting and auditing system to verify locally reported data and to ensure that performance data are being collected consistently across grantees according to established criteria.* The Department provided guidance and technical assistance to grantees in 2007 to refine and improve the uniformity of data collection and reporting. The new performance reports, required as of December 2008, should generate accurate, consistent data across all HEP projects. The Department will conduct a careful verification of the data to ensure that all data are accurate as reported, and will provide technical assistance via written communication and training at grantee meetings during 2008.

CAMP Program:

- *Develop a more effective method of using outcome data to hold grantees accountable.* The Department is using existing monitoring strategies, including designating grantees as “low-performing” and “high-risk” recipients, to improve program performance and accountability. The Department developed a protocol for reviewing grantee reports for substantial progress towards performance goals and appropriate use of funds and for determining whether the Department should identify grantees for further action.
- *Use the newly adopted efficiency measure, analyze CAMP program costs relative to the costs of other programs that help disadvantaged students go to college.* The Department developed a baseline and is working on developing targets.
- *Develop a reporting and auditing system to verify locally reported data and to ensure that performance data are being collected consistently across grantees according to established criteria.* Along with development of a new annual report, the Department will provide guidance and technical assistance to grantees on refining their data collection procedures and ensuring the uniformity of data collection and reporting. Once the new performance

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Migrant education – High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs

reporting procedures are implemented, the Department will conduct a careful verification of the data to ensure that all data are accurate as reported, and will provide technical assistance via written communication and training at grantee meetings.

- *Develop data collection strategies for the program's long-term college completion goal.* The Department is collaborating with grantees to explore strategies for collecting data on program participants after they leave the program. The Department plans to develop a new annual performance report for grantees that would clearly define data elements for collecting post-program outcome data. The Department is also providing guidance to grantees on appropriate methodology for collecting these data.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

ESEA Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	194,251,412	214,991,392	222,998,559	8,007,167
Alaska	34,024,598	38,782,133	40,062,191	1,280,058
Arizona	263,204,306	272,912,714	274,362,009	1,449,295
Arkansas	122,031,484	143,561,197	150,207,375	6,646,178
California	1,643,496,281	1,696,361,946	1,726,659,560	30,297,614
Colorado	123,928,378	135,822,246	141,654,739	5,832,493
Connecticut	111,879,468	116,530,474	115,522,339	(1,008,135)
Delaware	34,110,286	38,366,294	39,628,403	1,262,109
District of Columbia	46,025,737	47,480,902	49,393,086	1,912,184
Florida	589,157,126	648,127,996	684,447,334	36,319,338
Georgia	410,011,238	446,324,608	462,328,127	16,003,519
Hawaii	39,638,957	44,674,689	47,032,557	2,357,868
Idaho	41,327,392	46,768,639	48,938,261	2,169,622
Illinois	593,136,349	593,015,719	588,642,525	(4,373,194)
Indiana	230,085,248	245,548,163	249,612,036	4,063,873
Iowa	69,213,583	73,177,347	75,355,054	2,177,707
Kansas	88,061,074	95,425,187	98,523,194	3,098,007
Kentucky	185,854,297	210,412,855	218,377,334	7,964,479
Louisiana	277,649,636	308,753,348	321,928,863	13,175,515
Maine	43,870,320	51,907,367	54,303,888	2,396,521
Maryland	188,034,165	188,316,397	192,271,138	3,954,741
Massachusetts	211,607,027	234,021,217	239,308,147	5,286,930
Michigan	460,301,629	523,125,161	542,541,035	19,415,874
Minnesota	114,582,991	124,791,195	127,993,439	3,202,244
Mississippi	174,679,246	188,588,696	193,969,948	5,381,252
Missouri	201,451,741	224,130,645	232,047,965	7,917,320
Montana	38,634,910	43,557,012	45,260,167	1,703,155
Nebraska	50,662,136	60,376,317	63,086,673	2,710,356
Nevada	80,298,566	79,753,639	84,302,685	4,549,046
New Hampshire	34,248,186	38,254,701	39,499,087	1,244,386
New Jersey	252,408,502	289,822,367	297,192,130	7,369,763
New Mexico	103,846,928	113,229,417	117,502,751	4,273,334
New York	1,210,071,290	1,224,956,349	1,238,206,130	13,249,781
North Carolina	301,103,680	358,661,956	376,763,584	18,101,628
North Dakota	29,825,087	33,837,695	34,946,198	1,108,503
Ohio	449,254,685	513,620,601	530,056,421	16,435,820
Oklahoma	128,266,400	148,369,471	154,618,549	6,249,078
Oregon	121,425,431	140,317,500	146,316,064	5,998,564
Pennsylvania	516,459,476	567,750,181	587,543,965	19,793,784
Rhode Island	50,390,387	52,952,219	53,283,998	331,779
South Carolina	187,901,935	205,430,472	214,194,125	8,763,653
South Dakota	37,273,903	41,564,693	42,969,392	1,404,699
Tennessee	205,727,619	240,757,784	253,109,889	12,352,105
Texas	1,169,499,588	1,301,828,968	1,343,208,897	41,379,929
Utah	58,196,911	59,538,182	61,129,169	1,590,987
Vermont	27,198,995	32,640,141	33,697,407	1,057,266
Virginia	204,733,095	226,630,019	237,162,901	10,532,882
Washington	182,795,119	188,788,308	193,689,654	4,901,346
West Virginia	89,220,610	99,947,437	103,996,948	4,049,511
Wisconsin	201,600,575	198,827,687	197,691,296	(1,136,391)
Wyoming	28,094,060	31,244,022	32,281,740	1,037,718
American Samoa	8,626,477	9,609,520	9,898,190	288,670
Guam	9,261,007	11,579,512	11,927,362	347,850
Northern Mariana Islands	3,302,856	3,490,570	3,595,427	104,857
Puerto Rico	455,589,077	511,419,276	538,073,064	26,653,788
Virgin Islands	11,591,805	12,912,766	13,300,667	387,901
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside (BIA)	91,753,636	97,545,977	100,476,265	2,930,288
Other (non-State allocations)	<u>7,248,099</u>	<u>7,741,219</u>	<u>7,811,099</u>	<u>69,880</u>
Total	12,838,125,000	13,898,874,505	14,304,901,000	406,026,495

