

**Department of Education**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**  
**Fiscal Year 2023 Budget Request**

**CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Appropriations Language.....	1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	3
Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers.....	5
Summary of Changes .....	6
Authorizing Legislation.....	7
Appropriations History.....	8
Significant Items in FY 2022 Appropriations Reports .....	10
Summary of Request .....	14
Activities:	
Supporting effective instruction State grants .....	16
21st Century community learning centers .....	21
State assessments .....	28
Education for homeless children and youths.....	34
Native Hawaiian education .....	40
Alaska Native education .....	45
Training and advisory services .....	49
Rural education .....	55
Supplemental education grants .....	62
Comprehensive centers.....	65
Student support and academic enrichment grants .....	72
School-Based Health Professionals .....	79
Account Summary Table.....	83
State Tables*	

\*State tables reflecting final 2021 allocations and 2022 and 2023 estimates are posted on the Department's webpage at: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/index.html>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Appropriations Language

For carrying out school improvement activities authorized by part B of title I, part A of title II, subpart 1 of part A of title IV, part B of title IV, part B of title V, and parts B and C of title VI of the ESEA; the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002; the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003; and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, \$5,525,982,000, of which \$3,844,541,000 shall become available on July 1, 2023, and remain available through September 30, 2024, and of which \$1,681,441,000 shall become available on October 1, 2023, and shall remain available through September 30, 2024, for academic year 2023-2024: *Provided*, That \$378,000,000 shall be for part B of title I<sup>1</sup>: *Provided further*, That \$1,309,673,000 shall be for part B of title IV<sup>2</sup>: *Provided further*, That \$37,397,000 shall be for part B of title VI, which may be used for construction, renovation, and modernization of any public elementary school, secondary school, or structure related to a public elementary school or secondary school that serves a predominantly Native Hawaiian student body, and that the 5 percent limitation in section 6205(b) of the ESEA on the use of funds for administrative purposes shall apply only to direct administrative costs<sup>3</sup>: *Provided further*, That \$36,453,000 shall be for part C of title VI, which shall be awarded on a competitive basis, and may be used for construction, and that the 5 percent limitation in section 6305 of the ESEA on the use of funds for administrative purposes shall apply only to direct administrative costs<sup>4</sup>: *Provided further*, That \$52,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 and the Secretary shall make such arrangements as determined to be necessary to ensure that the Bureau of Indian Education has access to services provided under this section<sup>5</sup>: *Provided further*, That \$24,463,218 shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands<sup>6</sup>: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may reserve up

to 5 percent of the amount referred to in the previous proviso to provide technical assistance in the implementation of these grants<sup>7</sup>: *Provided further*, That \$202,840,000 shall be for part B of title V<sup>8</sup>: *Provided further*, That \$1,220,000,000 shall be available for grants under subpart 1 of part A of title IV<sup>9</sup>.

#### NOTES

A full-year 2022 appropriation for this account was not enacted at the time the Budget was prepared; therefore, the Budget assumes this account is operating under the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2022 (Division A of Public Law 117-43, as amended). The amounts included for 2022 reflect the annualized level provided by the continuing resolution.

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

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><u>1... of which \$3,844,541,000 shall become available on July 1, 2023, and remain available through September 30, 2024, and of which \$1,681,441,000 shall become available on October 1, 2023, and shall remain available through September 30, 2024, for academic year 2023-2024: <i>Provided</i>, That \$378,000,000 shall be for part B of title I</u></p>	<p>This language provides for a portion of funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis. This language also provides that a portion of funds for Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants is available on an advance-funded basis. This language also specifies the funding level for State Assessments.</p>
<p><u>2... <i>Provided further</i>, That \$1,309,673,000 shall be for part B of title IV</u></p>	<p>This language specifies the funding level for 21st Century community learning centers.</p>
<p><u>3 ...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$37,397,000 shall be for part B of title VI, which may be used for construction, renovation, and modernization of any public elementary school, secondary school, or structure related to a public elementary school or secondary school that serves a predominantly Native Hawaiian student body, and that the 5 percent limitation in section 6205(b) of the ESEA on the use of funds for administrative purposes shall apply only to direct administrative costs</u></p>	<p>This language specifies the funding level for the Native Hawaiian education program, authorizes the use of funds appropriated for school construction, renovation, and modernization, and specifies that the administrative cost limitation applies only to direct administrative costs.</p>
<p><u>4 ...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$36,453,000 shall be for part C of title VI, which shall be awarded on a competitive basis, and may be used for construction, and that the 5 percent limitation in section 6305 of the ESEA on the use of funds for administrative purposes shall apply only to direct administrative costs</u></p>	<p>This language specifies the funding level for the Alaska Native education program, authorizes the use of funds appropriated for construction, and specifies that the administrative cost limitation applies only to direct administrative costs.</p>
<p><u>5 ...<i>Provided further</i>, That \$52,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 and the Secretary shall make such arrangements as determined to be necessary to ensure that the Bureau of Indian Education has access to services provided under this section</u></p>	<p>This language specifies the funding level for the Comprehensive Centers program and authorizes the Secretary to provide the Bureau of Indian Education access to program services.</p>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>6</sup> ... <u>Provided further, That \$24,463,218 shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands</u></p>	<p>This language specifies the funding level for Supplemental Education Grants to the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.</p>
<p><sup>7</sup> ... <u>Provided further, That the Secretary may reserve up to 5 percent of the amount referred to in the previous proviso to provide technical assistance in the implementation of these grants</u></p>	<p>This language allows the Secretary to reserve up to 5 percent of Supplemental Education Grants funds to provide technical assistance for these grants.</p>
<p><sup>8</sup> ... <u>Provided further, That \$202,840,000 shall be for part B of title V</u></p>	<p>This language specifies the funding level for the Rural Education Achievement Program.</p>
<p><sup>9</sup> ... <u>Provided further, That \$1,220,000,000 shall be available for grants under subpart 1 of part A of title IV</u></p>	<p>This language specifies the funding level for the Student Support and Academic Enrichment grants program.</p>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Appropriation, Adjustments and Transfers (dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2021	2022	2023
<b>Discretionary:</b>			
Appropriation	\$5,444,217	\$5,444,217	\$6,525,982
Total, discretionary appropriation	5,444,217	5,444,217	6,525,982
<b>Advance:</b>			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-1,681,441	-1,681,441	-1,681,441
Advance from prior year	1,681,441	1,681,441	1,681,441
Total, budget authority	5,444,217	5,444,217	6,525,982
<b>Mandatory:</b>			
Supplemental, ARP Act (P.L 117-02)	170,000	0	0
Total, mandatory appropriation	170,000	0	0
Total, discretionary and mandatory appropriation	5,614,217	5,444,217	6,525,982

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Summary of Changes (dollars in thousands)

	\$5,444,217
2022 Estimate	6,525,982
2023	+1,081,765
Net change	+1,081,765

	2022 base	Change from base
<b>Increases:</b>		
<u>Program:</u>		
Supporting effective instruction State grants	\$2,143,080	+\$5,500
21st Century Community Learning Centers	1,259,673	+50,000
Education for homeless children and youths	106,500	+3,500
Rural Education	187,840	+15,000
Supplemental Education Grants	16,699	+7,765
School-Based Health Professionals	0	+1,000,000
Subtotal, increases		+1,081,765
Net change		+1,081,765

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Authorizing Legislation

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2022 Authorized	2022 Estimate	2023 Authorized	2023 Request
Supporting effective instruction State grants ( <i>ESEA II-A</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	\$2,143,080	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	\$2,148,580
21st century community learning centers ( <i>ESEA IV-B</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	1,259,673	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	1,309,673
State assessments ( <i>ESEA I-B, sections 1201-1203</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	378,000	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	378,000
Education for homeless children and youths ( <i>MVHAA Title VII-B</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	106,500	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	110,000
Native Hawaiian Education ( <i>ESEA VI-B</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	37,397	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	37,397
Alaska Native education equity ( <i>ESEA VI-C</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	36,453	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	36,453
Training and advisory services ( <i>CRA IV</i> )	Indefinite	6,575	Indefinite	6,575
Rural education ( <i>ESEA V-B</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	187,840	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	202,840
Supplemental education grants ( <i>Compact of Free Association Act</i> )	\$23,690 <sup>2</sup>	16,699	\$24,464 <sup>2</sup>	24,464
~ Comprehensive centers ( <i>ETAA section 203</i> )	0 <sup>3</sup>	52,000	To be determined <sup>3</sup>	52,000
Student support and academic enrichment grants ( <i>ESEA IV-A-1</i> )	0 <sup>1</sup>	1,220,000	To be determined <sup>1</sup>	1,220,000
School-Based Health Professionals (Proposed legislation)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>To be determined</u>	<u>1,000,000</u>
Total definite authorization	23,690		24,464	
Total appropriation		5,444,217		6,525,982

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations action.

<sup>2</sup> Reflects amount initially authorized in fiscal year 2005, adjusted for inflation in accordance with the authorizing statute, which requires such adjustments through fiscal year 2023.

<sup>3</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2009. Reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations action.



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2014 <sup>1</sup> (2014 Advance for 2015)	\$1,075,559 (0)	N/A	\$4,676,862 (1,681,441)	\$4,397,391 (1,681,441)
2015 <sup>2</sup> (2015 Advance for 2016)	966,923 (0)	N/A	4,402,674 (1,681,441)	4,402,671 (1,681,441)
2016 <sup>3</sup> (2016 Advance for 2017)	4,693,171 (1,681,441)	\$3,500,720 (1,681,441)	4,134,746 (1,681,441)	4,443,629 (1,681,441)
2017 <sup>4</sup> (2017 Advance for 2018)	4,658,409 (1,681,441)	4,799,912 (1,681,441)	4,177,239 (1,681,441)	4,408,567 (1,670,022)
2018 <sup>5</sup> (2018 Advance for 2019)	697,321 (0)	2,369,964 (0)	4,458,567 (1,681,441)	5,158,467 (1,681,441)
2019 <sup>6</sup> (2019 Advance for 2020)	645,214 (0)	5,258,467 (1,681,441)	5,291,967 (1,681,441)	5,246,967 (1,681,441)
2020 <sup>7</sup> (2020 Advance for 2021)	675,614 (0)	6,016,470 (1,681,441)	5,305,967 (1,681,441)	5,404,967 (1,681,441)
2021 <sup>9</sup> (2021 Advance for 2022)	392,374 (0)	5,453,617 (1,681,441)	5,449,967 (1,681,441)	5,444,217 (1,681,441)

1 The House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action. The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

2 The House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action. The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

3 The levels for House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2016 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 114th Congress only through the House Committee and Senate Committee.

4 The levels for House and Senate allowances reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2017 appropriation bill; the Appropriation reflects the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017.

5 The level for the House allowance reflects floor action on the Omnibus appropriations bill; the Senate allowance reflects Committee action on the regular annual 2018 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115-141).

6 The levels for the House and Senate Allowance reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2019 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects enactment of the Department of Defense and Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 115-245).

7 The Senate allowance reflects the Chairman's mark; the Appropriation reflects the Further Consolidated Appropriation Act, 2020 (P.L. 116-94).

8 The Senate allowance reflects the Chairman's mark; the Appropriation reflects the Further Consolidated Appropriation Act, 2020 (P.L. 116-94).

9 The level for the Senate Allowance reflects the Chairman's mark; the Appropriation reflects Division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (P.L. 116-260).

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2021 Mandatory Supplemental, ARP Act (P.L. 117-02) <sup>1</sup>	0	0	0	\$170,000
2022 <sup>2</sup> (2022 Advance for 2023)	\$6,532,675 (1,681,441)	\$5,803,539 (1,681,441)	\$5,760,835 (1,681,441)	5,444,217 (1,681,441)
2023 (2023 Advance for 2024)	6,525,982 (1,681,441)			

<sup>1</sup> The Appropriation reflects the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (P.L. 117-02).

<sup>2</sup> The House allowance reflects floor action on the FY 2022 Consolidated Appropriations Act; the Senate allowance reflects the Chairman's mark; and the Appropriation reflects the annualized continuing resolution level.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Significant Items in FY 2022 Appropriations Reports

#### Teaching Commission

Senate: The Committee requests a briefing for the authorizing and appropriations committees of Congress on the structure, objectives, stakeholder engagement and selection criteria for commission membership, not later than 30 days prior to any obligation of funds or public notice related to the commission.

Response: The Department will comply with this request.

#### Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants

Senate: The Committee notes ESEA requires SEAs and LEAs to address whether low-income and minority students served by Title I, Part A are taught at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced educators compared to their peers. The Committee is concerned that the Department does not have reliable performance information from States on important measures such as the number of States that decrease the gap between the percentage of inexperienced teachers in the highest poverty quartile and the lowest poverty quartile schools and the number of States that decrease the gap between the percentage of teachers with emergency or provisional credentials in the highest poverty quartile schools. The Committee appreciates the Department's review of alternative sources of information and measures for understanding, reporting, and improving equitable access to effective educators for all students. The Committee requests the Department describe actions taken and planned on this issue in the fiscal year 2023 and future CJs.

Response: Please see the performance section of the program's budget justification narrative for the Department's new measures for the Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants program.

#### Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Senate: The Committee strongly encourages the Department of Education to support technical assistance to SEAs in effectively using the sub state grant priority for applicants demonstrating that services would not otherwise be accessible to students. Such assistance could expand the availability of afterschool and other authorized programs using evidence-based practices to successfully assist vulnerable populations in rural afterschool programs. The Committee requests an update in the fiscal year 2023 CJ on actions taken and plans for supporting such technical assistance.

Response: In recent years, the Department has hosted several webinars for State Coordinators of the Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers program that provide guidance to the SEAs on completing their applications.

## **SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

Among the topics covered is implementation of the subgrant priorities, including the priority for eligible entities that demonstrate that the proposed activities would provide services to students who currently cannot otherwise access them.

### **State Assessments**

Senate: The Committee recommendation includes \$58,811,000 for competitive grants to SEAs or consortia of SEAs to carry out activities designed to improve the quality, validity, and reliability of State academic assessments. The Committee believes assessments must provide aligned, comparable, statewide data for all students and produce assessment data for use as a tool for improvement of student and school outcomes, particularly for improving equity and educational achievement for underserved students. The Committee is particularly interested in grants that measure student academic achievement of all ESEA subgroups of students using multiple measures from multiple sources or evaluate achievement through the development of comprehensive instruments that emphasize mastery of academic standards and aligned competencies in a competency-based education model. The Committee notes the CJ also identifies these as potential priorities for competitive grants in fiscal year 2022. The Committee directs the Department to prioritize applications that address these issues for all ESEA subgroups of students and requests a briefing not later than 14 days prior to the posting of a notice inviting applications for such grants.

Response: The notice inviting applications for Competitive Grants for State Assessments was published on February 16, 2022.

