

# Archived Information

## Department of Education

### CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

#### Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Request

#### CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	M-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	M-3
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	M-5
Obligations by Object Classification.....	M-6
Summary of Changes.....	M-7
Authorizing Legislation.....	M-9
Appropriations History.....	M-11
Significant Items in FY 2008 Appropriations Reports.....	M-12
Summary of Request.....	M-13
Activities:	
Career and technical education:	
State grants.....	M-15
National programs.....	M-25
Tech prep education State grants.....	M-27
Adult education:	
Adult basic and literacy education State grants.....	M-33
National leadership activities.....	M-42
National Institute for Literacy.....	M-46
Smaller learning communities.....	M-50
State grants for incarcerated youth offenders.....	M-57
State Tables.....	M-60

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, [the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006,] the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, [subpart 4 of part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (“ESEA”) and title VIII-D of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998,] [\$1,976,166,000] \$574,590,000, [of] which [\$4,077,000] shall become available on [October 1, 2007 and remain available until September 30, 2009, of which \$1,181,089 shall become available on] July 1, [2008] 2009, and shall remain available through September 30, [2009] 2010<sup>1</sup> [, and of which \$791,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009]:

*Provided*, That of the amount provided for Adult Education State Grants, \$67,896,000 shall be made available for integrated English literacy and civics education services to immigrants and other limited English proficient populations<sup>2</sup>: *Provided further*, That of the amount reserved for integrated English literacy and civics education, notwithstanding section 211 of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, 65 percent shall be allocated to States based on a State’s absolute need as determined by calculating each State’s share of a 10-year average of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services data for immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence for the 10 most recent years, and 35 percent allocated to States that experienced growth as measured by the average of the 3 most recent years for which United States Citizenship and Immigration Services data for immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence are available, except that no State shall be allocated an amount less than \$60,000<sup>3</sup>:

*Provided further*, That of the amounts made available for the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, [\$7,000,000] \$14,000,000 shall be for national leadership activities under section 243<sup>4</sup> and [\$6,583,000] \$6,468,000 shall be for the National Institute for Literacy under section 242.<sup>5</sup> [: *Provided further*, That \$81,532,000 shall be available to support the activities authorized under subpart 4 of part D of title V of the ESEA, of which up to 5 percent shall

become available October 1, 2007, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009, for evaluation, technical assistance, school networks, peer review of applications, and program outreach activities, and of which not less than 95 percent shall become available on July 1, 2008, and remain available through September 30, 2009, for grants to local educational agencies: *Provided further*, That funds made available to local educational agencies under this subpart shall be used only for activities related to establishing smaller learning communities within large high schools or small high schools that provide alternatives for students enrolled in large high schools.] (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2008.*)

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

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>1</sup> ...<u>\$574,590,000</u>, [of] which [\$4,077,000] shall become available on [October 1, 2007 and remain available until September 30, 2009, of which \$1,181,089 shall become available on] July 1, [2008] <u>2009</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2009] <u>2010</u>:</p>	<p>This language provides for funds to be appropriated on a “forward-funded” basis for Adult Education programs.</p>
<p><sup>2</sup> <i>Provided</i>, That of the amount provided for Adult Education State Grants, \$67,896,000 shall be made available for integrated English literacy and civics education services to immigrants and other limited English proficient populations:...</p>	<p>This language earmarks funds from the Adult Education State Grants appropriation for English Literacy and Civics Education State Grants.</p>
<p><sup>3</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That of the amount reserved for integrated English literacy and civics education, notwithstanding section 211 of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, 65 percent shall be allocated to States based on a State’s absolute need as determined by calculating each State’s share of a 10-year average of the Immigration and Naturalization Service data for immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence for the 10 most recent years, and 35 percent allocated to States that experienced growth as measured by the average of the 3 most recent years for which Immigration and Naturalization Service data for immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence are available, except that no State shall be allocated an amount less than \$60,000:...</p>	<p>This language specifies an allocation formula for awarding State grants for English literacy and civics education, which are not otherwise authorized under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.</p>
<p><sup>4</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That of the amounts made available for the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, [\$7,000,000] <u>\$14,000,000</u> shall be for national leadership activities under section 243...</p>	<p>This language provides a specific amount for National Leadership activities authorized under section 243 of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, overriding the statutory set-aside of 1.5 percent of the Adult Education appropriation (not to exceed \$8 million).</p>

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

**Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes**

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>5</sup> ... and [\$6,583,000] <u>\$6,468,000</u> shall be for the National Institute for Literacy under section 242.</p>	<p>This language provides a specific amount for the National Institute for Literacy, authorized under section 242 of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, overriding the statutory set-aside of 1.5 percent of the Adult Education appropriation (not to exceed \$8 million).</p>

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

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

---

	2007	2008	2009
<hr/>			
Discretionary appropriation:			
Appropriation	\$1,992,170	\$1,976,166	\$574,590
Across-the-board reduction	0	-34,524	0
Subtotal, appropriation	1,992,170	1,941,642	574,590
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-791,000	-791,000	0
Advance from prior year	791,000	791,000	791,000 <sup>1</sup>
Subtotal, comparable budget authority	1,992,170	1,941,642	1,365,590
Unobligated balance, start of year	130,569	131,732	0
Recovery of prior-year obligations	10	0	0
Unobligated balance expiring	-109	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	-131,732	0	0
Total, direct obligations	1,990,908	2,073,374	1,365,590

---

<sup>1</sup>The FY 2008 President's budget assumes that statutory language will be included in a full year 2007 Continuing Resolution to make advance appropriations available in 2008 at the same level as provided in the 2006 Department of Education Appropriations Act for use in 2007.

---

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

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

	2007	2008	2009
Personnel compensation and benefits .....	\$1,468	\$1,648	\$1,697
Travel and transportation of things .....	140	60	70
Rental payments to GSA and others .....	364	385	443
Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges .....	49	31	35
Printing and reproduction .....	99	172	162
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services .....	991	5,634	2,000
Other services .....	5,812	11,404	15,630
Peer Review.....	684	400	70
Purchases of goods and services .....	227	18	15
Research and development contracts .....	10,692	4,500	0
Operation and maintenance of equipment .....	<u>176</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>145</u>
Subtotal .....	20,702	24,337	20,267
Supplies and materials .....	28	19	19
Equipment.....	13	6	14
Grants, subsidies, and contributions .....	1,970,149	2,049,012	1,345,290
Interest and dividends .....	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations.....	1,990,908	2,073,374	1,365,590

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

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

---

2008 .....	\$1,941,642
2009 .....	<u>574,590</u>
Net change.....	-1,367,052

---

	<u>2008 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<b>Increases:</b>		
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase funding for Adult Education National Leadership Activities to support high-priority projects designed to help adult English language learners and adults preparing to enter higher education.	\$6,878	<u>+\$14,000</u>
Subtotal, increases		+7,122
<b>Decreases:</b>		
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminate funding for the Career and Technical Education State Grants in order to support higher-priority programs, including Title I allocations to high schools.	1,160,911	-1,160,911
Eliminate funding for Career and Technical Education National Programs in order to support higher-priority programs, including Title I allocations to high schools.	7,860	-7,860
Eliminate funding for the separate Tech Prep State Grants program in order to support higher-priority programs, including Title I allocations to high schools.	102,923	-102,923
Eliminate funding for Smaller Learning Communities because of diminishing local interest in the program and little evidence of effectiveness.	80,108	-80,108
Eliminate funding for State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders to focus limited resources on high-priority programs instead of small categorical programs that have indirect or limited impact, for which there is little evidence of effectiveness, and for which other funding is available.	22,372	-22,372



VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

Summary of Changes  
(\$000s)

---

	<u>2008 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-1,374,174
Net change		-1,367,052

---

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

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

Activity	2008 Authorized	2008 Estimate	2009 Authorized	2009 Request
Career and technical education: <i>(Carl D. Perkins CTEA)</i>				
State grants <i>(CTEA Title I)</i>	Indefinite	\$1,160,911	Indefinite	0
National programs <i>(CTEA section 114)</i>	Indefinite	7,860	Indefinite	0
Tech prep education State grants <i>(CTEA Title II)</i>	Indefinite	102,923	Indefinite	0
Adult education: <i>(Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA))</i>				
Adult basic and literacy education State grants <i>(AEFLA and WIA section 503)</i>	To be determined <sup>1,2</sup>	554,122	To be determined <sup>1,2</sup>	554,122
National leadership activities <i>(AEFLA section 243)</i>	To be determined <sup>1,2</sup>	6,878	To be determined <sup>1,2</sup>	14,000
National Institute for Literacy <i>(AEFLA section 242)</i>	To be determined <sup>1,2</sup>	6,468	To be determined <sup>1,2</sup>	6,468
Smaller learning communities <i>(ESEA V-D, subpart 4)</i>	(3)	80,108	(3)	0
State grants for incarcerated youth offenders <i>(HEA Amendments of 1998, VIII-D)</i>	(4)	<u>22,372</u>	(4)	<u>0</u>
<u>Unfunded authorizations</u>				
Occupational and employment information <i>(CTEA section 118)</i>	Indefinite	0	Indefinite	0
Total definite authorization	0		0	
Total appropriation				574,590
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				574,590

M-9

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 211(a) of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act requires that, of the funds appropriated for Adult Education, the Secretary reserve 1.5 percent, not to exceed \$8 million, for the National Institute for Literacy; 1.5 percent, not to exceed \$8 million, for National Leadership Activities; and 1.72 percent for incentive grants (as authorized under section 503 of the Workforce Investment Act).

<sup>2</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. The program is authorized in FY 2008 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2009.

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

<sup>4</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. The program is authorized in FY 2008 through appropriations language. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation for FY 2009.

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

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

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2000	1,750,250	1,582,247	1,676,750	1,681,750
2000 Advance for 2001	0	(772,000)	0	(791,000)
2001	1,751,250	1,718,600	1,726,600	1,825,600
2001 Advance for 2002	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2002	1,801,660	2,006,060	1,818,060	1,934,060
2002 Advance for 2003	0	(807,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2003	1,897,617	1,919,560	1,938,060	1,943,346
2003 Advance for 2004	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2004	1,597,532	2,101,430	2,101,430	2,109,172
2004 Advance for 2005	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2005	1,602,233	2,025,458	2,102,086	2,010,949
2005 Advance for 2006	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2006	215,734	1,991,782	1,927,016	1,992,159
2006 Advance for 2007	0	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2007	579,552			1,992,170
2007 Advance for 2008	(791,000)	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	(791,000)
2008	1,189,808	2,038,220	1,894,788	1,941,642
2009	574,590			

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

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Significant Items in FY 2008 Appropriations Reports

#### Smaller Learning Communities

- Conference: The conferees direct that the Department consult with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations prior to the release of program guidance for the Smaller Learning Communities grant competitions for fiscal year 2008.
- Response: The Department will consult with the Committees on plans for the FY 2008 program competition prior to the public release of program guidance.
- Conference: The conferees direct that a greater share of the 5 percent set-aside for national activities be used to support direct technical assistance to grantees through regional laboratories, university-based organizations, and other entities with expertise in high school reform, and direct that the Department submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations an operating plan outlining the planned use of the set-aside prior to the obligation of these funds.
- Response: The Department intends to submit a report on FY 2007 plans for the 5 percent set-aside before obligating any of the funds. The plans will address the conferees' intent that a greater share of funds support direct technical assistance to grantees through regional laboratories, university-based organizations, and other entities with expertise in high school reform.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2009 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

(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
<b>Career, Technical, and Adult Education</b>							
1. Career and technical education (Carl D. Perkins CTEA):							
(a) State grants (CTEA Title I)							
Annual appropriation	D	390,553	369,911	0	(369,911)	-100.0%	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	791,000	791,000	0	(791,000)	-100.0%	
Subtotal		1,181,553	1,160,911	0	(1,160,911)	-100.0%	
(b) National programs (section 114)	D	10,000	7,860	0	(7,860)	-100.0%	
(c) Tech prep education State grants (Title II)	D	104,753	102,923	0	(102,923)	-100.0%	
Subtotal, Career and technical education		1,296,306	1,271,694	0	(1,271,694)	-100.0%	
2. Adult education (Adult Education and Family Literacy Act):							
(a) Adult basic and literacy education State grants (AEFLA and WIA section 503)	D	563,975	554,122	554,122	0	0.0%	
(b) National leadership activities (AEFLA section 243)	D	9,005	6,878	14,000	7,122	103.6%	
(c) National Institute for Literacy (AEFLA section 242)	D	6,583	6,468	6,468	0	0.0%	
Subtotal, Adult education		579,563	567,468	574,590	7,122	1.3%	
3. Smaller learning communities (ESEA V-D, subpart 4)	D	93,531	80,108	0	(80,108)	-100.0%	
4. State grants for incarcerated youth offenders (HE Amendments of 1998, VIII-D)	D	22,770	22,372	0	(22,372)	-100.0%	
<b>Total, Appropriation</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>1,992,170</b>	<b>1,941,642</b>	<b>574,590</b>	<b>(1,367,052)</b>	<b>-70.4%</b>	
Total, Budget authority	D	1,992,170	1,941,642	1,365,590	(576,052)	-29.7%	
Current		1,201,170 <sup>1</sup>	1,150,642 <sup>1</sup>	574,590	(576,052)	-50.1%	
Prior year's advance		791,000	791,000	791,000	0	0.0%	
Outlays	D	1,955,780	2,125,604	1,876,204	(249,400)	-11.7%	

<sup>1</sup> Excludes an advance appropriation of \$791,000 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

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

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Summary of Request

Programs in the Career, Technical, and Adult Education account further State and community efforts to improve their career and technical education programs and adult education and literacy systems. The objective of these programs is to develop the academic, career, and technical skills of students in high schools and community colleges by helping States to develop challenging standards; promoting the integration of academic, career, and technical instruction; and supporting State and local program improvements. Adult education programs support local efforts to provide educational services to adults who lack the basic or English literacy skills so that they can benefit fully from job training, obtain better jobs, complete secondary education, and become full participants in their children's education. The Career and Technical Education programs were reauthorized through the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006. Adult Education is included in the pending Workforce Investment Act reauthorization. The Smaller Learning Communities program, which is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is subject to reauthorization, as is the State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders program, which is authorized by the Higher Education Amendments of 1998.