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

School Improvement Grants

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	1,861,720	7,603,120	7,578,381	(24,739)
Alaska	387,886	1,585,017	1,596,482	11,465
Arizona	2,559,460	9,216,786	9,196,095	(20,691)
Arkansas	1,190,751	5,252,992	5,225,243	(27,749)
California	16,620,295	61,839,310	62,172,257	332,947
Colorado	1,233,591	5,030,473	5,030,352	(121)
Connecticut	1,072,455	3,848,405	3,824,026	(24,379)
Delaware	328,808	1,342,060	1,345,865	3,805
District of Columbia	430,133	1,662,416	1,669,293	6,877
Florida	5,729,854	23,771,280	23,831,649	60,369
Georgia	3,975,771	15,815,392	15,773,420	(41,972)
Hawaii	358,793	1,617,857	1,619,252	1,395
Idaho	431,188	1,788,922	1,780,220	(8,702)
Illinois	5,669,746	19,201,569	19,219,139	17,570
Indiana	2,253,964	8,570,800	8,520,447	(50,353)
Iowa	675,321	2,594,849	2,579,585	(15,264)
Kansas	947,069	3,733,233	3,686,786	(46,447)
Kentucky	1,828,604	7,652,139	7,614,965	(37,174)
Louisiana	2,646,711	10,957,504	10,951,750	(5,754)
Maine	420,802	1,870,100	1,862,044	(8,056)
Maryland	1,804,240	6,442,331	6,451,574	9,243
Massachusetts	2,017,490	8,137,510	8,105,432	(32,078)
Michigan	4,472,453	18,511,672	18,469,046	(42,626)
Minnesota	1,103,590	4,374,652	4,375,230	578
Mississippi	1,644,376	6,522,106	6,527,537	5,431
Missouri	1,939,187	7,906,731	7,874,966	(31,765)
Montana	361,711	1,533,662	1,535,282	1,620
Nebraska	527,388	2,310,491	2,291,200	(19,291)
Nevada	771,291	2,842,840	2,856,040	13,200
New Hampshire	328,634	1,333,299	1,336,936	3,637
New Jersey	2,397,833	10,093,141	10,037,317	(55,824)
New Mexico	948,538	3,984,133	3,975,550	(8,583)
New York	11,640,707	41,234,675	41,398,584	163,909
North Carolina	2,927,463	12,921,759	12,889,201	(32,558)
North Dakota	284,321	1,172,728	1,181,655	8,927
Ohio	4,325,232	17,972,270	17,909,675	(62,595)
Oklahoma	1,194,184	5,249,447	5,242,494	(6,953)
Oregon	1,259,126	5,366,958	5,359,723	(7,235)
Pennsylvania	5,021,980	20,041,263	19,992,586	(48,677)
Rhode Island	487,186	1,790,860	1,786,986	(3,874)
South Carolina	1,814,877	7,298,983	7,275,515	(23,468)
South Dakota	361,862	1,464,105	1,468,181	4,076
Tennessee	1,961,679	8,577,511	8,618,446	40,935
Texas	11,556,803	46,901,244	46,830,642	(70,602)
Utah	576,478	2,135,991	2,127,791	(8,200)
Vermont	267,783	1,161,455	1,163,557	2,102
Virginia	1,954,005	8,068,221	8,051,278	(16,943)
Washington	1,883,922	7,047,560	7,183,088	135,528
West Virginia	796,450	3,496,548	3,479,750	(16,798)
Wisconsin	1,936,898	6,506,780	6,496,340	(10,440)
Wyoming	272,871	1,100,684	1,105,675	4,991
American Samoa	82,466	329,929	329,990	61
Guam	73,538	397,566	397,639	73
Northern Mariana Islands	31,130	119,844	119,866	22
Puerto Rico	4,361,443	18,169,389	18,149,835	(19,554)
Virgin Islands	110,813	443,341	443,423	82
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside (BIA)	877,130	3,349,097	3,349,719	622
Other (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0
Total	<u>125,000,000</u>	<u>491,265,000</u>	<u>491,265,000</u>	<u>0</u>

