

Department of Education
ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations language	B-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	B-5
Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers	B-11
Summary of Changes	B-12
Authorizing Legislation	B-13
Appropriations History	B-14
Significant Items in FY 2014 Appropriations Reports.....	B-16
Summary of Request	B-17
Activities:	
College- and career-ready students	B-20
School turnaround grants	B-37
Evaluation	B-46
State agency programs:	
Migrant student education	B-50
Neglected and delinquent children and youth education	B-56
Homeless children and youth education	B-61
State tables*	

*State tables reflecting 2014 allocations and 2015 estimates are posted on the Department's Web page at:
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/index.html#update>.

[EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED] ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY¹

[For carrying out title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (referred to in this Act as “ESEA”) and section 418A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (referred to in this Act as “HEA”), \$15,552,693,000, of which \$4,625,762,000 shall become available on July 1, 2014, and shall remain available through September 30, 2015, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, 2014, and shall remain available through September 30, 2015, for academic year 2014–2015:² *Provided*, That \$6,459,401,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA:³ *Provided further*, That up to \$3,984,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education (referred to in this title as “Secretary”) on October 1, 2013, to obtain annually updated local educational agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:⁴ *Provided further*, That \$1,362,301,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA:⁵ *Provided further*, That \$3,281,550,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:⁶ *Provided further*, That \$3,281,550,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:⁷ *Provided further*, That funds available under sections 1124, 1124A, 1125 and 1125A of the ESEA may be used to provide homeless children and youths with services not ordinarily provided to other students under those sections, including supporting the liaison designated pursuant to section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, and providing transportation pursuant to section 722(g)(1)(J)(iii) of such Act:⁸ *Provided further*, That \$880,000 shall be to carry out sections 1501 and 1503 of the ESEA:⁹ *Provided further*, That \$505,756,000 shall be available for school improvement grants under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, which shall be allocated by the Secretary through the formula described in section 1003(g)(2) and shall be used consistent with the requirements of section 1003(g), except that State and local educational agencies may use such funds to serve any school eligible to receive assistance

under part A of title I that has not made adequate yearly progress for at least 2 years or is in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates and, in the case of secondary schools, priority shall be given to those schools with graduation rates below 60 percent:¹⁰

Provided further, That notwithstanding section 1003(g)(5)(C) of the ESEA, the Secretary may permit a State educational agency to establish an award period of up to 5 years for each participating local educational agency:¹¹ *Provided further*, That funds available for school improvement grants may be used by a local educational agency to implement a whole-school reform strategy for a school using an evidence-based strategy that ensures whole-school reform is undertaken in partnership with a strategy developer offering a whole-school reform program that is based on at least a moderate level of evidence that the program will have a statistically significant effect on student outcomes, including more than one well-designed or well-implemented experimental or quasi-experimental study:¹² *Provided further*, That funds available for school improvement grants may be used by a local educational agency to implement an alternative State-determined school improvement strategy that has been established by a State educational agency with the approval of the Secretary:¹³ *Provided further*, That a local educational agency that is determined to be eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of title VI of the ESEA may modify not more than one element of a school improvement grant model:¹⁴ *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 1003(g)(5)(A), each State educational agency may establish a maximum subgrant size of not more than \$2,000,000 for each participating school applicable to such funds:¹⁵ *Provided further*, That the Secretary may reserve up to 5 percent of the funds available for section 1003(g) of the ESEA to carry out activities to build State and local educational agency capacity to implement effectively the school improvement grants program:¹⁶ *Provided further*, That \$158,000,000 shall be available under section 1502 of the ESEA for a comprehensive literacy development and education program to advance literacy skills, including pre-literacy skills, reading, and writing, for students from birth

through grade 12, including limited- English-proficient students and students with disabilities, of which one-half of 1 percent shall be reserved for the Secretary of the Interior for such a program at schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Education, one-half of 1 percent shall be reserved for grants to the outlying areas for such a program, up to 5 percent may be reserved for national activities, and the remainder shall be used to award competitive grants to State educational agencies for such a program, of which a State educational agency may reserve up to 5 percent for State leadership activities, including technical assistance and training, data collection, reporting, and administration, and shall subgrant not less than 95 percent to local educational agencies or, in the case of early literacy, to local educational agencies or other nonprofit providers of early childhood education that partner with a public or private nonprofit organization or agency with a demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving the early literacy development of children from birth through kindergarten entry and in providing professional development in early literacy, giving priority to such agencies or other entities serving greater numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children:¹⁷ *Provided further*, That the State educational agency shall ensure that at least 15 percent of the subgranted funds are used to serve children from birth through age 5, 40 percent are used to serve students in kindergarten through grade 5, and 40 percent are used to serve students in middle and high school including an equitable distribution of funds between middle and high schools:¹⁸ *Provided further*, That eligible entities receiving subgrants from State educational agencies shall use such funds for services and activities that have the characteristics of effective literacy instruction through professional development, screening and assessment, targeted interventions for students reading below grade level and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice.]¹⁹ (Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2014.)

NOTES

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

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

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
¹ <u>[EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED] ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY</u>	This language is included because the Administration proposes to change the title of this account from Education for the Disadvantaged to Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity.
² [...of which \$4,625,762,000 shall become available on July 1, 2014, and shall remain available through September 30, 2015, and of which \$10,841,177,000 shall become available on October 1, 2014, and shall remain available through September 30, 2015, for academic year 2014–2015:]	This language provides for funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for the Title I Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, Education Finance Incentive Grants, School Improvement Grants, State Agency Migrant and Neglected and Delinquent, and Striving Readers programs. The language also provides that a portion of the funds is available in an advance appropriation that becomes available for obligation on October 1 of the following fiscal year.
³ [... <i>Provided</i> , That \$6,459,401,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of the ESEA:]	This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Basic Grants.
⁴ [... <i>Provided further</i> , That up to \$3,984,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education (referred to in this title as “Secretary”) on October 1, 2013, to obtain annually updated local educational agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:]	This language makes available, on a current-funded basis, \$3,992,000 from Basic Grant funds to support continued work by the Census Bureau to update LEA-level poverty data.
⁵ [... <i>Provided further</i> , That \$1,362,301,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of the ESEA:]	This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Concentration Grants.
⁶ [... <i>Provided further</i> , That \$3,281,550,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of the ESEA:]	This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Targeted Grants.
⁷ [... <i>Provided further</i> , That \$3,281,550,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of the ESEA:]	This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Education Finance Incentive Grants.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>⁸ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That funds available under sections 1124, 1124A, 1125 and 1125A of the ESEA may be used to provide homeless children and youths with services not ordinarily provided to other students under those sections, including supporting the liaison designated pursuant to section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, and providing transportation pursuant to section 722(g)(1)(J)(iii) of such Act:</p>	<p>This language allows funds under Title I Part A of the ESEA to be used to provide homeless children and youths with services not ordinarily provided to other students under that program, including (1) supporting the local liaisons who are responsible for coordinating services to ensure that homeless children and youth enroll in school and have the opportunity to succeed academically under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; and (2) providing transportation as required under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to permit homeless students to remain in their schools of origin despite their residential instability.</p>
<p>⁹ [<i>Provided further</i>, That \$880,000 shall be to carry out sections 1501 and 1503 of the ESEA:]</p>	<p>This language establishes a specific funding level for Title I Evaluation.</p>
<p>¹⁰ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$505,756,000 shall be available for school improvement grants under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, which shall be allocated by the Secretary through the formula described in section 1003(g)(2) and shall be used consistent with the requirements of section 1003(g), except that State and local educational agencies may use such funds to serve any school eligible to receive assistance under part A of title I that has not made adequate yearly progress for at least 2 years or is in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates and, in the case of secondary schools, priority shall be given to those schools with graduation rates below 60 percent:]</p>	<p>This language expands eligibility for participation in the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program to schools that are eligible for but do not receive Title I Part A funds and meet certain requirements. The language also establishes a priority for secondary schools that have graduation rates below 60 percent.</p>

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹¹ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That notwithstanding section 1003(g)(5)(C) of the ESEA, the Secretary may permit a State educational agency to establish an award period of up to 5 years for each participating local educational agency:]</p>	<p>This language allows State educational agencies to make SIG awards of up to 5 years to local educational agencies.</p>
<p>¹² [...<i>Provided further</i>, That funds available for school improvement grants may be used by a local educational agency to implement a whole-school reform strategy for a school using an evidence-based strategy that ensures whole-school reform is undertaken in partnership with a strategy developer offering a whole-school reform program that is based on at least a moderate level of evidence that the program will have a statistically significant effect on student outcomes, including more than one well-designed or well-implemented experimental or quasi-experimental study:]</p>	<p>This language allows local educational agencies to use SIG funds to implement, in partnership with a strategy developer, whole school reform strategies that meet specific standards of evidence of effectiveness.</p>
<p>¹³ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That funds available for school improvement grants may be used by a local educational agency to implement an alternative State-determined school improvement strategy that has been established by a State educational agency with the approval of the Secretary:]</p>	<p>This language allows local educational agencies to use SIG funds to implement an alternative school improvement strategy that has been established by the State educational agency and approved by the Secretary.</p>
<p>¹⁴ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That a local educational agency that is determined to be eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of title VI of the ESEA may modify not more than one element of a school improvement grant model:</p>	<p>This language allows local educational agencies that are eligible to receive funds and services under the Rural Education Achievement Act to modify not more than one element of a SIG model:</p>
<p>¹⁵ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That notwithstanding section 1003(g)(5)(A), each State educational agency may establish a maximum subgrant size of not more than \$2,000,000 for each participating school applicable to such funds:]</p>	<p>This language overrides the statutory cap on the maximum per-school subgrant size for subgrants made by States under the SIG program.</p>

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
¹⁶ [... <i>Provided further</i> , That the Secretary may reserve up to 5 percent of the funds available for section 1003(g) of the ESEA to carry out activities to build State and local educational agency capacity to implement effectively the school improvement grants program:]	This language authorizes the Secretary to reserve up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated for the SIG program for capacity-building.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹⁷ [...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$160,000,000 shall be available under section 1502 of the ESEA for a comprehensive literacy development and education program to advance literacy skills, including pre-literacy skills, reading, and writing, for students from birth through grade 12, including limited-English-proficient students and students with disabilities, of which one-half of 1 percent shall be reserved for the Secretary of the Interior for such a program at schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Education, one-half of 1 percent shall be reserved for grants to the outlying areas for such a program, up to 5 percent may be reserved for national activities, and the remainder shall be used to award competitive grants to State educational agencies for such a program, of which a State educational agency may reserve up to 5 percent for State leadership activities, including technical assistance and training, data collection, reporting, and administration, and shall subgrant not less than 95 percent to local educational agencies or, in the case of early literacy, to local educational agencies or other nonprofit providers of early childhood education that partner with a public or private nonprofit organization or agency with a demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving the early literacy development of children from birth through kindergarten entry and in providing professional development in early literacy, giving priority to such agencies or other entities serving greater numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children:]</p>	<p>This language provides funding for a Striving Readers program that serves students from birth through grade 12; provides a portion of the funds to the Department of Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas; establishes the amount the Department may reserve for national activities; and establishes the amount the Department must distribute through competitive awards to States. The language also specifies the amount of funds that States receiving competitive awards may reserve for State leadership activities and the amount of funds that they award through subgrants to local educational agencies or to nonprofit organizations that provide early childhood education services.</p>

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
¹⁸ [... <i>Provided further</i> , That the State educational agency shall ensure that at least 15 percent of the subgranted funds are used to serve children from birth through age 5, 40 percent are used to serve students in kindergarten through grade 5, and 40 percent are used to serve students in middle and high school including an equitable distribution of funds between middle and high schools:]	This language establishes that States must use particular amounts of Striving Readers funds to support projects serving children in specific age groups or grades.
¹⁹ [... <i>Provided further</i> , That eligible entities receiving subgrants from State educational agencies shall use such funds for services and activities that have the characteristics of effective literacy instruction through professional development, screening and assessment, targeted interventions for students reading below grade level and other research-based methods of improving classroom instruction and practice.]	This language establishes requirements for the types of activities that entities may conduct with their Striving Readers funds.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers

(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2013	2014	2015
Discretionary:			
Appropriation	\$15,741,703	\$15,552,693	\$15,377,965
Across-the-board reduction (P.L. 113-6)	<u>-31,483</u>	0	0
Total, discretionary appropriation.....	15,710,220		
Sequester (P.L. 112-25).....	<u>-788,585</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, adjusted discretionary appropriation	14,921,636	15,552,693	15,377,965
Comparative transfer to:			
<u>Education Improvement Programs</u> for:			
Striving Readers.....	-151,378	-158,000	0
High School Graduation Initiative.....	-46,267	-46,267	0
<u>Higher Education</u> for Special Programs for:			
Migrant Students	-34,623	-34,623	0
Comparative transfer from: <u>Education</u>			
<u>Improvement Programs</u> for:			
Homeless Children and Youth Education:	<u>61,771</u>	<u>65,042</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, comparative discretionary			
appropriation.....	14,751,139	15,378,845	15,377,965
Advance:			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-10,841,177	-10,841,177	-11,681,898
Advance from prior year	<u>10,841,177</u>	<u>10,841,177</u>	<u>10,841,177</u>
Total, budget authority	14,751,139	15,378,845	14,537,244

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Summary of Changes

(dollars in thousands)

2014.....	\$15,378,845
2015.....	<u>15,377,965</u>
Net change	-880

Decreases:		<u>2014 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>			
Eliminate separate funding for Evaluation. The ESEA reauthorization proposal includes provisions for funding program evaluations through set-asides from program funds.		\$880	<u>-\$880</u>
Net change			-880

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Authorizing Legislation

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2014 Authorized	2014 Estimate	2015 Authorized	2015 Request
College- and career-ready students (<i>ESEA-1-A</i>):				
LEA grants formulas:	0 ¹		To be determined ¹	
Basic grants (<i>Section 1124</i>)	² \$6,459,401		² \$6,459,401	
Concentration grants (<i>Section 1124A</i>)	² 1,362,301		² 1,362,301	
Targeted grants (<i>Section 1125</i>)	² 3,281,550		² 3,281,550	
Education finance incentive grants (<i>Section 1125A</i>)	² 3,281,550		² 3,281,550	
School turnaround grants (<i>ESEA Section 1003(g)</i>)	0 ¹	505,756	To be determined ¹	505,756
Evaluation (<i>ESEA I-E-1501 and 1503</i>)	0 ¹	880	To be determined ¹	0
State agency programs:				
Migrant student education (<i>ESEA I-C</i>)	0 ¹	374,751	To be determined ¹	374,751
Neglected and delinquent children and youth education(<i>ESEA I-D</i>)	0 ¹	47,614	To be determined ¹	47,614
Homeless children and youth education (<i>McKinney-Vento Act, Title VII-B</i>)	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>65,042</u>	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>65,042</u>
Total definite authorization	0		0	
Total appropriation		15,378,845		15,377,965
Portion of request subject to reauthorization		15,378,845		15,377,965

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing language is sought for fiscal year 2014.

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

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2006 (2006 Advance for 2007)	\$16,431,473 (7,383,301)	\$14,728,735 (7,383,301)	\$14,532,785 (7,383,301)	\$14,481,161 (7,383,301)
2007 (2007 Advance for 2008)	16,469,541 (7,383,301)	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	14,725,593 (7,383,301)
2008 (2008 Advance for 2009)	16,689,090 (7,383,301)	15,969,818 (8,136,218)	15,867,778 (8,867,301)	15,489,476 (7,934,756)
2009 (2009 Advance for 2010) Recovery Act Supplemental (PL 111-5)	16,917,059 (7,934,756)	15,788,285 ² (10,841,176)	15,735,884 ² (8,893,756)	15,760,086 (10,841,176)
	0	13,000,000	12,400,000	13,000,000
2010 (2010 Advance for 2011)	16,431,632 (10,841,176)	15,938,215 (10,841,176)	15,891,132 ³ (10,841,176)	15,914,666 (10,841,176)
2011 (2011 Advance for 2012) Rescission (P.L. 112-74)	15,912,193 (11,681,897)	15,914,666 ⁴ (10,841,176)	16,726,579 ³ (10,841,176)	15,914,666 ⁵ (10,841,176) -(20,490) ⁶
2012 (2012 Advance for 2013)	16,253,026 (11,681,897)	15,949,319 ⁷ (13,279,177)	15,741,703 ⁷ (10,841,177)	15,741,703 (10,841,177)
2013 (2013 Advance for 2014)	15,558,649 (11,681,898)	15,208,151 ⁸ (10,841,177)	15,840,103 ⁸ (10,841,177)	14,921,636 (10,841,177)
2014 (2014 Advance for 2015)	15,683,649 (11,681,898)	N/A ⁹	15,875,231 ³ (10,841,177)	15,552,693 (10,841,177)
2015 (2015 Advance for 2016)	15,377,965 (11,681,898)			

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

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

³ The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

⁴ The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year continuing resolution.

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

⁶ The level for rescission reflects the continuing resolution (P.L. 111-322) passed December 22, 2010.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Appropriations History—continued

⁷ The level for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill and the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

⁸ The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2013 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 112th Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

⁹ The House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Significant Items in FY 2014 Appropriations Reports

School Improvement Grants

Senate: The Committee expects that any approach taken with SIG funds should address schoolwide factors, whole school culture, the individual needs of the students, and the use of data to inform instruction and provide continuous improvement; ensure that the needs of the students are met through the organization of the school, curriculum and instruction, and social and emotional support services; and improve teacher and leader effectiveness, including through training and support for teachers and school leaders in school improvement efforts and in the needs of students.

Response: The Department believes that the current school turnaround models required by the SIG program regulations, while providing considerable discretion to local educational agencies to select and implement locally designed interventions, promote and encourage the factors and strategies described in the Senate language. In addition, the Department is considering options for implementing the new provisions for the SIG program in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014, such as issuing new regulations or providing guidance or technical assistance to SEAs and LEAs. These options may include clarifying or strengthening the emphasis of the SIG program on one or more of the factors or strategies described in the Senate report language.

Striving Readers

Senate: The Committee directs the Secretary to utilize the 5 percent set-aside for national activities to implement a national evaluation of the Striving Readers program.

Response: The Department plans to consult with the Committee on the best way to use the national activities set-aside at the current stage of program implementation by existing Striving Readers grantees.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2015 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

[Click here for accessible version.](#)

(in thousands of dollars)		Category Code	2013	2014	2015	2015 President's Budget	
Account, Program and Activity	Appropriation		Appropriation	President's Budget	Compared to 2014 Appropriation		
					Amount	Percent	
Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity							
1. College- and career-ready students (ESEA I-A):							
(a) Basic grants (section 1124)							
Annual appropriation	D	2,919,042	3,543,625	2,702,904	(840,721)	-23.725%	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,313,597	2,915,776	3,756,497	840,721	28.834%	
Subtotal		6,232,639	6,459,401	6,459,401	0	0.000%	
(b) Concentration grants (section 1124A)							
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,293,919	1,362,301	1,362,301	0	0.000%	
Subtotal		1,293,919	1,362,301	1,362,301	0	0.000%	
(c) Targeted grants (section 1125)							
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,116,831	3,281,550	3,281,550	0	0.000%	
Subtotal		3,116,831	3,281,550	3,281,550	0	0.000%	
(d) Education finance incentive grants (section 1125A)							
Annual appropriation	D	0	0	0	0	---	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,116,831	3,281,550	3,281,550	0	0.000%	
Subtotal		3,116,831	3,281,550	3,281,550	0	0.000%	
Subtotal, College- and career-ready students		13,760,219	14,384,802	14,384,802	0	0.000%	
Annual appropriation	D	2,919,042	3,543,625	2,702,904	(840,721)	-23.725%	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	10,841,177	10,841,177	11,681,898	840,721	7.755%	

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

- Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested or that are proposed for consolidation in FY 2015 are proposed under new authorizing legislation.
- Multiple programs affected by the proposed ESEA reauthorization have been renamed and moved among accounts, some of which also have been renamed.
- Account totals and programs shown within accounts in FY 2013 and FY 2014 have been adjusted for comparability to FY 2015.
- Accounts are shown under the administering office that has primary responsibility for most programs in that account; however, there may be some programs that are administered by another office.

Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2015 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(in thousands of dollars)		Category Code	2013 Appropriation	2014 Appropriation	2015 President's Budget	2015 President's Budget Compared to 2014 Appropriation	
Account, Program and Activity						Amount	Percent
<i>Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity (continued)</i>							
2. School turnaround grants (ESEA section 1003(g)):		D	505,756	505,756	505,756	0	0.000%
3. Evaluation (ESEA sections 1501 and 1503)		D	3,028	880	0	(880)	-100.000%
4. State agency programs:							
(a) Migrant student education (ESEA I-C)		D	372,751	374,751	374,751	0	0.000%
(b) Neglected and delinquent children and youth education (ESEA I-D)		D	47,614	47,614	47,614	0	0.000%
Subtotal			420,365	422,365	422,365	0	0.000%
5. Homeless children and youth education (MVHAA Title VII-B)		D	61,771	65,042	65,042	0	0.000%
Total, Appropriation ¹		D	14,751,139	15,378,845	15,377,965	(880)	-0.006%
Total, Budget authority		D	14,751,139	15,378,845	14,537,244	(841,601)	-5.472%
Current ²			3,909,962	4,537,668	3,696,067	(841,601)	-18.547%
Prior year's advance			10,841,177	10,841,177	10,841,177	0	0.000%

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

- Programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which funds are requested or that are proposed for consolidation in FY 2015 are proposed under new authorizing legislation.
- Multiple programs affected by the proposed ESEA reauthorization have been renamed and moved among accounts, some of which also have been renamed.
- Account totals and programs shown within accounts in FY 2013 and FY 2014 have been adjusted for comparability to FY 2015.
- Accounts are shown under the administering office that has primary responsibility for most programs in that account; however, there may be some programs that are administered by another office.

Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

¹ Adjusted for comparability. Excludes \$34,623 thousand in fiscal years 2013 and 2014 for Special Programs for Migrant Students, requested in FY 2015 in the Higher Education account; and includes \$61,771 thousand in FY 2013 and \$65,042 thousand in FY 2014 for Homeless Children and Youth Education, which was funded in those years under the School Improvement Programs account, now the Education Improvement Programs account.

² Excludes advance appropriations that become available on October 1 of the following year, which total \$10,841,177 thousand in fiscal years 2013 and 2014, and \$11,681,898 thousand in FY 2015. In FY 2015, the amount for advances is increased due to the proposed consolidation of Improving Teacher Quality State Grants into the Innovation and Instructional Teams account.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Summary of Request

The programs in the Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity (formerly Education for the Disadvantaged) account provide the foundation for school improvement efforts needed to ensure that all children receive a high-quality education. The Department is requesting a total of \$15.4 billion in fiscal year 2015 for the programs in this account.

Most of the programs in the account are authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and are, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that these programs will be implemented in fiscal year 2015 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

The \$14.4 billion request for the reauthorized College- and Career-Ready Students program (under current law, Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)) would support local efforts aimed at helping more than 23 million students in high-poverty schools make progress toward the new college- and career-ready standards that States would implement under the Administration's reauthorization proposal (and that the great majority of States are currently implementing). The reauthorized program also would support a more differentiated approach to measuring school progress and identifying schools in need of improvement, reward highly effective schools and LEAs, require implementation of rigorous school intervention models in the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools, strengthen LEA improvement efforts, and help ensure an equitable distribution of effective teachers across high- and low-poverty schools.

The 2015 request also includes \$505.8 million for School Turnaround Grants (STG) to support a reauthorized State grant program (under current law School Improvement Grants). The STG program would require States and LEAs to use most of their funds to implement one of four school intervention models (Turnaround, Restart, School Closure, and Transformation) in their schools that (1) are in the bottom 5 percent of schools in the State in terms of student achievement or (2) in the case of secondary schools, have graduation rates below 60 percent. The reauthorized program also would include a national activities authority that would allow the Department to build nationwide school turnaround capacity through data collection, technical assistance, and demonstration activities.

