DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Fiscal Year 2001

Justifications of Appropriation Estimates to the Congress

VOLUME I

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Justifications of Appropriation Estimates

to the Congress

Fiscal Year 2001

CONTENTS

Divider Title: **EDUCATION REFORM**

Department of Education

EDUCATION REFORM

Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Request

CONTENTS

EDUCATION REFORM

[For carrying out the activities authorized by titles III and IV of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, and sections 3122, 3132, 3136, and 3141, and parts B, C, and D of title III, and part I of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, $1,768,370,000, of which $456,500,000 for the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and $55,000,000 for the School-to-Work Opportunities Act shall become available on July 1, 2000 and remain available through September 30, 2001,[1] and of which $109,500,000 shall be for section 3122:[2] *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated or expended to carry out section 304(a)(2)(A) of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act,[3] except that no more than $1,500,000 may be used to carry out activities under section 314(a)(2) of that Act:[4] *Provided further*, That section 315(a)(2) of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act shall not apply:[5] *Provided further*, That up to one-half of 1 percent of the amount available under section 3132 shall be set aside for the outlying areas, to be distributed on the basis of their relative need as determined by the Secretary in accordance with the purposes of the program:[6] *Provided further*, That if any State educational agency does not apply for a grant under section 3132, that State's allotment under section 3131 shall be reserved by the Secretary for grants to local educational agencies in that State that apply directly to the Secretary according to the terms and conditions published by the Secretary in the Federal Register:[7] *Provided further*, That of the funds made available to carry out section 3136 and notwithstanding any other provision of law, $500,000 shall be awarded to the Houston Independent School District for technology infrastructure, $8,000,000 shall be awarded to the I CAN LEARN program, $3,000,000 shall be awarded to the Linking Education Technology and Educational Reform (LINKS) project for educational technology, $1,000,000 shall be awarded to the Center for Advanced Research and Technology (CART) for comprehensive secondary education reform, $250,000 shall be awarded to the Vaughn Reno Starks Community Center in

Elizabethtown, Kentucky for a technology program, $125,000 shall be awarded to the Wyandanch Compel Youth Academy Educational Assistance Program in New York, $3,000,000 shall be awarded to Hi-Technology High School in San Bernardino County, California for technology enhancement, $300,000 shall be awarded to the Long Island 21st Century Technology and E-Commerce Alliance, $800,000 shall be awarded to Montana State University-Billings for a distance learning initiative, $2,000,000 for the Tupelo School District in Tupelo, Mississippi for technology innovation in education, $900,000 for the University of Alaska at Anchorage for distance learning education, $1,000,000 shall be awarded to the Seton Hall College in Greensburg, Pennsylvania for a model education technology training program, $500,000 shall be awarded to the University of Alaska-Fairbanks, in Fairbanks, Alaska for a teacher technology training program, $200,000 shall be awarded to the Alaska Department of Education for the Alaska State Distance Education Technology Consortium, $1,000,000 shall be awarded to the North East Vocational Area Cooperative in Washington State for a multi-district technology education center, $400,000 shall be awarded to the University of Vermont for the Vermont Learning Gateway Program, $2,500,000 shall be awarded to the State University of New Jersey for the RUNet 2000 project at Rutgers for an integrated voice-video-data network to link students, faculty and administration via a high-speed, broad band fiber optic network, $500,000 shall be awarded to the Iowa Area Education Agency 13 for a public/private partnership to demonstrate the effective use of technology in grades 1—3, $235,000 shall be for the Louisville Deaf Oral School for technology enhancements: *Provided further*, That in the State of Alabama $50,000 shall be awarded to the Bibb County Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Calhoun County Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Chambers County Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Chilton County Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Clay

County Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Cleburne County Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Coosa County Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Lee County Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Macon County Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the St. Clair County Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Talladega County Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Tallapoosa County Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Randolph County Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Russell County Board of Education for technology enhancements; $50,000 shall be awarded to the Alexander City Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Anniston City Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Lanett City Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Pell City Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Roanoke City Board of Education for technology enhancements, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Talledega City Board of Education for technology enhancements, $500,000 shall be to continue a state-of-the-art information technology system at Mansfield University, Mansfield, Pennsylvania, $250,000 shall be awarded to the Chicago Public School Science and Technology Academy to establish a curriculum of math, science and technology, $500,000 shall be awarded to the Prairie Hills, Illinois Elementary School District 144 for a public/private teacher technology training program, $1,000,000 shall be awarded to Adelphi University in New York for the Information Commons project, $250,000 shall be awarded to the Oakland School District in California to support a distance education initiative, $800,000 shall be awarded to the Kennedy Krieger Career and Technology Center in Maryland for a distance learning project, $1,000,000 shall be awarded to