### **Alaska Native Education**

Senate: The Committee directs the Department to make every effort to ensure that grants are awarded well in advance of the school year, to maximize grantees' ability to hire the necessary staff and have their programs ready to go with the start of Alaska's school year in mid-August. The Committee continues to direct the Department to ensure that Alaska Native tribes, Alaska Native regional non-profits, and Alaska Native corporations have the maximum opportunity to successfully compete for grants under this program by providing these entities multiple opportunities for technical assistance in developing successful applications for these funds, both in Alaska and via various forms of telecommunications. The Committee also encourages the Department to include as many peer re-viewers as possible who have experience with Alaska Native education and Alaska generally on each peer review panel.

Response: The Department will comply with this request and continue to provide technical assistance to ensure that Alaska Native Tribes, Alaska Native regional nonprofits, and Alaska Native corporations have the maximum opportunity to successfully compete for grants under this program.

## **SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

### **Training and Advisory Services**

- Senate: The Committee directs the Department to brief House and Senate authorizing and appropriations committees not later than 30 days prior to publishing a notice inviting applications for new awards under this program.
- Response: The fiscal year 2022 notice inviting applications for awards under this program was published in the Federal Register on February 15, 2022.

### **Rural Education**

- Senate: The Committee directs the Department, in collaboration with the U.S. Census Bureau, to provide a briefing and related material for the authorizing and appropriations Committees of Congress within 180 days of enactment of this act that includes: analysis of the accuracy and effectiveness of U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates as a measurement of student enrollment from families with incomes below the poverty line for the RLIS and Small Rural Schools Achievement programs; analysis of the accuracy and effectiveness of other poverty measurements, including State-provided poverty data for measuring student enrollment from families with incomes below the poverty line for the RLIS and Small Rural Schools Achievement programs; and any recommendations for improving measurements of poverty in rural LEAs.
- Response: The Department will comply with this directive.

### **Student Support and Academic Enrichment State Grants**

- House: Menstrual Health.—The Committee is concerned about the disruptions to educational opportunities that children living in period poverty experience. Industry reports found that one in five school age children have missed school due to lack of access to safe and affordable menstrual products. The Committee directs the Secretary to provide technical assistance to LEAs and SEAs on effective strategies for offering information about free menstrual product programs, as an option for safe and healthy student programming under SSAE.
- Response: The Department is considering how best to respond to this directive, including by engaging the program technical assistance center in providing assistance to SEAs and LEAs on this topic.
- House: School Diversity.—The Committee strongly encourages the Department to use the 2 percent set-aside for technical assistance and capacity building under SSAE to award capacity-building grants to LEAs and SEAs to reduce racial and socioeconomic segregation across and within school districts.
- Response: The Department is considering how best to support efforts to reduce racial and socioeconomic segregation using funds from this program's set-aside for technical assistance and capacity building, including fiscal year 2022 funds carried over into fiscal year 2023.

## **SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

Senate: The Committee appreciates the information provided in the fiscal year 2022 CJ on current expenditures for the 2 percent set-aside for technical assistance and capacity building and requests additional information about planned activities or the process for identifying the technical assistance and capacity needs of SEAs and LEAs also be included in future CJs.

Response: The Department's response to this directive is provided in the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants program narrative.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Summary of Request

The programs in the School Improvement Programs (SIP) account support State and local efforts to implement the reforms and educational improvements called for in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), including through professional development and other support for teachers and school leaders, before- and after-school programs, flexible formula funding to support State and local needs, additional funding for school districts in rural areas, improving the quality of the State assessments required by the ESEA, and addressing the particular educational needs of special populations.

The Administration is requesting approximately \$6.5 billion, \$1.1 billion more than a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation, for the following programs in this account:

- \$2.1 billion for **Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants** to support ongoing State and local efforts to improve teacher and principal effectiveness and help ensure that all students have equitable access to well-prepared, qualified, and effective teachers and principals. Since the beginning of the pandemic, SEAs and LEAs have faced unprecedented challenges in resuming in-person instruction in a safe manner and teachers and school leaders need continued support to ensure that students are able to recover from lost instructional time.
- \$1.3 billion, an increase of \$50 million, for **21st Century Community Learning Centers** as part of the Administration's commitment to expanding access to high-quality, evidence-based afterschool programs as a core equity strategy for closing achievement and attainment gaps between students from low-income backgrounds, students of color, and other students. Expanded access to before- and after-school programs are a critical, evidence-based strategy for recovering from lost instructional time due the COVID-19 pandemic.
- \$378.0 million for **State Assessments** to help States continue to administer high-quality assessment systems as a cornerstone of successful ESEA implementation. The request includes \$8.9 million for the Competitive Grants for State Assessment program to help States, either alone or in consortia, address pressing needs they have identified for developing and implementing new or improved assessment systems.
- \$110.0 million, an increase of \$3.5 million, for **Education for Homeless Children and Youths** to help maintain services and support for the increased numbers of children and youth from families experiencing homelessness due to the ongoing disruption and dislocation caused by the pandemic.
- \$37.4 million for **Native Hawaiian Education** to provide supplemental education programs and services to Native Hawaiian children and adults, in such areas as teacher training, family-based education, gifted and talented education, special education, higher education, and community-based education learning centers.
- \$36.5 million for **Alaska Native Education** to support the development and operation of supplemental education programs and services for Alaska Native children and adults.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Summary of Request—continued

- \$6.6 million for **Training and Advisory Services** to support regional equity assistance centers that provide technical assistance upon request to school districts in addressing educational equity related to issues of race, sex, national origin, and religion.
- \$202.8 million, an increase of \$15 million, for **Rural Education** to provide resources to rural LEAs and schools that often face unique challenges in meeting the needs of their students.
- \$24.5 million, an increase of \$7.8 million for **Supplemental Education Grants** program, including the first inflation increase in over a decade, to provide support to the Federated States of Micronesia and to the Republic of the Marshall Islands in place of grant programs in which those Freely Associated States no longer participate pursuant to the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003.
- \$52.0 million for **Comprehensive Centers**, to provide comprehensive technical assistance to grantees. Funds would support the continuation costs of 19 Regional Centers and a National Center that provide intensive capacity-building services to help SEAs and other recipients identify, implement, and sustain effective evidence-based practices that improve instruction and student outcomes.
- \$1.2 billion for **Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants** to improve academic achievement by increasing the capacity of States and local educational agencies (LEAs) to provide students with access to a well-rounded education and improve school conditions and use of technology.
- \$1.0 billion for a proposed **School-Based Health Professionals** program to provide formula grants to State educational agencies, which would then make competitive grants to high-need local educational agencies to support the goal of doubling the number of health professionals, including school counselors, nurses, school psychologists, and social workers, in our Nation's schools.



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Supporting effective instruction State grants

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2023 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

	2022 Estimate	2023 Request	Change
Annual appropriation	\$461,639	\$467,139	+\$5,500
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	1,681,441	1,681,441	0
Total	2,143,080	2,148,580	+5,500

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Supporting Effective Instruction (SEI) State Grants provide formula grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), which subgrant most funds to local educational agencies (LEAs) to support activities designed to increase educational opportunity and student achievement by improving the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders; increase the number of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement in schools; provide students from low-income backgrounds and students of color greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders; and reduce class size. SEAs and LEAs have flexibility to carry out a wide variety of activities based on identified needs.

Funds are distributed to States by a formula that uses the number of children aged 5 to 17 and the number of children aged 5 to 17 from poor families. For the past two decades a “hold harmless” provision took into account the amount of money received under two antecedent programs, but the 2015 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) established a multi-year phase-out of this provision by fiscal year 2022. Fiscal year 2023 is the first year in which all appropriated funds are to be allocated strictly by the formula, which is weighted 80 percent for children from low-income backgrounds and 20 percent according to States’ relative shares of the population aged 5 to 17.

The Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) in the Department of the Interior and the Outlying Areas each receive one-half of 1 percent of the appropriation. The Department may reserve up to one-half of 1 percent of funding for evaluation. Each State must reserve at least 95 percent of its funds for subgrants to LEAs and may use up to 1 percent for administration and the remainder for State-level activities. The statute further authorizes States to reserve up to an additional 3 percent of the amount otherwise reserved for subgrants to LEAs for a range of State-level activities aimed at improving the effectiveness of principals and other school leaders. In making subgrants to LEAs, 20 percent of allocations are based on LEAs’ share of children aged

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations action.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Supporting effective instruction State grants

---

5 through 17 and 80 percent on the LEAs' share of children aged 5 through 17 from low-income backgrounds. The reauthorization also provided greater flexibility for States and districts in how they use Title II-A funds, by expanding the option to transfer funds to other ESEA programs; in 2018-19, no States transferred funds from Title II-A to other programs and only four transferred funds to Title II-A from other programs. However, 23 percent of districts transferred funds out of Title II-A to other programs, and 6 percent of districts transferred funds to Title II-A from other programs.

States may use their State-level funds for a variety of activities, including:

- improving equitable access to effective teachers;
- strengthening teacher and principal preparation programs including through high-quality residencies;
- improving teacher, principal, and other school leader certification and licensing standards and requirements;
- technical assistance to LEAs; improving professional development; improving State reciprocity of teacher and principal certification or licensing;
- creating or improving alternative routes to certification including for paraprofessionals, mid-career professionals, and former military personnel and through Grow Your Own programs;
- training teachers and school staff on the appropriate and effective use of student data; and
- helping LEAs design and implement teacher, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support systems that are based in part on evidence of student academic achievement and include multiple measures of educator performance and provide clear, timely, and useful feedback to teachers, principals, or other school leaders.

LEAs may use funds to:

- develop, implement, and evaluate comprehensive programs and activities to improve teacher and school leader effectiveness;
- implement initiatives to assist in recruiting, hiring, supporting and retaining effective teachers and paraprofessionals, especially in underserved schools;
- promote teacher leadership;
- reduce class size;
- provide high-quality, research-based professional development, including through professional learning communities; and
- develop feedback and collaboration mechanisms to improve school working conditions.

Professional development was a priority for both SEAs and LEAs in 2019-20, the most recent year for which use of funds data are available. SEAs spent more of their funds on professional development (18 percent) than on any activity other than administrative costs. Eighty-one percent of LEAs reported using Title II-A funds for short- and long-term professional development; overall, 59 percent of all Title II-A spending at the district level—approximately \$1 billion—was used for this purpose. Other common uses were for recruiting, hiring, and retaining educators (34 percent of districts and 15 percent of district funds); class-size reduction

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Supporting effective instruction State grants

---

(21 percent of districts and 15 percent of funds), and evaluation systems (12 percent of districts and 2 percent of funds). (See <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/2021011/>.)

SEI State Grants 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 15 months, through September 30 of the following year. The remaining funds become available on October 1 of the fiscal year following the year of appropriation and remain available for 12 months, expiring at the same time as the forward-funded portion.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2018	\$2,055,830
2019	2,055,830
2020	2,131,830
2021	2,143,080
2022 Estimate	2,143,080

### FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$2.15 billion for the Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants program, \$5.5 million more than a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. The request would support ongoing State and local efforts to improve teacher and school leader effectiveness and help ensure that all students have equitable access to well-prepared, qualified, experienced, and effective teachers and principals. Since the beginning of the pandemic, SEAs and LEAs have faced unprecedented challenges, and teachers and school leaders need continued support to ensure that students are able to recover from lost instructional time.

Funds allow States and LEAs to support activities designed to improve teacher effectiveness and student outcomes. A large majority of LEAs use funds for professional development, with many LEAs supporting long-term teacher professional development (77 percent of LEAs) and job-embedded professional development (52 percent of LEAs). LEAs also use funds for professional development for principals: 84 percent of districts reported using funds for short-term training or conferences, 61 percent for longer-term professional development or education, and 38 percent for collaborative of job-embedded professional development. LEAs also can use funds to help recruit, hire, and retain effective educators, including supporting programs to mentor new teachers and recruiting people in other fields or currently working in other school-based positions, such as paraprofessionals, who want to become teachers or leaders through high quality pathways.

The Department would reserve up to 0.5 percent of the appropriation for evaluation.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Supporting effective instruction State grants

---

#### Commission on the Future of the Teaching Profession

The request includes appropriations language for the Program Administration account to enable the Secretary to support a Commission on the Future of the Teaching Profession, to address the factors and pressing needs impacting the field. Issues to be taken up by the Commission include: strengthening the recruitment, preparation, and retention of diverse and talented educators; making the compensation of educators competitive with similarly educated professionals; supporting educators in their professional development, learning, and leadership; enhancing and providing competitive teacher compensation; addressing educator shortages, particularly in underserved schools and school districts; enhancing opportunities for educator growth and advancement; and supporting positive and inclusive environments that improve educator satisfaction and improve outcomes for students.

The Commission, which would be comprised of 12-18 public members appointed by the Secretary, would review local data, such as State and regional labor market data, as well as seek input from a wide variety of stakeholders, including pre-service, current, and retired teachers, spanning diverse geographies and experiences. The Commission would submit a final report to the Secretary with recommendations for action at the Federal, State, and local levels on an expedited timeline.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2021	2022	2023
Funding for State awards	\$2,111,041	\$2,111,041	\$2,116,459
Funding for Outlying Areas	10,662	10,662	10,689
Funding for BIE	10,662	10,662	10,689
Funding for evaluation	10,715	10,715	10,743
Range of State awards	\$10,421 – 234,750	\$10,488 – 231,425	\$10,582 – 236,090
Average State award	\$40,597	\$40,597	\$40,701

---

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including SEI State Grants, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department pooled \$8,101 thousand in fiscal year 2021 and may pool funds in fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2023.

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, program 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 Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Supporting effective instruction State grants

---

The Department developed new measures for the program following reauthorization of the ESEA in late 2015:

- The number of States that decrease the gap between the percentage of inexperienced teachers in the highest poverty quartile and the lowest poverty quartile of schools.
- The number of States that decrease the gap between the percentage of teachers with emergency or provisional credentials in the highest poverty quartile and the lowest poverty quartile of schools.
- The number of States that decrease the gap between teachers who are not teaching in the subject or field for which they are certified or licensed teaching in the highest poverty quartile and the lowest poverty quartile of schools.

The Department collected data on these measures from SEAs via the *EDFacts* reporting system. Because two years of data are required to determine whether gaps are decreasing or increasing, baseline data could not be determined until data for both school years 2017-18 and 2018-19 were available; however, initial analyses of these data in the fall of 2020 found significant impediments to using the data, in part because nearly two-fifths of SEAs had missing data and in part because of unanticipated methodological challenges resulting from the measures themselves.