The request of \$574.6 million for Adult Education includes \$554.1 million for formula grants to States, \$14 million for National Leadership Activities, and \$6.5 million for the National Institute for Literacy. The request for Adult and Literacy Education State grants is the same amount as the FY 2008 appropriation and will assist States in meeting a significant and ongoing need for adult education services. The continued high rate of students who drop out of high school and the growing numbers of adult immigrants generate high demand for adult education services. In addition, the request reflects the strong rating of "Effective" that the program received in the 2006 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review. The request includes continuation of a \$68 million set-aside for English Literacy/Civics Education State Grants to help States and communities provide limited English proficient adults with expanded access to high-quality English literacy programs linked to civics education. The request for National Leadership Activities is \$7.1 million over the FY 2008 level in order to support continued development of a Web-based adult learning portal as well as the "Bridge to College" demonstration program. The request for the National Institute for Literacy is the same amount as the FY 2008 appropriation level.

The request would eliminate funding for the Career and Technical Education State Grants program, consistent with the Administration's policy of eliminating funding for programs that are unable to demonstrate effectiveness and are narrowly focused. The Administration believes that students previously served by this program would be better served through increases in programs that aim to improve the quality of high school education. The budget also does not include funding for the Career and Technical Education National Programs, since those programs focus mostly on helping States implement requirements of the State Grant program or on evaluating the success and impact of that implementation. No funds are requested for Tech Prep Education State Grants consistent, again, with the Administration's policy of reducing or eliminating funding for narrowly focused programs that have limited impact, and for which other sources of funding are available.

The budget request would also eliminate funding for Smaller Learning Communities and State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders, in keeping with the Department's policy of focusing limited resources on high-priority programs instead of small categorical programs that have only indirect or limited impact and for which there is little or no evidence of effectiveness.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Career and technical education: State grants

(Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, Title I)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$369,911	0	-\$369,911
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>791,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-791,000</u>
Total	1,160,911	0	-1,160,911

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV), State Grants for Career and Technical Education assist States and Outlying Areas in expanding and improving career and technical education in high schools, technical schools, and community colleges. Each State uses program funds to support a variety of career and technical education programs developed in accordance with its State plan.

The Department allocates funds to States, including the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, through a formula based on State per-capita income and population in three age cohorts (15-19, 20-24, and 25-65). The formula provides for a minimum State allocation of at least 0.5 percent of the total, and a “hold-harmless” provision in the formula ensures that no State’s share of the appropriation is less than its share of the fiscal year 1998 appropriation. A special provision limits the increase a State with an initial allocation of the 0.5 percent minimum may receive, resulting in a number of States that receive an allocation of less than 0.5 percent of the total. If appropriations result in the amount of funds for allocation to States exceeding the amount of funds allocated to States from the FY 2006 appropriation, up to one-third of the additional funds would be allotted to States with FY 2006 grants that are less than the minimum 0.5 percent grant amount and the remainder would flow to the other States.

In addition, the Pacific territories receive 0.13 percent of the total appropriated for State Grants to operate the same kinds of career and technical education programs as the States. Within that set-aside, Guam receives \$660,000, American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands each receive \$350,000, and Palau receives \$160,000. In the first year after enactment of Perkins IV (FY 2007), the Pacific Regional Education Lab (PREL) received the remaining funds generated under the set-aside to make grants for career and technical education and training in the Pacific territories; thereafter, the remaining funds are distributed among Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands in equal shares. Also, 1.25 percent of the total appropriation for State Grants is set aside for grants to federally recognized Indian tribes and tribal organizations, and 0.25 percent is set aside for competitive grants to organizations that primarily serve and represent Hawaiian Natives.



## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

Under the statute:

- Programs must, among other things, integrate academic and career and technical education, promote student attainment of challenging academic and career and technical standards, provide strong linkages between secondary and postsecondary education, and provide professional development for teachers, counselors, and administrators.
- The Secretary and each State must reach agreement on annual levels of performance for a number of “core indicators” specified in the law.
  - The core indicators for secondary education programs focus on student attainment of challenging academic standards, as measured by attainment of the proficient level or above on the Statewide assessments required under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB); student attainment of career and technical skill proficiencies; student attainment of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, or a proficiency credential in conjunction with a secondary school diploma; high school graduation; student placement in postsecondary education, advanced training, military service, or employment; and student participation in and completion of career and technical education programs that lead to employment in fields that are traditionally dominated by one gender.
  - The core indicators for postsecondary education programs focus on student attainment of challenging career and technical skill proficiencies; student attainment of an industry-recognized credential, certificate, or degree; student retention in postsecondary education or transfer to a baccalaureate degree program; student placement in the military or in apprenticeship programs, or placement or retention in employment; and student participation in and completion of career and technical education programs that lead to employment in fields that are traditionally dominated by one gender.
- Within States, at least 85 percent of funds are allocated by formula to local educational agencies (LEAs) and postsecondary institutions, except that a State may reserve up to 10 percent of funds to make grant awards to local agencies in rural areas, areas with high percentages of career and technical education students, and areas with high numbers of career and technical education students.
- States may use up to 10 percent of their allocations to carry out State leadership activities, such as professional development, expanding the use of technology, assessing career and technical education services, integrating academic and career and technical education to improve student achievement, preparing students for employment in fields that are traditionally dominated by one gender, delivering career and technical education in correctional institutions, and providing services for special populations.

In recent years, including fiscal year 2008, this has been a forward-funded program that included advance appropriations. A portion of the funds becomes available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which the funds were appropriated and remained available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year. The remaining funds become available on October 1 of the fiscal year following the appropriations act and remained available for 12 months, expiring at the same time as the forward-funded portion.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$1,195,008
2005.....	1,194,331
2006.....	1,182,388
2007.....	1,181,553
2008.....	1,160,911

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Career and Technical Education State Grant program. The request is consistent with the Administration's policy of eliminating funding for programs that are unable to demonstrate effectiveness, are narrowly focused, or whose objectives would be better accomplished through other programs.

The most recent evaluation of the program, the 2004 National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE), raised questions about the effectiveness of the program in helping to prepare secondary school students academically for the transition to postsecondary education and the workforce. The NAVE noted that there is little evidence that vocational coursetaking is responsible for the academic progress of vocational students; participation in vocational courses has no effect on whether a student pursues postsecondary education or training; academic and vocational integration suffers because vocational and academic subject teachers disagree about the role of academics in vocational curricula while academic course teachers focus on meeting academic standards; and vocational teachers are less likely to hold a baccalaureate degree than other secondary teachers.

Although the reauthorized Perkins Act strengthened the program's accountability provisions and provides opportunities to improve student academic achievement, the purpose is still focused on improving the quality of career and technical education (CTE) programs, rather than on strengthening high school education in general. The Administration believes that CTE students would be better served through increases in programs that aim to improve the quality of high school education, particularly for students who are struggling academically and are likely to drop out or to graduate without the education needed to succeed in postsecondary education or the workforce. The Administration's reauthorization proposal for the ESEA Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program would significantly increase the share of Title I funds that go to high schools and would help States in their efforts to reform high school education and improve academic achievement and graduation rates for at-risk high school students, many of whom are CTE students. For FY 2009, therefore, the budget would provide a \$406 million increase for Title I rather than funding Career and Technical Education.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
State grants	\$1,162,294	\$1,141,988	0
Range of awards to States	\$623-129,515	\$613-126,118	
Territories allocation	\$1,520	\$1,509	0
PREL	\$16	0	0
Indian set-aside	\$14,769	\$14,511	0
Number of grants	30	30	0
Native Hawaiian grant	\$2,954	\$2,902	0
Number of grants	8	8	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. No 2009 targets are provided because the Administration is not requesting funds for this program in fiscal year 2009.

In 2007, the Department adopted new performance measures for the program in order to align them with the core indicators of performance specified in section 113 of the reauthorized Perkins Act. The Department has negotiated targets for school years 2007-08 and 2008-09 for the measures that address (1) CTE student achievement on the statewide assessments of reading/language arts and mathematics that States must administer under ESEA Title I, and (2) CTE students who graduate from high school, as defined under Title I.

In 2008, the Department will negotiate with States on targets for (1) secondary education measures for technical skill attainment, secondary school completion, placement, and nontraditional participation and completion; and (2) postsecondary education measures for technical skill attainment; attainment of credentials, certificates, or diplomas; student retention or transfer; student placement; and nontraditional participation and completion.

The Department is still reporting on the previously established indicators because data for the new NCLB indicators will not be available until late 2008.

**Goal: Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen education achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.**

**Objective:** *Ensure that CTE concentrators, including special populations, will achieve high levels of proficiency in mathematics, science, and English.*

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of CTE concentrators meeting State-established academic standards.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2004	76	75
2005	77	78
2006	78	72
2007	79	
2008	80	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core indicators required under the statute. The most recent State-reported student outcomes are for the 2005-06 school year. State data show a decrease from 2005 to 2006 in the percentages of CTE concentrators meeting State academic standards. Targets for succeeding years are based on expectations of incremental growth, as well as on agreements with State agencies.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of secondary CTE concentrators meeting State/locally adopted skill standards, using State-recognized approaches.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2004	70	64
2005	79	65
2006	74	80
2007	81	
2008	82	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators meeting State/locally adopted skill standards, using State-recognized approaches.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2004	80	78
2005	79	77
2006	80	71
2007	81	
2008	82	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core indicators required under the statute. The most recent State-reported student outcomes are for the 2005-06 school year. The State data show a large increase between 2005 and 2006 in skill attainment among secondary CTE concentrators, from 65 percent to 80 percent. The performance of postsecondary CTE concentrators decreased, from 77 percent to 71 percent. Targets for succeeding years are based on expectations of incremental growth, as well as on agreements with State agencies. No 2009 targets are provided because the Administration is not requesting funds for this program in fiscal year 2009.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

**Objective:** *Ensure that concentrators, including special populations, make successful transitions to further education and employment.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of CTE concentrators who have completed high school.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2004	88	84
2005	87	84
2006	88	89
2007	89	
2008	90	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of CTE concentrators who have transitioned to postsecondary education or employment.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2004	87	87
2005	87	87
2006	88	87
2007	89	
2008	90	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators who have a positive placement in the military or employment.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2004	86	83
2005	88	84
2006	89	87
2007	90	
2008	91	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators who have completed a postsecondary degree or certification.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2004	45	41
2005	44	42
2006	45	47
2007	46	
2008	47	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core indicators required under the statute. The most recent State-reported student outcomes are for the 2005-06 school year. The data show an increase in high school completion for secondary program participants between 2005 and 2006, slightly surpassing the target of 88 percent for 2006. There was no change in the percentage of CTE concentrators who have transitioned to postsecondary education or employment, failing slightly to meet the target of 88 percent for 2006. The data show an increase in both the percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators who have a positive placement in employment or military service (from 84 percent in 2005 to 87 percent in 2006) and in the percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators who have completed a postsecondary degree or certification (from 42 percent in 2005 to 47 percent in 2006), failing, however, to meet the target for the former but surpassing the target for the latter. Targets for succeeding years are based on expectations of incremental growth, as well as on agreements with State agencies. No 2009 targets are provided because the Administration is not requesting funds for this program in fiscal year 2009.