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Reading First State Grants

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	17,969,131	7,037,389	17,999,199	10,961,810
Alaska	2,463,421	935,641	2,398,375	1,462,734
Arizona	24,023,586	8,385,141	21,446,283	13,061,142
Arkansas	10,660,870	4,424,927	11,317,429	6,892,502
California	136,987,926	48,953,409	125,205,844	76,252,435
Colorado	10,549,448	4,160,836	10,641,977	6,481,141
Connecticut	7,215,502	2,537,713	6,490,591	3,952,878
Delaware	2,463,421	935,641	2,398,375	1,462,734
District of Columbia	2,463,421	935,641	2,398,375	1,462,734
Florida	49,974,763	19,389,120	49,590,643	30,201,523
Georgia	33,159,079	12,432,936	31,799,139	19,366,203
Hawaii	2,463,421	969,762	2,480,316	1,510,554
Idaho	3,742,419	1,598,193	4,087,625	2,489,432
Illinois	41,265,735	13,967,253	35,723,388	21,756,135
Indiana	17,378,940	6,792,874	17,373,815	10,580,941
Iowa	5,999,470	2,347,840	6,004,959	3,657,119
Kansas	6,637,493	2,460,391	6,292,826	3,832,435
Kentucky	15,119,318	5,983,274	15,303,140	9,319,866
Louisiana	22,570,181	9,013,695	23,053,905	14,040,210
Maine	2,656,361	1,179,621	3,017,061	1,837,440
Maryland	11,966,084	4,021,721	10,286,168	6,264,447
Massachusetts	13,537,057	5,279,482	13,503,084	8,223,602
Michigan	30,916,445	12,613,410	32,260,729	19,647,319
Minnesota	9,245,351	3,584,022	9,166,686	5,582,664
Mississippi	15,876,139	6,075,554	15,539,161	9,463,607
Missouri	17,755,674	6,965,420	17,815,127	10,849,707
Montana	2,552,762	1,086,441	2,778,740	1,692,299
Nebraska	3,672,235	1,579,026	4,038,601	2,459,575
Nevada	6,801,776	2,398,434	6,134,364	3,735,930
New Hampshire	2,463,421	935,641	2,398,375	1,462,734
New Jersey	16,578,981	6,746,080	17,254,132	10,508,052
New Mexico	8,439,134	3,376,943	8,637,048	5,260,105
New York	71,313,825	24,285,135	62,112,952	37,827,817
North Carolina	28,208,675	11,765,721	30,092,635	18,326,914
North Dakota	2,463,421	935,641	2,398,375	1,462,734
Ohio	32,222,888	13,191,083	33,738,215	20,547,132
Oklahoma	11,563,758	4,937,456	12,628,299	7,690,843
Oregon	9,923,830	4,064,837	10,396,443	6,331,606
Pennsylvania	32,361,132	12,483,204	31,927,707	19,444,503
Rhode Island	3,234,593	1,155,427	2,955,181	1,799,754
South Carolina	16,009,130	6,163,176	15,763,267	9,600,091
South Dakota	2,463,421	935,641	2,398,375	1,462,734
Tennessee	19,071,841	7,938,778	20,304,642	12,365,864
Texas	101,653,601	40,200,209	102,818,192	62,617,983
Utah	5,868,714	2,105,409	5,384,906	3,279,497
Vermont	2,463,421	935,641	2,398,375	1,462,734
Virginia	16,023,323	6,270,455	16,037,649	9,767,194
Washington	16,129,940	5,940,934	15,194,850	9,253,916
West Virginia	6,201,416	2,625,294	6,714,592	4,089,298
Wisconsin	14,137,083	4,689,794	11,994,867	7,305,073
Wyoming	2,463,421	935,641	2,398,375	1,462,734
American Samoa	1,633,283	623,668	1,586,892	963,224
Guam	1,456,466	556,150	1,415,097	858,947
Northern Mariana Islands	593,275	226,541	576,424	349,883
Puerto Rico	36,021,862	13,593,633	36,856,623	23,262,990
Virgin Islands	1,463,146	558,701	1,421,587	862,886
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside (BIA)	5,146,170	1,965,060	5,000,000	3,034,940
Other (non-State allocations)	<u>33,573,400</u>	<u>14,825,300</u>	<u>30,650,000</u>	<u>15,824,700</u>
Total	1,029,234,000	393,012,000	1,000,000,000	606,988,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Even Start