Because of these problems, the Department considered a range of options and established three new measures in 2022:

- **Measure 1:** The difference between the lowest and highest LEA poverty quartile in percentage of teachers with provisional credentials.
- **Measure 2:** The difference between lowest and highest LEA poverty quartile in percentage of teachers teaching out of field.
- **Measure 3:** The percentage of LEAs indicating that one of their top two uses of Title II, Part A professional development funds was for professional development that is sustained, job-embedded, and/or collaborative.

Data for teachers teaching out of field and teachers with provisional credentials come from an annual *EDFacts* collection to meet reporting requirements under Title I, Part A of the ESEA. LEA-level poverty data come from the Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates. Data for Measure 3 come from a longstanding annual survey of LEAs. The Department will have baseline data for these measures in summer 2022.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### **21st Century community learning centers**

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2023 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

	2022 Estimate	2023 Request	Change
	\$1,259,673	\$1,309,673	+\$50,000

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers program (21st CCLC) enables communities to establish or expand centers that provide additional student learning and enrichment opportunities through before- and after-school programs and summer school programs aimed at improving student academic outcomes. Centers, which also may offer training in parenting skills and family literacy services, must target their services primarily to students who attend schools identified for improvement under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) or other schools determined by local educational agencies (LEAs) to be in need of assistance. The program currently provides funding to approximately 10,500 centers serving 1.6 million students and 290,000 adults and family members. In the 2019–2020 program year, approximately 600,000, or 50 percent, of the 1.2 million school year participants attended a center for 30 or more days during the academic year.

Program funds may be used for a broad range of activities, such as those that support a well-rounded education; cultural programs; financial and environmental literacy programs; programs that support a healthy and active lifestyle; programs for students who have been chronically absent, suspended, or expelled; services for individuals with disabilities; activities for multilingual learners; telecommunications and technology education programs; expanded library service hours; family engagement and literacy programs; drug and violence prevention activities; programs that focus on in-demand fields of the local workforce; and programs that build skills in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Funds also may support in-school activities as part of an expanded learning time program under which the regular school day has been extended to include at least 300 additional program hours.

Program funds are allocated by formula to States. Of the total appropriation, the Department reserves up to 1 percent to carry out national activities and up to 1 percent for grants to the Bureau of Indian Education in the Department of the Interior and to the Outlying Areas. The Department allocates the remaining funds to States in proportion to each State's share of funds

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations action.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### 21st Century community learning centers

---

received the previous fiscal year under Part A of Title I of the ESEA, except that each State receives at least one-half of 1 percent of the total amount available for States.

Each State educational agency (SEA) must award at least 93 percent of its allocation competitively to LEAs, community-based organizations, Indian tribes or tribal organizations, faith-based organizations, or other public or private entities that can demonstrate experience, or the promise of success, in providing education and related activities. In making awards, States give priority to applications that: (1) propose to target services to students who attend schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under Title I; (2) are submitted jointly by at least one LEA that receives funds under Part A of Title I and another eligible entity; or (3) demonstrate that the activities proposed in the application are not otherwise accessible to the students who would be served by the program or would expand access to high-quality services. States must make awards of at least \$50,000 per year for a period of 3 to 5 years. An SEA may reserve up to 2 percent of its allocation for administrative expenses, including the costs of conducting its grant competition, and up to 5 percent for monitoring local programs, providing technical assistance and training, and evaluating the effectiveness of the State's program.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2018	\$1,211,673
2019	1,221,673
2020	1,249,673
2021	1,259,673
2022 Estimate	1,259,673

### FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$1.31 billion for the 21st CCLC program, \$50 million more than a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. The request reflects the importance of out-of-school programming in the development of elementary and secondary school students, as well as the Administration's commitment to expanding access to high-quality, evidence-based afterschool programs as a core equity strategy aimed at closing the opportunity, achievement, and attainment gaps between students from low-income backgrounds, students of color, and other students. With a broad array of authorized activities and delivery models, the program allows grantees to meet locally identified needs, from academic enrichment and tutoring to help students meet challenging State standards to programming that improves students' social and emotional wellbeing and provides students with access to a well-rounded education.

21st CCLC complements Title I, Part A of the ESEA by serving and prioritizing underserved students. The program's State allocations are based on Title I, Part A allocations, States must

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### 21st Century community learning centers

---

give priority to projects serving students attending schools that are implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under ESEA section 1111(d) and students who may be struggling academically or at risk of not graduating from high school.

The Department would continue to reserve the 1 percent authorized for national activities focused on research, developing and updating professional development resources, data collection, technical assistance, outreach, dissemination, and an annual institute that enables grantees to share effective practices. National activities funds also would support continuation awards under a demonstration program that provides opportunities to students outside regular school hours to participate in a high-quality career pathways program that leads to an industry-recognized credential in existing and emerging in-demand industry sectors and occupations identified by the State, including through completion of an apprenticeship or internship.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2021	2022	2023
Funding for States awards	\$1,234,480	\$1,234,480	\$1,283,480
Range of State awards	\$6,172–148,460	\$6,172–149,692	\$6,417–148,876
Average State award	23,740	23,740	24,682
Reservation for State activities (maximum)	61,724	61,724	64,174
Reservation for State administration (maximum)	24,690	24,690	25,670
National activities	12,597	12,597	13,097
Amount for Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas	12,597	12,597	13,097

---

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including this one, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department did not reserve funds for this purpose from 21st CCLC in fiscal year 2021, but may do so in fiscal years 2022 and 2023.

---

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, program 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 Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program.



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### 21st Century community learning centers

---

The Department revised the program's performance measures in 2020. Grantees began collecting data on the new measures in program year 2021–2022 and baseline data will be available in early 2023. The new measures focus on improvements in student achievement on State assessments, grade point average (GPA), school day attendance, student behavior, and student engagement:

- **Measure 1a:** The percentage of students in grades 4–8 participating in 21st CCLC programming during the school year and summer who demonstrate growth in reading/language arts on State assessments.
- **Measure 1b:** The percentage of students in grades 4–8 participating in 21st CCLC programming during the school year and summer who demonstrate growth in math on State assessments.
- **Measure 2:** The percentage of students in grades 7–8 and 10–12 attending 21st CCLC programming during the school year and summer with a prior-year unweighted GPA less than 3.0 who demonstrated an improved GPA.
- **Measure 3:** The percentage of youth in grades 1–12 participating in 21st CCLC during the school year and summer who had a school-day attendance rate at or below 90 percent in the prior school year and demonstrated an improved attendance rate in the current school year.
- **Measure 4:** The percentage of students grades 1–12 attending 21st CCLC programming during the school year and summer who experienced a decrease in in-school suspensions compared to the previous school year.
- **Measure 5:** The percentage of students in grades 1–5 participating in 21st CCLC programming in the school year and summer who demonstrated an improvement in teacher-reported engagement in learning.

Grantees continued to collect data on the old performance measures through program year 2020–2021. The Department is currently reviewing 2021 data but reports the existing data below.

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

*Objective: Participants in 21st CCLC programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.*

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### 21st Century community learning centers

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

Year	Target Elementary School Participants	Target Middle and High School Participants	Target All Regular Participants	Actual Elementary Participants	Actual Middle and High School Participants	Actual All Regular Participants
2017	40.0%	40.0%	40.0%	51.4%	47.6%	50.0%
2018	50.0	50.0	50.0	51.3	46.5	49.7
2019	50.0	50.0	50.0	48.5	45.6	47.6
2020	50.0	50.0	50.0	49.0	51.7	49.7
2021	50.0	50.0	50.0			

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

Year	Target Elementary School Participants	Target Middle and High School Participants	Target All Regular Participants	Actual Elementary Participants	Actual Middle and High School Participants	Actual All Regular Participants
2017	48.5%	48.5%	48.5%	50.0%	48.1%	49.4%
2018	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.1	46.2	48.8
2019	50.0	50.0	50.0	48.2	46.7	47.7
2020	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.7	53.9	51.5
2021	50.0	50.0	50.0			

**Additional information:** A “regular program participant” is defined as a student who attends the program for 30 days or more during the course of the school year (approximately 39 percent of all student participants). To report data by grade span for this measure, the program’s data system sorts performance data by analyzing participant demographic information at the center level (as opposed to the individual student level). For this reason, programs that serve youth of all ages are not included in columns disaggregated by grade level, which applies to this measure and the student behavior measure below. Data for 2021 will be available in spring 2022.

**Measure:** The percentage of regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above on State assessments.

Year	Target Elementary Reading	Target Middle and High School Math	Actual Elementary Reading	Actual Middle and High School Math
2017	15.0%	25.0%	25.4%	19.1%
2018	30.0	25.0	25.5	18.6
2019	30.0	25.0	26.0	19.2
2020	30.0	25.0		
2021	30.0	25.0		

**Additional information:** The Department calculates results for this measure by dividing the number of regular participants who scored proficient or better in spring of the reporting year (but

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### 21st Century community learning centers

were not proficient in the previous year) by the total number of current-year regular participants who scored below proficient the previous spring. For a regular participant to be included in the data for this measure, the center must have data on the student's prior-year and current-year State assessment results. The Department waived assessment requirements for the 2019–2020 school year due to widespread closures related to COVID-19; therefore, the Department does not expect to report actual data for this measure for 2020.

**Measure:** The percentage of students with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.

Year	Target Elementary School Participants	Target Middle and High School Participants	Target All Participants	Actual Elementary Participants	Actual Middle and High School Participants	Actual All Participants
2017	60%	75%	75%	62.2%	58.8%	60.4%
2018	60	60	60	63.1	60.7	62.4
2019	60	60	60	62.0	62.1	62.0
2020	60	60	60	63.6	62.8	63.4
2021	60	60	60			

**Additional information:** As with the measures for reading and math grades and proficiency, to report data by grade span for this measure the data system sorts program performance data by analyzing participant demographic information at the center level (as opposed to the individual student level). For this reason, programs that serve youth of all ages are not included in the columns disaggregated by grade level.

### Efficiency measures

The Department has three operational efficiency measures for 21st CCLC.

**Measure:** The percentage of SEAs that submit complete data on 21st CCLC program performance measures by the deadline.

Year	Target	Actual
2017	95%	98%
2018	95	100
2019	95	93
2020	95	93
2021	95	

**Measure:** The average number of days it takes the Department to submit a final monitoring report to an SEA after the conclusion of a site visit.

Year	Target	Actual
2017	35	45
2018	35	55
2019	35	42
2020	35	41
2021	35	

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### 21st Century community learning centers

---

**Measure:** The average number of weeks a State takes to resolve compliance findings in a monitoring visit report.

Year	Target	Actual
2017	4	24
2018	4	13
2019	4	26
2020	4	17
2021	4	

**Additional information:** This measure tracks States' timeliness in responding to the Department's fiscal management monitoring findings that require States to take corrective action within 30 days. Changes in data for the efficiency measures are due in part to the volume and severity of the findings for each year. Ongoing issues with a small number of States have made the average number of weeks a State takes to resolve compliance findings significantly higher in recent years.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### **State assessments**

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title I, Part B)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2023 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

2022 Estimate	2023 Request	Change
\$378,000	\$378,000	0

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, (ESEA) requires States to test all students annually in grades 3 through 8 and once in high school in reading/language arts and mathematics and to administer annual assessments in science once in each of three grade spans specified in the law (grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12). Furthermore, States must assess the English language proficiency of all English learners annually. The annual statewide assessments, aligned to the State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, provide critical information about student achievement and progress to parents and educators, which can be used to help identify where additional instructional and other support is needed.

More specifically, as part of the statewide accountability and improvement systems required by the ESEA, the results of annual assessments in reading and mathematics must be used as a factor in determining whether States, local educational agencies (LEAs), and schools are meeting long-term goals and interim measures of progress and to differentiate annually and meaningfully the performance of all schools. All assessments must be used only for purposes for which such assessments are valid and reliable, include measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding, and enable achievement results to be disaggregated by major racial and ethnic group, gender, poverty, disability, English proficiency, and migrant status.

State compliance with the Title I assessment requirements is contingent on the annual appropriations levels for the State Assessments program. Under section 1111(b)(2)(I) of the ESEA, for any year for which Congress appropriates less than a “trigger amount” of \$369.1 million, States may defer the commencement or suspend the administration of State assessments required by the ESEA.

The Grants for State Assessments program provides formula grants to States to pay the costs of developing the challenging academic standards and high-quality, fully aligned assessments

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations language.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### State assessments

---

required by Title I of the ESEA. Once a State has developed the assessments, it may use program funds to pay for the administration of the assessments and for other activities related to improving the quality and utility of those assessments. Such activities may include, among other things, refining State assessments to ensure continued alignment with standards, expanding the range of testing accommodations for students with disabilities and for English learner students, developing multiple measures to ensure the validity and reliability of State assessments, developing or improving models to measure student progress or growth, and using performance-based assessments or computer adaptive assessments to better reflect complex, real world tasks.

The Assessment System Audit program, funded by an optional set-aside of up to 20 percent of the trigger amount (or any lesser amount appropriated by Congress), supports audits of State and local assessment systems as part of a State plan to eliminate unnecessary or low-quality assessments, support dissemination of best practices for improving assessment quality and efficiency, and assist LEAs in streamlining local assessment systems, including the establishment of a regular process to review and evaluate local assessments to help ensure that all assessments are worth taking. This authority has not been implemented since it was added to State Assessments in the 2015 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Competitive Grants for State Assessments program, which is funded with the amount, if any, of appropriations in excess of the trigger amount, makes discretionary awards to States or consortia of States to support efforts to: (1) improve the quality, validity, and reliability of State academic assessments; (2) measure student academic achievement through the use of multiple measures from multiple sources; (3) develop or improve models to measure and assess student progress or growth; (4) develop or improve assessments for English learners, including assessments of English language proficiency or assessments of academic content in languages other than English; (5) develop or improve assessments for children with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate academic achievement standards; and (6) develop and use comprehensive assessment instruments, such as performance-based or extended performance task assessments, which may include computer adaptive assessments, that allow for new and improved methods for measuring critical thinking, writing, and problem solving skills.

After reserving 0.5 percent of funds equal to or less than the trigger amount of \$369.1 million for the Bureau of Indian Education and 0.5 percent for the Outlying Areas, the Department allocates a minimum of \$3 million to each State, plus a portion of any funds remaining for grants under this program based on each State's share of students ages 5–17, for the Grants for State Assessments program. The Department must use any funds appropriated above the trigger amount for Competitive Grants for State Assessment.

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

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### State assessments

---

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

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2018	\$378,000
2019	378,000
2020	378,000
2021	378,000
2022 Estimate	378,000

### FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$378 million for State Assessments, level with a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. The request would provide \$369.1 million for State grants along with \$8.9 million for awards under the Competitive Grants for State Assessment program. The \$369.1 million proposed for State grants is the minimum “trigger amount” needed to ensure that States continue to administer the assessments required under Title I, Part A; States may stop administering these assessments if the appropriation for the program is less than this amount.