Augsburg College and Twin Cities Public Television to demonstrate interactive technology to assist teachers and parents in effectively using emerging innovations in education, $100,000 shall be awarded to the Santa Barbara Industry Education Council in California to provide technology education to area students and teachers, $200,000 shall be awarded to the Nebraska Community College for technology training, and $250,000 shall be awarded to the Providence Public School System, in partnership with the Metropolitan Regional Career and Technical Center, for Project Family Net to provide computer technology training to children and their parents:[8] *Provided further*, That of the funds made available to carry out title III, part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and notwithstanding any other provision of law, $750,000 shall be awarded to the Technology Literacy Center at the Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago, $1,000,000 shall be awarded to an on-line math and science training program at Oklahoma State University, $4,000,000 shall be awarded to continue and expand the Iowa Communications Network State-wide fiber optic demonstration project, and $250,000 shall be awarded to the WinstonNet distance learning project in Winston Salem, North Carolina:[9] *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for title X, part I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and notwithstanding any other provision of law, $6,000 shall be awarded to the Study Partners Program, Inc., in Louisville, Kentucky, $12,000 shall be awarded to the Shawnee Gardens Tenants Association Inc., in Louisville, Kentucky for a tutorial program, $12,000 shall be awarded to the 100 Black Men of Louisville, Kentucky for a mentoring and leadership training program, $500,000 shall be awarded to the Omaha, Nebraska Public Schools for the OPS 21st Century Learning Grant, $25,000 shall be for the Plymouth Renewal Center in Kentucky for a tutoring program, $25,000 shall be for the Canaan Community Development Corporation's Village Learning Center Program, $25,000 shall be for the St. Stephen Life Center After School Program, $25,000 shall be for the Louisville Central Community Centers Youth Education Program, $15,000 shall be for the Trinity Family Life

Center tutoring program, $15,000 shall be for the New Zion Community Development Foundation, Inc., after school mentoring program, $20,000 shall be for the St. Joseph Catholic Orphan Society program for abused and neglected children, $25,000 shall be for the Portland Neighborhood House after school program, $25,000 shall be for the St. Anthony Community Outreach Center, Inc., for the Education PAYs program, $250,000 shall be awarded to the Harvey Public School District 152 in Chicago, Illinois for the "Project CAFÉ" after school program, $200,000 shall be awarded to the St. Clair County, Michigan Intermediate School District for after school programs, $400,000 shall be awarded to the Macomb County, Michigan Intermediate School District for after school programs, $200,000 shall be awarded to the Danbury Public School System in Connecticut for an ESCAPE Arts after-school program, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Tuckahoe School District for an after-school program in Eastchester, New York, $100,000 shall be awarded to Innovative Directions, an Educational Alliance (IDEA), based at the City Island School (P.S. 175) in the Bronx, New York City, New York for after-school programs, $250,000 shall be awarded to the New York Hall of Science in Queens, New York for after-school programs, $60,000 shall be awarded to the Mamaroneck School District in Mamaroneck, New York for expansion of an after-school program, $250,000 shall be awarded to the White Plains School District for an after-school program in White Plains, New York, $200,000 shall be awarded to the New Rochelle School District for an after-school program in New Rochelle, New York, $250,000 shall be awarded to the Community School District 30 in Queens, New York for the expansion of after-school activities, $500,000 shall be awarded to the Jefferson Elementary School for a joint after-school program with the Madison Elementary School in Stevens Point, Wisconsin, $400,000 shall be awarded to the School District of Superior in Wisconsin for an after school center, $100,000 shall be awarded to the Independence School District in Kansas City, Missouri for an after school program, and $500,000 shall be awarded to the Clark County School District in Nevada for an after school program.[10]] *(Department of Education Appropriation Act, 2000, as enacted by section 1000(a)(4) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000 (P.L. 106-113).)*

Of the funds to be made available under this heading, $120,000,000 shall be available to support activities under section 10105 of part A, title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965,[11] of which up to 5 percent may be available for evaluation, technical assistance, and school networking activities:[12] *Provided*, That funds made available to local educational agencies under section 10105 shall be used only for activities related to establishing smaller learning communities in high schools:[13] *Provided further*, That funds to be made available for section 10105 shall become available on July 1, 2001, and remain available through September 30, 2002.[14]

NOTES

For FY 2001 appropriations language is provided for activities authorized under Section 10105 of Part A, Title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. All language for programs in this account is deleted because either no funds are requested in FY 2001 or the requested resources are proposed for later transmittal upon enactment of proposed legislation to revise and reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

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

EDUCATION REFORM

Analysis of Language and Provisions

Language Provision	Explanation
[1][...of which $456,500,000 for the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and $55,000,000 for the School-to-Work Opportunities Act shall become available on July 1, 2000 and remain available through September 30, 2001,]	This language specifies that the Goals 2000 State grants and School-to-Work Opportunities programs are forward funded.
[2][...and of which $109,500,000 shall be for section 3122:]	This language earmarks funds for Educational Technology National Activities.
[3][...*Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated or expended to carry out section 304(a)(2)(A) of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act,]	Under this provision, no funds may be reserved for national leadership activities under the Goals 2000 Act (except as noted below).
[4][...except that no more than $1,500,000 may be used to carry out activities under section 314(a)(2) of that Act:]	This provision authorizes the Secretary to reserve up to $1,500,000 of the Goals 2000 funds for evaluation studies to measure the progress of education reform nationally.
[5][...*Provided further*, That section 315(a)(2) of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act shall not apply:]	This provision allows outlying areas to consolidate Goals 2000 funds under Title V of Public Law 95-134, which authorizes the outlying areas to consolidate funds they receive from most Department of Education programs.
[6][...*Provided further*, That up to one-half of 1 percent of the amount available under section 3132 shall be set aside for the outlying areas, to be distributed on the basis of their relative need as determined by the Secretary in accordance with the purposes of the program:]	Because section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act includes outlying areas in the definition of State, outlying areas would, in the absence of this language, be eligible for the 0.5 percent minimum grant intended for States under the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. This provision instead continues language from the 1997, 1998, and 1999 appropriations acts to set aside a total of up to 0.5 percent of the appropriation for that program to be allocated among all outlying areas.