The request would fund the other programs in this account as the same level as 2014, providing \$374.8 million for Migrant Student Education, \$47.6 million for Neglected and Delinquent Children and Youth Education, and \$65 million for Homeless Children and Youth Education.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget authority:

	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
Basic grants	\$6,459,401	\$6,459,401	0
Concentration grants	1,362,301	1,362,301	0
Targeted grants	3,281,550	3,281,550	0
Education finance incentive grants	<u>3,281,550</u>	<u>3,281,550</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	14,384,802	14,384,802	0
Annual appropriation	3,543,625	2,702,904	-840,721
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	10,841,177	11,681,898	+840,721

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2015.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) provide supplemental education funding, especially in high-poverty areas, for local programs that provide extra academic support to help raise the achievement of students at risk of educational failure or, in the case of schoolwide programs, to help all students in high-poverty schools meet challenging State academic standards. The program serves an estimated 23 million students in 77 percent of school districts and more than half of all public schools—including 70 percent of the Nation's elementary schools.

The ESEA gives school districts and schools considerable flexibility in using Title I dollars to support instructional strategies and methods that best meet local needs. Title I schools help students reach challenging State standards through one of two models: “targeted assistance” that supplements the regular education program for individual children deemed most in need of special assistance, or a “schoolwide” approach that allows schools to use Title I funds—in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds—to improve the overall instructional program for all children in a school. Schools in which poor children account for at least 40 percent of enrollment are eligible to operate schoolwide programs, and in the 2011-2012 school year approximately 37,141 schools, or 70 percent of all Title I schools, operated these programs, which accounted for approximately 94 percent of participating students.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

The ESEA encourages the use of Title I funds for effective educational practices. Both schoolwide and targeted assistance programs must employ effective methods and instructional strategies grounded in scientifically based research. Schools must further ensure that services provided with Title I funds supplement the regular instruction that students would receive in the absence of Title I funds, such as by extending the school day, week, or year. Schools also must provide ongoing professional development for staff working with disadvantaged students and carry out activities designed to increase parental involvement. Additionally, Title I funds may be used to support high-quality preschool programs for eligible children and joint professional development for school staff and other early childhood educators.

Title I Grants to LEAs provides the foundation for the ESEA's accountability system, which emphasizes State and local responsibilities in the areas of standards and assessments, measuring progress, supporting school improvement, and improving teacher quality.

Standards and Assessments

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

The States also were required to create or adopt academic assessments that measure the achievement of all students against their standards. These assessments must be valid and reliable, include measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding of challenging content, and enable achievement results to be disaggregated by major racial and ethnic group, gender, and poverty, disability, English proficiency, and migrant status. The Department provides dedicated State formula grant support for the development and implementation of required State assessments (see Assessing Achievement in the Education Improvement Programs account).

Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, States have been required to administer their reading and mathematics assessments annually to all students in grades 3-8 and once in high school in reading and math. States also must assess annually the English proficiency of English Learner (EL) students and were required to add science assessments during the 2007-2008 school year (testing once in each of three grade spans specified in the law). Finally, to provide a uniform benchmark for comparing student achievement gains nationwide, the ESEA requires biennial State participation in the reading and mathematics assessments for 4th- and 8th-graders conducted by the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Adequate Yearly Progress

State assessments are used to hold LEAs and schools accountable for making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward State standards for proficiency in reading and math, with the goal of ensuring that all students are proficient in both subjects by the end of the 2013-2014 school year. For a school to make AYP, all students, including those in statutorily specified

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

groups—economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and EL students—must meet the same annual statewide measurable objectives for improved achievement. However, the statute includes a “safe harbor” exception under which a school can be considered to have made AYP if the percentage of students in each group not reaching the proficient level decreases by at least 10 percent from the previous year and the school makes progress on the “other academic indicator” included in the State’s AYP definition.

The Department has taken a number of actions, primarily through regulation, to give States additional flexibility in making AYP determinations. For example, in December 2003, the Department announced a final regulation permitting States, school districts, and schools to include in AYP calculations the “proficient” scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take assessments based on alternate achievement standards. The number of those proficient scores included in AYP determinations may not exceed 1 percent of all students in the grades tested (about 9 percent of students with disabilities). Since 2007, the Department also has provided additional flexibility permitting States to count for AYP purposes the “proficient” scores of a limited number of students with disabilities who take assessments based on modified achievement standards. The number of such “proficient” scores is capped at 2 percent of all students tested. These regulations are intended to give schools and teachers credit for raising the achievement of students with disabilities.

In addition, the Department allows States to exclude from AYP calculations the assessment results for EL students in their first year of enrollment in U.S. schools. States also may include in the EL subgroup for up to 2 years those students who were EL but who have attained English proficiency. Finally, the Department has taken steps to allow States to incorporate individual academic growth into their AYP systems, beginning with a pilot growth-model initiative in late 2005 and then in a final regulation published in 2008 permitting all States to apply for approval to add growth models to AYP determinations.

Accountability and School Improvement

Title I accountability and school improvement provisions require escalating improvement measures over time for schools that continue to miss AYP targets. In addition, LEAs must implement specific strategies for students attending schools identified for improvement, including public school choice and supplemental educational services (SES) options.

School Improvement

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

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

States must reserve 4 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations to support school improvement activities and are required to distribute 95 percent of these funds to LEAs with schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. In reserving school improvement funds, States are not permitted to reduce an LEA's allocation below its prior-year level, a restriction that may prevent a State from reserving the full 4 percent for school improvement. Additional funding for school improvement is provided through the separately authorized section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants program (see School Turnaround Grants).

Corrective Action

If an identified school does not make AYP for 2 additional years (4 years of not making AYP), the LEA must take corrective action. Corrective actions may include replacing school staff responsible for the continued inability to make AYP, comprehensive implementation of a new curriculum (including professional development), and reorganizing the school internally. LEAs must continue to provide choice and SES options to students in schools identified for corrective action.

Restructuring

If a school does not increase student achievement in response to corrective action, the LEA must begin planning for restructuring, which involves making a fundamental change such as closing the school and reopening it as a public charter school, replacing all or most of the school's staff, turning operation of the school over to a private management company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, or any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement. The LEA must implement the restructuring plan no later than the beginning of the following school year if the school still does not make AYP (i.e., 6 years of not making AYP), and must continue to provide choice and SES options to its students.

Qualifications for Teachers and Paraprofessionals

The ESEA requires LEAs to ensure that all Title I teachers hired after the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year are "highly qualified." For new teachers, this means being certified by the State (which may be through an alternative route to certification), holding at least a bachelor's degree, and passing a rigorous State test on subject knowledge and teaching skills. Veteran teachers also must possess a bachelor's degree and be fully certified or licensed by the State, and must either pass the State test on subject-matter knowledge or demonstrate subject-matter competency through a "high, objective, uniform State standard of evaluation." LEAs must use at least 5 percent of their Part A allocations to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified. States were required to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that would ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects were highly qualified by the end of the 2005-06 school year, and both States and LEAs must report annually on progress toward this goal. In addition, LEAs must annually notify parents of their right to receive information on the professional qualifications of their child's teachers.

In 2004, the Department provided additional flexibility to States and school districts working to meet the highly qualified teacher (HQT) requirements. First, rural teachers who teach more than one academic subject and who are highly qualified in at least one subject were given 3 more years to become highly qualified in the additional subjects they teach. Second, States

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

may permit science teachers to demonstrate that they are highly qualified either under a general science certification or in an individual field such as biology or chemistry. And, third, States may develop a single, streamlined process for determining that veteran multi-subject teachers are highly qualified.

ESEA Flexibility

The ESEA was scheduled for reauthorization in 2007 and is well into its second decade without modification to reflect State progress in implementing the law or new directions in State and local education reform policies. In addition, the 2014 deadline under current law for ensuring that 100 percent of students are proficient in reading and mathematics means that States will soon be forced to identify nearly all of their Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. This failure of current law to differentiate among schools that are helping most, but not all, of their students to meet State academic standards and schools in which large majorities of students are not meeting such standards threatens to undermine public support for ESEA accountability requirements. Forty-five States and DC already are engaged in transitioning to “next-generation accountability systems” based on the adoption of State standards linked to college- and career-readiness, new assessments aligned with those standards, differentiated approaches to LEA and school accountability that target improvement resources to the lowest-performing LEAs and schools and those with the largest achievement gaps, and new systems for evaluating and supporting teachers and principals that are based in part on student growth.

In recognition of these changes, in September 2011, the Administration invited all States to request “ESEA flexibility,” which offers waivers of key provisions of current law in exchange for a comprehensive plan to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, and improve the quality of instruction. More specifically, States approved for ESEA flexibility no longer have to meet the 2014 deadline for ensuring that 100 percent of students are proficient in reading and mathematics; no longer have to identify schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and no longer have to carry out the prescriptive improvement, corrective action, or restructuring plans required under current law. States and LEAs also receive greater flexibility in the use of funds in rural schools, in adopting the schoolwide program model regardless of school poverty levels, in meeting teacher qualification requirements, and in transferring funds among ESEA programs.

States seeking ESEA flexibility must submit plans to the Department describing how they will transition to State college- and career-ready standards and aligned assessments capable of measuring student academic growth; implement differentiated recognition, accountability, and support systems that identify and reward high-performing schools, require rigorous interventions in the lowest-performing schools, and target meaningful improvement measures to schools with the largest achievement gaps; and develop and implement high-quality teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that use multiple valid measures, including data on student growth as a significant factor, to determine performance levels.

All States are eligible to receive ESEA flexibility, and the Department has established a rigorous process for reviewing and approving State requests, including expert peer review. As of February 2014, 42 States, D.C., and Puerto Rico are approved for ESEA flexibility. Additionally,

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

as of that same date, three States and the Bureau of Indian Education have submitted requests for ESEA flexibility. The approved States began implementing new ESEA accountability systems that are more fair, flexible, and focused on students most at risk beginning in the 2012-2013 school year. In general, the waivers of current law included in ESEA flexibility have been approved through the 2013-2014 school year. The waivers may be revoked if Congress reauthorizes the ESEA, but in the continued absence of reauthorization States will be permitted to seek extension of their waivers through the 2014-2015 school year. Additional information on ESEA flexibility is available at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>

Allocations

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

Three formulas are based primarily on the number of formula children in each LEA, weighted by State per-pupil expenditures for education. Basic Grants are awarded to school districts with at least 10 formula children who make up more than 2 percent of their school-age population (defined as children ages 5 to 17) and, thus, spread funds thinly across nearly all LEAs. Concentration Grants provide additional funds to LEAs in which the number of formula children exceeds 6,500 or 15 percent of the total school-age population. The Targeted Grants formula weights child counts to make higher payments to school districts with high numbers or percentages of formula students. To be eligible for Targeted Grants, an LEA must have at least 10 formula children counted for Basic Grant purposes, and the count of formula children must equal at least 5 percent of the school age population.

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

In determining allocations under each of the four formulas, the statute requires the use of annually updated Census Bureau estimates of the number of children from low-income families in each LEA. There is roughly a 2-year lag between the income year used for LEA poverty estimates and the fiscal year in which those estimates are used to make Title I allocations. For example, the fiscal year 2013 allocations were based on LEA poverty estimates for 2011. The Department transfers a small amount of funding from the annual Title I appropriation (\$3.8 million in 2013) to the Census Bureau to finance the preparation of these LEA poverty estimates.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

LEAs also use poverty data—generally the number of students eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch—to make within-district allocations to schools. LEAs with more than 1,000 students must serve, in rank order by poverty rate, all schools with a poverty rate above 75 percent, including middle and high schools, before serving schools with less needy student populations.

One percent of the total appropriation for Title I Grants to LEAs is reserved for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas (the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands). In addition, States are permitted to reserve up to 1 percent, or \$400,000, whichever is greater, to cover SEA costs of administering Title I programs, except that such amounts may not exceed the level that is provided if the total appropriation for Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA equals \$14 billion, a threshold that has been exceeded each year beginning with fiscal year 2008.