Annual, high-quality, statewide assessments fully aligned to challenging State academic standards are an important element of the statewide accountability and improvement systems that each State must establish under the ESEA, providing parents and educators with information they need to understand whether students are meeting State-determined college- and career-ready academic standards. State assessments also help identify schools that are meeting these standards and schools where additional resources and supports may be needed to improve educational opportunity and academic achievement. In addition, regular administration of high-quality State academic assessment systems can help identify and address the impact of lost instructional time related to COVID-19 on student academic achievement, particularly for those students most at risk for falling behind due to school closures and uneven access to virtual or hybrid instructional alternatives.

The fiscal year 2023 request will help States continue to administer high-quality assessment systems as a cornerstone of successful ESEA implementation. Funds may be used to improve the quality of these assessment systems so that they measure higher order thinking skills across multiple levels of proficiency, including through the incorporation of portfolios, projects, or extended performance tasks; appropriately assess all students, including students with disabilities and English learners; and provide timelier and more useful data to students, educators, and parents. States may also use funds to develop comprehensive academic assessment instruments such as performance-based assessments and technology-based assessments, including computer adaptive assessments.

The request also would provide \$8.9 million for the Competitive Grants for State Assessment program to help States, either alone or in consortia, address pressing needs they have identified for developing and implementing new or improved assessment systems. Potential priorities for the fiscal year 2023 competition could include activities to support and improve high-quality assessment systems, such as measuring student academic achievement using multiple measures of student academic achievement from multiple sources and evaluating student

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### State assessments

---

academic achievement and growth through the development of comprehensive academic assessment instruments (such as performance and technology-based academic assessments, computer adaptive assessments, projects, or extended performance task assessments) that emphasize the mastery of standards and aligned competencies in a competency-based education model.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2021	2022	2023
Grants for State Assessments:			
Amount for State Grants	\$365,409	\$365,409	\$365,409
Estimated number of awards	52	52	52
Range of awards	\$3,330-28,152	\$3,330-28,152	\$3,330-28,152
Average award	\$7,027	\$7,027	\$7,027
BIE and Outlying Areas	\$3,691	\$3,691	\$3,691
Competitive Grants for State Assessments:			
Funding for new awards	\$8,811	\$8,811	\$8,811
Number of new awards	3-4	3-4	3-4
Range of new awards	\$3,800-3,900	\$3,800-3,900	\$3,800-3,900
Peer review of new award applications	\$89	\$89	\$89

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The goal of the Grants for State Assessments program is to support States in the development and implementation of the State assessments required under Title I of the ESEA. The performance measure is the number of States (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) that have reading/language arts and mathematics assessments that align with the State's academic content standards for all students in grades 3–8 and in high school and science assessments that align with the State's academic content standards for all students in each of three grade spans (grades 3–5, 6–9, and 10–12). Beginning in school year 2018-19, each State must also demonstrate that assessments used to measure English Language Proficiency (ELP) of all English Learners are aligned with their State ELP standards. States that develop alternate assessments for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities must also demonstrate that such assessments are based on alternate academic achievement standards. Success in meeting these requirements is determined primarily by formal peer reviews of State assessment systems by panels of external assessment experts.

The Department launched a new round of peer reviews in 2016 based on updated practices and technical standards in the field. Thirty-eight States submitted assessments for review in 2016, six additional States in 2017, and the final eight States submitted academic assessments for review in 2018. Additionally, States reviewed in 2016 submitted additional evidence in



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### State assessments

---

succeeding years based on their peer review outcomes (5 in 2017 and 33 in 2018). In 2019, 48 States submitted evidence for peer review for their ELP assessments and 13 States submitted evidence for academic assessments. In 2020, the Department conducted peer reviews for 35 states across all subject areas. During 2021, 17 States participated in assessment peer reviews.

The tables below show the number of States that were determined to have partially met, substantially met, or met all requirements by assessment subject, grade, and type (general or alternate) as of December 31, 2021, and also indicate the number of States where the outcome was pending (i.e., the Department is still reviewing the State documentation and peer recommendations to provide a formal determination to the State). In 2022, the Department is reviewing both academic and ELP assessments from another 29 states.

Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics Assessments Status as of December 31, 2021

Outcome	Grades 3-8 General	High School General	Grades 3-8 and High School Alternate
Met All Requirements	16	10	8
Substantially Met	32	34	26
Partially Met	4	8	5
Does not meet	0	0	3
Pending Outcome Notification	6	6	1

Science Assessments Status as of December 31, 2021

Outcome	Grades 3-8 General	High School General	Grades 3-8 and High School Alternate
Met All Requirements	1	2	0
Substantially Met	14	13	14
Partially Met	8	9	3
Does not meet	0	0	4
Pending Outcome Notification	1	1	1

English Language Proficiency Assessments Status as of December 31, 2021

Outcome	ELP General	ELP Alternate
Met All Requirements	0	0
Substantially Met	6	0
Partially Met	43	35
Does not meet	0	0
Pending Outcome Notification	6	3

States must revise their assessments periodically and undergo peer review each time they make significant changes to their Standards or the assessments themselves. For example, at least four States that received “met all requirements” designations in 2017, 2018 or 2019 have

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### **State assessments**

---

changed their assessments since then, thus triggering new peer review cycles in 2019, 2020 and 2021.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### **Education for homeless children and youths**

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2023 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

	<u>2022 Estimate</u>	<u>2023 Request</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$106,500	\$110,000	+\$3,500

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Education for Homeless Children and Youths program helps ensure that all children and youth experiencing homelessness have equal access to the same free, appropriate public education available to other children and youth 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 children and youth experiencing homelessness; and (3) make subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to support the education of those children and youth.

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 \$150,000, 0.25 percent of the funds appropriated, or the amount of the State's fiscal year 2001 allocation, whichever is greatest. 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 children, including preschool-aged children, and youth experiencing homelessness.

Education for Homeless Children and Youth 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired through September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations action.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Education for homeless children and youths

---

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

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2018	\$85,000
2019	93,500
2020	101,500
2021	106,500
2022 Estimate	106,500

### FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$110 million for Education for Homeless Children and Youths, \$3.5 million more than a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. This funding, which would become available to States and districts after much of the American Rescue Plan (ARP) funds that were appropriated to provide support for these students during the COVID-19 pandemic have been committed or used, would help maintain services and support for the increased numbers of children and youth from families experiencing homelessness due to the ongoing disruption and dislocation caused by the pandemic.

Although the number of identified students experiencing homelessness reported to the Department decreased by nearly 8 percent between school years 2018-19 and 2019-20, data from other sources indicate that this figure may be misleading. A survey of local liaisons under the program by SchoolHouse Connection and Poverty Solutions at the University of Michigan identified an “undercount” in the number of children and youth identified as experiencing homelessness at the start of school year 2020-21. Respondents to that survey attributed the lower numbers to the difficulty of identifying families and youth due to the prevalence of school building closures and distance learning.<sup>1</sup>

These data also do not account for the possible impact of COVID-19. The full effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on homelessness is not yet known, as the pandemic disrupted Federal-level data collection on homelessness. The United States Interagency Council on Homelessness has reported that, as a result, data on homelessness for 2021 reflect a more limited snapshot of homelessness than normal, particularly for unsheltered individuals and families. Further, a recent analysis of economic data supported by the Economic Roundtable<sup>2</sup> noted that homelessness tends to lag behind joblessness. The report forecasts that chronic homelessness could increase as much as 49 percent over the next 4 years because of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on employment. Furthermore, an increase in individuals and families who are homeless is expected by fiscal year 2023 because the Federal level temporary moratorium of residential evictions in communities with substantial or high levels of community transmission of COVID-19 ended in fall of 2021.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://schoolhouseconnection.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Lost-in-the-Masked-Shuffle-and-Virtual-Void.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <https://economicrt.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Locked-Out.pdf>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Education for homeless children and youths

---

The Education for Homeless Children and Youths program supports a broad set of activities to help reduce and eliminate the barriers to educational success faced by children and youth experiencing homelessness, including transportation and healthcare needs, and ensure they have access to academic services available to other children, such as preschool programs, special education, gifted and talented programs, and career and technical education. Approximately 1.28 million students were identified as homeless in school year 2019-20, of which approximately 17 percent were English learners, 19.1 percent were eligible to receive services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and 8.8 percent were unaccompanied youth (i.e., youth who were not in the physical custody of a parent or guardian).

The Department plans to continue to coordinate activities under the Education for Homeless Children and Youths program with other programs that serve students experiencing homelessness, in particular the ESEA’s Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program. Title I, for which students experiencing homelessness are automatically eligible, authorizes recipients to provide homeless children and youth with services not ordinarily provided to other students, such as supporting LEA liaisons for children and youth experiencing homelessness and providing transportation.

For fiscal year 2023, at the requested level, the Department plans to reserve approximately \$1.8 million for national activities to support projects to improve educational services and outcomes for youth experiencing homelessness through the National Center for Homeless Education (NCHE). The Department will also continue to seek opportunities to work with other agencies that administer programs that serve family and youth experiencing homelessness. For example, the Department currently works with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to facilitate collaboration among school districts, institutions of higher education, and grantees under HUD’s Youth Homeless Demonstration program to address the educational needs of unaccompanied homeless youth and provide them with pathways to postsecondary education, training, and careers. In March 2021, NCHE released a brief discussing lessons learned from Round 3 of that program<sup>1</sup>.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2021	2022	2023
Amount for State grants	\$103,579	\$103,579	\$107,040
Range of State awards	\$266–12,925	\$266–12,363	\$275–12,760
Average State award	1,992	1,992	2,058
Amount to BIE	1,065	1,065	1,100
Amount to Outlying Areas	107	107	110
National activities	1,749	1,749	1,750

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://nche.ed.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/yhdp-round3-summary-profile.pdf>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Education for homeless children and youths

---

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

##### **Performance Measures**

The Department will be reviewing GPRA program performance goals, objectives, and measures for the Education for Homeless Children and Youths program for possible revision in future. This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, program 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 Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program.

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

***Objective:** Children and youth experiencing homelessness will have greater access to a free and appropriate public education.*

**Measure:** The percentage of assessed students experiencing homelessness, grades three through eight, enrolled in all LEAs, who meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics.

Year	Target – Reading	Actual – Reading	Target – Math	Actual – Math
2019		29.6%		24.5%
2020		Not available		Not available
2021	29.9%		24.8%	
2022	30.2		25.1	
2023	30.5		25.4	

**Measure:** The percentage of assessed students experiencing homelessness, grades three through eight, who meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics, as reported by LEA subgrantees.

Year	Target – Reading	Actual – Reading	Target – Math	Actual – Math
2018	80%	27.5%	80%	23.4%
2019	80	27.5	80	23.5
2020	80	Not available	80	Not available
2021	27.5		23.5	
2022	27.8		23.7	
2023	28.1		23.9	

**Additional Information:** The source of the data is EDFacts, the Department’s system for States to submit kindergarten through grade 12 data. Reporting on proficiency of students experiencing homelessness enrolled in all LEAs was a new measure for 2022. The new proficiency measures are focused on the academic achievement of all students experiencing homelessness in a State, as opposed to the other measures the Department has been reporting on, which focus exclusively on the performance of students experiencing homelessness in LEAs receiving subgrants under the program. In 2021 the Department re-set targets for the measures of

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Education for homeless children and youths

---

proficiency pertaining to LEA subgrantees when it started implementing the measures for proficiency for all students experiencing homelessness. Data for 2020 are not available because the Department waived assessment requirements for 2019-20 due to widespread closures related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Data for 2021 will be available in late summer of 2022.

**Measure:** The percentage of students who were identified as homeless at any time in grades 9-12 and who graduated in 4 years with a regular high school diploma (4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR)).

Year	Target Percentage	Actual Percentage
2019		67.8%
2020		68.2
2021	69.2%	
2022	69.9	
2023	70.6	

**Additional Information:** The source of the data is *EDFacts*, the Department's system for States to submit kindergarten through grade 12 data. Reporting on ACGR for students experiencing homelessness is a new measure for 2022. Note that the ESEA provides flexibility for how a State defines the students in cohorts, including the homeless ACGR and, as a result, States have different ways for accounting for students experiencing homelessness in high school and the data they report for this measure are not necessarily comparable. Some States reported that they only track students who were identified as homeless in Grade nine. Data for 2021 will be available in late summer 2022.

**Measure:** The percentage of students who experienced homelessness in grades pre-K-13 at some point in the school year who were reported at the school-level as being chronically absent.

Year	Target Percentage	Actual Percentage
2019		36.7%
2020		33.0
2021	34.8%	
2022	33.8	
2023	32.8	

**Additional Information:** The source of the data is *EDFacts*, the Department's system for States to submit kindergarten through grade 12 data. Reporting on chronic absenteeism for students experiencing homelessness was a new measure for 2022. Chronic absenteeism is a measure of the number of students who have missed 10 percent or more of their instructional time during their period of enrollment in half-day increments, and is often a better indicator than measures such as average daily attendance for which students need more intervention and support to attend school regularly and persist. About two-thirds of States chose chronic absenteeism as a measure of School Quality and Student Success as part of their statewide accountability and improvement systems under their ESEA Consolidated State Plans. Note that this measure may include duplicate data as chronically absent students experiencing homelessness may have

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Education for homeless children and youths

---

been enrolled in more than one school during the school year. Data for 2021 will be available in late summer 2022.

#### 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 events.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	40	39
2019	40	36
2020	40	Not applicable
2021	60	180
2022	60	
2023	60	

**Additional Information:** This measure provides information on monitoring events with States. In 2020, the Department revised its monitoring procedures and incorporated monitoring for the program into a consolidated monitoring process with other programs. The target was re-set to reflect the new process. The increase in 2021 was due to the Department conducting consolidated monitoring for 10 programs, which required more staff time to coordinate compilation and clearance of monitoring reports.

#### Other Performance Information

The Department released a report in February 2015 from a national study of implementation of the Education for Homeless Children and Youths program.<sup>1</sup> The study examined State and local program administration and use of funds, efforts to collect data on students experiencing homelessness, policies to remove barriers faced by these students, and coordination of services. The study found that transportation, school supplies, and tutoring and supplemental instruction were reported by district liaisons as the largest local program expenditures and that transportation needs and preoccupation with survival needs were most frequently identified as barriers to students experiencing homelessness and their enrollment and attendance in school.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/homeless/state-district-implementation-homeless-children-report.pdf>



**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

---

**Native Hawaiian education**

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2023 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

	2022 Estimate	2023 Request	Change
	\$37,397	\$37,397	0

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Native Hawaiian Education program supports the provision of supplemental education services to the Native Hawaiian population. The program awards 3-year competitive grants to support a variety of authorized activities in such areas as teacher development and training, family-based education, gifted and talented education, early childhood education, special education, higher education, and community-based education learning centers. Eligible applicants include Native Hawaiian educational organizations and community-based organizations, public and private nonprofit organizations, agencies, and institutions with experience in developing or operating Native Hawaiian programs or programs of instruction in the Native Hawaiian language, and other entities.