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	1,131,162	944,085	0	(944,085)
Alaska	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
Arizona	1,531,232	1,124,123	0	(1,124,123)
Arkansas	702,922	637,205	0	(637,205)
California	9,500,194	7,213,753	0	(7,213,753)
Colorado	714,525	596,757	0	(596,757)
Connecticut	648,837	474,948	0	(474,948)
Delaware	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
District of Columbia	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
Florida	3,394,818	2,888,463	0	(2,888,463)
Georgia	2,396,929	1,949,322	0	(1,949,322)
Hawaii	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
Idaho	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
Illinois	3,479,163	2,402,872	0	(2,402,872)
Indiana	1,355,076	1,050,937	0	(1,050,937)
Iowa	403,973	316,718	0	(316,718)
Kansas	0	418,819	0	(418,819)
Kentucky	1,081,537	927,744	0	(927,744)
Louisiana	1,608,287	1,360,713	0	(1,360,713)
Maine	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
Maryland	1,104,198	803,995	0	(803,995)
Massachusetts	1,223,671	1,008,718	0	(1,008,718)
Michigan	2,705,376	2,290,107	0	(2,290,107)
Minnesota	669,824	542,464	0	(542,464)
Mississippi	1,003,116	815,561	0	(815,561)
Missouri	1,179,643	982,773	0	(982,773)
Montana	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
Nebraska	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
Nevada	472,554	355,300	0	(355,300)
New Hampshire	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
New Jersey	1,451,664	1,249,984	0	(1,249,984)
New Mexico	578,360	496,126	0	(496,126)
New York	7,108,861	5,134,032	0	(5,134,032)
North Carolina	1,765,501	1,596,400	0	(1,596,400)
North Dakota	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
Ohio	2,640,537	2,240,690	0	(2,240,690)
Oklahoma	723,760	655,140	0	(655,140)
Oregon	700,776	619,788	0	(619,788)
Pennsylvania	3,039,492	2,479,122	0	(2,479,122)
Rhode Island	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
South Carolina	1,106,422	908,687	0	(908,687)
South Dakota	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
Tennessee	1,204,292	1,074,886	0	(1,074,886)
Texas	6,775,148	5,635,823	0	(5,635,823)
Utah	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
Vermont	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
Virginia	1,191,897	1,005,293	0	(1,005,293)
Washington	1,068,070	818,045	0	(818,045)
West Virginia	487,675	437,347	0	(437,347)
Wisconsin	1,186,484	812,626	0	(812,626)
Wyoming	378,501	305,690	0	(305,690)
American Samoa	109,720	81,102	0	(81,102)
Guam	97,841	97,729	0	(97,729)
Northern Mariana Islands	41,418	29,460	0	(29,460)
Puerto Rico	2,686,648	2,283,331	0	(2,283,331)
Virgin Islands	147,435	108,981	0	(108,981)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	1,189,241	951,816	0	(951,816)
Other (non-State allocations)	<u>4,996,966</u>	<u>4,047,264</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(4,047,264)</u>
Total	82,282,760	66,454,399	0	(66,454,399)