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

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

(dollars in thousands)

	Basic Grants	Concentration Grants	Targeted Grants	Education Finance Incentive Grants
2010.....	\$6,597,946	\$1,365,031	\$3,264,712	\$3,264,712
2011.....	6,579,151	1,359,726	3,252,025	3,252,025
2012.....	6,577,904	1,365,031	3,288,126	3,288,126
2013.....	6,232,639	1,293,919	3,116,831	3,116,831
2014.....	6,459,401	1,362,301	3,281,550	3,281,550

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's 2015 budget request for the College- and Career-Ready Students (CCRS) program (Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies under current law) is \$14.4 billion, the same as the 2014 level. The request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2015 under a reauthorized ESEA that is consistent with the Administration's reauthorization proposal. This proposal would make key changes in the areas of standards and assessments; accountability and support for schools, LEAs and States; and teacher and leader effectiveness and equity.

The 2015 request would restore funding reduced through sequestration for the CCRS program, continuing a trend of strong support for one of the Administration's foundation programs. The reauthorization proposal also would permit the Department to reserve up to 0.5 percent of CCRS formula grant funds for ESEA program evaluation and performance measurement.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

New College- and Career-Ready Standards and High-Quality Assessments

While the current Title I program has succeeded in firmly establishing standards-based accountability systems in all 50 States, No Child Left Behind's emphasis on punitive sanctions for not making lock-step progress toward meeting the goal of 100 percent proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2014 has inadvertently encouraged States to lower the quality of their standards as well as the levels of proficiency needed to meet them. The net result has been wide divergence in most States in student performance on State assessments compared to student performance on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). For example, the August 2011 report from the National Center for Education Statistics, "Mapping State Proficiency Standards Onto NAEP Scales: 2005-2009," found that 35 States set grade 4 standards for the Proficient level in reading that were lower than the Basic level on NAEP.

In response to this problem, the Administration's Title I reauthorization proposal would ask States to adopt State-developed standards in reading or language arts and in mathematics that build toward college- and career-readiness by the time students graduate from high school, and high-quality statewide assessments aligned with these standards. Forty-five States and the District of Columbia already have adopted a common set of State-developed college- and career-ready standards in reading and math, and the Administration's reauthorization proposal would provide additional incentives and resources for States seeking to implement these standards and aligned assessments.

The proposed new standards and assessments would give families and communities the information they need to determine whether their students are on track to college- and career-readiness and to evaluate the effectiveness of their schools. States would also continue to implement statewide science standards and aligned assessments in specific grade spans, and could include those assessments—as well as statewide assessments in other subjects, such as history—in their Title I accountability system so long as they meet the same "college- and career-ready" requirements as the reading and mathematics standards. Finally, States would develop and adopt statewide English language proficiency standards for English Learners, as well as aligned English language proficiency assessments, that reflect the academic language necessary to master each State's content standards.

Rigor, Rewards, and Flexibility in State Accountability Systems

Building on these statewide standards and aligned assessments, the Administration's Title I reauthorization proposal would require every State to ensure that its statewide system of accountability rewards schools and districts for progress and success, requires rigorous interventions in the lowest-performing schools and districts and in those with the largest achievement gaps, and gives local officials flexibility to determine the appropriate improvement and support strategies for most schools.

The foundation of these new, more rigorous and fair accountability systems would be comprehensive data systems that gather information that is critical to determining how schools and districts are progressing in preparing students to graduate from high school ready for

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

college and careers. States and districts would collect and publicly report data relating to student academic achievement and growth in reading and mathematics, student academic achievement in science, and, if States choose, student academic achievement and growth in other subjects, such as history. At the high school level, States also would collect and report graduation rates and, over time, college enrollment rates and college persistence rates. Reporting of these data would be disaggregated by race, gender, ethnicity, disability status, English Learner status, status as connected to the active-duty military, and family income. States and districts also would collect other key information about teaching and learning conditions, including information on school climate, such as student, teacher, and school leader attendance; disciplinary incidents; or the results from student, parent, or school staff surveys about their school experience.

The reauthorization proposal would replace the AYP measure in current law, which is based primarily on a single, static snapshot of student proficiency on academic assessments, with a broader, more accurate measure of school performance that looks at student achievement, student growth, and school progress. Performance targets would be aligned with the objective of ensuring that, by 2020, all students are graduating (or are on track to graduate) from high school ready for college and a career.

The schools, districts, and States that are successful in reaching performance targets, significantly increasing student performance for all students, closing achievement gaps, or turning around the lowest-performing schools would be eligible for rewards, which could include financial rewards for the staff and students in high-poverty schools and flexibility for LEAs and schools in the use of ESEA funds.

School improvement assistance would be focused on three categories of schools. First, States and LEAs would be required to implement one of four school turnaround models in the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools in each State, based on student academic achievement, student growth, graduation rates, and a lack of progress on these measures. An LEA that has been identified for rewards would have flexibility to implement its own research-based intervention model in those schools.

Second, schools that fall between the fifth and tenth percentiles based on student academic achievement, student growth, and graduation rates would be placed in a warning category, and States and LEAs would implement research-based, locally determined strategies to help them improve. And, third, in schools that are not closing significant, persistent achievement gaps, LEAs would be required to implement data-driven interventions—which could include expanded learning time, supplemental educational services, or other strategies—to support those students who are farthest behind and help close those achievement gaps.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal also would require identification of and intervention in low-performing States and LEAs. Such interventions could include governance or staffing changes, restrictions on the use of ESEA funds, or partnering with an outside organization to improve student academic achievement.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

Equitable Distribution of Effective Teachers and Leaders

Strong teachers and leaders are the heart of educational improvement. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would require States to develop definitions of "effective" and "highly effective" teachers and principals, based in significant part on student academic growth, which would be used in the development of State and local teacher and principal evaluation systems. In addition, both States and LEAs would be required to develop meaningful plans to achieve the equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders.

Resources for Reform

The Administration's Title I reauthorization proposal also would give States and LEAs greater flexibility in using Title I, Part A funds to build State and local capacity to improve student achievement. For example, States would be permitted to reserve up to 5 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations to carry out such activities as: (1) implementing rigorous standards and high-quality assessments and, in particular, helping teachers teach to the new standards; (2) using data more effectively to identify local needs and improve student outcomes; (3) improving capacity at the State and district levels to use technology to improve instruction; (4) coordinating with early learning programs to improve school readiness; or (5) carrying out effective family engagement strategies. States also would be permitted to set aside up to 1 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations to fund programs that support family engagement and to identify and disseminate best practices in this area.

In addition, the Administration's reauthorization proposal would broaden the requirement in current law for LEAs with schools in improvement to spend an amount equal to 20 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations on public school choice and/or supplemental educational services. LEAs would instead be required to use an identical amount to improve student performance in high-need schools by implementing effective school improvement strategies and carrying out strategies designed to ensure the equitable distribution of effective teachers and school leaders. LEAs would also be required to reserve at least 2 percent of their Title I, Part A allocations to develop and implement comprehensive family engagement plans. LEAs would continue to have flexibility to use Title I, Part A funds to serve eligible pre-K students and, in particular, to support activities designed to improve the school readiness of young children across a range of domains and lay the foundation for success in the early grades.

The ESEA proposal also would encourage increased resource equity by: (1) strengthening "comparability" requirements to ensure that the high-poverty schools in each LEA receive State and local funding (for personnel and relevant non-personnel expenditures) comparable to the amount received by the LEA's low-poverty schools; and (2) requiring States to measure and report on resource disparities and to develop a plan to reduce those disparities.

Title I Rewards Program

The Administration also is proposing a new Title I Rewards program that would help ensure that State accountability systems provide meaningful positive incentives and rewards that recognize and encourage improved student outcomes. Encouraging, recognizing, and rewarding

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

outstanding performance by high-poverty schools and LEAs would bring a much-needed corrective balance to the emphasis of current law on what often are perceived as punitive sanctions for low performance. While the reauthorization proposal would create a separately funded State formula grant program for Title I Rewards, for 2015, the Department would work with the appropriators to provide a 2 percent State-level set-aside of funds under CCRS grants that would be used to reward high-poverty LEAs and schools that are the highest achieving or are making the most progress in improving student achievement. Such rewards could include: (1) financial rewards for principals, teachers, and other staff; (2) college scholarships for students in high-performing schools; (3) school-level financial rewards; or (4) other innovative rewards and incentives developed by the States.

Evaluation

The Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal also would authorize the Department to reserve up to 0.5 percent of Title I, Part A formula grant funds under a broad ESEA evaluation authority aimed at supporting the comprehensive evaluation of the implementation, outcomes, impact, and cost-effectiveness of ESEA programs, including the Title I, Part A CCRS program. Title I evaluation activities would be included in a biennial evaluation plan that the Department would develop and submit to Congress. The Administration's reauthorization proposal also would permit the Department to use funds reserved for ESEA evaluation to complete evaluations that were initiated before ESEA reauthorization.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands, except per-child amounts)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Allocations by LEA Poverty Rate:			
0-15%			
# of LEAs	4,866	4,862	4,862
Dollars	\$1,610,660	\$1,743,101	\$1,751,340
% of Total \$	11.94	12.35	12.40
# of Formula Eligible Children	1,719,375	1,725,527	1,725,527
0-15% \$ Per Formula Child	\$937	\$1,010	\$1,015
15-25%			
# of LEAs	4,611	4,678	4,678
Dollars	\$3,737,959	\$3,912,520	\$3,935,537
% of Total \$	27.71	27.72	27.87
# of Formula Eligible Children	3,552,850	3,493,473	3,493,473
\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,052	\$1,120	\$1,127
>25%			
# of LEAs	3,639	3,595	3,595
Dollars	\$8,141,872	\$8,458,732	\$8,432,907
% of Total \$	60.35	59.93	59.72
# of Formula Eligible Children	6,309,201	6,451,411	6,451,411
\$ Per Formula Child	\$1,290	\$1,311	\$1,307
LEA Allocation Subtotal	\$13,490,491	\$14,114,353	\$14,119,784
BIA/Outlying Areas	137,564	143,808	143,808
Part D, Subpart 2	128,387	122,657	117,210
Census Updates	<u>3,777</u>	<u>3,984</u>	<u>4,000</u>
Grants to LEAs Total	13,760,219	14,384,802	14,384,802
# of Schools receiving Title I funds			
Schoolwide programs	37,141	37,141	37,141
Targeted assistance programs	<u>16,055</u>	<u>16,055</u>	<u>16,055</u>
Total	53,196	53,196	53,196
# of Students served (in millions)			
In schoolwide programs	21.6	21.6	21.6
In targeted assistance programs	1.2	1.2	1.2
In non-public and N&D programs	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.2</u>
Total	23.0	23.0	23.0

Note: Descriptive data are from ED Data Express (school year 2011-12). Data on Title I status for GA, OR, and VA are from the 2010-11 school year.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2015 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The performance measures and targets for the Title I Grants to LEAs program rely on data submitted annually through the ESEA Consolidated State Performance Reports, which include State and local performance information primarily as specified through the annual “report card” requirements described in Section 1111(h) of the ESEA.

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

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

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

Measure: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments.

Year	Target Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency	Actual Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency
2010	77.7%	61.4%
2011	83.2	61.3%
2012	88.8	59.7
2013	94.4	
2014	100.0	
2015	100.0	

Additional information: Assessment data for 2012 show that the average proficiency rate in reading/language arts for economically disadvantaged students declined slightly from the previous years. Unless the rate of improvement picks up in future years, less than two-thirds of economically disadvantaged students will be proficient in reading in 2014, well short of the ESEA’s current goal of 100-percent proficiency. The Department intends to adjust or replace future years’ targets in response to the development and implementation of new student academic proficiency goals set by the more than 40 States implementing new systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support under ESEA flexibility.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

Measure: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments.