The program also supports the activities of the Native Hawaiian Education Council. The Council coordinates the educational and related services and programs available to Native Hawaiians, directly or through subgrants. It also provides administrative support and financial assistance to island councils authorized by the statute. The Council must receive a minimum award of \$500,000 annually.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2018	\$36,397
2019	36,397
2020	36,897
2021	37,397
2021 Mandatory ARP Act	85,000
2022 Estimate	37,397

**FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$37.4 million for Native Hawaiian Education, level with a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. The

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations language.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Native Hawaiian education

---

request would support the continued provision of education-related services to the Native Hawaiian population through 9 continuation awards and approximately 35 new competitive grants.

Data on the educational performance of Native Hawaiian students demonstrate the continuing need for this program. In 2019, 18 percent of Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 4th-grade students demonstrated proficiency in reading and 18 percent demonstrated proficiency in mathematics on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), compared to 34 percent proficient in reading and 40 percent proficient in mathematics for all 4th-grade students in Hawaii. Similarly, 24 percent of Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 8th-grade students demonstrated proficiency in reading and 16 percent demonstrated proficiency in mathematics on the NAEP assessment, as compared to 29 percent proficient in reading and 28 percent proficient in mathematics for all 8th-grade students in Hawaii.

Program grants help address these gaps by developing programs tailored to the educational and cultural needs of Native Hawaiian students in order to improve their academic achievement and support high school graduation.

The American Rescue Plan Act provided a supplemental appropriation of \$85 million for new awards under the Native Hawaiian Education program intended to help applicants address needs arising from the COVID-19 pandemic, including the impact of lost instructional time on student achievement and attainment outcomes, as well as to provide social, emotional, and mental health supports to Native Hawaiian students and their families. The Department made 36 new awards in 2021 for projects of up to 3 years in length.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Native Hawaiian education

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2021	2022	2023
Amount for new awards	\$7,597	0	\$28,926
Number of new awards	9	0	35
Amount for continuation awards	\$29,300	\$36,897	\$7,597
Number of continuation awards	24	32	9
Native Hawaiian Education Council	\$500	\$500	\$500
Peer review of new award applications	0 <sup>1</sup>	0	\$374

---

#### NOTES:

The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including this one, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department did not reserve such funds from this program in fiscal year 2021 but may do so in fiscal years 2022 and 2023.

---

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

##### **Performance Measures**

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, program 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 Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program.

The Department waived assessment requirements for the 2019-2020 school year due to widespread closures related to COVID-19; therefore, the Department does not expect to report actual data for these measures for 2020. Data for 2021 will be available in winter 2022.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Department funded nine new awards in fiscal year 2021 from the fiscal year 2020 slate.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Native Hawaiian education

---

**Measure:** The percentage of students served by the program who scored at the proficient level or higher in reading on the State’s annual assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	47%	49%
2019	48	49
2020	49	Not available
2021	49	
2022	49	
2023	49	

**Measure:** The percentage of students served by the program who scored at the proficient level or higher in math on the State’s annual assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	40%	41%
2019	41	42
2020	42	Not available
2021	42	
2022	42	
2023	42	

**Measure:** The percentage of students served by the program who scored at the proficient level or higher in science on the State’s annual assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	28%	28%
2019	29	42
2020	41	Not available
2021	41	
2022	41	
2023	41	

**Measure:** The percentage of students served by the program that demonstrated school readiness in literacy.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	45%	54%
2019	45	46
2020	45	46
2021	45	
2022	45	
2023	45	

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Native Hawaiian education

---

**Additional Information:** Because not all grantees provide early learning services, this measure may not apply to all grantees in a given year.

**Measure:** The percentage of students in schools served by the program who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma in 4 years.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	82%	85%
2019	82	84
2020	82	85
2021	82	
2022	82	
2023	82	

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### **Alaska Native education**

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2023 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

2022 Estimate	2023 Request	Change
\$36,453	\$36,453	0

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Alaska Native Education program supports supplemental educational programs and services designed to improve educational opportunities and outcomes for Alaska Natives. The program awards 3-year competitive grants to eligible applicants, which include Alaska Native organizations and entities located in Alaska with experience operating Alaska Native programs that have been granted a charter from an Alaska Native tribe or Alaska Native organization.

Allowable activities include the development and implementation of curricula and educational programs that address needs of the Alaska Native student population (including the use and preservation of Alaska Native languages), professional development for educators, the development and operation of home instruction programs for Alaska Native preschool children that help support active involvement of parents in their children's education, family literacy services, student enrichment programs in science and mathematics, and dropout prevention programs.

The American Rescue Plan Act provided a supplemental appropriation of \$85 million for new awards under the Alaska Native Education program intended to help applicants address needs arising from the COVID-19 pandemic, including the impact of lost instructional time on student achievement and attainment outcomes, as well as to provide social, emotional, and mental health supports to Alaska Native students and their families. The Department made 29 new awards in fall 2021 for projects of up to 3 years in length.

Grantees may use up to 5 percent of their awards for administrative costs.

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations language.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Alaska Native education

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2018	\$35,453
2019	35,453
2020	35,953
2021	36,453
2021 Mandatory ARP Act	85,000
2022 Estimate	36,453

### FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Department requests \$36.5 million for Alaska Native Education in fiscal year 2023, level with a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. The request would support education-related services to the Alaska Native population through approximately 50 continuation awards.

Data on the educational performance of Alaska Native students demonstrate the continuing need for the range of activities supported by this program. Results from the spring 2019 Alaska Standards-Based Assessment indicated that Alaska Native and American Indian students in the State continue to struggle with academic performance. Because Alaska Natives constitute approximately 95 percent of the State's American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) student population, the AI/AN scores are good proxies for Alaska Native achievement. Fifteen percent of AI/AN students demonstrated proficiency on the 4th-grade English language arts assessment, compared to 40 percent of all 4th-grade students, and 22 percent of AI/AN students achieved proficiency in mathematics, compared to 45 percent of all 4th-grade students. Eighth-grade assessments showed similar achievement gaps as 15 percent of AI/AN students demonstrated proficiency on the 8th-grade English language arts assessment, compared to 36 percent of all 8th-grade students, and 12 percent of AI/AN students achieved proficiency in mathematics, compared to 27 percent of all 8th-grade students.

These outcomes from State assessment data are confirmed by the results of the 2019 National Assessment of Educational Progress for AI/AN students in Alaska. In 4th-grade reading, 9 percent of AI/AN students in Alaska were proficient, while the overall average for all students in Alaska was 25 percent. There were similar differences in 8th-grade reading (20 percent proficient compared to 33 percent for all students in Alaska), 4th-grade mathematics (13 percent proficient compared to 33 percent for all students in Alaska), and 8th-grade mathematics (15 percent proficient compared to 33 percent for all students in Alaska).

In addition to achievement data, the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development reported that the annual dropout rate (the proportion of students who drop out of school during the course of a year) among AI/AN students in grades 7 through 12 was 4.7 percent in the 2019-2020 school year, higher than the rate for any other racial or ethnic group in the State and well above the statewide rate of 2.7 percent. Further, Alaska's "Report Card to the Public: 2019-2020" reported that the high school graduation rate for AI/AN students was 67.6 percent, while the statewide figure was 74.0 percent.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Alaska Native education

---

Alaska's geography and population patterns add to the challenge of delivering quality educational services to Alaska Native students. The State has many rural districts, which often operate schools spread out over large, remote areas, and Alaska Native students are disproportionately enrolled in small, rural, and isolated schools.

Program grants help address these barriers by funding extra academic supports and culturally responsive related services tailored to the educational needs of Alaska Native students in order to improve their academic success and support their successful graduation from high school.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2021	2022	2023
Amount for new awards	\$15,734	\$36,008	0
Number of new awards	15	48	0
Amount for continuation awards	\$20,496	0	\$36,453
Number of continuation awards	19	0	50
Peer review of new award applications	\$223	\$365	0

---

NOTE:

The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including this one, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department did not reserve such funds from this program in fiscal year 2021, but may do so in fiscal years 2022 and 2023.

---

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, program 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 Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program.

The Department waived assessment requirements for the 2019-2020 school year due to widespread closures related to COVID-19; therefore, the Department does not expect to report actual data for these measures for 2020. Data for 2021 will be available in winter 2022.



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Alaska Native education

---

**Measure:** The percentage of Alaska Native students in schools served by the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards for reading, mathematics, and science on the State’s annual assessments.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	48%	49%
2019	49	51
2020	50	Not available
2021	51	
2022	52	
2023	53	

**Measure:** The percentage of Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs who demonstrate school readiness in language and literacy as measured by the Revised Alaska Developmental Profile.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	57%	62%
2019	58	64
2020	59	Not available
2021	60	
2022	61	
2023	62	

**Measure:** The percentage of Alaska Native students in schools served by the program who graduate from high school with a high school diploma in 4 years.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	57%	58%
2019	58	60
2020	59	Not available
2021	60	
2022	61	
2023	62	

**Additional Information:** After working with a data specialist to review data for this measure, the Department discovered that it had incorrectly reported prior years’ data on this measure. The Department has corrected the data and will provide technical assistance to grantees to improve performance on the high school graduation measure.

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**

---

**Training and advisory services**

(Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV)

(dollars in thousands)


FY 2023 Authorization: Indefinite

Budget Authority:

2022 Estimate	2023 Request	Change
\$6,575	\$6,575	0

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Training and Advisory Services program supports efforts to achieve the intent of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act by aiding educators in preparing, adopting, and implementing plans for desegregating public schools and solving equity problems related to race, sex, national origin, and religion. To carry out those activities, the Department awards grants to Equity Assistance Centers (EACs) in four geographic regions serving the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Outlying Areas of American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.



The EACs provide services to school districts upon request. Typical activities include disseminating information on successful educational practices and on legal requirements related to nondiscrimination in educational programs. Other activities include training designed to

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

develop educators' skills in such areas as the identification of race and sex bias in instructional materials and technical assistance in the identification and selection of appropriate educational programs to meet the needs of a diverse student body. Topics covered by the EACs go beyond a traditional view of desegregation to include areas such as school climate, disproportionate and exclusionary discipline, bullying and harassment, culturally and linguistically relevant pedagogy, educator diversity, the effect of poverty on equity in educational opportunity and achievement gaps, and instructional practices that reach all students.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2018	\$6,575
2019	6,575
2020	6,575
2021	6,575
2022 Estimate	6,575

### FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$6.6 million for Training and Advisory Services, level with a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. Fiscal year 2023 funds would support the second year of Equity Assistance Center grants made in fiscal year 2022 under a competition aligned with President Biden's equity agenda.

In fiscal year 2021, the four EACs provided targeted and intensive assistance to 33 State educational agencies, 222 local educational agencies, and 285 schools in 35 States and territories in areas such as creating a positive, safe, and inclusive school climate; improving family engagement; increasing educator diversity; and implementing instructional practices that reach all students. Of the EAC clients that participated in an annual Client Satisfaction Survey, 91 percent indicated satisfaction with the services they received, a seven-percentage point increase from the previous year.

The Equity Assistance Centers continue to develop and implement innovative approaches to technical assistance that respond to needs across States, districts, and schools, and are engaged in a range of evidence-based activities to improve equity and access to high-quality educational environments and resources. Examples of these activities include:

- Developing resources and promoting best practices to help students, educators, and families confront, respond to, and combat anti-Asian American and Pacific Islander discrimination and xenophobia.
- Providing professional development on practical instructional strategies for planning and delivering sheltered content for English learners within the context of standards-based lesson planning, instruction, and assessment.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

- Ensuring, through collaboratively designed lessons and ongoing implementation support, that students, teachers, administrators, and support personnel in schools are prepared to respond to individuals who experience sexual harassment in schools.

In addition, the Equity Assistance Centers remain key thought partners and technical assistance providers to States and school districts across the country as they respond to disruptions and seek to swiftly and safely reopen their schools and maintain in-person instruction during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2021	2022	2023
Amount for grant awards	\$6,532	\$6,468	\$6,528
Data collection	\$43	\$47	\$47
Peer review of new award applications	0	\$60	0
Number of new awards	0	4	0
Number of continuation awards	4	0	4
Average size award	\$1,633	\$1,617	\$1,632

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, program 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 Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program.

Except where stated otherwise below, data for the following measures are collected through an annual survey of EAC clients. The Federal Research Division of the Library of Congress conducts the survey under an interagency agreement with the Department.

Targets for these measures for the fiscal year 2022 cohort, using 2023 as the baseline year, will be developed at a later date.

**Goal: To support access and equity in public schools and help school districts solve equity problems in education related to race, sex, national origin, and religion.**

**Objective:** *Provide coordinated technical assistance and training to State educational agencies and public school districts in addressing equity in education.*

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

**Measure:** The percentage of clients reporting an increase in awareness or knowledge resulting from technical assistance provided.

Year	Target (Combined Only)	Combined Actual	Awareness Actual	Knowledge Actual
2018	85%	80%	80%	75%
2019	83	84	81	84
2020	86	88	88	81
2021	90	81	80	81
2022	92			

**Additional information:** Clients were asked whether they increased their awareness or knowledge and, if so to what extent, on different topics for which they received assistance. The “Combined Actual” percentage is the higher of the two reported percentages for Awareness and Knowledge.

**Measure:** The percentage of clients who report changed policies or practices related to providing students with a full opportunity for participation in all educational programs regardless of their sex, race, religion, and national origin.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	79%	76%
2019	78	75
2020	78	73
2021	78	82
2022	80	

**Measure:** The percentage of clients reporting an increase in capacity resulting from technical assistance provided.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	77%	71%
2019	74	89
2020	90	73
2021	76	64
2022	78	

**Additional information:** Clients were asked whether their organizations received assistance to (1) build inclusive leadership, (2) identify and/or leverage mutually beneficial relationships or partnerships, or (3) obtain and/or leverage tangible materials or systems, and, if so, the extent to which their capacity increased after receiving assistance from the EAC. Data reflect the percentage of respondents who said their capacity increased to a moderate or great extent in at least one of these ways. The decline in 2020 and 2021 likely is explained by service disruptions and challenges in transitioning to a virtual service model during the COVID-19 pandemic.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Training and advisory services

---

**Measure:** The percentage of technical assistance requests received from organizations that were accepted during the performance period.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	96%	96%
2019	97	98
2020	98	97
2021	98	95
2022	98	

**Additional information:** Data are from EAC grantee annual performance reports.

**Measure:** The percentage of technical assistance requests received from new (not previously served by the EAC) organizations during the performance period.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	68%	72%
2019	75	41
2020	48	69
2021	71	67
2022	73	

**Additional information:** Data are from EAC grantee annual performance reports. The significantly lower percentage on this measure in 2019 may be due to the high number of existing clients who reported high satisfaction with the services received and requested additional services in this school year than in previous years. The Department is eliminating this measure beginning with the fiscal year 2022 cohort.