The percentages provided in each of the above charts are composites of State-reported data; they do not represent either a national average or the results of any single national evaluation. Because States have had considerable latitude in setting their own measures, measurement approaches, and data definitions, the measurements on which these data are based vary greatly from State to State. For example, States set their own definitions of dropout rates. This limits the validity and usefulness of these data at the national level.

Below are targets for the new measures, which address CTE student achievement on the statewide assessments of reading/language arts and mathematics that States must administer under Title I, and CTE student high school graduation rate. These targets are based on the performance targets the Department has negotiated with States for these indicators for school years 2007-08 and 2008-09. Targets for school years 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12 will be negotiated in 2009. No 2009 targets are provided because the Administration is not requesting funds for this program in fiscal year 2009.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of CTE concentrators meeting the State-established reading/language arts standards.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	61	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of CTE concentrators meeting the State-established reading/mathematics standards.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	54	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of CTE students who graduated in the reporting year.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2008	75	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

### Efficiency Measures

The Department has adopted cost per participant as the efficiency measure for this program. This is also the efficiency measure for the job training common measures adopted by the Administration. Although the Department is able to calculate this measure at the national and State levels, the validity and reliability of the data used for these calculations are questionable. State definitions of participants vary widely, limiting the validity of comparisons across States. The following chart shows national-level costs per secondary student and per postsecondary student for fiscal years 2004 and 2005. Data for fiscal year 2006 will be available in late 2008.

Year	Cost per secondary student	Cost per postsecondary student
2004	64	79
2005	75	83

### Other Performance Information

As discussed above, the quality and validity of the data States submit to the Department varies widely. Both the 2004 National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) and the 2002 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review concluded that the performance data collected by States were poor and, therefore, compromised the integrity of the program's accountability system.

States have reported annually on core indicators of performance since the 1998 reauthorization of the Perkins Act. That law gave States wide latitude in selecting their own performance measures and in defining which students' performance to include in those measures. Thus, it has been difficult to gauge States' progress, as the data often have not been valid, reliable or comparable. Until 2006, twenty-four States had measured the academic achievement of their CTE students through such indirect measures as high school graduation or completion of a specific number of courses. Some States that used State assessments to measure academic achievement held CTE students to a low standard by using the "basic" level to determine achievement instead of the "proficient" level that States must use to measure achievement under ESEA Title I. Furthermore, many States changed one or more of their measurement approaches, student population definitions, or performance levels, making it impossible to analyze State performance trends over time, except in the most general terms.

In addition, performance data have not been comparable from State to State, as State definitions and measures differ. For example, one State may have measured academic attainment using a State assessment while another State may have used grade point averages. The Department's 2006 Report to Congress on State Performance, which contains 2003-04 State data on the performance of all CTE students on each of the indicators, reiterates a previous finding that, although States have made progress in building the performance

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

accountability systems required under the statute, the Department and States still face considerable challenges in obtaining complete, accurate, comparable, and reliable data. Although Perkins IV retained provisions that allow States to define their own measures on the statutory core indicators of performance, the Act also gives the Secretary the authority to determine if the measures are valid and reliable. The Department has developed guidance and is providing technical assistance to States on improving the quality of the States' performance data and on ensuring that those data are aligned with the requirements in Perkins IV. Furthermore, the Department is considering whether any areas of the new law should be regulated to improve the comparability and reliability of performance data.

The 2004 NAVE also found mixed results on the effectiveness of the program. While the assessment found that career and technical education has important earnings benefits for most secondary and postsecondary students, the benefits were less clear for high school students who do not go on to postsecondary education, the group that has historically been the focus of vocational education policy. The NAVE also concluded that, over the last decade, secondary students who participated in CTE programs increased their academic coursetaking and achievement, in some cases narrowing the gap between them and students who took few or no CTE classes. However, there is no evidence that high school CTE courses themselves contribute to either academic achievement or college enrollment.

### Followup on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Career and Technical Education State Grants program was reviewed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) in 2002, and was rated "Ineffective." The PART review identified a number of weaknesses in the program, including unavailability of data on program outcomes, few positive findings on effectiveness from the most recent National Assessment of Vocational Education, and a lack of demonstrated State progress on the core indicators of performance specified in the statute.

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

- *Set short-term targets based on the measures in the new Perkins law and develop strategies for collecting the necessary data.* The Department has set targets for FY 2008 and 2009 for the performance measures that are tied to ESEA. During FY 2008, targets for the other performance indicators will be set for FY 2009 and 2010. The Department has issued guidance on measurement approaches and is updating its data collection instrument to align with the new measures in the reauthorized Perkins Act.
- *Issue regulations on implementation of performance measures systems under the new Perkins law.* The Department will make a final determination in January 2008 on whether to issue regulations on implementing the performance measures under the reauthorized Perkins Act. If the decision is to regulate, final regulations will be published by December 2008. The Department has issued guidance on measurement approaches for the program's indicators and expects to issue additional guidance in the event no regulations are issued.
- *Provide technical assistance on integrating challenging academic/career technical instruction and collecting and reporting better performance data under the new Perkins law.*



## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

During 2008, the Department will make a grant for a model project on rigorous programs of study and will post on its Web site a curriculum project on enhancing math and science instruction in a number of technical fields. In addition, the Department will host Data Quality Institutes in 2008 to provide assistance on improving the quality of performance data for the program.

- *Set long-term targets based on the measures in the new Perkins law.* In 2009, the Department will negotiate long-term targets for States for FY 2010-12.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Career and Technical Education: National programs

(Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, Section 114)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$7,860	0	-\$7,860

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV) includes an authority for National Programs to support research, development, demonstration, dissemination, evaluation, and assessment activities aimed at improving the quality and effectiveness of career and technical education. Within this authority, Perkins IV specifically calls for the operation of a national center to carry out scientifically based research in career and technical education and a national assessment of career and technical education programs operated under the Act. An interim report on the national assessment is due to Congress on January 1, 2010, and a final report is due on July 1, 2011.

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)
2003.....	\$11,922
2004.....	11,852
2005.....	11,757
2006.....	9,164
2007.....	10,000
2008.....	7,860

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2009, the Administration requests no funding for Career and Technical Education National Programs. This request is consistent with the decision to request no funding for the Career and Technical Education State Grant program. As the authority for National Programs is mostly focused on supporting activities to help States implement requirements of the State Grant program or to evaluate the success and impact of that implementation, no funds for National Activities are needed when the State Grants program is not operating.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: National programs

---

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
National Career and Technical Education Research Center	\$4,500	\$4,500	0
National Assessment of Career and Technical Education	3,000	1,560	0
Projects for strengthening accountability and improving program quality	2,500	1,800	0

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

In 2007, the Department made a new award for the National Career and Technical Education Research Center called for under Perkins IV. The Department will implement the following performance measures for the new Center: (1) the percentage of scientifically based research studies conducted by the Center that are of high relevance to career and technical education practices; (2) the percentage of products (e.g., instructional approaches, methods, programs, models, and strategies) disseminated to practitioners by the Center that are judged by expert panels to be of high quality; (3) the percentage of technical assistance services that are judged by target audiences to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice; and (4) the percentage of professional development activities offered by the Center that are judged by participants to be of high quality. The Department will set a baseline for these measures in 2009, based on results achieved by the Center with FY 2008 funds.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

(Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, Title II)

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$102,923	0	-\$102,923

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Tech Prep Education program provides grants to States, which in turn provide subgrants to consortia of local educational agencies and postsecondary institutions. The purpose of tech prep is to develop a structural link between secondary and postsecondary institutions that integrates academic and career and technical education and better prepares students to make the transition from high school to college and from college to careers. Each tech prep project is carried out under an articulation agreement between the participants in the consortium and consists of at least 2 years of high school followed by 2 years or more of higher education or apprenticeship. Tech Prep programs help students to attain a common core of required proficiencies in mathematics, science, reading, writing, communications, and technological skills. The programs are designed to lead to an associate's degree or a postsecondary certificate in a technical career field and, where appropriate, link to courses of study at 4-year institutions.

The Department distributes Tech Prep funds to States using the Career and Technical Education State Grants formula. States may target their Tech Prep funds to local programs by awarding funds to local consortia through a competition, or they may subgrant the funds on a formula basis.

Under the 2006 Perkins Act (Perkins IV), tech prep programs are subject to the same accountability measures as the Career and Technical Education State Grants. These measures require tech prep programs to continuously improve students' academic and technical skill proficiencies and their placement and retention in further education and employment. In addition, States must require local recipients that have failed to meet their performance targets for three consecutive years to resubmit their applications for Tech Prep funds. States also have the option of terminating these subgrants.

The 2006 Act includes a new provision that allows States to consolidate the Tech Prep funds they receive under the Act with the funds they receive for Career and Technical Education State Grants. States that choose to consolidate Tech Prep funds must distribute these funds in accordance with the requirements of the Career and Technical Education State Grants program, to carry out activities authorized under that program. These States are not required to report performance data separately for the funds they receive under the Tech Prep program.

## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

---

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.....	\$106,665
2005.....	105,812
2006.....	104,754
2007.....	104,753
2008.....	102,923

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2009, the Administration requests no funding for the Tech Prep Education State Grants program. This request is consistent with the Administration's policy of reducing or eliminating funding for lower-priority programs that are narrowly focused and have only limited impact. Instead, during this tight budget year, the Administration favors increasing funding for programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which have been key to improving student achievement and narrowing the achievement gap over the last 6 years. The Administration's proposal for reauthorization of that Act would significantly increase the share of Title I Grants to local educational agencies funds flowing to high schools, in order to support high school reform. The Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal would also spur the creation of stronger linkages between secondary and postsecondary institutions by requiring States to develop additional high school standards that are aligned with college entrance and workforce requirements. Those activities would strengthen high school education in general, rather than supporting a limited number of programs through a narrowly focused program such as Tech Prep.

The request is also consistent with the Administration's policy of not funding programs for which there is little or no evidence of effectiveness. The 2004 National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) identified several weaknesses in the Tech Prep program. In particular, the study found that the Tech Prep program had not been successful in creating distinct, rigorous programs of technical study that link high school and postsecondary education. In addition, the NAVÉ determined that tech prep programs were less likely to be offered in secondary schools with high proportions of economically disadvantaged, minority, or disabled students, even though the Perkins Act targets local funding to high-poverty school districts where these students are most likely to be going to school.

## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

---

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Number of grants	53	53	0
Range of grants	\$56-11,260	\$55-11,252	0
Average award	\$1,977	\$1,942	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.

Under Perkins IV, States must report on the performance of Tech Prep students under the core indicators of performance specified in section 113 of the Act. In 2007, the Department adopted new performance measures for the program in order to align them with the indicators under that Act. The new measures address Tech Prep student achievement on the statewide assessments of reading/language arts and mathematics that States must administer under ESEA Title I, as well as the rate of graduation of tech prep students from high school (as defined under Title I).

The Department has negotiated performance targets with States for those indicators for school years 2007-08 and 2008-09. In addition, the Department will be negotiating with States during 2008 on (1) secondary education measures for technical skill attainment, secondary school completion, placement, and nontraditional participation and completion; and (2) postsecondary measures for technical skill attainment; attainment of credentials, certificates, or diplomas; student retention or transfer; student placement; and nontraditional participation and completion.

The Department is still reporting on the previously established indicators on the performance of tech prep students on measures of secondary academic attainment and transition from secondary to postsecondary education because data for the new indicators will not be available until late 2008. Below is performance information for these measures.