Analysis of Language and Provisions

Language Provision	Explanation
[7][...*Provided further*, That if any State educational agency does not apply for a grant under section 3132, that State's allotment under section 3131 shall be reserved by the Secretary for grants to local educational agencies in that State that apply directly to the Secretary according to the terms and conditions published by the Secretary in the Federal Register:]	This language permits the Secretary to reserve the funds of any State that chooses not to apply for a State grant and, rather than reallot those funds to other States, make grants directly to districts in the non-participating State through a competition announced in the Federal Register.
[8][...*Provided further*, That of the funds made available to carry out section 3136 and notwithstanding any other provision of law, $500,000 shall be awarded to the Houston Independent School District for technology infrastructure,...and $250,000 shall be awarded to the Providence Public School System, in partnership with the Metropolitan Regional Career and Technical Center, for Project Family Net to provide computer technology training to children and their parents:]	This language earmarks Technology Innovation Challenge Grant funds for specific projects.
[9][...*Provided further*, That of the funds made available to carry out title III, part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and notwithstanding any other provision of law, $750,000 shall be awarded to the Technology Literacy Center at the Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago,... and $250,000 shall be awarded to the WinstonNet distance learning project in Winston Salem, North Carolina:]	This language earmarks Star Schools funds for specific projects.

EDUCATION REFORM

Analysis of Language and Provisions

Language Provision	Explanation
[10][...*Provided further*, That of the funds made available for title X, part I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and notwithstanding any other provision of law, $6,000 shall be awarded to the Study Partners Program, Inc., in Louisville, Kentucky,... and $500,000 shall be awarded to the Clark County School District in Nevada for an after school program.]	This language earmarks 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds for specific projects.
[11]...$120,000,000 shall be available to support activities under section 10105 of part A of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965,	This language allows the use of funds appropriated for this account for grants under the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools program.
[12]...of which up to 5 percent may be available for evaluation, technical assistance, and school networking activities:	This provision authorizes the Secretary to reserve up to 5 percent of the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools funds for national activities.
[13]...*Provided*, That funds made available to local educational agencies under section 10105 shall be used only for activities related to establishing smaller learning communities in high schools:	This language specifies that Small, Safe and Successful High Schools funds be used only for creating smaller learning communities in high schools.
[14]...*Provided further*, That funds to be made available for section 10105 shall become available on July 1, 2001, and remain available through September 30, 2002.	This language specifies that Small, Safe and Successful High Schools program is forward funded.

EDUCATION REFORM

Amounts Available for Obligation
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
Discretionary authority:			
Annual appropriation	$1,314,100	$1,768,370	$2,073,000
Enacted rescission	0	-3,188	0
Subtotal, appropriation	1,314,100	1,765,182	2,073,000
Comparable transfer from Education Research, Statistics, and Improvement for: 21st century community learning centers	200,000	0	0
Comparable transfer to School Improvement Programs for: Parental assistance Centers	-30,000	-33,000	0
Subtotal, comparable current authority	1,484,100	1,732,182	2,073,000
Unobligated balance, start of year	203,812	133,107	64,130
Unobligated balance transferred to the Department of Labor	-64,354	0	0
Unobligated balance transferred from the Department of Labor	4,572	0	0
Unobligated balance expiring	-543	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	-133,107	-64,130	0
Total, direct obligations	1,494,480	1,801,159	2,137,130

EDUCATION REFORM

Obligations by Object Classification
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
Travel	$60	$83	$92
Other contractual services and supplies:			
Communications and utilities	12	17	18
Printing	4	5	6
Advisory and assistance services	14,811	20,511	22,717
Peer review	2,000	2,473	5,280
Other services	1,575	2,478	203
Purchases of goods and services From Government accounts	5,581	7,730	8,560
Research & development contracts	3,190	4,417	4,893
Subtotal	27,173	37,631	41,677
Supplies	11	15	17
Grants	1,467,236	1,763,430	2,095,344
Total, direct obligations	1,494,480	1,801,159	2,137,130

EDUCATION REFORM

Summary of Changes
($000s)

2000	$1,732,182
2001	2,073,000
Net change	+340,818

	2000 base	Change from base
Increases:		
Program:		
Increase in 21st Century Community Learning Centers to support after-school programs in 6,400 more schools	$453,377	+$546,623
Increase to begin the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools initiative to assist 760 high schools to implement comprehensive reform programs	0	+120,000
Increase in Technology Literacy Challenge Fund to assist 3,400 districts to implement their local technology plans	425,000	+25,000
Increase to begin the Next Generation Technology Innovation grants program to support development of "cutting edge" applications of educational technology	0	+170,000
Increase to begin the Telecommunications Program for Professional Development to support sustained professional development and teacher networks in the core academic subjects	0	+5,000
Increase in the Community Technology Centers program to provide access to computers and technology to individuals living in low-income communities	32,500	+67,500

EDUCATION REFORM

Summary of Changes
($000s)