**Measure:** The percentage of clients willing to request additional technical assistance or refer another organization to an EAC for technical assistance during the performance period.

Year	Target (Combined Only)	Combined Actual	Request Additional Assistance Actual	Refer Another Agency Actual
2018	85%	86%	84%	86%
2019	88	89	89	87
2020	91	89	84	89
2021	91	89	89	84
2022	93			

**Additional information:** Clients were asked how likely they were to request additional assistance from the EAC and how likely they were to refer another agency to an EAC for technical assistance. The “Combined Actual” percentage is the higher of the two reported percentages for Request Additional Assistance and Refer Another Agency.

The Department has established the following additional measure for the program beginning with the fiscal year 2022 cohort: The percentage of clients who report that outcomes, as

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### **Training and advisory services**

---

documented in memoranda of understanding with EACs, were met as a result of the technical assistance provided.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Rural education

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2023 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

2022 Estimate	2023 Request	Change
\$187,840	\$202,840	+\$15,000

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) includes two distinct programs to assist rural local educational agencies (LEAs) in carrying out activities to help improve the quality of teaching and learning in their schools. The Small, Rural School Achievement program (SRSA) provides funds to rural LEAs that serve small numbers of students; the Rural and Low-Income School program (RLIS) provides funds to rural LEAs that serve high concentrations of students living in poverty, regardless of the total number of students served. Funds appropriated for REAP are divided equally between the SRSA and the RLIS programs.

#### Small, Rural School Achievement Program (Subpart 1)

To be eligible to receive funds under the SRSA program, an LEA must: (1) have a total average daily attendance (ADA) of less than 600 students or serve only schools that are located in counties that have a population density of fewer than 10 persons per square mile; and (2) serve only schools that have a National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) locale code of 41 (Rural, Fringe), 42 (Rural, Distant), or 43 (Rural, Remote) or are located in an area of the State defined as rural by a governmental agency of the State.

The Department makes formula allocations directly to eligible LEAs based on the number of students in ADA in the schools served by the LEA and the amount the LEA received under certain Federal programs in the previous fiscal year. For each eligible LEA, the Department calculates an initial allocation that is equal to \$20,000 plus \$100 for each child in ADA above 50, with a maximum initial allocation of \$60,000. An LEA's final allocation is equal to the initial allocation minus the amount received in "applicable funding," which are funds allocated in the previous fiscal year under the Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants (Part A of Title II) and Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants (Part A of Title IV) programs.

LEAs may use program funds to carry out activities authorized under the following Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) programs: (1) Part A of Title I (Improving Basic Programs

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations action.



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

Operated by Local Educational Agencies); (2) Part A of Title II (Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants); (3) Part A of Title III (English Language Acquisition State Grants); (4) Part A of Title IV (Student Support and Academic Enrichment State Grants); and (5) Part B of Title IV (21st Century Community Learning Centers).

SRSA-eligible LEAs also may, under an alternative fund use authority (AFUA) previously known as “REAP-Flex”, consolidate any and all of their applicable funding for allowable activities authorized under the five programs specified above.

### Rural and Low-Income School Program (Subpart 2)

Under the RLIS program, the Department makes formula allocations to States based on each State’s share of children in ADA in eligible LEAs. An LEA is considered eligible for RLIS if it: (1) has a poverty rate of at least 20 percent based either on data from the U.S. Census Bureau’s Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program or, for an LEA for which SAIPE data are unavailable, on the same State-derived poverty data used to determine LEA allocations under part A of title I of the ESEA (State-derived poverty data), and (2) serves only schools that have an NCES locale code of 32 (Town, Distant), 33 (Town, Remote), 41 (Rural, Fringe), 42 (Rural, Distant), or 43 (Rural, Remote). Each State then makes RLIS subgrants to eligible LEAs. Additionally, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, established a “hold harmless” provision that enables certain LEAs for which SAIPE poverty data are not available, and that do not have a poverty rate of at least 20 percent based on the State-derived poverty data, to be considered eligible for RLIS at decreasing levels through fiscal year 2027.

States have the option of allocating funds to eligible LEAs competitively or through a formula based on the number of children in ADA in eligible LEAs within the State. A State may also use an alternative formula to allocate funds if it can demonstrate that an alternative method would better target funds to eligible LEAs that serve the highest concentrations of students from low-income backgrounds. If an RLIS-eligible LEA is in a State whose State educational agency (SEA) does not submit an RLIS application, the LEA may apply directly to the Department to receive the funding it would have generated for its State, based on its ADA, had the SEA applied for RLIS. These LEAs are referred to in the statute as Specially Qualified Agencies (SQAs).

LEAs may use RLIS program funds for: (1) Part A of Title I (Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies); (2) Part A of Title II (Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants); (3) Part A of Title III (English Language Acquisition State Grants); (4) Part A of Title IV (Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants); and (5) parental involvement activities.

Lastly, the Department allocates one half of 1 percent of RLIS funds to the Bureau of Indian Education of the Department of the Interior and an equal amount to the Outlying Areas.

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

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal year	(dollars in thousands)
2018	\$180,840
2019	180,840
2020	185,840
2021	187,840
2022 Estimate	187,840

### FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$202.8 million for REAP, \$15 million more than a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. The request would support an average LEA award of approximately \$24,000 under SRSA and an average LEA subgrant of approximately \$44,000 under RLIS.

The fiscal year 2023 request for REAP recognizes the significant obstacles faced by many rural LEAs in ensuring that all students meet challenging State academic standards and graduate high school ready for college and career, consistent with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Based on 2018 data from the National Center for Education Statistics, 28 percent of the Nation’s public schools were located in rural areas, while 19 percent of all public school students were enrolled at these schools. The small size and remoteness of many rural schools and LEAs creates unique challenges. For example, rural schools and LEAs generally do not benefit from economies of scale and, thus, can face greater per-pupil costs in areas such as staffing or transportation compared to some urban and suburban areas.

While rural student performance on reading and mathematics on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is roughly the same as the national average (for example, the NAEP scale scores of public school students attending rural schools and nationwide were roughly the same in 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading and 4<sup>th</sup>-grade mathematics), and the rural student adjusted cohort graduation rate is higher than the national average (90 percent compared to 86 percent),<sup>1</sup> resource challenges still impede academic opportunities for rural students. For example, rural LEAs often are not able to offer their students the same level of access to advanced coursework opportunities as other LEAs. In the 2015–16 school year, just 44 percent of rural schools serving students in grades 9 through 12 offered Advanced Placement courses, compared to 62 percent of comparable suburban schools.<sup>2</sup> In addition, because of size and location, many small, rural LEAs have faced difficulty in recruiting and retaining fully certified, effective teachers in all fields and subjects. This can make it difficult to provide students with access to high-quality career and technical education, science, technology, engineering, and math, and advanced coursework opportunities. Rural LEAs also may face greater challenges than non-rural districts in providing access to educational technology, such as the high-speed, broadband internet required for distance learning.

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d20/tables/dt20\\_219.47.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d20/tables/dt20_219.47.asp)

<sup>2</sup> <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d19/tables/xls/tabn225.72.xls>

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

REAP funds provide rural LEAs with additional resources that can be used to help meet such challenges.

Rural LEAs also frequently receive allocations under the Department's other formula grant programs that are too small to allow the LEA to effectively address the purposes for which the funds are appropriated. Recognizing that rural LEAs frequently receive small allocations from Federal formula grants, the AFUA gives SRSA-eligible LEAs the flexibility to make more effective use of these small allocations by consolidating them. An estimated 30 percent of eligible LEAs notified their respective States of their intention to take advantage of this authority in school year 2019-20. Yet even when the eligible LEAs consolidate their allocations under these programs, some do not have enough money to address statutory objectives in a meaningful manner. REAP funds can help ensure that such LEAs have sufficient funds to implement ESEA programs consistent with Congressional intent.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2021	2022	2023
<b>Small, rural school achievement program</b>			
Total funding	\$93,920	\$93,920	\$101,420
Number of LEAs receiving grants	4,255	4,255	4,255
Average LEA grant	\$22	\$22	\$24
Average award per student (whole \$)	\$83	\$83	\$89
Range of awards to LEAs	0-\$66	0-\$66	0-\$72

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

Output Measures	2021	2022	2023
<b>Rural and low-income school program</b>			
Total funding	\$93,920	\$93,920	\$101,420
Amount for State and SQA grants	\$92,981	\$92,981	\$100,406
Amount for BIE	\$470	\$470	\$507
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$470	\$470	\$507
Number of States receiving grants	47	47	47
Number of LEAs receiving subgrants	2,147	2,147	2,147
Number of LEAs receiving SQA grants	22	22	22
Average State grant	\$2,012	\$2,012	\$2,173
Average LEA subgrant	\$41	\$41	\$44
Average SQA grant	\$20	\$20	\$21
Average award per student (whole \$)	\$25	\$25	\$28
Range of awards to States	\$3–\$10,160	\$3–\$10,160	\$4–\$11,040
Estimated range of subgrants to LEAs	0–\$320	0–\$320	0–\$348

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including REAP, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA programs. The Department did not reserve funds for this purpose from REAP in fiscal year 2021, but may do so in fiscal years 2022 and 2023.

## PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, program 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 Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program.

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

**Objective:** *Students enrolled in LEAs participating in REAP programs will score proficient or above on States' assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics.*

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

**Measure:** The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the SRSA program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	100%	48%
2019	100	49
2020	100	
2021	100	
2022	100	

**Measure:** The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the SRSA program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in mathematics.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	100%	43%
2019	100	43
2020	100	
2021	100	
2022	100	

**Measure:** The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the RLIS program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	100%	43%
2019	100	43
2020	100	
2021	100	
2022	100	

**Measure:** The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the RLIS program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in mathematics.

Year	Target	Actual
2018	100%	40%
2019	100	40
2020	100	
2021	100	
2022	100	

**Additional information:** The Department waived assessment requirements for the 2019-2020 school year due to widespread closures related to COVID-19; therefore, the Department does not expect to report actual data for these measures for 2020. Data for 2021 will be available in spring 2022. The performance targets for these measures reflect the previous reauthorization

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Rural education

---

of the ESEA, which required all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by 2014. These targets are no longer relevant under the current authorization and no targets are established for fiscal year 2023 because the Department plans to revise the program's performance measures in 2022.

**Objective:** *SRSA-eligible rural school districts will use the REAP flexibility authority.*

**Measure:** The percentage of SRSA-eligible school districts using the REAP flexibility authority (known as REAP-Flex prior to 2017, now the alternative fund use authority, or AFUA).

Year	Target	Actual
2018	65%	43%
2019	65	39
2020	65	30
2021	65	
2022	65	

**Additional information:** While this measure was developed to capture the percentage of eligible LEAs actually using the flexibility authority, the best available information is on the number of LEAs reporting to the State their intent to use this authority. Since there is little reason to believe that LEAs would provide this notification and not use the authority, reported intent serves as a reasonable proxy.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Supplemental education grants

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2023 Authorization: \$24,464<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

2022 Estimate	2023 Request	Change
\$16,699	\$24,464	+\$7,765

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-188) eliminated the participation of the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) and the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in most domestic formula grant programs funded by the Departments of Education (ED), Health and Human Services (HHS), and Labor (DOL). As a replacement, beginning in fiscal year 2005, the Act authorizes supplemental education grants in an amount that is roughly equivalent to the total formula funds that these entities received in fiscal year 2004 under the Federal formula programs for which they are no longer eligible, adjusted for inflation. These grants augment the funds that the FSM and the RMI receive for general education assistance under their Compacts of Free Association with the U.S. Government.

The Act eliminated the participation of the FSM and the RMI in the following Department of Education programs: Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies, Career and Technical Education Grants under Title I of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants, Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunities Grants, and Federal Work-Study. However, they remain eligible for participation in other Department programs, including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act State Grants and programs under Part A, Subpart 1 of Title IV of the Higher Education Act, as well as ED, HHS, and DOL competitive programs. Also, the Act eliminated FSM and RMI participation in programs under Title I (other than Job Corps) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (DOL) and Head Start (HHS).

The Department of Education is required to transfer funds appropriated for Supplemental Education Grants to the Department of the Interior (DOI) for disbursement to the RMI and the FSM not later than 60 days after the appropriation becomes available. Appropriations are to be used and monitored in accordance with an interagency agreement between the four agencies and in accordance with the "Fiscal Procedure Agreements" entered into by the FSM and the

---

<sup>1</sup> The 2023 authorization is based on the fiscal year 2005 authorization level, adjusted for inflation in accordance with statutory requirements.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Supplemental education grants

---

RMI with the U.S. Government. These agreements call for the funds to be used at the local school level for direct educational services focused on school readiness, early childhood education, elementary and secondary education, vocational training, adult and family literacy, and the transition from high school to postsecondary education and careers. They may not be used for construction or remodeling, the general operating costs of school systems, or teacher salaries (except the salaries of teachers who carry out programs supported by the grants).

The FSM and the RMI may request technical assistance from ED, HHS, or DOL, on a reimbursement basis. Since fiscal year 2015, appropriations acts have allowed ED to reserve up to 5 percent of Supplemental Education Grants funds to provide technical assistance for these grants, but the Department has yet to exercise this authority.

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

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2018	\$16,699
2019	16,699
2020	16,699
2021	16,699
2022 Estimate	16,699

### FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$24.5 million for Supplemental Education Grants, \$7.8 million more than a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. The request would include a partial inflation adjustment for the first time since the program was initially authorized and help ensure the continuation of services for residents of the RMI and the FSM. The request also includes appropriations language that would continue to give the Department of Education the authority to reserve up to 5 percent of appropriated funds to provide technical assistance to support effective use of program funds to improve educational outcomes in the RMI and the FSM.

The RMI and the FSM have used Supplemental Education Grant funds for early childhood education, education improvement programs, vocational and skills training, and professional development. Both the RMI and the FSM have also used funds to prepare students for jobs resulting from the Guam military build-up. The Administration anticipates that fiscal year 2023 funding would be used for similar purposes.



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Supplemental education grants

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>	<u>2023</u>
Grant to the Federated States of Micronesia	\$11,131	\$11,131	\$16,323
Grant to the Republic of the Marshall Islands	5,568	5,568	8,141

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

The Department has not established performance measures for this program because it is operated by the Department of the Interior.