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

State Agency Programs--Migrant

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	2,063,788	2,033,639	1,967,236	(66,403)
Alaska	6,818,552	7,124,388	7,547,998	423,610
Arizona	6,427,146	6,522,343	6,309,373	(212,970)
Arkansas	5,155,481	5,231,597	5,275,877	44,280
California	126,859,282	129,008,837	140,370,117	11,361,280
Colorado	7,476,191	7,897,737	8,443,026	545,289
Connecticut	1,001,313	986,685	954,468	(32,217)
Delaware	297,869	292,599	283,045	(9,554)
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0
Florida	22,801,963	22,551,030	22,432,376	(118,654)
Georgia	8,319,873	8,198,334	7,930,640	(267,694)
Hawaii	741,024	796,599	820,998	24,399
Idaho	4,068,020	4,008,593	3,877,703	(130,890)
Illinois	1,913,974	1,886,014	1,824,431	(61,583)
Indiana	5,077,832	5,457,278	5,279,085	(178,193)
Iowa	1,673,344	1,798,838	1,933,732	134,894
Kansas	11,578,601	11,451,077	11,077,173	(373,904)
Kentucky	7,179,121	7,330,358	7,091,005	(239,353)
Louisiana	2,413,887	2,449,594	2,369,609	(79,985)
Maine	1,058,930	1,138,346	1,101,176	(37,170)
Maryland	525,637	540,906	523,244	(17,662)
Massachusetts	1,619,022	1,595,370	1,543,278	(52,092)
Michigan	8,568,487	8,482,494	8,205,521	(276,973)
Minnesota	1,678,148	1,653,633	2,397,632	743,999
Mississippi	1,322,280	585,779	1,128,119	542,340
Missouri	1,521,519	1,499,292	1,450,337	(48,955)
Montana	955,311	997,226	964,664	(32,562)
Nebraska	5,120,277	5,045,478	4,880,731	(164,747)
Nevada	224,831	234,373	226,720	(7,653)
New Hampshire	142,866	144,855	140,125	(4,730)
New Jersey	1,998,900	1,963,968	1,899,840	(64,128)
New Mexico	867,476	912,425	882,633	(29,792)
New York	9,478,326	9,790,604	9,470,918	(319,686)
North Carolina	5,923,390	5,836,860	5,646,273	(190,587)
North Dakota	221,480	230,939	402,589	171,650
Ohio	2,472,325	2,628,523	2,542,696	(85,827)
Oklahoma	1,975,583	1,016,277	1,419,417	403,140
Oregon	11,808,826	11,636,320	12,490,972	854,652
Pennsylvania	9,091,717	8,958,904	8,666,375	(292,529)
Rhode Island	67,895	66,904	64,719	(2,185)
South Carolina	537,179	555,852	537,702	(18,150)
South Dakota	817,402	828,800	801,737	(27,063)
Tennessee	532,055	569,524	2,291,387	1,721,863
Texas	57,532,030	58,383,393	56,477,040	(1,906,353)
Utah	1,740,226	1,827,591	1,767,917	(59,674)
Vermont	609,784	628,408	607,890	(20,518)
Virginia	795,099	791,911	1,051,892	259,981
Washington	15,484,572	15,258,370	20,696,713	5,438,343
West Virginia	82,249	81,048	78,402	(2,646)
Wisconsin	615,436	629,058	860,881	231,823
Wyoming	217,755	232,453	263,568	31,115
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	<u>19,049,446</u>	<u>10,000,000</u>	<u>12,500,000</u>	<u>2,500,000</u>
Total	386,523,720	379,771,426	399,771,000	19,999,574