	2000 base	Change from base
Increases:		
Program: -- continued		
Increase in the Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology program (Teacher Training in Technology) to support development and Implementation of programs to prepare new teachers to use technology effectively in their classrooms	$75,000	+$75,000
Increase to begin the Recognition and Reward program to provide financial awards to States that meet specific goals	0	+50,000
Subtotal, increases		+1,059,123
Decreases:		
Program:		
Elimination of funds for the Technology Innovation Challenge Grants program because of the proposed consolidation of the program with Star Schools into one program focusing on developing "cutting edge" applications of educational technology	146,255	-146,255
Elimination of funds for the Star Schools program because of the proposed consolidation of the program with Technology Innovation Challenge Grant programs into one program focusing on developing "cutting edge" applications of educational technology	50,550	-50,550
Elimination of funds for Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Mathematics because it would be replaced by the Telecommunications Program for Professional Development, which supports a broader range of activities	8,500	-8,500

EDUCATION REFORM

Summary of Changes
($000s)

	2000 base	Change from base
Decreases:		
Program: -- continued		
Elimination of funds for the Goals 2000 State and Local Education Systemic Improvement program, authorization was repealed effective September 30, 2000	$458,000	-$458,000
Decrease in School-to-Work to complete planned phase-out of program.	55,000	-55,000
Subtotal, decreases		-718,305
Net change		+340,818

EDUCATION REFORM

Authorizing Legislation
($000s)

Activity	2000 Authorized	2000 Estimate	2001 Authorized	2001 Request
21st Century community learning centers (ESEA X, Part I)	Indefinite [1]	$453,377	To be determined [2]	$1,000,000
Small, safe and successful high schools (ESEA X, Part A)	Indefinite [1]	--- [3]	--- [4]	120,000
Educational Technology *(ESEA III)*:				
Technology literacy challenge fund *(A-2, section 3132)*	Indefinite [1,5]	425,000	To be determined [2]	450,000
Next generation technology innovation (proposed legislation)	---	---	To be determined	170,000
Technology innovation challenge grants *(A-2, section 3136)*	Indefinite [1,5]	146,255	0 [6]	0
Star schools (Part B)	Indefinite [1]	50,550	0 [6]	0
Regional technology in education consortia *(A-3, section 3141)*	Indefinite [1,5]	10,000	To be determined [2]	10,000
Technology leadership activities *(A-1, section 3122)*:	Indefinite [1,5]	2,000	To be determined [2]	2,000
Ready to learn digital television (Part C)	Indefinite [1]	16,000	To be determined [2]	16,000
Telecommunications program for professional development (proposed legislation)	---	---	To be determined	5,000
Telecommunications demonstration project for mathematics *(Part D)*	Indefinite [1]	8,500	0 [6]	0
Community technology centers (section 3122)	Indefinite [1]	32,500	To be determined [2]	100,000
Preparing tomorrow's teachers to use Technology (ESEA III, section 3122)	Indefinite [1]	75,000	To be determined [2]	150,000
Recognition and reward (ESEA X, Part A)	Indefinite [1]	0	To be determined [2]	50,000

EDUCATION REFORM

Authorizing Legislation
($000s)

Activity	2000 Authorized	2000 Estimate	2001 Authorized	2001 Request
Goals 2000:				
State and local education systemic improvement *(Goals 2000 EAA-III)*	0 [7]	$458,000	0 [7]	0
School-to-work opportunities *(School-to-Work Opportunities Act)*	0 [8]	$555,000	0 [9]	0
Unfunded authorizations:				
Educational technology product development *(ESEA III-A-4)*	Indefinite [1]	0	0 [6]	0
Elementary mathematics and science equipment grants *(ESEA III-E)*	Indefinite [1]	0	0 [6]	0
Elementary and secondary school Library media resources programs *(ESEA III-F)*	Indefinite [1]	0	0 [4]	0
Total appropriation		1,732,182		2,073,000

Note: All activities in this account for which funds are proposed in fiscal year 2001 are requested under proposed legislation.

[1]The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2000.

EDUCATION REFORM

Authorizing Legislation
(0000s)

---

[2]The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000; new authorizing legislation is proposed.

[3]In FY 2000, $45,000,000 was appropriated for Small Leaning Communities under the Fund for the Improvement of Education in the Education Research, Statistics, and Improvement account.

[4]The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000; program would be authorized through proposed FY 2001 appropriations language.

[5]When the appropriation for title III, part A, subparts 1, 2, and 3 is less than $75 million, $3 million is to be set aside for subpart 1 and $10 million for subpart 3, and the remainder is to be made available for section 3136. When the appropriation for title III, part A, subparts 1, 2, and 3 is $75 million or greater, $5 million is to be set aside for subpart 1, $10 million for subpart 3, and the remainder for section 3132 and continuation costs for section 3136.

[6] The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000; no new authorizing legislation is proposed.

[7] The GEPA extension expired September 30, 1999; authorizing statute was repealed effective September 30, 2000.

[8]The School-to-Work Opportunities Act expired September 30, 1999. The GEPA extension does not apply.

[9] The School-to-Work Opportunities Act expired September 30, 1999. The GEPA extension does not apply; no new authorizing legislation is proposed.