Year	Target Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency	Actual Percentage of Students Who Test At or Above Proficiency
2010	76.2%	61.6%
2011	82.1	61.1
2012	88.1	58.0
2013	94.0	
2014	100.0	
2015	100.0	

Additional information: Assessment data for 2012 show that the average proficiency rate in mathematics for economically disadvantaged students declined by 3 percentage points from the previous years. Unless the rate of improvement picks up in future years, only two-thirds of economically disadvantaged students will be proficient in mathematics in 2014, well short of the ESEA's current goal of 100-percent proficiency. The Department intends to adjust or replace future years' targets in response to the development and implementation of new student academic proficiency goals set by the more than 40 States implementing new systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support under ESEA flexibility.

Measure: The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments.

Year	Target Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students	Actual Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students
2010	6.5%	10.9%
2011	4.9	10.7
2012	3.3	10.6
2013	1.6	
2014	0.0	
2015	0.0	

Additional information: The 2012 results show that the reading achievement gap is closing, but far too slowly to eliminate this gap by 2014, the year by which the current ESEA calls for all student groups to be proficient in reading/language arts (thus reducing the gap to zero). The Department intends to adjust or replace future years' targets in response to the development and implementation of new student academic proficiency goals set by the more than 40 States implementing new systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support under ESEA flexibility.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

Measure: The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State math assessments.

Year	Target Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students	Actual Gap in Proficiency Percentage Between Economically Disadvantaged Students and All Students
2010	6.4%	10.0%
2011	4.8	9.9
2012	3.2	10.2
2013	1.6	
2014	0.0	
2015	0.0	

Additional information: The 2012 results show that the mathematics gap is rising, and now exceeds the gap from 2 years earlier, making it unlikely that this gap will be eliminated by 2014, the year by which the ESEA calls for all student groups to be proficient in math (thus reducing the gap to zero). The Department intends to adjust or replace future years' targets in response to the development and implementation of new student academic proficiency goals set by the more than 40 States implementing new systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support under ESEA flexibility.

Efficiency Measure

Measure: Average number of business days to complete State monitoring reports, following the completion of a site visit.

Year	Target Number of Days	Actual Number of Days
2010	40.0	30.9
2011	40.0	35.2
2012	40.0	32.3
2013	40.0	57.3
2014	40.0	
2015	40.0	

Assessment of progress: In 2012, the Department continued to outperform its target of completing State monitoring reports within 40 days of the conclusion of a site visit. Data for 2013 represent 3 monitoring visits under the traditional Title I, Part A, monitoring protocol. The Department conducted an additional 35 monitoring reviews under ESEA flexibility (Part A monitoring) and those reports were completed in an average 108.4 days. The increase in the average number of business days to complete monitoring reports was generally due to a more inquiry-based approach for ESEA flexibility monitoring, which was new for the Department and States. The Department will revise targets for future years once this transition is complete.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

Other Performance Information

The Title I Program at a Glance

In the 2011-2012 school year, the most recent year for which complete data are available, the Title I program served approximately 23 million students, or 46 percent of the total student population. More detailed program information, compared to the overall public school population, is displayed in the tables below.

2011-2012 School Year

Student Group	# of Students, All Schools	# of Students, Title I Schools	% of students served by Title I
All	49,974,409	22,808,295	46%
American Indian	547,407	329,124	60
Asian/Pacific Islander	2,504,208	923,565	37
Black	7,822,565	5,030,198	64
Hispanic	12,172,760	8,219,429	68
White	25,583,039	7,673,489	30
Two or More Races	1,270,321	500,045	39
Economically disadvantaged	23,549,530	14,486,663	62
English Learners	4,475,327	3,596,049	80
Students with disabilities	6,507,565	3,009,056	46

In addition, data on the concentration of students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch show that Title I funds seem to be reaching the target schools and students. There are 17,582 schools where between 81 and 100 percent of the student population qualify for free or reduced-price lunch; 80 percent of those schools are served by Title I.

2011-2012 School Year

Concentration ranges of students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch	# of Schools	# of Title I Schools	% Title I Schools
0-20%	15,389	4,868	32%
21-40%	18,210	6,424	35
41-60%	21,755	11,752	54
61-80%	18,793	12,806	68
81-100%	17,582	14,039	80

Note: Descriptive data are from the 2011-12 school year Common Core of Data. Data on Title I status for GA, OR, and VA are from the 2010-11 school year.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

College- and career-ready students

National Assessment of Title I: Final Report

The ESEA required a comprehensive, multi-year national assessment on the implementation and impact of the Title I Grants to LEAs. The most recent data from this assessment are included in two reports. The first, a 2009 report entitled “Title I Implementation: Update on Recent Evaluation Findings,” provides a summary of findings from Title I evaluation studies that have become available after the publication of the National Assessment of Title I final report in 2007. The second report, “State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume IX-Accountability Under NCLB: Final Report,” was published in 2010 and provides updated information on State, district, and school implementation of NCLB provisions concerning accountability and school improvement. Findings from these reports demonstrate the need to address the current accountability provisions under current law. Both reports, as well as other related Title I evaluation reports, are available in full on the Department of Education’s Web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oepd/ppss/reports.html#title>.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Section 1003(g))

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$505,756	\$505,756	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2015.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes the Department to award School Improvement Grants (SIGs) to each State educational agency (SEA) based on the SEA's proportionate share of funds under ESEA Title I, Parts A, C, and D. Each SEA must use at least 95 percent of its allocation to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to assist their Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116. SEAs may use up to 5 percent of their SIG allocations for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance activities.

The statute requires States to give priority in making subgrants to LEAs demonstrating the greatest need for school improvement funding and the strongest commitment to providing the resources needed to help their lowest-performing schools successfully implement improvement plans. Subgrants to LEAs must be of sufficient size and scope to support the activities required under section 1116 of the ESEA and are renewable for two additional 1-year periods.

Since fiscal year 2012, appropriations acts have authorized the Department to reserve up to 5 percent of SIG funds to carry out activities to build SEA and LEA capacity to implement the SIG program effectively.

Rapid Funding Growth

Congress first funded the School Improvement Grants program in fiscal year 2007 with an initial appropriation of \$125 million, followed by a large increase to \$491 million in fiscal year 2008 and \$546.6 million in the regular 2009 appropriation. In addition, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) provided \$3 billion for the SIG program, for a 2009 total of just over \$3.5 billion. In response to this unprecedented increase in SIG funding, and as part of a comprehensive effort to maximize the impact of one-time Recovery Act funding, the Administration developed and issued new regulations governing the SIG program. These regulations, which were coordinated with regulations published for two other major education programs in the Recovery Act, the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund and the Race to the Top program, were aimed primarily at ensuring that the historic Recovery Act investment in the SIG

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

program was used to implement rigorous school intervention models in the Nation's persistently struggling schools, including many of the high schools with graduation rates below 60 percent.

New Regulations

The new SIG regulations were issued in two parts. First, the Department published SIG final requirements in the Federal Register on December 10, 2009 (74 FR 65618). Second, in response to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010, which was signed into law on December 16, 2009, and which included new provisions applicable to the SIG program for fiscal years 2009 and 2010, the Department published additional interim final regulations in January 2010. The January 2010 interim final regulations incorporated language in the Consolidated Appropriations Act that expanded school eligibility for the SIG program, while continuing to target funds on the lowest-performing schools. Under these regulations, SEAs and LEAs have the option of serving certain Title I schools that are not in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and certain schools that are eligible for, but that do not receive, Title I, Part A funds. The interim final regulations also raised the maximum annual amount an LEA may receive under the SIG program from \$500,000 to \$2 million per participating school. The December 2009 and January 2010 regulations were consolidated in a final rule published in the Federal Register on October 8, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

Defining Greatest Need

A key purpose of the SIG regulations was to define more closely the statutory priorities on awarding SIG funds to LEAs that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to ensuring that the funds are used to provide resources that enable the lowest-performing schools to raise substantially the achievement of their students. To drive school improvement funds to LEAs with the greatest need for those funds, the SIG regulations incorporate the common definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" developed for use in the reporting required by the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund and in State plans for turning around their lowest-performing schools under Race to the Top. Persistently lowest-achieving schools are defined generally as: (1) the State's bottom 5 percent, in terms of academic achievement, of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; (2) the bottom 5 percent, in terms of academic achievement, of secondary schools in each State that are eligible for, but that do not receive, Title I, Part A funds; and (3) Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent and other Title I-eligible secondary schools with graduation rates below 60 percent. In identifying schools in categories (1) and (2), States must take into account the academic achievement of the "all students" group in each school in terms of proficiency on ESEA reading/language arts and mathematics assessments combined, as well as that group's lack of progress on those assessments. The "bottom 5 percent," as used in the definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, must include at least five schools.

To determine greatest need for the purposes of the SIG program, the SIG regulations established three tiers of schools based on the definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools and the eligibility requirements of ESEA section 1003(g). Under the regulations, States have some flexibility in assigning schools to the three tiers, but in general must adhere to the following guidelines:

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

- Tier I schools are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that either (1) are in the bottom 5 percent of such schools in achievement and are not improving, or (2) have graduation rates below 60 percent.
- Tier II schools are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds and that either (1) are in the State's bottom 5 percent of such schools in terms of achievement and are not improving, or (2) have graduation rates below 60 percent.
- Tier III schools are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I.

The final regulations also incorporate the optional expanded eligibility provisions included in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. That Act allows SEAs and LEAs to use SIG funds to serve, in addition to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, schools that are eligible for (but might or might not receive) Title I, Part A funds and that either: (1) have not made AYP for at least 2 years, or (2) are in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates. States that choose to add schools that are eligible for SIG funds under these expanded eligibility provisions must ensure that the school is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school in the tier to which it is added. The Department also has provided flexibility, available through a waiver, for States to include low-achieving Title I secondary schools in their lists of Tier II schools (which, absent this waiver, would include only secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds).

Defining Strongest Commitment

States also must determine which LEAs have the strongest commitment to using SIG funds for interventions that are most likely to turn around their lowest-performing schools and produce improved student outcomes. The regulations define "strongest commitment" as a commitment by an LEA to use SIG funds to implement fully and effectively one of the following four school intervention models in each of its Tier I and Tier II schools:

- The Turnaround model, which involves, among other things, replacing the principal and retaining no more than 50 percent of a school's staff, adopting a new governance structure, and implementing an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next, as well as aligned with a State's academic standards.
- The Restart model, which requires an LEA to convert a school to a charter school or close and reopen it under the management of a charter school operator, a charter management organization, or an education management organization that has been selected through a rigorous review process.
- School Closure, which involves closing a school and enrolling its students in other, higher-achieving schools in the LEA.
- The Transformation model, which addresses four specific areas critical to transforming the lowest-performing schools, including replacing the principal and ineffective teachers,

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

comprehensive instructional reform, increasing learning time, and expanding operational flexibility.

The Department encourages LEAs that serve high-need Tier III schools to use SIG funds to implement one of the intervention models in those schools, but they may also use SIG funds to carry out the school improvement activities described in section 1116 of the ESEA.

Awarding School Improvement Grants to LEAs

In awarding grants to an eligible LEA, an SEA must provide sufficient funding to the LEA to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA applies to serve and to serve participating Tier III schools. More broadly, an SEA must award funds to serve each Tier I and Tier II school that its LEAs apply to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have the capacity to serve, before it awards funding to LEAs to serve Tier III schools. LEAs may receive up to \$2 million annually over 3 years to implement the selected intervention model in a school; School Closure generally requires only modest funding (e.g., \$50,000 to \$100,000) and is implemented in just 1 year. Since fiscal year 2010, LEAs have been permitted to request funding in their first-year budgets for pre-implementation activities conducted in the spring and summer prior to the beginning of the school year in which the LEA will fully implement an intervention model in a Tier I or Tier II school.

LEAs receiving grants must establish annual goals, subject to SEA approval, for student achievement and must report progress on certain leading indicators for their Tier I and Tier II schools. Tier III schools must meet goals established by the LEA and approved by the SEA; for Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, these may be the goals in their improvement plans required by section 1116 of the ESEA. SEAs must review progress toward these goals prior to renewing the second and third years of an LEA's SIG award.