A December 2006 General Accounting Office report, entitled “Compacts of Free Association: Micronesia and the Marshall Islands Face Challenges in Planning for Sustainability, Measuring Progress, and Ensuring Accountability,” documented both the continuing need for improvement in the public education systems of the Freely Associated States and the difficulties in obtaining and reporting performance data for this program. The RMI, according to the report, was not able to measure progress towards its educational goals because the data collected were inadequate, inconsistent, and incomplete. Tests to measure achievement were not administered in 2005 and 2006, and some of the tests were not aligned with the curriculum used in RMI schools and thus were not adequate measures of student achievement. The FSM also lacked consistent performance outcomes and measures; measures and outcomes had been established but had constantly changed, making it difficult to track progress.

Additional information from the Department of the Interior (DOI) covering the 5-year period between 2004 and 2009 highlighted the continuing challenges faced by both entities in improving the quality of education due to a lack of qualified teachers, poor facilities, and a high absentee rate among students and teachers. While access to elementary and secondary education had increased in the RMI and student enrollment had increased during this period despite significant out-migration, the RMI continued to have few standardized tests for assessing student achievement, a low graduation rate, and a low percentage of qualified teachers. The FSM continued to struggle with low student achievement, discouraging student drop-out rates, and problematic teacher attendance.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### Comprehensive centers

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2023 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

	2022 Estimate	2023 Request	Change
	\$52,000	\$52,000	0

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Comprehensive Centers program is authorized to fund not fewer than 20 Comprehensive Centers, including regional centers and content centers, that provide training, technical assistance, and professional development to build State capacity to provide high-quality education for all students, particularly those in local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools with low rates of performance. Centers provide support to State educational agencies (SEAs), and through them, to LEAs and schools. The Comprehensive Centers are part of a Department technical assistance network that includes the Regional Educational Laboratories, the What Works Clearinghouse, Equity Assistance Centers, Office of Special Education Program-funded technical assistance centers, and other program-specific centers designed to provide support to SEAs, LEAs, and schools.

The statute requires that the Department fund a minimum of 10 regional centers. The program currently supports 19 regional centers and 1 national center that received 5-year grants in 2019. The regional centers provide broad assistance to SEAs in their assigned States, following annual State service plans developed in consultation with each State's Chief State School Officer. The national center develops an annual service plan in consultation with the Department and the regional centers. The national service plan takes into account challenges identified in the regional centers' State service plans, Department monitoring and audit findings, and emerging national education trends. The national center also maintains the Comprehensive Center website and disseminates information to a wide variety of education stakeholders, including parents. Information on the new Centers is available at <https://www.compcenternetwork.org/>. The program also supports one content center, first funded in 2016, that focuses on students at risk of not attaining full literacy skills due to a disability. This center was re-competed in 2021.

---


<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2023 is expected through appropriations action.

# SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

## Comprehensive centers

Each regional Center serves a specific set of States, as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Regional Comprehensive Centers



The Education Technical Assistance Act (ETAA) does not authorize the Comprehensive Centers to provide direct support to the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE). However, beginning in fiscal year 2017 Congress has directed the Department through appropriations language to ensure that BIE has access to services from the Comprehensive Centers, and the BIE currently receives services through the Region 13 Center (funded by an annual supplement of \$400,000).

The statute requires the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, a component of the Department's Institute of Education Sciences (IES), to carry out an independent evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers to determine the extent to which each center meets its objectives. The National Evaluation for the Comprehensive Centers program is currently under way. Data collection is set to begin late spring 2022. The final evaluation report is scheduled for completion fall 2023.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2018	\$52,000
2019	52,000
2020	52,000
2021	52,000
2022 Estimate	52,000

### FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$52.0 million for the Comprehensive Centers program, level with a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. All funds would be used for the final year of continuation costs of the 19 Regional Centers and the National Center, as well as the third year of funding for the center for students at risk of not attaining full literacy skills due to a disability.

Regional Centers provide intensive capacity-building services to help SEAs and other recipients identify, implement, and sustain effective evidence-based practices that improve instruction and student outcomes. The National Center provides universal and targeted capacity-building services to address common high-impact problems and common programmatic monitoring and audit findings, as well as information on emerging national education issues. The Centers' work has taken on additional meaning during the COVID-19 crisis, and Centers successfully pivoted to provide services to help SEAs and LEAs adapt to difficult and changing situations, revising their service plans on an on-going basis to address changing needs. Centers raised awareness of existing resources and services, provided information to SEAs to inform their resource allocation decisions in ways that would support educational equity, improved literacy instruction, and the educator workforce. Regional Centers also are helping SEAs identify how to integrate stimulus funding into ESEA plans.

Examples of recent and ongoing Center work include:

- Regions 1 and 9 are creating a community of practice to support districts across six states— Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont—as they assess the quality of remote or hybrid teaching models, focusing initially on student and parent engagement, and teacher working conditions.
- The Region 14 Center is working to improve underserved students' access to effective educators by identifying and developing resources for the Texas SEA and its education service centers (ESCs).
- The Region 16 Center partnered with REL Northwest to host a 6-part series targeted to teachers in Alaska on teaching K-3 students to read remotely. Participants had the option of earning University of Alaska Anchorage credit for the series. (<https://aklearns.org/teaching-early-literacy-remotely/>)

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

A collaborative project between the Regions 2, 13, and 15 Centers supports a virtual, cross-state meeting among SEA staff to develop and implement the periodic resource allocation reviews required by the Every Student Succeeds Act for certain schools identified for improvement.

The request would retain appropriations language that permits the provision of direct support to the BIE, allowing services for schools that are often in great need of assistance.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2021	2022	2023
Funding for new grant awards	\$1,475	0	0
Funding for continuation grant awards	50,026	\$52,000	\$52,000
Evaluation	474	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	25	0	0
Total	52,000	52,000	52,000
Number of New Grant Awards	1	0	0
Average New Grant Award	\$1,475	-	-
Number of Continuation Grant Awards	20	21	21
Average Continuation Grant Award	\$2,501	\$2,476	\$2,476
Range of Continuation Grant Awards	\$1,000–\$6,270	\$1,000–\$6,270	\$1,000–\$6,270

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, program 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 Federal resources provided for the program as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by the program. Targets will be set after 2 years of baseline data are available.

The Comprehensive Centers measures are designed to analyze the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the services provided by the centers and reported in grantees' Annual Performance Reports (APRs) and Annual Evaluation Reports (AERs). Each Center has developed a methodology for reporting which is described in its APR. Methodologies differ slightly across the 20 Comprehensive Centers. The data available at this time and reported for 2021 below are for the full second year of the program performance, with a reporting period of October 1, 2020 through September 30, 2021. Targets will be set by May, 2022.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

**Goal:** To improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, and improve the quality of instruction under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESEA).

**Objective:** *Improve the quality of Comprehensive Center services.*

**Measure:** The extent to which Comprehensive Center Clients are satisfied with the quality, usefulness, and relevance of services provided.

Year	Target	Actual
2020	Baseline	91%
2021	Baseline	90%
2022		
2023		

**Additional information:** All 20 Centers provided 2021 data for this measure and were included in the calculation, which showed that 90 percent of clients were satisfied with services. The Department has established a Center evaluation workgroup to help standardize reporting on this measure.

**Objective:** *To maximize the impact of public funds and make the work of the Comprehensive Centers program available to as many REAs, SEAs, LEAs, and schools in need of support as possible.*

**Measure:** The extent to which Comprehensive Centers provide services and products to a wide range of recipients.

Year	Target	Actual
2020	Baseline	
2021	Baseline	10%
2022		
2023		

**Additional information:** Data from all 20 centers are included in the calculation of this measure. The calculation of this measure changed from the percentage of recipients that reported receiving services as planned in the 2020 AER to the number of distinct recipient groups that received services and products in the 2021 AER. Most frequently reported recipient group types by centers were SEA Leadership, other SEA staff, LEA staff, Regional Education Agency staff, school administrators, Institutes of Higher Education, and school educators.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

**Objective:** *To improve the implementation of capacity building services provided by the Comprehensive Centers Program.*

**Measure:** The extent to which Comprehensive Centers demonstrate that capacity building services were implemented as intended.

Year	Target	Actual
2020	Baseline	73%
2021	Baseline	83
2022		
2023		

**Additional information:** Data from 17 centers are included in the calculation of this measure, which shows that 83 percent of planned milestones were completed.

**Objective:** *To improve the extent to which Comprehensive Center clients achieved their intended outcomes and the extent to which Center services produced the intended outcomes.*

**Measure:** The extent to which Comprehensive Centers demonstrate that recipient outcomes were met.

Year	Target	Actual
2020	Baseline	
2021	Baseline	86%
2022		
2023		

**Additional information:** Data from 16 centers are included in the calculation of this measure, which showed that 86 percent of recipient outcomes were completed. The Comprehensive Center Evaluation Workgroup is currently finalizing data collection tools and resources for this measure. No data was reported for 2020.

### OTHER PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Institute of Education Sciences began a descriptive study of the Comprehensive Centers in December 2020 that is examining the delivery and usefulness of the Centers' technical assistance. Study questions include:

- What key educational problems are the Comprehensive Centers addressing?
- What capacity-building services are Comprehensive Centers providing and what types of capacity are these services designed to increase?
- What are the successes and challenges of program changes, including the shift in the number and geographic reach of the centers and new requirements to increase collaboration with the Department's Regional Educational Laboratories?

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Comprehensive centers

---

- How can the outcome of the Comprehensive Centers — improving SEA and LEA capacity — be measured accurately, validly, and reliably?

The study will be based on document reviews, surveys and interviews of SEA and LEA staff, and interviews with Comprehensive Center and REL project directors, and will examine ways in which the pandemic altered plans for the first years of the grant. The study team will develop measures of SEA capacity by reviewing existing survey and assessment items that gauge similar concepts, interviewing stakeholders, and conducting pilot testing with SEA and district stakeholders. The final report is scheduled for completion fall 2023.



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### **Student support and academic enrichment grants**

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2023 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

	2022 Estimate	2023 Request	Change
	\$1,220,000	\$1,220,000	0

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants are intended to improve academic achievement by increasing the capacity of States and local educational agencies (LEAs) to provide students with access to a well-rounded education and improve school conditions and use of technology.

The Department allocates program funds to States by formula based on each State's share of funds received under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA), for the preceding fiscal year. No State may receive less than 0.5 percent of the total program appropriation except for Puerto Rico, which may not receive more than this amount. The Department also reserves funds for the outlying areas and for the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) of the Department of the Interior (0.5 percent in each case) and to provide technical assistance and capacity building (2 percent).

States must use not less than 95 percent of funds to make subgrants to LEAs and not more than 1 percent for administrative costs and may use any remaining funds for State-level activities consistent with the purposes of the program, which may include providing technical assistance or direct support to LEAs to carry out authorized activities. States allocate subgrants to LEAs on the same formula basis as above (i.e., shares of Title I, Part A funds), except that no LEA receiving an allocation may receive less than \$10,000. LEAs may form consortia and combine subgrant allocations to carry out activities jointly. States and LEAs must use funds to supplement, and not supplant, non-Federal funds that would otherwise be used for authorized activities.

LEAs receiving formula allocations of \$30,000 or more must conduct a comprehensive needs assessment and use not less than 20 percent of their allocations for activities to support well-rounded educational opportunities, not less than 20 percent for activities to support safe and healthy students, and a portion to support the effective use of technology. LEAs receiving less than \$30,000 must use funds to carry out activities in at least one of these three areas. LEAs must prioritize support to schools with the greatest needs as determined by the LEA, schools with the highest concentrations of Title I formula children, schools that are identified for

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2021. Reauthorization for FY 2023 is proposed through appropriations language.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Student support and academic enrichment grants

---

comprehensive support and improvement or implementing targeted support and improvement plans, or schools that are identified as persistently unsafe schools. LEAs may reserve up to 2 percent of their allocations for administrative costs.

LEAs may use funds for a range of activities to support a well-rounded education, including: promoting student engagement and success through music and the arts; improving instruction in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (including computer science); increasing the availability of accelerated learning courses, such as Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses, dual or concurrent enrollment programs and early college high schools, and the foundational and gateway courses necessary in elementary and middle school; strengthening instruction in American history, civics, economics, geography, and government; providing foreign language instruction and environmental education; and providing college and career counseling, including financial literacy activities and support in completing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA).

Authorized activities to support safe and healthy students include: evidence-based drug and violence prevention programs; school-based mental health services, including through partnerships with mental health or health care entities; activities to support a healthy, active lifestyle, including physical education; activities to help prevent and address bullying and harassment; mentoring and school counseling; school dropout prevention, reentry, and reengagement programs, including early warning indicator and intervention systems; high-quality training for school personnel in such areas as suicide prevention, crisis management, and conflict resolution; child sexual abuse awareness and prevention programs; designing and implementing plans to reduce exclusionary discipline practices; and implementing schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports. In these areas, LEAs may use funds to implement pay for success initiatives (i.e., performance-based agreements under which, among other things, payments are made only after achievement of outcomes).

Lastly, LEAs may pursue such educational technology-related activities as: providing school and LEA personnel with tools and resources to use technology effectively to improve instruction, support teacher collaboration, and personalize student learning; building technological capacity and infrastructure, including by procuring content, purchasing devices, equipment, and software, and ensuring they are fully accessible to all students; providing specialized or rigorous technology-based academic courses; carrying out projects blending classroom and technology-based instruction in a way that provides students with control over the time, path, or pace of learning; providing professional development on the effective integration of technology into teaching and learning; and providing students in rural and other underserved areas with access to digital learning experience and resources, including online courses. Of funds supporting the effective use of technology, LEAs may use not more than 15 percent to purchase technology infrastructure.

Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants 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.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Student support and academic enrichment grants

---

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

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2018	\$1,100,000
2019	1,170,000
2020	1,210,000
2021	1,220,000
2022 Estimate	1,220,000

### FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2023, the Administration requests \$1.22 billion for Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants, level with a fiscal year 2022 annualized CR based on the fiscal year 2021 appropriation. The request supports the Administration's goal of ensuring equity in access to educational opportunity for all students, particularly those attending schools with high rates of poverty or persistently underperforming schools, which receive priority for service under the program statute.

Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants provide resources for improving student opportunities and outcomes that can be used flexibly in response to locally identified needs. Funds can be used for a range of activities that promote equity in access to and success in well-rounded educational opportunities, safe and healthy learning environments, and effective use of technology in teaching and learning.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2021	2022	2023
Amount to States	\$1,177,483	\$1,177,483	\$1,177,483
Range of State awards	5,887–144,537	5,887–145,971	5,887–136,925
Average State award	22,644	22,644	22,644
Amount to Outlying Areas	6,070	6,070	6,070
Amount to BIE	6,070	6,070	6,070
Technical assistance and capacity building	24,278	24,278	24,278
Evaluation	6,100	6,100	6,100

---

NOTE: The Department is authorized to reserve up to 0.5 percent of funds appropriated for most ESEA programs, including Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants, and to pool such funds for use in evaluating any ESEA program. The Department reserved \$6,100 thousand from Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants for pooled evaluation in fiscal year 2021 and expects to reserve funds for this purpose in fiscal years 2022 and 2023.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Student support and academic enrichment grants

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department collects performance information for Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants primarily through the annual Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) and descriptive implementation studies.