EDUCATION REFORM

Appropriations History
($000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
1994	$585,000	$133,750	$166,000	$147,000
1995	900,000	528,400	528,400	528,400
1995 Rescission	0	-186,030	-10,100	-34,030
1996	950,000	95,000	385,000	530,000
1997 Advance	0	0	151,000	0
1997	691,000	175,000	535,000	690,973
1998	1,245,000	1,022,165	1,271,000	1,275,035
1999	1,347,000	861,500	1,244,500	1,314,100
2000	1,947,000	800,100	1,655,600	1,768,370
2000 Rescission	0	0	0	-3,188
2001	2,073,000			

EDUCATION REFORM

Significant Items in FY 2000 Appropriations Reports

Reports on educational technology

House: The Committee expects that the Department will continue to abide by, and supply the data required by, the conference report on P.L. 104-208. In addition, the Committee expects the Department to continue to providing such data for all programs funded in this account under the heading "Educational Technology" and for funding made available through the "E-Rate" program as part of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-104) in their annual operating plan.

Response: The Department will continue to provide the reports relating to educational technology.

Overall plan for educational technology

House: In the report on H.R. 2264 (H. Rpt. 105-205) the Committee directed the Department to provide it with an "overall plan for education technology, including all funds for technology available from the Department and giving recognition to other funds and funding discounts available under the Telecommunications Act." It has been almost two years since the Committee requested this plan and it has yet to appear. It is difficult for the Committee to understand how such large sums can be requested and spent without any clear understanding as to the amounts of Federal funding involved and any clear policy as to the role of Federal funding vis-à-vis on-going local funding in increasing the use of technology in the classroom. The Committee directs the Department to provide the Committee with this plan by December 1, 1999.

Response: The Department complied with the original directive and provided the Committee with an overall plan for educational technology in July 1998. The Department provided the Committee with a second copy of the technology plan in January 2000.

(in thousands of dollars) Office, Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	1999 Appropriation	2000 Appropriation	2001 President's Request	President's Request Compared to FY 2000 Appropriation Amount	Percent
OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION (OESE)						
Education Reform						
1. 21st Century community learning centers (ESEA X-I)......	D	200,000 [1]	453,377	1,000,000	546,623	120.6%
2. Small, safe, and successful high schools (ESEA X-A, section 10105)......	D	0	0	120,000	120,000	---
3. Educational technology (ESEA III):						
(a) Technology literacy challenge fund (section 3132)...	D	425,000	425,000	450,000	25,000	5.9%
(b) Next-generation technology innovation:						
(1) Next-generation technology innovation (proposed legislation)......	D	0	0	170,000	170,000	---
(2) Technology innovation challenge grants (section 3136)......	D	115,100	146,255	0	(146,255)	-100.0%
(3) Star schools (Part B)......	D	45,000	50,550	0	(50,550)	-100.0%
Subtotal......		160,100	196,805	170,000	(26,805)	-13.6%
(c) Regional technology in education consortia (section 3141)......	D	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	0.0%
(d) Technology leadership activities (section 3122).....	D	2,000	2,000	2,000	0	0.0%
(e) Ready to learn digital television (Part C)......	D	11,000	16,000	16,000	0	0.0%
(f) Telecommunications program for professional development:						
(1) Telecommunications program for professional development (proposed legislation)......	D	0	0	5,000	5,000	---
(2) Telecommunications demonstration project for mathematics (Part D)......	D	5,000	8,500	0	(8,500)	-100.0%
(g) Community technology centers (section 3122)......	D	10,000	32,500	100,000	67,500	207.7%
(h) Preparing tomorrow's teachers to use technology (ESEA III, section 3122)......	D	75,000	75,000	150,000	75,000	100.0%
Subtotal, educational technology		698,100	765,805	903,000	137,195	17.9%
4. Recognition and reward (ESEA X-A)......	D	0	0	50,000	50,000	---
5. Goals 2000 State and local education systemic improvement (Goals 2000 EAA-III)......	D	461,000	458,000	0	(458,000)	-100.0%
6. School-to-work opportunities (STW Opportunities Act, Titles II, III and IV)......	D	125,000 [2]	55,000 [2]	0 [2]	(55,000)	-100.0%
Total......		1,484,100 [3]	1,732,182 [3]	2,073,000	340,818	19.7%
Outlays......		*887,118*	*1,124,949*	*1,488,433*	*363,484*	*32.3%*

[1] *Adjusted for comparability. Funds were provided in the Education Research, Statistics, and Improvement account.*
[2] *An identical amount is included in the budget for the Department of Labor.*
[3] *Adjusted for comparability. Excludes $30,000 thousand in 1999 and $33,000 thousand in 2000 for the Goals 2000 Parental Assistance program, which is requested in 2001 as Parental Information Resource Centers in the School Improvement Programs account.*

NOTE: All activities in this account for which funds are proposed in fiscal year 2001 are requested under proposed legislation.

NOTE: Category Codes are as follows: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program.

EDUCATION REFORM

Summary of Request

Through the 1994 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and the enactment of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the Administration emphasized provision of Federal support for States in development and implementation of challenging State standards for all children and of curricula and assessments aligned with those standards. One of the driving principles embedded in the Administration's 1999 ESEA reauthorization proposal is that of helping to ensure that high standards are implemented in every classroom. Programs in the Education Reform account provide critical support for State and local efforts to implement challenging standards in every classroom and to help ensure that all children are prepared to meet those standards.

The request of $2.073 billion includes funding to meet the following objectives:

- **All children achieve to high standards.** An increase of $546.6 million is requested for the **21st Century Community Learning Centers** program to support after-school programs that provide academic and recreational services to students and other members of the community. The Administration is proposing to target all new funds to the 7,000 schools identified as in need of improvement under Title I of the ESEA so that they would be able to provide their students with extended learning opportunities. The budget also includes $120 million for the new **Small, Safe and Successful High Schools** program, which would assist high schools, to create learning environments of no more than 600 students and continue the activities begun in 2000 under the Smaller Learning Communities program. In addition, $50 million is requested for the new **Recognition and Reward** activity, which would identify and reward States that demonstrate increased student achievement in the core academic subjects and reduce the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students.