SIG under ESEA Flexibility

The SIG program is playing a key role in the differentiated recognition, accountability, and support systems that States are creating and implementing under ESEA flexibility. More specifically, the Department has permitted States receiving ESEA flexibility and submitting applications to make new SIG awards to replace their lists of SIG Tier I, II, and III schools with their lists of priority schools under ESEA flexibility and to provide funds to LEAs to carry out one of the SIG intervention models in those schools. (The definition of "priority school" used in ESEA flexibility is based largely on the definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools in the regulations governing the SIG program.)

New SIG Provisions in FY 2014 Appropriations

The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2014, includes new provisions for the SIG program. These provisions, which apply to the use of fiscal year 2014 funds, allow an SEA to establish an award period for its LEAs receiving SIG funds of up to 5 years; allow an LEA to use SIG funds to implement, in partnership with a strategy developer, a whole-school reform strategy for which there is at least moderate evidence of effectiveness or to implement an alternative school improvement strategy established by the SEA and approved by the

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

Department; and allow an LEA that is eligible for assistance under the Rural Education Achievement programs to modify an element of a SIG intervention model. As of March 2014, the Department is considering options for implementing the respective provisions, such as issuing new regulations or providing guidance or technical assistance to SEAs and LEAs.

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

Funding levels for the program for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010.....	\$545,633
2011.....	534,562
2012.....	533,552
2013.....	505,756
2014.....	505,756

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$505.8 million for School Turnaround Grants (School Improvement Grants under current law) in fiscal year 2015, the same as the fiscal year 2014 level. Under the Administration's proposal to reauthorize the ESEA, these formula grants would play a critical role in efforts to implement rigorous interventions in persistently lowest-performing schools, which would be identified through the reauthorized Title I accountability system rather than the three-tiered system established in the SIG final regulations under current law. In general, these would be schools that are in the bottom 5 percent of schools in each State based on student achievement and, at the high school level, graduation rates, and that are not improving.

Under the reauthorization proposal, States would be permitted to reserve funds to build their capacity to improve low-performing schools, including by reviewing and ensuring the effectiveness of external partners. States would subgrant most funds through competitive awards to LEAs (or partnerships of LEAs and nonprofit organizations) to implement one of the locally selected intervention models: turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation. LEAs would receive up to 3 years of funding to implement fully and effectively one of these intervention models, and would be eligible for 2 additional years of funding to support a school's ongoing improvement if the school is showing progress. With the exception of the closure model, each of these models allows flexibility for locally designed plans that recognize and meet a broad range of student needs from preschool through grade 12 and that support investments across the age continuum, from improving the school readiness of young children to helping dropouts return to school and graduate ready for college or a career.

In addition to providing State and local funding, the Department would be authorized to reserve funds to carry out activities designed to enhance the capacity of States, LEAs, and nonprofit organizations to improve schools, such as by investing in model school quality review teams to identify school needs and support school improvement. The Department could also use these

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

funds to continue its support for the School Turnaround AmeriCorps initiative of the Corporation for National and Community Service, which provides SIG schools and priority schools served in States receiving ESEA flexibility with AmeriCorps members who support critical interventions aligned to locally developed school and LEA turnaround plans, as well as for the School Turnaround Leaders program, which the Department is initiating in fiscal year 2014 (using funds from the fiscal year 2013 appropriation) to help ensure that leaders of schools eligible for or receiving SIG funds possess the specialized skills needed to drive successful efforts to turn those schools around.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Amount to States	\$475,970	\$475,958	\$475,958
Range of State awards	1,110-57,026	1,089-59,971	1,089-59,971
Average State award	9,153	9,153	9,153
Amount to BIE	3,152	3,113	3,113
Amount to Outlying Areas	1,346	1,397	1,397
National activities	25,288	25,288	25,288

NOTE: The 2013 and 2014 appropriations acts authorized the Department to use up to 5 percent, or in each case \$25,288 thousand, of SIG funds for activities to build SEA and LEA capacity to implement the SIG program effectively. The Department has not yet determined the specific amount of fiscal year 2013, 2014, or 2015 funds that it would use for national activities.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The final regulations for the SIG program include reporting metrics intended to help the Department, States, and LEAs evaluate the effectiveness of the required interventions and to inform technical assistance activities. States must report to the Department on the LEAs that received SIG awards, the size of the awards, and the schools served by each LEA with SIG funds (including the level of support provided to each participating school). States also must report school-level information, such as the type of intervention, student achievement levels, graduation and dropout rates, and data on teacher performance and school climate. The Department collects these data through its *EDFacts* system.

Numbers and Characteristics of Schools Eligible for and Receiving SIG Grants

In May 2011, the Department published “Baseline Analyses of SIG Applications and SIG-Eligible and SIG-Awarded Schools” (SIG Baseline Study), which provides descriptive analyses of States’ fiscal year 2009 SIG competitions and is available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20114019/>. The SIG Baseline Study showed that States identified a total of 1,107 Tier I schools, 1,034 Tier II schools, and 13,136 Tier III schools that were eligible to receive SIG funds in the fiscal year 2009 competitions. Of the total of 15,277 eligible schools

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

identified, 55 percent were elementary schools, 20 percent were middle schools, 19 percent were high schools, and 6 percent were “non-standard.”

According to the study, States funded in the fiscal year 2009 SIG competitions included 514 Tier I schools, 312 Tier II schools, and 402 Tier III schools. Of the total of 1,228 schools served, 32 percent were elementary schools, 22 percent were middle schools, 40 percent were high schools, and 5 percent were “non-standard.” States made just over half of SIG awards to urban schools, about one-quarter to suburban schools, and about one-quarter to rural schools. High schools were particularly likely to be funded, receiving 40 percent of SIG awards while constituting just 19 percent of eligible schools. Rural schools also competed successfully, receiving almost a quarter of awards despite constituting only one-fifth of eligible schools. The following table compares SIG-eligible and SIG-awarded schools by grade range and school locale:

**Comparison of FY 2009 SIG-Eligible and SIG-Awarded Schools
by School Level and Locale**

Grade range	SIG-eligible schools	SIG-awarded schools
Elementary	55.3%	32.2%
Middle	20.1%	22.1%
High	19.1%	40.4%
Non-standard	5.5%	5.2%
Locale Type		
Central City	44.9%	52.5%
Urban Fringe	35.2%	24.3%
Rural	19.9%	23.2%

Other key findings of the SIG Baseline Study include the following:

- Nearly three-quarters (603 schools, or 74 percent) of SIG-awarded Tier I and Tier II schools are implementing the transformation model, while 20 percent (168 schools) are implementing the turnaround model. Just 33 schools, or 4 percent, are implementing the restart model and 16 schools, or 2 percent, are implementing school closure.
- Award amounts varied by tier and by State. The average 3-year award among Tier I and Tier II schools was \$2.54 million, compared to \$520,000 among Tier III schools.
- The percentage increase in overall per-pupil funding associated with SIG varied across States. The highest State average increase in per-pupil funding in Tier I and Tier II schools receiving SIG awards was 58 percent (in Montana) while the lowest was 3 percent (in Vermont).

In October 2012, the Department published “School Improvement Grants: Analyses of State Applications and Eligible and Awarded Schools,” which analyzes States’ fiscal year 2010 SIG competitions and compares them to the fiscal year 2009 competitions, and is available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20124060/>. The study shows that in their 2010 competitions States

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

made SIG awards to an additional 315 Tier I schools, 174 Tier II schools, and 111 Tier III schools, a total of 600 schools. According to the study, this second SIG cohort largely mirrors the first cohort in distribution of schools by grade range, locale type, and intervention model implemented. The average 3-year award among Tier I and Tier II schools in fiscal year 2010 competitions was \$2.84 million, an increase of \$300,000 over that for the first cohort; the average award among Tier III schools saw a similar increase, from \$520,000 for the first cohort to \$810,000 for the second.

In addition to the combined 1,303 Tier I and II schools served in the fiscal year 2009 and 2010 competitions, States reported awarding new grants to 153 and 197 Tier I and Tier II schools in their 2011 and 2012 competitions, respectively. The Department estimates that another 340 Tier I and Tier II schools will be served beginning with fiscal year 2013 or 2014 funds, bringing the total number of the Nation's persistently lowest-achieving schools that to date are or will be implementing rigorous interventions with the support of SIG funds to approximately 2,000.

Implementation of SIG Grants

In 2013, the Department initiated a set of quick-release profiles designed to accelerate collection and dissemination of promising practices in the school turnaround field. These profiles will be informed by interviews of selected States, LEAs, and schools receiving SIG funds and analyses of implementation data and will address topics such as turnaround leadership, data-based decision-making, school climate, community engagement, and capacity building. The profiles are expected to be released in phases beginning in March 2014.

The Department is also conducting a series of more detailed case studies of SIG implementation. The studies, which include a set of special studies focusing on rural SIG schools and SIG schools serving high percentages of English learners, will provide descriptively rich information on a carefully selected sample of 25 schools that began implementing SIG interventions in the 2010-2011 school year. A report with findings from the schools' first implementation year, along with evaluation briefs on the special case study schools, is expected to be available in summer 2014.

Outcomes of SIG Grants

In February 2014, the Department published an analysis of State assessments results for schools receiving SIG funding from the fiscal year 2009 and 2010 competitions. Comparing, where data permit, schools' average proficiency rates in the 2011-2012 school year (the second year of SIG implementation for schools receiving fiscal year 2009 grants and the first implementation year for schools in the 2010 cohort) to their rates in the year prior to receiving SIG funds, the analysis notably found that:

- Proficiency rates in SIG schools have on average increased in both reading/language arts and mathematics, with more schools demonstrating gains in proficiency than declines;
- Proficiency rates in 2009 cohort SIG schools continued to increase on average in the second year of implementation; and

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

School turnaround grants

- When compared to all schools nationally, 2009 cohort SIG schools on average showed larger increases in proficiency rates in both reading/language arts and mathematics, while 2010 cohort schools showed larger increases in reading/language arts but similar increases in mathematics.

The Department is also conducting a formal evaluation of the impact of school turnaround efforts in both the Race to the Top (RTT) and SIG programs. This evaluation involves collecting data from all 50 States and DC, as well as roughly 60 LEAs and 525 schools. The study will focus on (1) the implementation of RTT and SIG; (2) the relationship between receipt of RTT funds and student outcomes; (3) the impact of the receipt of SIG funds on student outcomes in the lowest-achieving schools; and (4) the relationship between the four school turnaround models (and related improvement strategies) and student outcomes and school performance. The Department released a brief from this evaluation in December 2013 (accessible at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20144008/>) outlining trends in the operational authority (e.g., autonomy over school budgets, student discipline policies, and staffing) of SIG and non-SIG schools, the most common forms of technical assistance and other supports for turnaround efforts, and the role of State monitoring. The first full evaluation report is scheduled for release in late 2014.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Evaluation

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$880	0	-\$880

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. No appropriations language or reauthorization legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

The ESEA required a comprehensive, multi-year national assessment on the implementation and impact of the Title I Grants to LEAs. Data from the multi-year national assessment are included in two reports. The first, a 2009 report entitled "Title I Implementation: Update on Recent Evaluation Findings," provides a summary of findings from Title I evaluation studies that have become available after the publication of the National Assessment of Title I final report in 2007. The second report, "State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume IX-Accountability Under NCLB: Final Report," was published in 2010 and provides updated information on State, district, and school implementation of NCLB provisions concerning accountability and school improvement. Funding under this program also supported nine volumes of reports on the "State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)" as well as a series of reports on specialized topics. Some of those specialized topics include analyses of States' accountability provisions; implementation and outcome findings in districts that received waivers to serve as supplemental educational services providers, despite being districts identified for improvement; an evaluation of the growth model pilot project, a project initiated to allow States to experiment with adjustments to the NCLB status accountability system, which informed the Administration's future decisions on accountability under ESEA flexibility; and an examination of the Title I comparability requirement, which included the first national data collection on school-level expenditures. These reports, as well as other related Title I evaluation reports, are available in full on the Department of Education's Web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oepd/ppss/reports.html#title>.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Evaluation

Ongoing studies under way in fiscal year 2014 include the following:

- The implementation of ESEA Title I and Title II program initiatives. This study will examine the implementation of policies promoted through the ESEA at the State, district and school levels in four core areas: State content standards, aligned assessments, accountability and school turnaround, and developing effective teachers and leaders. The study will address changes since the previous national assessment of Title I (in 2006) as well as ESEA flexibility. The study will include a survey of all 50 States and DC, as well as a nationally representative sample of 570 school districts, 1,300 schools, and 9,100 teachers.
- Early childhood language development. Data from 83 Title I schools, collected during the 2011-2012 school year, will be analyzed to estimate the associations between instructional programs and programs for students in preschool through grade 3 and the outcomes for those students.
- Case studies of the implementation of school turnaround models. These case studies, involving approximately 60 schools in 6 States, will focus on the change process in schools implementing school turnaround models and examine leading indicators of successful implementation of the models to provide information useful to both policy-makers and practitioners. Descriptive analyses of State SIG applications and SIG-eligible and SIG-awarded schools are available for the first and second cohorts of SIG grantees (fiscal year 2010 and 2011 competitions).¹
- Early implementation of ESEA flexibility. This study of 12 States and 24 school districts that have begun the first full year of implementing provisions under ESEA flexibility will provide reports of early implementation of ESEA flexibility to policy-makers as they continue to refine policy and technical assistance to States on issues related to the flexibility provisions.
- Feasibility Study on Improving the Quality of School-Level Expenditure Data. This feasibility study will explore options for improving the completeness, consistency, and accuracy of school-level expenditure reporting by interviewing fiscal staff in five States and districts that have finance systems that track school-level financial data and then collecting and analyzing available school-level expenditure data in the selected States and districts.