#### Consolidated State Performance Reports

Consistent with the program statute's public reporting requirements for States and LEAs, the Department collects State-aggregate data on LEA uses of funds through the CSPR. Specifically, the Department collects data on the percentage of funds spent by LEAs in each of the three program content areas and the percentage of LEAs spending funds in each area.

Available data from school year 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 CSPRs that meet quality-control checks are provided in the tables below; data from the school year 2020-2021 CSPR are expected to be available in fall 2022. The Department is providing technical assistance to States to improve their data collection and reporting capabilities.

#### Percent of Funds Spent in Each Content Area

Content Area	Percent of Funds Spent in 2018-2019 School Year	Percent of Funds Spent in 2019-2020 School Year
Well-Rounded Education	49%	45%
Safe and Healthy Students	38	36
Effective Use of Technology	13	19

**Additional Information:** Data are from 38 of 52 States (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) and roughly track findings on use of funds in the 2018-2019 school year from the "first-look" implementation study described below.

#### Percent of LEAs Spending Funds in Each Content Area

Content Area	Percent of LEAs Spending Funds in 2018-2019 School Year	Percent of LEAs Spending Funds in 2019-2020 School Year
Well-Rounded Education	70%	73%
Safe and Healthy Students	64	66
Effective Use of Technology	47	52

**Additional Information:** Data for the 2018-2019 school year are from 32 of 52 States and for the 2019-2020 school from 36 States and roughly track findings on use of funds in the 2018-2019 school year from the "first-look" implementation study described below.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Student support and academic enrichment grants

---

#### “First-Look” Implementation Study

The Department also collected information on use of funds in school year 2018-2019 based on State analyses of LEA applications for fiscal year 2018 program funding, as well as other basic program information. Key findings from this contractor-supported study, released in February 2020,<sup>1</sup> include the following:

- Less than one-third (31 percent) of LEAs receiving a fiscal year 2018 formula allocation received at least \$30,000.
- Most LEAs (74 percent) retained at least some of their fiscal year 2018 funds for use under the program, as opposed to transferring their entire allocation to other ESEA programs, as permitted under statute.
- On average, LEAs that retained fiscal year 2018 funds spent an estimated 44 percent of the funds for well-rounded educational opportunities, 41 percent of funds to support safe and healthy students, and 14 percent on the effective use of technology.
- An estimated 73 percent of LEAs used funds to support well-rounded educational opportunities, 70 percent used funds to support safe and healthy students, and 53 percent to support the effective use of technology.
- Two percent of LEAs receiving a fiscal year 2018 allocation operated in consortia.

#### Formal Implementation Study

In addition, the Department is conducting a formal implementation study that will examine local uses of funds, State-level program activities, and other aspects of local implementation (e.g., how LEAs conduct comprehensive needs assessments and use them in deciding how to spend program funds), including how school districts are using funds in efforts to recover from the COVID-19 pandemic. The study will consist of surveys of State program coordinators in all States, a nationally representative survey of LEAs, and, likely, site visits to a select number of LEAs to collect in-depth program implementation information. The Department plans to initiate data collection for the study in spring 2022 (covering the use of funds during school year 2021-2022), with a descriptive report expected in early 2023. Additional study products are under consideration.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/esea/title-iv-first-look-2020.pdf>.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Student support and academic enrichment grants

---

#### Other Performance Information

##### Technical Assistance and Capacity Building

In fiscal year 2022, the Department plans to use fiscal year 2021 funds reserved for technical assistance and capacity building under Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants to continue the following actions initiated in prior years:

- A program technical assistance center providing general resources as well as customized technical assistance to States to increase their capacity to assist LEAs in carrying out program activities, including through a network of subject matter experts who can help identify activities and interventions across the program content areas that are evidence-based and can be incorporated into broader school improvement efforts (\$4.1 million).
- A center focused on building the capacity of States and LEAs to promote a well-rounded education by implementing evidence-based practices and programs in social and emotional learning (\$1.5 million).
- A technical assistance provider assisting LEAs that seek to use Title IV-A funds to improve school conditions for student learning by implementing positive behavioral interventions and supports frameworks (\$750,000).
- A national center for disseminating evidence-based practices in addressing chronic absenteeism, including analysis of attendance data and activities to improve student engagement (\$725,000).
- Technical assistance to States and LEAs in implementing human trafficking prevention activities (\$250,000).
- Maintenance of the schoolhealth.ed.gov website, which provides a single point of access to resources from Federal partner agencies for successful implementation of activities to address the physical and mental health of students and promote healthy school environments (\$100,000).
- Awards under the Trauma Recovery Demonstration Grants program, which supports model programs that enable low-income students who have experienced trauma to seek trauma-specific mental-health services from the provider that best meets the student's needs, as well as technical assistance to award recipients (\$6.6 million).
- Awards under the Expanding Access to Well-Rounded Courses Demonstration Grants program, which supports State efforts to provide well-rounded educational opportunities through model course-access programs, as well as technical assistance to award recipients (\$8.1 million).
- An award under the Well-Rounded Education Through Student-Centered Funding Demonstration Grants program, which supports LEA efforts to provide well-rounded

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### **Student support and academic enrichment grants**

---

educational opportunities through the development and implementation of student-centered funding systems based on weighted per-pupil allocations under section 1501 of the ESEA (\$215,000).

School crime and safety surveys administered or supported by the National Center for Education Statistics, including the School Survey on Crime and Safety, a survey of public school principals, and the School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, a survey of students ages 12 through 18 (\$1 million).

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

---

### School-Based Health Professionals

(Proposed legislation)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2023 Authorization: To be determined.

Budget Authority:

	2022 Estimate	2023 Request	Change
	0	\$1,000,000	+\$1,000,000

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The School-Based Health Professionals (SBHP) program, initially proposed in the fiscal year 2022 request, would provide formula grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), which would then make competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) with high rates of poverty to support the goal of doubling the number of health professionals in our public schools, including school counselors, nurses, school psychologists, and social workers.

Funds would be allocated to SEAs on the basis of shares of funding received under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in the preceding fiscal year. SEAs would be permitted to reserve up to 15 percent of their allocations to address shortages of health professionals by establishing partnerships with institutions of higher education (IHEs) to recruit, prepare, and place graduate students in school-based health fields in high-need LEAs and to complete required field work, credit hours, internships, or related training as applicable for the degree, license, or credential program of each health-based candidate. SEAs also may use a portion of these funds for review and revision of State licensure standards to promote mobility of health professionals into school settings.

SEAs would award at least 80 percent of their allocations to LEAs on a competitive basis, with a priority on LEAs with significant numbers of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement or targeted support and improvement. The funds would be prioritized to these schools first, and then to LEAs with a significant number of schools that receive Title I funds or are Title I-eligible, to close gaps in ratios of students to health professionals that substantially exceed the recommended ratios for student-to-school counselor, student-to-social worker, or student-to-nurse.<sup>1</sup> Funds would be used to pay recruitment costs, salaries, retention efforts such as additional supports, and related personnel costs. SEAs would be expected to describe

---

<sup>1</sup> The American School Counselor Association recommends a ratio 250:1; the National Association of Social Workers also calls for a ratio of 250:1; the National Association of School Nurses recommends 750:1; and the National Associations of School Psychologists recommends an overall ratio of 1000:1.



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### School-based health professionals

---

how funding for personnel costs in funded schools would be sustained after the grant expires, including through Federal and State funding sources.

SEAs would be required to provide a 25 percent non-Federal match for grants received under the SBHP program; the SEA match would be used only for subgrants to LEAs. LEAs also would be required to provide a 25 percent match for their formula awards and may use up to 20 percent of funds received under Part A of Title I, Part A of Title II, and Part A of Title IV of the ESEA, as well as any portion of funds received under the American Rescue Plan, for this purpose. SEAs would be permitted to waive the matching requirement for LEAs with high rates of poverty that demonstrate a need for such a waiver.

SEAs also would be permitted to reserve up to 5 percent of their allocations for administration, technical assistance, and identification and dissemination of evidence-based practices related to meeting students' social, emotional, and mental health needs.

One-half of 1 percent of SBHP appropriations would be reserved for the Bureau of Indian Education at the Department of the Interior and one-half of 1 percent would be reserved for the Outlying Areas (American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands).

### FY 2023 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$1 billion in first-time funding for the proposed School-Based Health Professionals (SBHP) program in fiscal year 2023, consistent with President Biden's goal to double the number of school counselors, nurses, social workers, and school psychologists in LEAs and schools over the next decade. With the help of the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund (ESSER), public schools have already seen a 65% increase in social workers and a 17% increase in counselors relative to average employment in these roles before the pandemic. However, too many students still do not have access to these services. This is particularly acute in underserved communities and as schools struggle to address the impact of the pandemic on student mental health and social and emotional development, with impacts on student behavior and overall wellbeing, with ripple effects across entire school communities.

The request reflects this growing recognition of trauma and stress encountered by students in our public schools, and its impact on student mental health and outcomes, particularly for students from low-income backgrounds and living in communities of concentrated poverty which can have a negative impact on the educational opportunities and supports students receive. This recognition was driven in part by the significant number of large-scale natural disasters over the past five years, such as Hurricanes Harvey and Maria in 2017 and catastrophic wildfires in California, as well as the regular gun violence that can occur near school grounds in communities of concentrated poverty and which disproportionately affect communities of color, as recently reported in 2020 by the Government Accountability Office.<sup>1</sup> Most recently, the

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-20-455.pdf>.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### School-based health professionals

---

COVID-19 pandemic caused nationwide disruption of our education system, familial loss, significant economic dislocation, and related stress that has taken an unprecedented toll on the mental health and well-being of students and families alike. In addition, the compounded daily effects of racial injustice can have a negative impact on the social, emotional, and mental health of many students. Research shows that school-based access to health professionals can help identify and mitigate the impacts of these experiences.

The American Rescue Plan Act (ARP Act) of 2021, and in particular the \$122 billion provided therein for ESSER, provides resources that can be used to meet near-term student social, emotional, and mental health needs. However, there continues to be a critical gap, that existed prior to and was only made worse by the pandemic, between the number of school-based health service providers needed to provide daily supports that encompass social and emotional learning, mental wellness, and positive and trusting relationships between students and adults and the number of such providers currently serving in our schools, particularly in LEAs and schools with high rates of poverty. The SBHP program is designed to help bridge that gap by providing dedicated, ongoing funding to assist LEAs in paying the salaries and related personnel costs of additional school-based health professionals.

The SBHP proposal also recognizes the importance of building the pipeline of providers to address longstanding shortages of school-based health professionals, particularly in underserved LEAs and schools, including LEAs and schools in rural and geographically isolated areas. The proposal would address this concern by allowing SEAs to reserve up to 15 percent of their allocations to create partnerships with IHEs focused on increasing the number of qualified graduates in school-based health fields.

The long-term impact of the SBHP program would be enhanced by a dual matching requirement, with SEAs required to provide a 25-percent non-Federal match of program funds and LEAs subject to a similar 25-percent match, which could be paid with other Federal education funds, specifically funds received under Part A of Title I, Part A of Title II, and Part A of Title IV of the ESEA, as well as funds received under the American Rescue Plan. The Administration believes that leveraging funds received under the ESEA authorities to support SBHP activities is consistent with the purposes of those authorities and can help to sustain these efforts. The SEA match would be used only for subgrants to LEAs.

The Administration estimates that the \$1 billion requested for the program, together with State and local matching funds, would allow LEAs to hire an additional 21,000 school counselors, nurses, social workers, and school psychologists.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### School-based health professionals

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

(dollars in thousands)

Output Measures	2023
Amount for grants	\$1,000,000
Range of awards	\$643–\$123,016
Number of awards	57
Amount available to hire school-based health professionals, including State and local matching funds	\$1,250,000
Total estimated number of school-based health professionals hired during initial program implementation	21,000

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

The Department anticipates developing program performances measures for the SBHP program similar to those initially proposed for the School-Based Mental Health Services Grant Program launched in fiscal year 2020 under School Safety National Activities in the Safe Schools and Citizenship Education account. These measures include the number of school-based health service providers recruited and hired, the number of school-based health service providers retained, the ratio of students to health service providers for underserved LEAs, and the annual attrition rate of school-based health service providers for high-need LEAs.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

### Account Summary Table

Click here for accessible version

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2023 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET  
(in thousands of dollars)

	Cat Code	2021 Appropriation	2022 Estimate	2023 Request	2023 Request Compared to 2022 Estimate	
					Amount	Percent
<b>School Improvement Programs</b>						
1. Supporting effective instruction State grants (ESEA II-A)						
Annual appropriation	D	461,639	461,639	467,139	5,500	1.19%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	1,681,441	1,681,441	1,681,441	0	0.00%
Subtotal	D	2,143,080	2,143,080	2,148,580	5,500	0.26%
2. 21st century community learning centers (ESEA IV-B)	D	1,259,673	1,259,673	1,309,673	50,000	3.97%
3. State assessments (ESEA I-B, section 1201-1203)	D	378,000	378,000	378,000	0	0.00%
4. Education for homeless children and youths (MVHAA Title VII-B)	D	106,500	106,500	110,000	3,500	3.29%
5. Native Hawaiian education (ESEA VI-B)	D	37,397	37,397	37,397	0	0.00%
6. Alaska Native education (ESEA VI-C)	D	36,453	36,453	36,453	0	0.00%
7. Training and advisory services (CRA IV)	D	6,575	6,575	6,575	0	0.00%
8. Rural education (ESEA V-B)	D	187,840	187,840	202,840	15,000	7.99%
9. Supplemental education grants (Compact of Free Association Act)	D	16,699	16,699	24,464	7,765	46.50%
10. Comprehensive centers (ETAA section 203)	D	52,000	52,000	52,000	0	0.00%
11. Student support and academic enrichment grants (ESEA IV-A)	D	1,220,000	1,220,000	1,220,000	0	0.00%
12. School-Based Health Professionals (proposed legislation)	D	0	0	1,000,000	1,000,000	---
<b>Total, Appropriation</b>	D	<b>5,444,217</b>	<b>5,444,217</b>	<b>6,525,982</b>	<b>1,081,765</b>	<b>19.87%</b>
Total, Budget authority	D	5,444,217	5,444,217	6,525,982	1,081,765	19.87%
Current		3,762,776	3,762,776	4,844,541	1,081,765	28.75%
Prior year's advance		1,681,441	1,681,441	1,681,441	0	0.00%
NOTES:						
1) D = discretionary program; M = mandatory programs						
2) Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.						