- **Technology as a tool to improve teaching and learning.** The budget includes $450 million for the **Technology Literacy Challenge Fund** program, to help States and local districts provide educators with sustained, high-quality training to integrate technology into their classrooms and to support other components of the Administration's Technology Literacy Challenge. The budget includes a request of $170 million for the new **Next Generation Technology Innovation** program, the successor to the Technology Innovation Challenge Grants and Star Schools programs, which would develop and expand cutting-edge technologies to improve teaching and learning. A $75 million dollar increase is requested for the **Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers To Use Technology** program, which is currently authorized as Teacher Training in Technology, to provide intensive training and support for new teachers in the use of educational technologies. The budget includes $10 million for the **Regional Technology in Education Consortia** to provide technical assistance to State and local educational agencies on the use of advanced technologies to improve teaching and student achievement. A $67.5 million increase is requested for the **Community Technology Centers** to provide access to computers for students and adults in low-income urban and rural communities.

21st Century community learning centers
(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title X, part I)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined.[1]

Budget Authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
$453,377	$1,000,000	+$546,623

[1] The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000; new authorizing legislation is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers program supports grants to local educational agencies (LEAs), on behalf of public elementary or secondary schools that are located in inner cities and rural areas and serve communities that have a high proportion of low-achieving students, lack resources to establish effective after-school programs, or have other significant needs that are germane to this program. The grants made under this program enable communities to establish or expand community learning centers that provide activities offering significant extended learning opportunities, such as before- and after-school programs, for children and youth in the community. These centers may also offer a variety of other services that benefit the educational, health, social service, cultural, and recreational needs of their communities.

Under the current law, the Department makes competitive grants directly to eligible LEAs. Assistance must be equitably distributed among the States and among urban and rural areas of the United States. Grants are for 3 years and must be made for at least $35,000 annually, and priority must be given to projects that offer: 1) a broad selection of services that address the needs of the community; and 2) significant, expanded learning opportunities for children and youth in the community.

Aside from extended learning opportunities, centers must also provide at least four of the following types of services: literacy education programs; senior citizen programs; children's day care services; integrated education, health, social service, recreational, or cultural programs; summer and weekend school programs in conjunction with recreation programs; expanded library service hours to serve community needs; telecommunications and technology education programs for individuals of all ages; parenting skills education programs; support and training for child day care providers; employment counseling, training, and placement; services for individuals who leave school before graduating from secondary school, regardless of the age of the individual; and services for individuals with disabilities.

21st Century community learning centers

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	($000s)
1996	$750
1997	1,000
1998	40,000
1999	200,000
2000	453,377

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department requests $1 billion for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program in fiscal year 2001, an increase of $546.6 million over the 2000 level. At this level, the program would support about 10,000 centers serving 2.5 million students.

As in past years, the 21st Century program, in fiscal year 2001, would focus on provision of after-school learning opportunities, particularly for children most in need of a safe environment and supplemental academic assistance. The response to the expansion of the program beginning in fiscal year 1998 demonstrates the strong demand nationally for after-school programs. That year, the Department received 1,965 applications, requesting over $540 million in funding and proposing $331 million in matching funds. The significant increase in 1999 again garnered tremendous interest from schools, with over 2,000 applications received requesting almost $900 million. Public opinion polls also demonstrate strong public support for programs of school-based enrichment programs during after-school hours.

This program is currently undergoing reauthorization. During the remainder of the reauthorization process, the Administration intends to work with Congress to obtain enactment of a bill that makes changes along the following lines: (1) converting the authority to a formula grant program once it reaches an appropriate funding level (except that the Department would continue to administer the direct grants made prior to the conversion); (2) requiring States to distribute funds within the State through competitive subgrants, giving priority to applications from LEAs that are in Title I "corrective action" or "school improvement" status; and (3) requiring grantees to pay 50 percent of the cost of any project.

The requested level is sufficient funding to provide every student in a failing school the opportunity to receive extended learning services, while also allowing the program to continue to serve a wide range of students.

Recent research has found that effective schools use extended learning time in reading and mathematics to improve student achievement. In a 1997 study of high- and low-performing elementary schools in Maryland, researchers found that the most successful schools were seeing consistent academic gains as a result of extended-day programs. The 1999 study by The Education Trust, *Dispelling the Myth: High-Poverty Schools Exceeding Expectations*, found that 86 percent of the high-performing, high-poverty schools offered extended instructional time in reading and 66 percent in mathematics.

21st Century community learning centers

Despite the proven effectiveness of extended learning time programs, few students in Title I schools are benefiting from such programs. The Department's 1999 report, *Promising Results, Continuing Challenges: The Final Report of the National Assessment of Title I*, found that, *while the number of Title I schools providing extended learning time as increased since the 1995 ESEA reauthorization,* still only 11 percent of students in Title I schools were served by extended learning time programs during the school year. Summer programs served only 19 percent of Title I students. A survey of Title I school principals conducted during the 1997-98 school year found that the average after-school program in a Title I school operated for only an average of one hour per day; the average before-school program operated for less than one hour per day.