**Goal: Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen education achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.**

**Objective:** *Ensure that concentrators, including special populations, make successful transitions to further education and employment.*

## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Tech Prep students who have completed high school.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2004</b>	88	87
<b>2005</b>	87	86
<b>2006</b>	88	88
<b>2007</b>	89	
<b>2008</b>	90	

<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Tech Prep students who have transitioned to postsecondary education.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2004</b>	87	66
<b>2005</b>	87	86
<b>2006</b>	61	89
<b>2007</b>	89	
<b>2008</b>	90	

<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Tech Prep students who meet State-established academic standards.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2004</b>	76	75
<b>2005</b>	77	77
<b>2006</b>	78	72
<b>2007</b>	79	
<b>2008</b>	80	

<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core indicators required under the statute. The State-reported student outcomes for the 2005-06 school year showed a small increase in the percentage of Tech Prep students who completed high school from 86 percent in 2005 to 88 percent in 2006, meeting the established target. The reported percentage of Tech Prep students who transitioned to postsecondary education grew from 86 percent in 2005 to 89 percent in 2006, surpassing the target of 61 percent. There was a decrease in the academic performance of Tech Prep students; in 2005, 77 percent of Tech Prep students met State-established academic standards and, in 2006, that figure was 72 percent. Targets are based on agreements with State agencies. No 2009 targets are provided because the Administration is not requesting funds for this program in fiscal year 2009.

The percentages provided above are composites of State-reported data; they do not represent either a national average or the results of any single national evaluation. Because States have had considerable latitude to set their own measures, measurement approaches, and data definitions, these data vary greatly from State to State. This limits the validity and usefulness of the data at the national level.

## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

The following are targets for the new measures, which address Tech Prep student achievement on the statewide assessments of reading/language arts and mathematics that States must administer under Title I, as well as the percentage of Tech Prep students who graduate from high school. These targets are based on the performance targets the Department has negotiated with States for these indicators for school years 2007-08 and 2008-09. Targets for school years 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12 will be negotiated in 2009. No 2009 targets are provided because the Administration is not requesting funds for this program in fiscal year 2009.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Tech Prep concentrators meeting the State-established reading/language arts standards.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	<b>63</b>	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Tech Prep concentrators meeting the State-established reading/mathematics standards.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	<b>38</b>	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Tech Prep students who graduated in the reporting year.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	<b>75</b>	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

### Efficiency Measures

The Department has adopted cost per participant as the efficiency measure for this program. This is also the efficiency measure for the common job training measures adopted by the Department and other agencies. However, the validity and usefulness of the data used for these calculations are questionable. State definitions of participants vary widely, limiting the validity of comparisons across States. Furthermore, States have not consistently identified the number of Tech Prep program participants separately from the number of participants under the Career and Technical Education State Grant program. The table below shows national-level costs per Tech Prep participant for fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005. Data for fiscal year 2006 will be available in late 2008.

	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>
<b>Cost per participant</b>	\$47	\$41	\$43



## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

---

#### Followup on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Tech Prep Education State Grants program underwent a Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review in 2002, and received a rating of "Results Not Demonstrated." The review found that the program is duplicative of the Career and Technical Education State Grants program and lacks data demonstrating that it has a significant impact on participating high school students.

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

- *Propose to terminate the program so that Federal resources for this program can be redirected to programs with a proven track record for effectiveness, such as Pell Grants.* The Administration is proposing termination in the FY 2009 President's Budget.
- *Issue regulations on implementation of performance measures systems under the new Perkins law.* Early in 2008, the Department will make a final determination on whether to issue regulations on implementing the performance measures under the 2006 Perkins Act. If the decision is to regulate, we anticipate the publication of final regulations in December 2008. The Department has issued guidance on measurement approaches for the program's performance indicators, and expects to issue additional guidance in the event no regulations are issued.
- *Provide technical assistance to recipients on improving the quality of performance data.* The Department will conduct Data Quality Institutes to promote valid and reliable data collection and submission by States. The National Research Center (discussed under Career and Technical Education National Programs) will also initiate technical assistance projects to help States improve data quality. In addition, Department staff conduct bi-monthly teleconference calls with States to discuss data issues.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

(Adult Education and Family Literacy Act and Workforce Investment Act, Section 503)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$554,122 <sup>2</sup>	\$554,122 <sup>2</sup>	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004; the program is authorized in FY 2008 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2009.

<sup>2</sup> FY 2008 appropriations language provides a \$68 million set-aside for English Literacy and Civics Education grants. The request for FY 2009 assumes continuation of this policy.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA), adult education grants to the States and Outlying Areas support programs that assist adults in becoming literate and obtaining the knowledge and skills necessary for employment and self-sufficiency; assist adults who are parents in obtaining the educational skills necessary to become full partners in the educational development of their children; and assist adults in the completion of a secondary education.

#### Adult Education State Grants

The Department awards formula grants to States and Outlying Areas. The formula provides an initial allotment of \$250,000 for each State and \$100,000 to each Outlying Area. Any additional funds are distributed on the basis of population aged 16 and older, individuals who are without a high school diploma or the equivalent, who are beyond the age of compulsory education, and who are not currently enrolled in secondary school. AEFLA also includes a "hold-harmless" provision that ensures that each State receives at least 90 percent of its previous year's amount. If funding is insufficient to satisfy the hold-harmless provision, each State is ratably reduced to receive the same proportion of available funding as in the previous year.

States may use up to 12.5 percent of their grant for State leadership activities and an additional 5 percent, or \$65,000 (whichever is greater), for State administration. At least 82.5 percent of a State's grant must be used for local awards; of this amount, up to 10 percent may be used to educate incarcerated and other institutionalized individuals. Of the funds provided by the State agency to eligible entities, at least 95 percent must be used for instructional activities.

States make grants to local entities that provide adult basic education, English literacy, adult secondary education, workplace literacy, and family literacy services. Local service providers include local educational agencies, community colleges, and community- and faith-based organizations. In distributing funds, States must give equitable access to all types of agencies and institutions that have the ability to provide adult education programs. States, in awarding

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### **Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants**

---

funds to local providers, must consider the extent to which these providers offer programs that, among other things, have measurable goals for client outcomes, can demonstrate past effectiveness in improving the literacy skills of adults and families, serve individuals who are most in need of literacy services, are built on a strong foundation of research about effective practices, and coordinate with other available resources in the community.

The State's leadership funds are used for State activities to improve adult education and literacy services, including professional development to improve the quality of instruction, technology assistance for local providers, and monitoring and evaluating the quality of local programs. States can also use a portion of their State leadership funds for financial incentives to reward local programs for high performance or exemplary program coordination.

To promote continuous program improvement, the Secretary and each State must reach agreement on annual performance targets for a number of "core indicators" in the areas of literacy skill improvement; placement in, retention in, or completion of postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment, or career advancement; and attainment of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent.

The Secretary reserves 1.72 percent of the total Adult Education appropriation to award incentive grants to States that exceed the agreed-upon performance levels for the AEFLA and other employment programs. Funds are transferred to the Secretary of Labor and are awarded along with funds reserved from the other programs.

### **English Literacy and Civics Education (EL/Civics) State Grants**

The Department also awards formula grants to States for English literacy and civics education from funds set aside from the Adult Education appropriation. Using Immigration and Naturalization Service data on the number of legal immigrants, the Department allocates 65 percent of funds based on each State's share of a 10-year average of immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence. The remaining 35 percent is allocated to States that have experienced recent growth in immigration, as measured by the average of the number of immigrants in the 3 most recent years. No State receives an award of less than \$60,000. States received EL/Civics formula grants for the first time in fiscal year 2000.

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.....	\$574,372
2005.....	569,672
2006.....	563,975
2007.....	563,975
2008.....	554,122

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### **Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants**

---

#### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department requests \$554 million for Adult Education State Grants, the same amount as the 2008 level, with the expectation that new authorizing legislation will take effect for fiscal year 2009. The Department believes that the program's "Effective" rating on the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), along with the unmet need for adult education services, particularly services for English language learners, support a modest increase for the program. The request would also provide a \$68 million set-aside for English Literacy/Civics Education State Grants.

According to the summary of findings from the 2003 National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL), certain subgroups of adult learners have shown little or no progress on measures associated with fundamental English language skills. The assessment, which examined prose, document, and quantitative literacy among adult learners, showed that when compared to the 1992 NAAL, Black and Asian/Pacific Islander scores increased both in prose and document literacy. During the same period, however, Hispanic learners decreased in competency on both measures. In addition, the overall percentage of adults who scored "proficient" in prose and document literacy on the NAAL declined between 1992 and 2003.

In addition to a skill gap between Hispanic adult learners and other racial and ethnic groups, high school dropout rates provide a continuing rationale for adult education programs. The Census Bureau reports a "status dropout rate," which represents the proportion of young people ages 16 through 24 who are out of school and who have not earned a high school credential. In October 2000, nearly 11 percent of students in that age group were not enrolled in high school and had not received a high school diploma or equivalent. For minority groups, the situation is worse: a 13.1 percent rate for Blacks; 27.8 percent for Hispanics; and 44.2 percent for Hispanics born outside of the United States.

Furthermore, immigration to the United States continues at a rapid pace. The most recent American Community Survey data from 2005 counted nearly 1.1 million immigrants as having entered the United States (including DC and Puerto Rico) during the previous 2 years. The growing pool of adult immigrants constitutes a second source of demand for adult education; programs that serve this population tend to have long waiting lists. The results of a survey conducted in the spring of 2006 by the National Council of State Directors of Adult Education highlight this need. Of the 43 States that responded to the survey, 40 confirmed that they had students on waiting lists. Within the 43 responding States, 66 percent of the local programs that responded confirmed that they had students on waiting lists. In some States, such as New York, programs have eliminated their waiting lists because the wait times could be as long as 1 or 2 years, and have resorted instead to a lottery system. A conservative estimate, resulting from the survey data, suggests that there are at least 90,000 adults who cannot access services.

Finally, the Department has ample evidence that Adult Education is an effective program. The PART assessment of the program, conducted in 2006, documents significant improvements in program management, increased participant data quality, and greater flexibility in addressing emerging issues in adult education, such as increased demand for English literacy in geographical regions that have not traditionally experienced high levels of immigration. The

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

Adult Education State Grants program is one of only two ED grant-making programs to receive the highest possible rating of “Effective.” The program has also demonstrated consistent improvements on measures of student performance and other program goals, such as job attainment and retention.

The program has continued to show progress in meeting its performance targets and has met all but one of them for 2006, with the remaining target missed by just one percentage point. The program also compares favorably with other Federal programs serving out-of-school youth and adult participants by demonstrating better student outcomes and a lower Federal cost per participant.

Even though Congress has not yet reauthorized the Adult Education State Grants program, the Department has taken proactive steps to address deficiencies identified through the PART process. For example, the Department has increased the availability of research-based instructional materials to adult education teachers, and all States are now using standardized assessments to measure student-learning gains. In addition, the Department has dramatically improved the quality and breadth of data collected through the program’s National Reporting System.

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Adult basic and literacy State grants	\$486,111	\$476,466	\$476,343
Range of awards to States	\$844-63,065	\$832-61,782 <sup>1</sup>	\$832-61,765 <sup>1</sup>
Total participants (estimated)	2,600,000	2,548,500	2,547,800
English literacy and civics education			
State grants	\$67,896	\$67,896	\$67,896
Range of awards to States	\$60-16,760	\$60-16,308 <sup>1</sup>	\$60-16,307 <sup>1</sup>
Number of students served (estimeted)	230,450	230,450	230,450
Incentive grants (maximum)	\$9,968	\$9,760	\$9,883
Range of awards	\$750-3,000	\$750-3,100	\$750-3,150

---

<sup>1</sup> Grant estimates for 2008 and 2009 assume formulae under current law.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### **Performance Measures**

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

---

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

The Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA), enacted as Title II of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998, identifies three core indicators that must be used to assess State performance. These are: (1) demonstrated improvements in skill levels in reading, writing, and speaking English; numeracy and problem-solving; English language acquisition, and other literacy skills; (2) placement in, retention in, or completion of postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment, or career advancement; and (3) receipt of a secondary school diploma or a recognized equivalent. The statute requires that the Department report annually to the Congress on State performance; the Department's 2007 report provided 2004-05 State data on the performance of all adult education students on each of the indicators.

In addition to the statutory indicators, the Department is collecting data for two other measures: (1) the percentage of adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program; and (2) the percentage of adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.