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2010	\$9,167
2011	8,151
2012	3,194
2013	3,028
2014	880

¹ <http://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=NCEE20114019> and <http://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=NCEE20124060>

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Evaluation

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting separate funding for Title I Evaluation in fiscal year 2015. The Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal would consolidate this activity into a broader evaluation authority aimed at supporting comprehensive evaluation of the implementation, outcomes, impact, and cost-effectiveness of ESEA programs. Funding would be made available through a reservation of up to 0.5 percent of the funds appropriated each year for programs authorized by Title I of the ESEA and up to 1.5 percent of the funds appropriated each year for all other ESEA programs.

Education improvement is an on-going process of building our knowledge about what works in improving practice and results for students. Understanding how ESEA programs are being implemented and whether they achieve their intended outcomes is essential for improvement. However, the current fragmentation of evaluation authorities and funding hampers effective evaluation and the development of effective performance management strategies. The proposed cross-cutting reservation of funds would provide resources to conduct rigorous, objective evaluations of ESEA programs, policies, and practices, while also supporting performance measurement essential for program improvement. In addition, the new authority would enable the Department to provide increased technical assistance on evaluation to States and LEAs in order to promote quality and comparability of evaluation results.

Under the reauthorization proposal, the Department would be required to develop and submit to the Congress an evaluation plan every 2 years describing proposed evaluation activities and the reservations required to fund this plan. The evaluation plan would identify the Department's key priorities for evaluations and related knowledge-building activities, such as strengthening performance measures and improving grantee evaluations, within and across program offices. The plan would support appropriate resource allocation and help ensure that evaluations generate usable knowledge that informs program improvement, policy development, and budget decision-making for Federal, State, and local decision-makers. The Department would be required to use at least 30 percent of total funds reserved for evaluation to conduct impact studies that employ experimental designs and other methodologies that support causal inferences.

In addition to evaluation and impact studies, the Department would carry out analyses of data from evaluations and other sources intended to inform policy-making and promote continuous program improvement. A recent example of this kind of activity is the policy brief published in November 2011, entitled: "The Potential Impact of Revising the Title I Comparability Requirement to Focus on School-Level Expenditures," which was based on a study of school-level expenditures conducted in response to a requirement in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. The currently funded study of ESEA flexibility will be another example of a quick turnaround study with the same overarching goal of informing policy-making and promoting continuous program improvement.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal also would permit the Department to use funds reserved for ESEA evaluation to complete evaluations that were initiated before ESEA reauthorization. Language from the fiscal year 2014 appropriations act clarified the Secretary's authority to evaluate ESEA programs under section 9601. In the absence of reauthorization,

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Evaluation

the Administration would work with appropriators to ensure sufficient funding for Title I evaluation activities and to more closely align future appropriations for evaluations with our reauthorization proposal.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Implementation of Title I and Title II Program Initiatives	\$1,675	\$502	0
Study of Early Childhood Language Development	500	50	0
Early Implementation of ESEA Flexibility	453	50	0
School Expenditure Study	400	104	0
Data Analysis and Support	<u>0</u>	<u>174</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, Evaluation	3,028	880	0

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Migrant student education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$374,751	\$374,751	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2015.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

Because the program appropriation has not exceeded the fiscal year 2002 level of \$396 million, State allocations are still based on the amount each State received in fiscal year 2002. Under the statute, all funds in excess of \$396 million would be allocated through a statutory formula based on each State's per-pupil expenditure for education, its count of eligible migratory students aged 3 through 21 residing within the State in the previous year, and its count of students who received services in summer or intersession programs provided by the State.

The Department may set aside up to \$10 million from the annual MEP appropriation for contracts and grants to improve inter- and intra-State migrant coordination activities, including academic credit accrual and exchange programs for migrant students. The Department is required to consult with States receiving allocations of \$1 million or less about whether they can

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Migrant student education

increase the cost-effectiveness of their programs by entering into inter-state consortium arrangements. By law, the Department may reserve up to \$3 million a year from coordination funds for incentive grants of not more than \$250,000 to such consortia.

The statute requires the Department to assist States in developing effective methods for the electronic transfer of migrant student records. The Department developed the Migrant Student Information Exchange System (MSIX) to enable States to exchange migrant student data records efficiently and expeditiously and provide an accurate, unduplicated count of the number of migrant students on a national and Statewide basis.

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:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010	\$394,771
2011	393,981
2012	393,236
2013	372,751
2014	374,751

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2015, the Administration requests \$374.8 million for the Title I Migrant Student Education program, the same amount as the 2014 appropriation. The fiscal year 2015 appropriation would support a reauthorized program that would continue to fund activities that identify highly mobile migratory children and youth, provide them comprehensive services that address their specific needs, and promote coordination of the Federal resources available to serve this population.

The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2015 under a reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The Administration's reauthorization proposal would revise the funding formula to address the problems identified in program reviews and audit findings. The current formula includes provisions that are cumbersome, difficult to interpret, and based on child counts from fiscal year 2001. The reauthorization proposal would simplify the formula and ensure that allocations respond to shifts in State counts of migrant students. The proposal would also improve targeting of services to migrant students by strengthening the program purpose language and clarifying which students receive priority for program services. State and local recipients would continue to have wide flexibility in how they allocate program funds provided they track and report on the academic achievement of migratory students in the State.

Migrant students represent an especially disadvantaged, hard-to-serve group due to a multitude of risk factors present in the population. In particular, the movement of these children across school district and State boundaries means that, in general, no single school district or State

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Migrant student education

has ongoing responsibility for the education of these students, thus creating a need for Federal support to assist in the coordination of services to meet their educational needs.

Moreover, the characteristics of the migrant population create a need for educational services that go well beyond services traditionally supported with State and local education budgets. In addition to being highly mobile, migrant students tend to live in poverty, have limited English proficiency, and belong to families that are likely to experience food and job insecurity and poor health and housing conditions. Almost one-third (32 percent) of the children and youth eligible to receive services under the program in 2011-2012 had moved within the previous 12 months. In addition, 36.6 percent of eligible children and youth were limited English proficient.

Migrant children and youth may also help their families perform agricultural work, and a growing number of migrant "emancipated youth" travel without a parent or guardian to obtain migratory work in the fields and in processing plants. A significant proportion of migrant individuals eligible for services under the program (13 percent of the eligible population in 2011-2012) are school-aged youth who do not attend school.

Data for 2011-12 indicate that the program provided services to 219,956 migrant students during the regular school year and 118,612 during the summer or intersessions. Program funds supported 4,002 projects that operated during the school day, 1,078 projects that provided an extended school day during the regular school year, 902 summer or intersession projects, and 1,630 year-round projects. The program served 3,979 children aged birth through 2; 27,512 children aged 3 through 5; 206,233 children and youth in kindergarten through grade 12; and 19,671 out-of-school youth. Services provided included supplemental instruction in reading, math, and other academic areas, family literacy and preschool instruction, and high school credit accrual. Program funds were also used to provide such support services as counseling, health and nutrition services, advocacy and referrals for migrant students with disabilities, and (especially in the summer) transportation.

The Department would reserve approximately \$10 million from the fiscal year 2015 appropriation for migrant coordination and national activities, including \$3 million for consortium incentive grants. The remainder of the funds would be used for activities related to inter- and intra-State coordination, primarily for maintenance and operation of the MSIX, including for technical assistance to States as they continue to implement their systems for collecting and exchanging data on migrant students.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Number of eligible children	375,000	375,000	375,000
SEA program:			
Amount for State grants	\$362,751	\$364,751	\$364,751
Range of State awards	\$0-\$127,952	\$66-\$128,260	\$66-\$128,260

Coordination activities:

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Migrant student education

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Consortium incentive grants	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
Migrant student information exchange and related coordination activities	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years, and in FY 2015 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

Measure: Number of States reporting that 50 percent or more of migrant students scored at the proficient level or above in reading at the elementary school level.

Year	Target Number of States	Number of States
2010	33	24
2011	35	24
2012	36	22
2013	37	
2014	24	
2015	25	

Measure: The number of States reporting that 50 percent or more of migrant students scored at the proficient level or above in reading at the middle school level.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	27	22
2011	29	26
2012	31	20
2013	33	
2014	25	
2015	26	

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Migrant student education

Measure: The number of States reporting that 50 percent or more of migrant students scored at the proficient level or above in mathematics at the elementary school level.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	33	32
2011	35	31
2012	37	27
2013	39	
2014	27	
2015	28	

Measure: The number of States reporting that 50 percent or more of migrant students scored at the proficient level or above in mathematics at the middle school level.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	25	25
2011	27	25
2012	29	22
2013	31	
2014	24	
2015	25	

Additional information: Data for elementary students include data for grades 3 through 5; data for middle school students include data for grades 6-8. Forty-seven States reported reading proficiency data in 2012 and all 47 reported reading and mathematics proficiency data that year. The source of the data is the Consolidated State Performance Reports that States submit to the Department. Data for 2013 will be available in summer 2014.

Based on State data, 51.5 percent of migrant 4th-grade students were proficient in reading and 57.7 percent in math in 2012, compared to 51.4 percent in reading and 59.9 percent in math in 2011. For 8th-grade migrant students, 48.3 percent were proficient in reading in 2012 and 43.7 percent in math, compared to 48.3 percent in reading and 45.9 percent in math in 2011.

The Department previously reported data on migrant student graduation and dropout rates, but there are will not be new data on these measures because those data elements are no longer collected through *EDFacts*. The Department recently determined that it had no authority to collect these data as part of the subgroup data it collects and reports to meet its own responsibilities under Title I of the ESEA. When MSIX is fully implemented (i.e., when all States are collecting and entering all three types of data elements collected in MSIX) and regulations are issued, the Department will have access to data on migrant student graduation, but it may not be able to calculate 4-year cohort graduation rates because MSIX contains only migrant student-level information.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Migrant student education

Efficiency Measures

The Department established an efficiency measure associated with the transfer of migrant student records through the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) system. The MSIX integrates procedures designed to achieve efficiencies and cost reductions by linking separate State and local efforts to transfer health and education records into a single system that can be used within and across all States. The system began collecting data from a number of States in December 2007, but not every State had access to the system at that time. Furthermore, the Department had to work with States to ensure that their data systems met the appropriate technical standards needed to connect to MSIX.