Centers are able to provide a wide range of academic services for students, particularly in the core subject areas, that are linked to students' classroom needs. Over three-quarters of the currently funded centers offer, or plan to offer, tutoring and homework assistance. Most offer a combination of after-school, before-school, summer, and weekend activities. For example, the Tucson Unified School District has created Project Sano y Salvo (Safe and Sound), which provides approximately 1,000 students in grades 6-8 with academic tutoring, enrichment in math, science, reading, writing, and technology, summer school, homework assistance, and expanded library and computer lab access. This project will provide services in three middle schools during afternoons, evenings, and weekends.

In addition to facilitating children's academic development, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program provides a means by which the Department can address other problems that are critical for the well-being of our Nation's youth and communities:

- **Promoting healthier attitudes towards school and the community**

  According to *Safe and Smart*, a publication of the Departments of Education and Justice, children who come home to an empty house are at a higher risk for drug, alcohol, and tobacco use; delinquent behavior; violent victimization; and injury than their peers who are supervised after school. Community learning centers can provide a wide range of mentoring and counseling services to help improve student behavior and attitudes, including providing services relating to violence prevention, conflict resolution, and improved self-esteem. Research clearly shows that positive and sustained interactions with adults contribute to the overall development of young people and their achievement in school.

  An important benefit of this program is increasing student safety and reducing juvenile crime rates. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics, recent studies show that adolescents who are unsupervised after school are more likely to use alcohol and other drugs. Studies by the FBI and youth-advocacy groups have found that the peak hours for juvenile crime and victimization are from 2 to 6 p.m. on school days -- hours when youth are most often without supervision. Community learning centers provide a safe haven for youth, supervised activities, and services focusing on crime, violence, and substance abuse prevention. For example, the

21st Century community learning centers

Lighted Middle Schools program in Salem, Oregon, is providing students with field trips, club and recreational activities, and after-school math, English as a second language, and computer classes. This summer, seventh-grade students participated in "BLAST (Bringing Law Enforcement and Students Together) Camp," a week-long program with activities such as gang resistance training and education in refusal skills.

Also, student motivation and interest in learning can be improved through enrichment activities in subjects such as music, art, and technology. Often, students are unable to take these subjects as electives and cannot afford activities outside the school, but the centers can provide these services. An analysis of grant applications found that 89 percent of applicants planned to offer students activities designed to increase their ability to use technology, and over half of applicants planned to include art and music activities in their programs.

- **Enhancing community involvement and support**

In addition to academic programs, centers are providing students and members of the community with comprehensive services such as recreational activities, technology training, parenting skills, and family literacy programs. Enhancing collaboration is an important objective of this program. The majority of current centers are already teaming up with community-based partners to deliver services. Partners include local libraries, museums, businesses, and special interest clubs. For example, the St. Louis Public Schools have teamed up with a large number of higher education institutions, government agencies, and community organizations such as the YMCA, YWCA, Boys and Girls Club, and Americorps. The program will provide after-school and Saturday programs for 650 students in seven schools to increase the academic performance of inner-city adolescents and develop responsible decision-making skills regarding drug use and violence.

The Administration proposes that States be able to use up to 10 percent of their allocations to make awards directly to CBOs, so long as their applications demonstrated the concurrence of the affected local school districts. This acknowledges the vital role that these organizations play in developing and maintaining healthy and safe communities. It also recognizes that, in some communities, CBOs may be better situated and equipped than schools to serve the interests of the community and the purposes of this program.

In 2001, the Department plans to reserve approximately $10 million for national activities, including funds for an on-going evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program. While the need for intervention is clear, and there is strong evidence that after-school programs have a positive impact on student outcomes, there is a dearth of rigorous research and evaluation efforts in this area. For this reason, the Department is funding a multi-year national evaluation – using rigorous methodologies – to answer questions relating to program implementation, student access and participation, and student outcomes and impacts. The study will look at both in-school and out-of-school outcomes such as achievement, high school completion, crime, and drug use. A final report from this evaluation should be available in the fall of 2001.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program information, including goals; indicators; targets; and, where possible, an assessment of the progress made toward achieving and objectives and program results. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2001 and future years.

Other performance indicators and strategies for this program are included in the Department's Annual Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

Performance Goal: To enable rural and inner-city public elementary and secondary schools, or consortia of such schools, to plan, implement, or expand projects that benefit the educational, health, social service, cultural, and recreational needs of their communities.

Objective: Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
Students regularly participating in the program will show continuous improvement in achievement through measures such as test scores, grades, and/or teacher reports. *Baseline will be established in 2000.*				

Because this program is still in its early stages, the Department will not have data on this indicator later in 2000. However, studies of similar programs reveal positive impacts on student behavior. For example, a study of New York City housing projects found that those with Boys and Girls Clubs on-site experienced a juvenile arrest rate that was 13 percent lower than housing projects without such programs. Annual grantee reports and an external evaluation will provide data for this indicator.

Objective: 21st Century Community Learning Centers will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental, and recreational services.

21st Century community learning centers

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
More than 85 percent of centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science. *FY 1999 Baseline: 80.5 percent.*		*85%*	*85%*	*85%*

This indicator will be measured by individual project reports, beginning in 1999. In the 1998 and 1999 competitions, the Department established a competitive priority for projects providing services in core subject areas. As a result, virtually all grantees will offer services in reading and literacy, mathematics, and/or science. Based on a review of grantee applications in 1998, 87 percent of grantees proposed a reading component; 86 percent proposed a mathematics component; and 72 percent proposed a science component.