**Goal: To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.**

**Objective:** *Provide adult learners with opportunities to acquire basic foundation skills (including English language acquisition), complete secondary education, and transition to further education and training and to work.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults in Adult Basic Education programs who acquire the level of basic skills needed to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	42	38
2005	42	40
2006	39	39
2007	42	
2008	44	
2009	46	

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core indicators required under the statute. The most recent State-reported student outcomes are from 2006 and demonstrate that States have met the revised target. Despite improvements in performance on this measure in most years, GPRA targets for 2001-05 proved unrealistic. Targets for 2006-09 reflect ambitious yet attainable goals that build upon the most recent program performance levels.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults enrolled in English literacy programs who acquire the level of English language skills needed to complete the levels of instruction in which they enrolled.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	45	36
2005	45	37
2006	38	37
2007	40	
2008	42	
2009	44	

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core indicators required under the statute. The most recent State-reported student outcomes are for the 2005-06 school year. Performance has improved over the last 4 years, but the program is not yet reaching the GPRA targets. Targets for 2006-09 have been adjusted to reflect realistic, yet ambitious, goals for this measure.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	42	45
2005	46	51
2006	46	49
2007	52	
2008	53	
2009	54	

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core indicators required under the statute. The most recent State-reported student outcomes are for the 2005-06 school year. For the past 4 years, the program has exceeded its GPRA targets. Targets for 2007, 2008, and 2009 are based on performance against these measures and reflect ambitious performance goals based on recent data.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	27	30
2005	30	34
2006	33	35
2007	37	
2008	39	
2009	41	

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	38	36
2005	40	37
2006	40	48
2007	41	
2008	41	
2009	42	

**Assessment of progress:** States report annually on two of the Administration's job training common measures as recommended by the 2002 PART review. States have consistently exceeded the targets for these two measures.

The program has one additional measure, the percentage of adults who retained employment in the third quarter after exit; which is also one of the job training common measures. Data show that those adult learners who enter the program unemployed, with a goal of obtaining employment, and who then enter employment within the first quarter after exit tend to still be employed three quarters after program exit. Those adult learners who enter the program employed, with a goal of retaining employment, tend to still be employed three quarters after program exit. Baseline data were collected in 2006 and showed 64 percent of adults meeting the goals of the measure. Targets are 66 percent for 2007, 2008, and 2009.

#### Efficiency Measures

The Department has developed two efficiency measures for the Adult Education State Grants program. These are: (1) annual cost per participant, and (2) cost per student learning gain. The first measure was established under the Administration's common performance measures initiative for job training programs, and the Department has collected sufficient data to report this measure through the National Reporting System. The second measure captures the average Federal cost for a student to advance to at least the next higher educational level in an Adult Education program or to earn a high school diploma or General Educational Development (GED) credential.

<b>Measure:</b> The annual Federal cost per participant.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		\$218
2005	\$217	
2006	\$215	
2007	\$215	
2008	\$215	
2009	\$215	

**Assessment of progress:** This measure reflects the average annual Federal cost per participant for Adult Education programs. Data do not include State and local resources, which account for a large proportion of Adult Education funds. Because funds are available for 27 months, States will report FY 2005 costs by January 2008.



## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

---

<b>Measure:</b> The annual Federal cost per student learning gain or high school diploma/GED attainment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2004</b>		\$475
<b>2005</b>	\$475	
<b>2006</b>	\$451	
<b>2007</b>	\$428	
<b>2008</b>	\$407	
<b>2009</b>	\$407	

**Assessment of progress:** This measure examines the annual Federal cost for Adult Education students who advance to at least the next higher educational level or who attain a high school diploma or GED certificate. As improved assessment and scientifically based curricula are implemented in more Adult Education programs, it is anticipated that the cost per learning gain or high school/GED attainment will decrease. Because funds are available for 27 months, States will report FY 2005 costs by January 2008.

#### Followup on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Adult Education State Grants program received an “Effective” rating in 2006 on the PART review, significantly improving upon its 2002 PART rating of “Results Not Demonstrated.” The improved PART rating reflects the program’s response to weaknesses identified through the earlier PART and underscores significant improvements made in data collection, application of standardized assessments, and the use of data to improve program performance and management. While the 2002 PART rating for this program reflected a lack of quality participant data and performance management, the 2006 review of the program noted gains made in program performance and student outcomes, and evaluations that demonstrate the program’s effectiveness when compared to other Federal programs serving the same population. For example, the percentage of Adult education students who obtained a GED or high school diploma increased by 55 percent from 2001 to 2006. In addition, the 2006 review noted that the program recruits, retains, and assists more people from its target population at a lower cost than other job training programs.

One recommendation from the 2002 PART review focused on implementing reforms to the program that included increased grantee accountability, improved performance reporting, and a clear focus on improving participants’ reading, math, and literacy skills so that they can earn a degree or certificate and obtain employment leading to economic self-sufficiency. The Administration’s blueprint for reauthorization of Adult Education programs proposed reforms in those areas. The Department continues to use National Leadership Activities funds to assist States in identifying or adapting rigorous curriculum frameworks to guide instruction, developing technical assistance for local programs to help them apply scientifically based research, and using student outcome data to improve program performance. The Department has worked closely with States to improve the quality of participant data, and all States are now using standardized assessments to measure student-learning gains.

Another PART recommendation called for the Department to adopt common job training performance measures (including a new measure to gauge cost-effectiveness), short- and long-term targets based on the common measures, and a data collection strategy for the common

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### **Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants**

---

measures. The Department has established short- and long-term targets based on the common measures. In addition, in fiscal year 2002, the Department began collecting data on the common measures related to degree or certificate attainment, literacy and numeracy skills attainment, and employment placement and retention. Under current law, the Department does not have the authority to require States to report data for the common measure related to increase in earnings. The Administration supports legislative changes that would allow these data to be collected. In the interim, the Department has encouraged States to use unemployment insurance (UI) wage records to identify the employment outcomes of adult education participants. However, privacy restrictions prevent some States from accessing UI records for this purpose.

The PART improvement plan recommendations from the 2006 review are presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address them.

- *Improve the availability of program performance data to enable comparison across States.* The Department continues to take action to increase the availability of quality performance data. In the short term, the program office annually verifies the accuracy of performance and financial data reported by the States, including the two cost efficiency measures, and makes these data available through an online database. The program office continues to clean States' data from previous years (PY 2000 – PY 2004) and populates the public database with these data to ensure public access to improved data across States and programs.
- *Pursue reauthorization language to enable the Department to collect participants' earnings data, either through Unemployment Insurance (UI) records or through other means allowed by State law.* The Department continues to work with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to pursue the collection of participant earnings data through UI employment records in States that have legislative or policy limits on utilizing the individual social security numbers. Recent activity involved working jointly with OMB and the Department of Labor (DOL) to provide technical assistance and guidance on DOL's legislative proposal related to increasing data collection access to State employment records.
- *Provide training to all States and Outlying Areas to improve the overall quality of program performance data collected and reported by State and local programs.* The Department will enter into a multi-year technical assistance and training contract to develop and provide a training workshop for all grantees on how to develop an electronic reporting tool generated from the State-level individual database that enables States to monitor and evaluate the extent to which local programs are meeting Federal data quality standards contained in the Department's data quality standards checklist.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Adult education: National leadership activities

(Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, section 243)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$6,878	\$14,000	+\$7,122

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004; the program is authorized in FY 2008 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2009.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Adult Education national leadership and evaluation activities, as authorized under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA), address major policy priorities in adult education, including program improvement, accountability, professional development, and increasing access to learning opportunities for adults. Under this authority, the Department supports applied research, development, dissemination, evaluation, and program improvement activities to assist States in their efforts to improve the quality of adult education programs. Examples of these activities include: evaluations of the effectiveness of adult education programs, training institutes, national and international adult literacy surveys, and technical assistance on using technology to improve instruction.

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.....	\$9,169
2005.....	9,096
2006.....	9,005
2007.....	9,005
2008.....	6,878

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2009, the Department requests \$14 million for National Leadership Activities, \$7.1 million more than the 2008 level, in expectation that a reauthorized program will take effect by fiscal year 2009. The request provides continued support for a Web-based adult learning portal, a Presidential priority, as well as initial support for a demonstration program, "Bridge to College," designed to support non-traditional students in becoming college-ready.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National leadership activities

---

Reauthorization of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA) is currently pending in Congress. While specific National Leadership Activities are subject to change upon reauthorization of the Act, the 2009 request would support the continuation of activities that are closely aligned with the Department's goals of strengthening accountability, expanding options, increasing flexibility, and funding what works. The Department has also identified a need to provide enhanced support to States for the Adult Education State Grant program's uniform data collection and accountability system, including assistance on using data for program improvement, as well as a need to provide more research-based materials to States to improve the effectiveness of local programs.

In addition, 2009 funds would support activities to address the need to increase the literacy skills of our Nation's native-born adult population as well as the growing need to meet the English language acquisition and literacy skills needs of the immigrant population. Some activities to address those needs would include:

- Continued development of a model for a Web-based adult learning portal, consistent with the President's goal of expanding the availability of adult education services through online learning. Fiscal year 2009 activities will build on prior-year investments to further improve upon the model for low-level English language learners (ELLs) and inform the Department of the elements needed to ensure the success of the adult online learner. The portal would provide access to instruction for adults seeking citizenship, a General Educational Development (GED) credential, or basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics.
- Creation of a demonstration program, "Bridge to College," intended to help ensure that non-traditional students enter college prepared to complete college-level work. More specifically, the program would aim to increase the number of non-traditional students who enroll in postsecondary education, reduce their need for remediation, and increase the availability of non-academic support services for these students. At the requested \$5 million level, the Department would fund a limited number of model or demonstration schools that can serve as resources and models for replication in future years.
- Continued support for the Adult English Language Education Technical Assistance Network (AELETAN), which supports adult English language learners (ELLs) by providing research-based resources for adult ELL educators and targeted technical assistance to States in need of improving their professional development systems for teachers of adult ELLs.
- Additional support for the Student Achievement in Reading (STAR) network—currently consisting of six States (California, Connecticut, Illinois, Maine, Ohio, and South Dakota)—to extend the network to adult education classrooms in new local programs and into additional States. FY 2009 funding will help States to maintain trainers qualified to assist teachers and program directors on implementing evidence-based reading strategies and will support the maintenance of a Web-based toolkit on such strategies.
- Continued work on a multi-year project to build on the work of the President's National Math Panel in order to assist States in improving mathematics outcomes for low-skilled adults. Activities include the creation of publications and tools specific to improving adult numeracy, promoting teacher quality, and identifying evidence-based practices and products.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National leadership activities

---

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Bridge to College	0	0	5,000 <sup>1</sup>
Research and evaluation	2,792	1,000 <sup>1</sup>	1,000 <sup>1</sup>
Technical assistance	6,213	5,878 <sup>1</sup>	8,000 <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Specific program activities may change upon reauthorization of the program.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

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

**Goal: To support research, evaluation, information dissemination, and other activities to help States improve adult education, and literacy programs.**

**Objective:** *To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of States submitting high-quality learner assessment data under the National Reporting System (NRS).		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2004</b>	95	75
<b>2005</b>	96	80
<b>2006</b>	100	80
<b>2007</b>	100	
<b>2008</b>	100	
<b>2009</b>	100	

**Assessment of progress:** The targets have not been met for this measure, although the percentage of States reporting high-quality data has increased significantly, from 65 percent in 2003, to 80 percent in 2005 and 2006. The target for 2006 and beyond is that 100 percent of States will provide consistent, high-quality assessment data regarding adult learners. Through National Leadership Activities, the Department offers technical assistance and guidance designed to help all States meet high standards for the collection and reporting of these data.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### **Adult education: National leadership activities**

---

While the adult education field has made considerable progress in meeting the variety of skill needs of U.S. adults, the program serves a small percentage of eligible adults annually. New technology-based instructional strategies and mechanisms will help provide greater access to programs and services. Therefore, the Department continues to explore a second measure that may track the Department's efforts to help States increase their capacity to serve more adults with low basic literacy skills.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### **Adult education: National Institute for Literacy** (Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, Section 242)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$6,468	\$6,468	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004; the program is authorized in FY 2008 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2009.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The National Institute for Literacy (NIFL) was created in 1991 to: (1) provide national leadership on issues related to literacy; (2) coordinate literacy services and policy; and (3) serve as a national resource for adult education and literacy programs through dissemination of the best and most current information and by supporting the creation of new ways to offer services of proven effectiveness. Through a variety of capacity-building activities, NIFL supports the development of State, regional, and national literacy services. NIFL's activities incorporate the input of adult learners in planning and implementation, build on and enhance existing efforts in the field, leverage resources from agency and private-sector partners, and promote collaborations among individuals and groups who have an interest in adult and family literacy.