Initially the Department assessed annual changes in the percentage of actively migrating students for which MSIX contained consolidated records that reflect a complete history of school and health information. As of 2012, MSIX contains consolidated records for migrant students who have enrolled in school in more than one State. The Department is now tracking how many States are collecting the three types of data elements collected in MSIX for migrant students: basic student information, student assessment data, and credit accrual information for secondary students.

Measure: The number of States collecting all the types of data elements collected in MSIX.

Year	Target	Actual
2013	Baseline	31
2014	31	
2015	31	

Additional information: As of August of 2013, 31 out of 47 States participating in the MEP are collecting all the types of data elements collected in MSIX. The Department developed a 3-phase plan to help States fully participate in MSIX. Under phase 1, States were to collect and make available all data elements for basic student information, which is required for all migrant students. Under phase 2, States would add student assessment data, which is required only for migrant students taking State assessments. Under phase 3, States would add credit accrual information for secondary students. At this time, State participation in MSIX is voluntary; once the Department issues regulations requiring States to collect and share data through MSIX, the Department will be able to expect all States participating in the MEP to collect all three types of data elements. The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that contains requirements for States pertaining to MSIX was published on December 27, 2013. Data for 2014 will be available in late 2014.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: To be determined¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$47,614	\$47,614	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008; reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2015.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

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:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010	\$50,427
2011	50,326
2012	50,231
2013	47,614
2014	47,614

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2015, the Administration requests \$47.6 million, the same as the 2014 level, for the Neglected and Delinquent (N and D) program. The activities supported with this funding would help an estimated 98,000 N and D students return to and complete school and obtain employment after they are released from State institutions.

The N and D program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization. The request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2015 under reauthorized legislation consistent with the Administration's reauthorization proposal, which would align instruction for N and D students with each State's college- and career-ready standards and improve the transition of these students into locally operated programs and postsecondary and career and technical education programs.

The Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal would also amend ESEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, under which SEAs currently use funding from the Title I, Part A program to make subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to support the provision of educational services for children and youth in local institutions and schools who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk of dropping out. The reauthorization proposal would target the Subpart 2 program on institutionalized children and youth, who may not be served adequately by the Title I, Part A program.

The population served by the Subpart 1 program is extremely disadvantaged and isolated, and research has shown that the youth served are up to 3 years behind in grade level and generally lack job skills. A study by Harris, Baltodano, Bal, Jolivet, and Malcahy (2009) of youth incarcerated in three long-term correctional facilities found low levels of reading achievement among this population, with significantly lower levels for certain ethnic and racial groups and for students in special education. Another study, by Balfanz, Spiridakis, Neild, and Legters (2003), noted that incarcerated youths in a large mid-Atlantic city tended to have failed at least half of their classes and had extremely low attendance rates in the year prior to incarceration. Moreover, a study by Keith and McCray (2002) reported on the special and unmet needs of incarcerated youth offenders with reading disabilities. The longstanding nature of this problem

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

is demonstrated by a 1996 study from the Educational Testing Service showing that while most of the inmates in America's prisons would eventually be paroled, two-thirds did not have the literacy skills needed to function in society. The findings of these reports show the importance of programs focused on improving educational outcomes for neglected and delinquent youth and preparing these students for further education or to enter the workforce.

From the 2015 request, the Department would reserve approximately \$1.3 million to continue to provide technical assistance and other services through the National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for Children who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk. Some of the Center's activities include: (1) developing a national model for evaluating the effectiveness of N and D programs; (2) collecting and disseminating information on tools and effective practices that can be used to support N and D youth; and (3) providing technical assistance, using experts and practitioners, to State agencies.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Number of participating institutions	727	727	727
Estimated number of students served	98,495	98,495	98,495
Average Federal contribution per child (whole dollars)	\$483	\$483	\$483
Range of awards to States	\$97-\$2,900	\$95-\$2,910	\$95-\$2,910
Average State award	\$893	\$893	\$893
National activities	\$1,190	\$1,190	\$1,190

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 2015 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

Measure: The percentage of students supported through the N and D program who obtain a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	13.4%	11.2%
2011	14.1	12.8
2012	13.8	13.0
2013	14.8	
2014	15.8	
2015	16.8	

Additional information: The Department revised the performance targets in 2013 to better align with recent performance.

Measure: The percentage of students supported through the N and D program earning high school course credits.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	58.0%	52.0%
2011	60.9	55.6
2012	56.6	52.3
2013	57.6	
2014	58.6	
2015	59.6	

Additional information: This measure includes students between the ages of 13 and 21 in neglected, juvenile detention, and juvenile correctional institutions, and not students in adult correctional institutions. The Department revised the performance targets in 2013 to be better aligned with recent performance.

Measure: The percentage of long-term students supported through the N and D program who improve reading skills as measured through State-approved assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	92.6%	69.9%
2011	97.2	70.4
2012	71.4	71.1
2013	72.4	
2014	73.4	
2015	74.4	

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Neglected and delinquent children and youth education

Measure: The percentage of long-term students supported through the N and D program who improve mathematics skills as measured through State-approved assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	84.2%	71.3%
2011	88.4	71.9
2012	72.9	71.9
2013	73.9	
2014	74.9	
2015	75.9	

Additional information: Student counts are based on the number of long-term students (those enrolled in a participating program or facility for 90 or more consecutive calendar days) who complete pre- and post-testing in reading and mathematics. These are not the same as the State assessments required under ESEA Title I and do not necessarily reflect State proficiency levels. The Department revised the performance targets in 2013 to be better aligned with recent performance.

Efficiency Measure

Measure: The cost per high school diploma or equivalent.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	\$3,739	\$5,256
2011	3,515	4,566
2012	4,520	4,891
2013	4,475	
2014	4,430	
2015	4,385	

Additional information: This measure attempts to determine program cost efficiency by tracking the ratio of the number of participating students achieving a high school diploma or its equivalent to the cost of the program. The Department revised the performance targets in 2013 to be better aligned with recent performance.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Homeless children and youth education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2015 Authorization: Indefinite

Budget Authority:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$65,042	\$65,042	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Homeless Children and Youth program helps ensure that all homeless children and youth have equal access to the same free, appropriate public education available to other children through grants to States to: (1) establish or designate an Office of Coordinator of Education of Homeless Children and Youth; (2) develop and carry out a State plan for the education of homeless children; and (3) make subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to support the education of those children.

The Department allocates program funds to States through a formula based on each State's share of funds under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). A State may not receive less than the greater of \$150,000, 0.25 percent of the total program appropriation for the fiscal year, or the amount of the State's fiscal year 2001 allocation. Program funds are also reserved for the outlying areas (0.1 percent of a fiscal year's appropriation) and the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) of the Department of the Interior (1 percent). In addition, the Department is authorized to reserve funds to provide technical assistance (if requested by a State) and conduct evaluation and dissemination activities.

A State may reserve up to 25 percent (or in the case of a State receiving the minimum award, 50 percent) of its allocation for State-level activities and must use remaining funds to make subgrants to LEAs. LEAs may use subgrant funds for such activities as providing enriched supplemental instruction, transportation, professional development, referrals to health care, and other services to facilitate the enrollment, attendance, and success in school of homeless children, including preschool-aged children, and youth.

The McKinney-Vento Act explicitly prohibits States that receive program funds from segregating homeless students in separate schools, except for short periods of time for health or safety emergencies or to provide temporary, special, and supplementary services. This prohibition does not apply to separate schools for homeless children or youth that were operating in fiscal year 2000 in four counties (San Joaquin, Orange, and San Diego counties in California, and Maricopa County in Arizona) if those schools and their LEAs meet certain requirements.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Homeless children and youth education

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

Funding levels for the program for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2010.....	\$65,427
2011.....	65,296
2012.....	65,173
2013.....	61,771
2014.....	65,042

FY 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2015, the Administration requests \$65.0 million for the Homeless Children and Youth Education program (which under current law is named the Education for Homeless Children and Youths program and is in the School Improvement Programs account), the same as the fiscal year 2014 level. The Administration is proposing to strengthen this program through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The fiscal year 2015 appropriation would fund the first year of operations of a reauthorized program, which would more directly target resources to homeless children and remove barriers to serving them effectively. Under the reauthorization proposal, program funds would be allocated to States based on the most recent State-reported data on the number of homeless children and youth rather than on State shares of ESEA Title I, Part A funds, a change that would help ensure that program funds flow to States on the basis of need. The reauthorization proposal also would eliminate the exemption to the prohibition against operating separate schools for homeless youth; this change is needed because homeless students are unlikely to receive a high-quality education in a segregated environment and because of the stigma attached to groups of students placed in segregated schools. The proposal would also support efforts to improve and accelerate the identification of homeless students and would increase transparency by requiring States to report on academic outcomes for homeless students served by the program, including high school graduation and college enrollment rates.

This program is an important component of the national effort to end the cycle of homelessness. Homeless children face many barriers that impede their educational access and success, such as immunization, transportation, and guardianship needs. This program helps reduce and eliminate those barriers while providing homeless children access to academic services available to other children, including preschool programs, special education, gifted and talented programs, and career and technical education.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Homeless children and youth education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
Amount for State grants	\$60,198	\$63,283	\$63,263
Average State award	1,158	1,217	1,217
Amount to Outlying Areas	62	65	65
Amount to BIE	618	650	650
National activities	893	1,044	1,064

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 2015 and future years as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

Measure: The percentage of homeless children and youth, grades 3 through 8, who are included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics, as reported by LEA subgrantees.

In 2012, 98.1 percent of students identified as homeless at the time of State assessments were included in State assessments in reading, and 98.0 percent of such students were included in State assessments in mathematics. In 2011, those rates were 98.5 and 98.6 percent, respectively.

Additional Information: Beginning in 2011, the Department developed a new method of calculating assessment participation rates of homeless students using different data elements in the Education Data Exchange Network. We believe this method produces more accurate and reliable results than the method used in prior years. Because, with this change, results are not comparable with prior years, we are providing participation rate data for 2011 and 2012 only. The Department is considering whether to continue reporting on this measure in future years.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Homeless children and youth education

Measure: The percentage of assessed homeless students, grades 3 through 8, who meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics.

Year	Target – Reading	Actual – Reading	Target – Math	Actual – Math
2010	57%	53%	57%	52%
2011	60	51	60	51
2012	63	50	63	47
2013	66		66	
2014	69		69	
2015	73			

Additional Information: Data for this measure are reported only for LEAs receiving subgrants under the program. Beginning in 2009, the Department directed States to report data based on whether homeless students were enrolled in LEAs with subgrants rather than whether the students were served by (but not necessarily enrolled in) such LEAs. Because student enrollment data are available for verification in State data systems, the Department believes that these data are the more reliable. Data for this measure for 2012 will be available in the summer of 2013.

The Department has worked to improve performance and reporting for this and the preceding measure by requiring States to report on the measures through the Consolidated State Performance Report and the Education Data Exchange Network and by providing, together with the National Center for Homeless Education (the Department's technical assistance contractor), a variety of guidance and technical assistance, including an annually updated Federal data collection guide for the program. The Department also is currently working with its Data Quality Initiative contractor to assess the reliability of State-reported data on homeless students.

Efficiency Measure

The Department established the following efficiency measure for the program:

Measure: The average number of days it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring visits.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	40	31
2011	40	35
2012	40	32
2013	40	51
2014	40	
2015	40	

Additional Information: This measure provides information on monitoring visits to States conducted by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. These visits cover the following Department formula grant programs: College- and Career-Ready Students, Neglected and Delinquent Children and Youth Education, Homeless Children and Youth Education, and Language Acquisition State Grants. In 2013, the Department began implementing a new set of monitoring protocols for States receiving ESEA flexibility.

ACCELERATING ACHIEVEMENT AND ENSURING EQUITY

Homeless children and youth education

Other Information

The Department initiated a national study of implementation of the Homeless Children and Youth Education program in the fall of 2010. The study will examine, at the State and local levels, program administration and use of funds, efforts to collect data on homeless students, policies to remove barriers faced by homeless students, and coordination of services to homeless students. Results from the study are expected to be available in the spring of 2014.

State tables