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

State Agency Programs--Neglected and Delinquent

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	919,897	904,594	960,050	55,456
Alaska	263,142	258,763	274,627	15,864
Arizona	1,774,916	1,745,391	1,852,392	107,001
Arkansas	285,709	284,776	302,235	17,459
California	2,523,695	2,485,818	2,638,210	152,392
Colorado	511,723	499,326	529,937	30,611
Connecticut	1,194,199	1,174,333	1,246,325	71,992
Delaware	437,279	430,006	456,367	26,361
District of Columbia	185,747	182,658	193,855	11,197
Florida	1,253,956	1,270,952	1,348,868	77,916
Georgia	1,265,473	1,266,276	1,343,905	77,629
Hawaii	234,975	243,482	258,409	14,927
Idaho	263,142	258,763	274,627	15,864
Illinois	1,283,096	1,229,511	1,304,885	75,374
Indiana	1,009,752	934,388	991,670	57,282
Iowa	498,886	473,647	502,684	29,037
Kansas	337,833	346,622	367,872	21,250
Kentucky	819,656	817,734	867,866	50,132
Louisiana	1,797,995	1,758,988	1,866,823	107,835
Maine	199,678	196,357	208,394	12,037
Maryland	998,427	1,012,221	1,074,275	62,054
Massachusetts	1,980,961	1,948,008	2,067,431	119,423
Michigan	667,506	638,800	677,961	39,161
Minnesota	211,804	208,073	220,829	12,756
Mississippi	624,167	613,784	651,412	37,628
Missouri	1,343,623	1,327,377	1,408,752	81,375
Montana	91,361	90,576	96,128	5,552
Nebraska	317,971	313,978	333,226	19,248
Nevada	336,924	331,320	351,632	20,312
New Hampshire	435,944	434,186	460,804	26,618
New Jersey	2,743,135	2,697,505	2,862,875	165,370
New Mexico	302,523	299,970	318,360	18,390
New York	2,978,144	2,928,604	3,108,142	179,538
North Carolina	1,035,024	1,032,357	1,095,646	63,289
North Dakota	84,432	88,313	93,727	5,414
Ohio	2,300,037	2,219,713	2,355,792	136,079
Oklahoma	249,727	245,572	260,627	15,055
Oregon	1,247,069	1,230,491	1,305,926	75,435
Pennsylvania	985,613	965,236	1,024,410	59,174
Rhode Island	558,789	549,494	583,181	33,687
South Carolina	1,732,026	1,716,842	1,822,093	105,251
South Dakota	257,068	250,088	265,419	15,331
Tennessee	482,483	474,457	503,544	29,087
Texas	3,358,536	3,240,075	3,438,707	198,632
Utah	698,615	686,994	729,110	42,116
Vermont	569,524	560,049	594,383	34,334
Virginia	1,535,246	1,526,149	1,619,709	93,560
Washington	689,951	670,812	711,936	41,124
West Virginia	548,255	534,495	567,262	32,767
Wisconsin	831,834	803,514	852,773	49,259
Wyoming	605,784	582,113	618,273	36,160
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	688,823	720,319	764,479	44,160
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	<u>1,244,925</u>	<u>1,223,176</u>	<u>1,298,175</u>	<u>74,999</u>
Total	49,797,000	48,927,046	51,927,000	2,999,954

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Comprehensive School Reform (Title I)

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	0	0	0	0
Alaska	0	0	0	0
Arizona	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	0	0	0	0
California	0	0	0	0
Colorado	0	0	0	0
Connecticut	0	0	0	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0
Florida	0	0	0	0
Georgia	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	0	0	0	0
Idaho	0	0	0	0
Illinois	0	0	0	0
Indiana	0	0	0	0
Iowa	0	0	0	0
Kansas	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	0	0	0	0
Maine	0	0	0	0
Maryland	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0
Michigan	0	0	0	0
Minnesota	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	0	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0	0
Montana	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	0	0	0	0
Nevada	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	0	0	0	0
New York	0	0	0	0
North Carolina	0	0	0	0
North Dakota	0	0	0	0
Ohio	0	0	0	0
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	0	0	0	0
Texas	0	0	0	0
Utah	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0
Virginia	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	0	0	0	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside (BIA)	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	<u>2,352,000</u>	<u>1,605,454</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(1,605,454)</u>
Total	2,352,000	1,605,454	0	(1,605,454)