The appropriation for NIFL supports both program activities and administrative expenses, including operational costs as well as personnel compensation and benefit costs. The appropriation also supports the work of NIFL's Advisory Board, which is appointed by the President. In addition, an interagency group, composed of the Secretaries of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services, sets policy for NIFL. The Board is responsible for providing independent advice on NIFL's operations and works with the interagency group to help set NIFL's goals and plan its programs. NIFL also receives a \$5 million set-aside from the Reading First appropriation for the dissemination of information related to scientifically based reading research and effective 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.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National Institute for Literacy

---

Funding levels for the past 5 years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$6,692
2005.....	6,638
2006.....	6,572
2007.....	6,583
2008.....	6,468

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department requests \$6.5 million for the National Institute for Literacy, the same as the 2008 appropriation. The Department believes that level funding will be sufficient for NIFL's continued leadership in improving literacy instruction. The budget request assumes reauthorization of the program by fiscal year 2009.

NIFL, a quasi-independent agency, has developed strong partnerships with adult literacy service providers through its dissemination, professional development, and technical assistance activities. NIFL has created Web-based resources focusing on literacy and has worked to synthesize findings from scientifically based reading research. NIFL's role also includes synthesis and dissemination of evidence-based research on children's reading. NIFL administers the Partnership for Reading, a joint effort with the Department of Education and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, whose mission is to provide information to literacy instructors and parents regarding the most successful instructional techniques.

While specific NIFL activities are subject to change upon reauthorization of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, the 2009 request would support activities that are closely aligned with NIFL's priorities, established with direction from the Interagency Group and guidance from its Advisory Board. Those activities include the dissemination of information and resources, translation of research into guidance and tools that can be used in practice, identification of high-performing programs, development of practices and policies that produce desirable outcomes, and support for research on literacy acquisition. Ongoing initiatives supported with funds appropriated to NIFL include, among other things:

- Reading — Since FY 2001, NIFL has supported the development and maintenance of a research-based online diagnostic reading tool intended to enable adult education practitioners to base their instruction on students' reading strengths and weaknesses. In FY 2009, NIFL expects to continue its support of activities that develop practitioners' ability to teach language and language skills, such as fluency, vocabulary and comprehension, and other elements of reading to General Educational Development (GED)-level students. NIFL also plans to support a new round of research on adult reading to answer questions identified in the adult literacy research agenda that NIFL funded. The adult literacy research agenda should be completed in early 2008.



## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National Institute for Literacy

---

- Learning Disabilities/Bridges to Practice — The *Bridges to Practice* project helps adult educators learn to recognize learning disabilities in adult students, screen for learning disabilities, and identify appropriate academic and job preparation activities for adults with learning disabilities. In FY 2009, NIFL expects to continue work to implement an updated, streamlined system of professional development using new materials based on the findings of a comprehensive literature review currently underway. Preliminary results suggest the need to restructure the current training to include both online and face-to-face components.
  
- Literacy Information and Communications System (LINCS) — *LINCS* includes (1) an online library of more than 10,000 catalogued literacy resources, 12 electronic discussion lists, and 12 “special collections” of materials on specific topics, and (2) training and technical assistance for States and local providers who are seeking to improve the use of technology in teaching and learning. At the end of fiscal year 2005, NIFL completed a comprehensive review of *LINCS*. Based on the results of the review, NIFL is in the process of redesigning *LINCS* to narrow the range of resources provided, emphasizing information and materials based on scientific research; improve the site’s architecture and navigation; and focus the technical assistance, offered through three regional centers, on the use of *LINCS* resources in classroom instruction. The redesigned system will promote the dissemination of online resources and training modules to State-level organizations and professional development networks. By February of 2008, the foundational tasks for the new system, including needs assessments, maps of professional development systems, and dissemination plans, will be completed and dissemination activities will begin. NIFL will host the competition for the regional centers and would fund the first year of grants using FY 2009 funds.

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Disseminating high-quality information	\$2,834	\$2,760	\$2,000
Translating research into practice	605	596	1,106
Supporting rigorous research	<u>550</u>	<u>550</u>	<u>800</u>
Total program costs	3,989	3,906	3,906 <sup>1</sup>
Personnel, compensation, and benefits	\$1,782	\$1,782	\$1,782
Other (non-personnel costs)	<u>812</u>	<u>780</u>	<u>780</u>
Total administrative costs	2,594	2,562	2,562
Number of full-time equivalent personnel	16	16	16

---

<sup>1</sup> Specific program activities may change upon reauthorization of the program.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National Institute for Literacy

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

In 2006, the Department worked with NIFL staff to develop performance measures that will more accurately gauge NIFL's effectiveness in serving its target populations. The previous indicators used by NIFL focused on specific program activities rather than a comprehensive review of NIFL's work. The measures are partially adapted from a set of common measures developed as part of a cross-Department effort to achieve consistency in assessing the performance of ED technical assistance programs. The measures are:

- For those who receive technical assistance through NIFL programs, the percentage of recipients who report that they are likely to implement instructional practices grounded in scientifically based research (or the most rigorous research available);
- The percentage of those assisted who can demonstrate that they implemented instructional practices grounded in scientifically based research within 6 months of receiving the technical assistance; and
- The percentage of products disseminated by NIFL that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent panel of qualified scientists.

The Department will continue to work with NIFL to establish baseline levels for the measures. Due to delays in the redesign of the *Bridges to Practice* training and *LINCS*, NIFL was not able to collect baseline data in FY 2007, but plans to do so in FY 2008.

In 2007, the Department worked with NIFL to establish an efficiency measure: the percentage of contracts awarded by NIFL that are completed within the original performance period. For fiscal year 2007, the level was 23 percent. NIFL has set targets that increase by 5 percentage points in 2008, 2009, and 2010.

In FY 2007, the Department began reviewing NIFL through an abridged Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) process. A formal PART review of NIFL is planned for FY 2008.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Smaller learning communities

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 4)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$80,108	0	-\$80,108

---

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

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Smaller Learning Communities program supports competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to enable those agencies to create smaller, more personalized learning environments in large schools. LEAs use the funds to, among other things: (1) study the feasibility of creating a smaller learning community or communities; (2) research, develop, and implement strategies for creating smaller learning communities; and (3) provide professional development for school staff in innovative teaching methods that would be used in the smaller learning community or communities.

In fiscal years 2000 through 2008, appropriations language has directed the Department to make awards only to support the creation of smaller learning communities in large high schools. For purposes of this program, the Department has defined a large high school as a school that includes grades 11 and 12 and serves at least 1,000 students in grades 9 and above. Strategies for creating smaller learning communities within large high schools include establishing "houses" or career academies, block scheduling, and teacher advisory systems. In fiscal years 2000 through 2008, appropriations language also authorized the Department to reserve a portion of program funds for evaluation, technical assistance, school networking, peer review of applications, and program outreach activities.

The Department has made two types of awards under this program: (1) implementation grants, which provide 3-year awards to support the creation or expansion of smaller learning communities; and (2) planning grants, which provide 1 year of funding to help LEAs plan smaller learning communities. Fiscal year 2003 was the fourth and last year that the Department made planning grants.

This is a forward-funded program that includes current-year appropriations. A portion of the funds, which are used for national activities, becomes available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which the funds are appropriated and remains available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year. The remaining funds become available for obligation on October 1 of the fiscal year in which the funds are appropriated and remain available for 12 months.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$173,967
2005.....	94,476
2006.....	93,531
2007.....	93,531
2008.....	80,108

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Smaller Learning Communities (SLC) 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 Administration policy to not fund programs that have other, ample available sources of support and for which there is no clear Federal role. The request is also supported by findings from the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review of the program in 2005, waning interest in the program, and a lack of data on the effects of smaller learning communities on student achievement.

The Department believes that there is little need for a specific Federal program to support the creation of smaller learning communities because of the ready availability, since 2000, of non-Federal funds for such purposes. Over the life of the SLC program, it has largely duplicated private-sector efforts of the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, as well as other foundations that have supported multi-year high school reform initiatives that focused, in part, on creating smaller learning communities. Recently, there appears to be less duplication, but only because grantmakers and others have come to question the value of smaller learning communities as an education reform strategy and have reduced their support. For example, in 2005, the Gates Foundation indicated that its grants at the high-school level would no longer focus on structural change as a first step in fostering the transformation of high schools, in part because evaluations had shown that “the disruptive process of structural change has distracted leaders, teachers, and students from the end goal” and that “extraordinary levels of time and political capital have been spent on restructuring, with little change in curriculum and instruction—and ultimately in student achievement” (Education Week, June 22, 2005: *Commentary: Achieving ‘Success at Scale’*, by Tom Vander Ark, pp. 46-47, 56).

The private efforts and the Federal program have more than met the demand for support for smaller learning communities among LEAs. Evidence shows limited interest in the Federal grants. By the end of fiscal year 2006, the Department had made approximately 900 planning and implementation grants to LEAs and supported the implementation of SLCs in about 30 percent of the 4,700 high schools eligible for SLC support. Many eligible schools have not chosen to create smaller learning communities, which is one indication that the program has already reached the LEAs with eligible high schools that have commitment to, and support for, the SLC restructuring strategy. In the most recent competition (awards made in September 2007), the number of applicants declined by 13 percent. The results of the previous

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

competition showed that 41 percent of applicants had received previous implementation grants. Interest in the program continues to be narrowly concentrated geographically; about a quarter of the FY 2006 and 2007 applications came from California, Florida, and Texas.

Further, the remaining need for assistance in creating smaller learning communities can be adequately supported by State formula grant funds and other sources. For example, the Administration's 2009 budget request includes several proposals specifically to improve academic achievement and graduation rates for at-risk high school students. The Administration seeks a \$406 million increase for Title I, and the Administration's reauthorization proposal would significantly increase the share of Title I funds that go to high schools. Depending on local priorities, LEAs would be able to use Title I funds, and those from other formula programs, to promote academic achievement by, among other things, restructuring schools into smaller learning communities. Also, a \$65 million increase for the Striving Readers program would significantly expand the development and implementation of research-based interventions to improve the skills of secondary school students who are reading significantly below grade level. In addition, the Administration is proposing \$70 million to expand the availability of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate programs in schools with large populations of low-income students to help ensure that such students are able to prepare for and successfully complete challenging, college-level curricula.

Finally, available research studies are unable to shed much light on the effects of smaller learning communities on student achievement. One general finding is that, in poorer communities, smaller schools exhibit higher achievement than larger schools, but in more affluent communities, bigger seems to be better. Another general finding is that students are more engaged in school activities in smaller schools and feel more connected to their schools. However, in a recent analysis of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, a federally funded survey of 72,000 adolescents in grades 7–12, a group of researchers at the University of Minnesota found that while a sense of "connectedness" to school is critical to a teenager's well-being, the effects of school size and class size are minimal. Instead, the report found that school climate, teacher empathy, consistency of application of rules and regulations, and classroom management are important. Currently, no findings are available from research using random assignment designs that allow strong conclusions about the effects of smaller schools on performance.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Number of new implementation grants	44 <sup>1,2</sup>	10 <sup>1</sup>	0
New implementation grants	\$88,855	\$19,103	
Average implementation grant	\$2,000	\$2,000	0
Average grant length (years)	5	5	0
Number of continuation awards	0	50 <sup>2</sup>	0
Continuation awards	0	\$57,000	0
Number of schools served	135	193	0
Peer review/national activities	\$4,676	\$4,005	0

---

<sup>1</sup>The Department intends to provide 3 years of funding for each grant from a single year's appropriation. Projects being implemented successfully may then receive additional funds in year 4.

<sup>2</sup>The data provided for FY 2007 are projections only. Since this is a forward-funded program, the FY 2007 appropriation will fund new awards in 2008 and the FY 2008 appropriation will fund 2-year continuation awards to grantees selected in the FY 2005 competition.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

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

The Department collects data for four outcome measures. Data for those measures are presented here. The Department collects and tracks data by each cohort of grantees.

**Goal: To assist high schools to create smaller learning communities that can prepare all students to achieve to challenging standards and succeed in college and careers.**

**Objective:** *Students in schools receiving smaller learning communities implementation grants will demonstrate continuous improvement in achievement in core subjects, as well as exhibit positive behavioral changes.*

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants scoring at or above proficient on State mathematics assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	60.0	48.0
2005	63.0	50.0
2006	63.0	
2007	64.5	
2008	65.0	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants scoring at or above proficient on State reading assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	70.0	54.0
2005	74.0	55.9
2006	78.0	
2007	79.0	
2008	80.0	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of graduates in schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants who enroll in postsecondary education, apprenticeships, or advanced training for the semester following graduation.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		77.8
2005		81.6
2006	82.1	
2007	83.0	
2008	83.5	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Communities grants who graduate from high school.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	63.0	86.0
2005	66.0	85.2
2006	69.0	
2007	69.3	
2008	69.5	

**Assessment of progress:** The data for performance measures are provided by grantees in their annual performance reports. The Department does not verify these data, although the Department is providing its grantees with assistance to improve the quality of the data provided in the reports. The grantee-reported data for the percentage of students graduating from high schools show a marked increase in 2004 and 2005. However, data provided for the percentages of students scoring proficient or better on the reading and mathematics assessments indicate that the program has fallen far short of its targets for 2 years in a row. The Department collects data by cohorts of grantees, which may explain significant increases or decreases in the actual data. The targets for these measures are tied to the NCLB goal of achieving proficiency by 2014 and have been set accordingly. Data for 2006 will be available in

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

late February 2008. No 2009 targets are provided because the Department is not requesting funding for this program in FY 2009.

#### Efficiency Measures

<b>Measure:</b> The cost per student (in dollars) demonstrating proficiency or advanced skills in reading.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2006</b>		\$416.0
<b>2007</b>	\$414.0	\$380.0
<b>2008</b>	\$412.0	

<b>Measure:</b> The cost per student (in dollars) demonstrating proficiency or advanced skills in mathematics.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2006</b>		\$475.0
<b>2007</b>	\$473.0	\$425.0
<b>2008</b>	\$471.0	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department calculates the cost by dividing the amount of program funds granted in a given year by the number of students served by the SLC program who score proficient or above on State reading and mathematics assessments. No 2009 targets are provided because the Department is not requesting funding for this program in FY 2009.

#### Other Performance Information

Many districts implementing Smaller Learning Communities projects have focused on the ninth grade, particularly through an intervention called “freshman academies” that provides tailored, intensive programs of study designed to ease the transition to high school for ninth-grade students. In 2004, the Department began a study to assess the impact of two supplemental reading interventions for struggling ninth-grade students that, as part of the study, will be implemented within participating freshman academies. The evaluation is examining: whether the interventions in the freshman academies improve reading proficiency, the effects on students’ attendance and coursetaking, students’ achievement in subsequent grades, and the characteristics of students who benefit most from participation in the interventions. The Department expects to publish the first interim report on findings from this evaluation early in 2008.

In addition, the Department carried out a descriptive evaluation of the Smaller Learning Communities program that examined FY 2001 grantees’ implementation of smaller learning communities, school data on students’ academic and behavioral outcomes, and differences in SLC approaches. Among other things, the study measured the extent to which schools funded in FY 2001 implemented all of the key features of the SLC program by the end of the grant period, rating them as high, moderate, or low implementers after assessing a set of defined features, such as common planning time for teachers. Most schools examined for the study adopted freshman or career academies as the primary approach for creating smaller learning communities. The study rated, as high or moderately implementing, 46 of 58 freshman



## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

academies and 34 of 44 career academies. But the annual performance report data reviewed for the evaluation showed little change in academic and behavioral outcomes. The Department plans to release this evaluation early this year.

### Followup on PART Findings and Recommendations

The 2005 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review gave the program a rating of “Results Not Demonstrated” and called attention to other deficiencies, in addition to the program’s significant overlap with private efforts. For example, the program has not addressed some strategic planning deficiencies or met its targets for increasing academic achievement in reading and mathematics, and grantees’ performance data are not publicly available. The Department has, however, addressed other deficiencies noted through the PART. For example, the Department has established baselines and long-term and annual targets for all six of the program’s performance measures and has also established a second efficiency measure for the program.

Additional PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by the Department’s actions to address them:

- *Develop a plan for phasing in the use of data collected from States (school-level data on student performance on standardized assessments and graduation rates) through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) submission system instead of collecting those data directly from grantees.* School-level data on student performance on standardized assessments and graduation rates are expected to be available through the EDEN submission system in the next several years.
- *Make performance data for active grants and for all school years available to the public.* In response to this recommendation, the program office will publicize grantee performance data for all active grants by the fall of 2008 and annually thereafter on the Department’s Web site. This year’s report will identify aggregate and grantee-level outcome data for active SLC grantee cohorts.
- *Produce and disseminate a guide for grantees on methods for improving the validity and reliability of the data they report on student enrollment in postsecondary education.* The program office is responding to the needs of grantees in order to improve the data collection methods and the quality of data.
- *Work with Congress to terminate funding for this duplicative program.* The Administration has requested no funds for this program again in 2009.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### State grants for incarcerated youth offenders

(Higher Education Amendments of 1998, Title VIII, Part D)

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

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$22,372	0	-\$22,372

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004; the program is authorized in FY 2008 through appropriations language. The Administration is not proposing appropriations language for FY 2009, nor seeking reauthorizing legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under this program, the Department makes grants to State correctional agencies to assist and encourage incarcerated youth to acquire functional literacy and mathematics skills as well as life and job skills. These youth are provided opportunities to pursue postsecondary education certificates or associate or bachelor's degrees. During and following their release from prison, they may also receive employment counseling and other related services to help ensure their successful reintegration into society.

In order to receive services under this program, a student must be 25 years of age or younger and be eligible to be released or paroled from prison within 5 years. Services may be provided to students for up to 5 years. On an annual basis, grantees may receive up to \$1,500 per eligible student for tuition, books, and materials, and up to \$300 per student for related services such as career development, substance abuse counseling, parenting skills training, and health education.

The Department distributes funds to States under a formula based on the number of eligible students in each State. In order to receive a grant, a State correctional agency must demonstrate how it will integrate the proposed programs with existing State correctional programs—such as adult education, vocational training, and graduate education degree programs—and State industry programs.

State correctional agencies receiving grants must provide annual evaluation reports to the Secretary of Education and the Attorney General. These reports must include measures of program completion, student academic and vocational skill attainment, success in job placement and retention, and recidivism.

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.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### State grants for incarcerated youth offenders

---

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$19,882
2005.....	21,824
2006.....	22,770
2007.....	22,770
2008.....	22,372

### FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

No funds are requested for the State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders program for fiscal year 2009. This request is consistent with the Administration's policy to eliminate small, categorical programs that have only indirect or limited effect on improving student outcomes and for which there are other available sources of funding. States may use up to 1 percent of the funds they receive from the Department under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education State Grants program to serve individuals in State institutions, including State correctional institutions.

Other Federal programs, such as those at the Department of Labor and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, may serve many of the needs of this population. The Reintegration of Ex-Offenders (REO) program at the Department of Labor, for example, offers a range of job training, housing, and mentoring services for juveniles and adults. For juvenile offenders, REO provides a greater focus on building basic literacy and mathematics skills and the completion of secondary education through alternative education pathways, leading to career opportunities through postsecondary credentialing programs or pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship programs. In addition, non-Federal funds, including State appropriations and prisoner self-funding, are also available to support correctional education.

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Average State award	\$455	\$447	0
Range of awards	\$27–2,579	\$27–2,579	0
Number of awards	50	50	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

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### State grants for incarcerated youth offenders

---

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

**Goal: Contribute to the reduction of recidivism by providing incarcerated youth offenders with educational services.**

**Objective:** *Improve the vocational and academic achievement of students served through State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students in the facility participating in the program completing a postsecondary education certificate, associate of arts, or bachelor's degree during the program year.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2004</b>		50.0
<b>2005</b>	50.0	23.5
<b>2006</b>	23.5	23.5
<b>2007</b>	25.5	38.5
<b>2008</b>	26.5	

**Assessment of progress:** In 2007, approximately 39 percent of students in the program's participating facilities completed a postsecondary education certificate, associate of arts, or bachelor's degree, exceeding the target of 26 percent. No targets are shown for 2009, as the program is proposed for elimination. Data reported for 2004 and prior years are not comparable, as they include participants who completed individual courses only (in addition to those obtaining degrees and certificates).

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and Technical Education State Grants

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	19,774,207	19,418,936	0	(19,418,936)
Alaska	4,214,921	4,214,921	0	(4,214,921)
Arizona	25,043,432	24,863,637	0	(24,863,637)
Arkansas	12,556,175	12,429,569	0	(12,429,569)
California	129,514,828	126,118,077	0	(126,118,077)
Colorado	15,865,151	15,260,254	0	(15,260,254)
Connecticut	10,274,130	10,527,977	0	(10,527,977)
Delaware	4,914,046	4,845,374	0	(4,845,374)
District of Columbia	4,214,921	4,214,921	0	(4,214,921)
Florida	64,341,737	60,244,066	0	(60,244,066)
Georgia	37,972,843	38,568,090	0	(38,568,090)
Hawaii	5,811,469	5,709,942	0	(5,709,942)
Idaho	6,854,771	6,618,362	0	(6,618,362)
Illinois	45,113,401	44,226,291	0	(44,226,291)
Indiana	25,869,765	25,607,793	0	(25,607,793)
Iowa	12,149,672	12,127,688	0	(12,127,688)
Kansas	11,335,552	10,996,331	0	(10,996,331)
Kentucky	18,060,923	17,905,647	0	(17,905,647)
Louisiana	21,645,169	21,041,943	0	(21,041,943)
Maine	5,811,469	5,709,942	0	(5,709,942)
Maryland	16,917,168	17,234,220	0	(17,234,220)
Massachusetts	18,392,738	19,454,915	0	(19,454,915)
Michigan	39,795,633	39,694,726	0	(39,694,726)
Minnesota	18,174,686	17,451,847	0	(17,451,847)
Mississippi	13,802,655	13,973,092	0	(13,973,092)
Missouri	23,901,445	23,264,244	0	(23,264,244)
Montana	5,549,303	5,468,522	0	(5,468,522)
Nebraska	7,081,437	7,013,323	0	(7,013,323)
Nevada	8,424,242	7,742,830	0	(7,742,830)
New Hampshire	5,811,469	5,709,942	0	(5,709,942)
New Jersey	25,034,642	25,395,043	0	(25,395,043)
New Mexico	9,300,232	9,012,306	0	(9,012,306)
New York	59,600,631	59,567,164	0	(59,567,164)
North Carolina	35,217,062	35,132,215	0	(35,132,215)
North Dakota	4,214,921	4,214,921	0	(4,214,921)
Ohio	45,707,822	44,923,905	0	(44,923,905)
Oklahoma	15,709,771	15,094,180	0	(15,094,180)
Oregon	14,387,572	14,041,738	0	(14,041,738)
Pennsylvania	45,499,323	44,534,922	0	(44,534,922)
Rhode Island	5,811,469	5,709,942	0	(5,709,942)
South Carolina	18,949,906	19,039,797	0	(19,039,797)
South Dakota	4,429,907	4,353,301	0	(4,353,301)
Tennessee	24,032,593	23,424,774	0	(23,424,774)
Texas	95,429,038	93,045,282	0	(93,045,282)
Utah	12,656,383	12,693,975	0	(12,693,975)
Vermont	4,214,921	4,214,921	0	(4,214,921)
Virginia	25,932,742	24,706,882	0	(24,706,882)
Washington	23,078,558	21,636,549	0	(21,636,549)
West Virginia	8,428,617	8,428,617	0	(8,428,617)
Wisconsin	22,103,558	21,574,071	0	(21,574,071)
Wyoming	4,214,921	4,214,921	0	(4,214,921)
American Samoa	350,000	347,510	0	(347,510)
Guam	660,000	655,304	0	(655,304)
Northern Mariana Islands	350,000	347,510	0	(347,510)
Puerto Rico	18,526,796	18,758,546	0	(18,758,546)
Virgin Islands	623,061	613,021	0	(613,021)
Freely Associated States (PREL)	160,000	158,862	0	(158,862)
Indian set-aside (BIA)	14,769,414	14,511,391	0	(14,511,391)
Other (non-State allocations)	2,969,902	2,902,278	0	(2,902,278)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,181,553,120</b>	<b>1,160,911,269</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(1,160,911,269)</b>

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Tech Prep Education State Grants

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	1,995,785	1,994,292	0	(1,994,292)
Alaska	360,858	250,163	0	(250,163)
Arizona	1,983,698	1,880,272	0	(1,880,272)
Arkansas	1,186,934	1,186,046	0	(1,186,046)
California	11,260,243	11,251,821	0	(11,251,821)
Colorado	1,394,658	1,393,615	0	(1,393,615)
Connecticut	869,581	868,931	0	(868,931)
Delaware	442,883	229,550	0	(229,550)
District of Columbia	309,309	134,677	0	(134,677)
Florida	5,096,530	4,815,872	0	(4,815,872)
Georgia	3,076,714	3,074,413	0	(3,074,413)
Hawaii	523,764	411,510	0	(411,510)
Idaho	624,444	623,977	0	(623,977)
Illinois	4,052,360	4,049,329	0	(4,049,329)
Indiana	2,465,494	2,463,650	0	(2,463,650)
Iowa	1,245,235	1,244,304	0	(1,244,304)
Kansas	1,066,366	1,065,568	0	(1,065,568)
Kentucky	1,863,662	1,862,268	0	(1,862,268)
Louisiana	2,190,094	2,188,456	0	(2,188,456)
Maine	525,905	525,512	0	(525,512)
Maryland	1,541,700	1,540,547	0	(1,540,547)
Massachusetts	1,649,446	1,648,212	0	(1,648,212)
Michigan	3,644,492	3,641,766	0	(3,641,766)
Minnesota	1,736,576	1,735,277	0	(1,735,277)
Mississippi	1,390,909	1,389,869	0	(1,389,869)
Missouri	2,179,465	2,177,835	0	(2,177,835)
Montana	500,136	428,023	0	(428,023)
Nebraska	709,518	708,987	0	(708,987)
Nevada	667,287	527,487	0	(527,487)
New Hampshire	523,764	376,158	0	(376,158)
New Jersey	2,188,871	2,187,234	0	(2,187,234)
New Mexico	834,472	833,848	0	(833,848)
New York	5,246,770	5,242,846	0	(5,242,846)
North Carolina	2,995,591	2,993,351	0	(2,993,351)
North Dakota	338,530	313,151	0	(313,151)
Ohio	4,449,520	4,446,192	0	(4,446,192)
Oklahoma	1,571,037	1,569,862	0	(1,569,862)
Oregon	1,291,669	1,290,703	0	(1,290,703)
Pennsylvania	4,238,522	4,235,352	0	(4,235,352)
Rhode Island	523,764	338,543	0	(338,543)
South Carolina	1,731,379	1,730,084	0	(1,730,084)
South Dakota	399,250	352,942	0	(352,942)
Tennessee	2,233,311	2,231,641	0	(2,231,641)
Texas	8,397,736	8,391,455	0	(8,391,455)
Utah	1,196,451	1,195,556	0	(1,195,556)
Vermont	341,854	237,187	0	(237,187)
Virginia	2,419,604	2,417,794	0	(2,417,794)
Washington	2,038,374	2,036,850	0	(2,036,850)
West Virginia	877,270	876,614	0	(876,614)
Wisconsin	2,106,802	2,105,226	0	(2,105,226)
Wyoming	276,937	233,729	0	(233,729)
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	1,921,202	1,919,765	0	(1,919,765)
Virgin Islands	56,154	54,653	0	(54,653)
Freely Associated States (PREL)	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0
Total	104,752,880	102,922,965	0	(102,922,965)

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	9,047,073	8,867,545	8,865,262	(2,283)
Alaska	967,882	953,231	953,045	(186)
Arizona	8,607,306	8,436,753	8,434,584	(2,169)
Arkansas	5,457,076	5,350,811	5,349,460	(1,351)
California	63,063,458	61,781,581	61,765,276	(16,305)
Colorado	5,635,410	5,525,506	5,524,108	(1,398)
Connecticut	4,944,875	4,849,063	4,847,845	(1,218)
Delaware	1,408,845	1,385,195	1,384,894	(301)
District of Columbia	1,272,285	1,251,423	1,251,157	(266)
Florida	27,583,902	27,026,081	27,018,985	(7,096)
Georgia	14,812,624	14,515,435	14,511,654	(3,781)
Hawaii	1,825,193	1,793,047	1,792,639	(408)
Idaho	2,029,457	1,993,143	1,992,681	(462)
Illinois	19,617,723	19,222,473	19,217,446	(5,027)
Indiana	9,542,380	9,352,744	9,350,332	(2,412)
Iowa	3,960,711	3,884,984	3,884,021	(963)
Kansas	3,709,272	3,638,676	3,637,778	(898)
Kentucky	8,488,221	8,320,098	8,317,959	(2,139)
Louisiana	9,142,005	8,960,540	8,958,231	(2,309)
Maine	1,948,521	1,913,858	1,913,417	(441)
Maryland	7,538,599	7,389,856	7,387,964	(1,892)
Massachusetts	8,574,301	8,404,421	8,402,260	(2,161)
Michigan	14,606,750	14,313,762	14,310,035	(3,727)
Minnesota	5,990,606	5,873,453	5,871,963	(1,490)
Mississippi	6,239,745	6,117,508	6,115,954	(1,554)
Missouri	9,088,940	8,908,557	8,906,263	(2,294)
Montana	1,369,057	1,346,220	1,345,929	(291)
Nebraska	2,394,646	2,350,879	2,350,322	(557)
Nevada	3,565,912	3,498,242	3,497,382	(860)
New Hampshire	1,717,472	1,687,524	1,687,143	(381)
New Jersey	12,948,458	12,689,312	12,686,015	(3,297)
New Mexico	3,441,692	3,376,557	3,375,729	(828)
New York	32,708,026	32,045,634	32,037,208	(8,426)
North Carolina	14,556,445	14,264,484	14,260,770	(3,714)
North Dakota	1,150,412	1,132,036	1,131,803	(233)
Ohio	16,982,040	16,640,578	16,636,235	(4,343)
Oklahoma	5,945,794	5,829,556	5,828,078	(1,478)
Oregon	4,950,074	4,854,156	4,852,936	(1,220)
Pennsylvania	19,018,283	18,635,266	18,630,395	(4,871)
Rhode Island	2,081,473	2,044,097	2,043,622	(475)
South Carolina	7,832,421	7,677,682	7,675,714	(1,968)
South Dakota	1,304,168	1,282,655	1,282,382	(273)
Tennessee	11,148,628	10,926,213	10,923,384	(2,829)
Texas	40,803,247	39,975,649	39,965,123	(10,526)
Utah	2,921,532	2,867,013	2,866,319	(694)
Vermont	1,004,246	988,854	988,658	(196)
Virginia	11,153,763	10,931,242	10,928,412	(2,830)
Washington	7,552,236	7,403,214	7,401,319	(1,895)
West Virginia	3,842,196	3,768,888	3,767,956	(932)
Wisconsin	7,474,005	7,326,580	7,324,705	(1,875)
Wyoming	843,956	831,835	831,681	(154)
American Samoa	216,564	214,186	214,155	(31)
Guam	371,159	365,625	365,555	(70)
Northern Mariana Islands	277,791	274,163	274,117	(46)
Puerto Rico	10,926,928	10,709,036	10,706,265	(2,771)
Virgin Islands	404,827	398,606	398,527	(79)
Freely Associated States	38,743	34,869	31,382	(3,487)
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	10,029,746	9,825,582	9,951,566	125,984
<b>Total</b>	<b>496,079,100</b>	<b>486,226,177</b>	<b>486,226,000</b>	<b>(177)</b>

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### English Literacy and Civics Education State Grants

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	176,908	190,783	190,782	(1)
Alaska	98,466	93,752	93,752	0
Arizona	1,071,393	1,106,898	1,106,895	(3)
Arkansas	152,203	152,231	152,231	0
California	16,759,891	16,244,023	16,243,980	(43)
Colorado	779,956	741,924	741,922	(2)
Connecticut	848,911	884,620	884,618	(2)
Delaware	134,544	131,738	131,738	0
District of Columbia	198,054	190,732	190,732	0
Florida	6,319,751	6,873,471	6,873,453	(18)
Georgia	1,311,151	1,436,529	1,436,526	(3)
Hawaii	460,318	434,711	434,710	(1)
Idaho	158,698	151,964	151,964	0
Illinois	3,229,011	3,134,608	3,134,599	(9)
Indiana	419,029	417,743	417,742	(1)
Iowa	280,078	264,531	264,530	(1)
Kansas	305,235	281,551	281,551	0
Kentucky	264,963	274,579	274,579	0
Louisiana	233,305	209,803	209,803	0
Maine	91,546	91,453	91,453	0
Maryland	1,514,774	1,516,041	1,516,037	(4)
Massachusetts	1,912,038	1,908,558	1,908,552	(6)
Michigan	1,369,315	1,318,607	1,318,603	(4)
Minnesota	811,586	851,804	851,801	(3)
Mississippi	89,086	88,268	88,268	0
Missouri	501,498	466,189	466,187	(2)
Montana	60,000	60,000	60,000	0
Nebraska	205,855	202,071	202,070	(1)
Nevada	611,924	660,350	660,349	(1)
New Hampshire	163,711	163,558	163,557	(1)
New Jersey	3,691,377	3,560,880	3,560,871	(9)
New Mexico	251,419	231,544	231,543	(1)
New York	8,582,666	8,618,146	8,618,123	(23)
North Carolina	817,685	867,157	867,154	(3)
North Dakota	60,000	60,000	60,000	0
Ohio	887,506	885,542	885,540	(2)
Oklahoma	265,076	262,756	262,755	(1)
Oregon	629,471	598,422	598,420	(2)
Pennsylvania	1,437,520	1,430,986	1,430,982	(4)
Rhode Island	229,112	232,482	232,481	(1)
South Carolina	215,646	234,729	234,728	(1)
South Dakota	60,000	60,000	60,000	0
Tennessee	404,490	442,032	442,031	(1)
Texas	5,698,227	5,465,327	5,465,313	(14)
Utah	312,632	310,900	310,899	(1)
Vermont	60,000	60,000	60,000	0
Virginia	1,669,193	1,737,270	1,737,265	(5)
Washington	1,557,333	1,484,972	1,484,968	(4)
West Virginia	60,000	60,000	60,000	0
Wisconsin	413,629	427,330	427,329	(1)
Wyoming	60,000	60,000	60,000	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	0	262,615	262,614	(1)
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>67,896,180</b>	<b>67,896,180</b>	<b>67,896,000</b>	<b>(180)</b>



## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	415,237	407,982	0	(407,982)
Alaska	48,946	48,091	0	(48,091)
Arizona	746,714	733,669	0	(733,669)
Arkansas	292,527	287,417	0	(287,417)
California	2,578,742	2,533,691	0	(2,533,691)
Colorado	563,109	553,271	0	(553,271)
Connecticut	484,979	476,506	0	(476,506)
Delaware	141,323	138,854	0	(138,854)
District of Columbia	66,181	65,024	0	(65,024)
Florida	1,465,508	1,439,905	0	(1,439,905)
Georgia	798,417	784,469	0	(784,469)
Hawaii	84,449	82,974	0	(82,974)
Idaho	147,298	144,724	0	(144,724)
Illinois	1,001,669	984,170	0	(984,170)
Indiana	509,337	500,439	0	(500,439)
Iowa	206,699	203,088	0	(203,088)
Kansas	171,426	168,431	0	(168,431)
Kentucky	211,295	207,604	0	(207,604)
Louisiana	802,668	788,646	0	(788,646)
Maine	36,997	36,350	0	(36,350)
Maryland	322,515	316,881	0	(316,881)
Massachusetts	128,799	126,549	0	(126,549)
Michigan	848,167	833,350	0	(833,350)
Minnesota	192,337	188,977	0	(188,977)
Mississippi	382,606	375,922	0	(375,922)
Missouri	511,405	502,471	0	(502,471)
Montana	70,317	69,088	0	(69,088)
Nebraska	112,369	110,406	0	(110,406)
Nevada	239,330	235,149	0	(235,149)
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	607,114	596,508	0	(596,508)
New Mexico	108,462	106,568	0	(106,568)
New York	1,225,833	1,204,418	0	(1,204,418)
North Carolina	704,776	692,464	0	(692,464)
North Dakota	31,137	30,593	0	(30,593)
Ohio	991,444	974,123	0	(974,123)
Oklahoma	371,691	365,197	0	(365,197)
Oregon	27,116	26,642	0	(26,642)
Pennsylvania	353,767	347,587	0	(347,587)
Rhode Island	69,053	67,847	0	(67,847)
South Carolina	484,979	476,506	0	(476,506)
South Dakota	86,173	84,667	0	(84,667)
Tennessee	292,527	287,417	0	(287,417)
Texas	2,154,888	2,117,242	0	(2,117,242)
Utah	77,325	75,975	0	(75,975)
Vermont	0	0	0	0
Virginia	454,187	446,252	0	(446,252)
Washington	334,809	328,960	0	(328,960)
West Virginia	117,424	115,373	0	(115,373)
Wisconsin	450,395	442,527	0	(442,527)
Wyoming	47,337	46,510	0	(46,510)
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	198,197	194,734	0	(194,734)
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>22,770,000</b>	<b>22,372,208</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(22,372,208)</b>