Preliminary research on after-school programs indicates an increase in student achievement when compared to past performance and to control groups made up of similar students not participating in the programs. Studies of individual programs have found positive impacts on grades, reading ability, attendance, homework completion, reduced grade retention and placement in special education, and increased graduation and enrollment in postsecondary education.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

($000s)	1999	2000	2001
Competitive Awards			
New awards	$153,127	$253,030	0
Number of new awards	359	590	
Earmarked awards	$4,600	$4,107	0
Continuation awards	$40,190	$192,481	$405,511
Number of continuation awards	99	468	959
Evaluation	$1,000	$2,268	0
Peer review of new award applications	$1,083	$1,491	0
Total funding	$200,000	$453,377	$405,511
New Awards			
Amount for States	0	0	$584,489
National activities	0	0	$10,000
Total funding	0	0	$594,489
Program awards and impact			
Total number of awards to districts	458	1,058	2,322
Total number of centers	1,601	3,961	10,045
Number of students served (estimate)	400,000	862,000	2,455,330

Small, safe and successful high schools
(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title X, Part A)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined

Budget authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
0[1]	$120,000	+$120,000

[1] The fiscal year 2000 appropriation for the Fund for the Improvement of Education included $45 million for the Smaller Learning Communities program; the continuation awards for that program would be funded under this proposed authority in 2001.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Small, Safe and Successful High Schools program is a new initiative designed to assist high schools to implement smaller, safer learning environments. The Department would award competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) on behalf of high schools that they serve. To be eligible for a grant, a high school must have a plan for creating smaller learning communities and demonstrate that the plan has the support of the school's staff, students, and parents. The Department would make two types of awards: (1) planning awards to schools that want to create smaller learning environments but have not yet developed a strategy for doing so; and (2) implementation awards for schools that have chosen an approach to reducing school size and have gained the support of the school community for that approach. Grantees would be selected through a rigorous peer review process based on need for assistance and the quality of the proposed plan. Grants would be awarded for a period of 3 years.

Schools would develop a strategy for creating smaller learning environments that best meet their needs. Examples of possible methods for creating a smaller school community include:

- **Schools-within-schools.** These are separate and autonomous units with their own personnel, budget, and program. They operate within a larger school, sharing resources and facilities. Teachers and students choose to affiliate with the school-within-a-school.

- **House plans.** In these arrangements, students across grades are assigned to groups of a few hundred each within the high school. Each "house" has its own discipline policies, student activity program, student government, and social activities.

- **Career academies.** Under this model, high schools organize their curriculum around one or more careers or occupations. These schools allow schools to make connections between what they are learning in school and what they might be doing in the workplace.

Regardless of the strategy chosen, all grantees would be expected, over time, to demonstrate: (1) increases in student achievement; (2) increases in graduation rates; (3) decreases in classroom disruptions; (4) fewer violent incidents, and (5) increases in the number of students pursuing postsecondary education.

The Department would also reserve program funds to carry out national activities, such as: (1) providing technical assistance to grantees; (2) facilitating the creation of networks among participating schools and LEAs, and (3) disseminating information on successful strategies to create smaller learning communities.

In 2001, the Department is proposing appropriations language to enable it to carry out the activities proposed for the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools program that is similar to language contained in the Department's fiscal year 2000 appropriations act for carrying out the Smaller Learning Communities program.

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

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

In support of the goal that all children reach challenging academic standards, the Department is requesting $120 million for the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools program. The amount requested would support reform efforts in approximately 400 high schools to create smaller learning communities. This initiative would continue and expand on the activities funded in fiscal year 2000 for Smaller Learning Communities under the ESEA X-A authority. Smaller Learning Communities funds will assist approximately 300 high schools to create learning environments of ideally no more than 600 students, through such strategies as schools-within-schools and career academies. Funds could also be used to develop mentoring strategies, reduce teaching loads, lengthen the school year or day, or implement other innovations designed to create a safer, more challenging, and more personalized high school experience. An expanded Small, Safe and Successful High Schools initiative, under a reauthorized ESEA, would stress these same goals, strategies and interventions.

Secondary schools face the challenge of preparing students for a rapidly changing workplace, where individuals can expect to change jobs and develop new sets of skills several times during the course of their career. High schools also must train students to be lifelong learners who analyze, reason, and communicate their ideas effectively. The National Education Goals call for schools to raise graduation rates and help students attain world-class standards. Achieving those goals requires that high schools provide stimulating, rigorous learning opportunities for all students.

A troubling gap, however, remains between the goals for all students and the realities of many of the Nation's high schools -- particularly large, urban high schools that serve large concentrations of poor or minority children. Almost half of all students graduating do not possess even the basic skills needed to succeed in college or the workforce. This lack of

Small, safe and successful high schools

consistent high-quality high school education is exemplified further by the findings from the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). The results of TIMSS indicate that the Nation's 12th graders scored below the international average in both mathematics and science and outperformed students from only 2 of the 21 countries participating.

Over time, high schools have become larger places and, as a result, students feel increasingly disconnected from adults. Between 1990 and 1997, the number of students attending high schools that enroll more than 1,500 students increased by almost 50 percent; the number of high schools enrolling more than 1,500 students increased by 45 percent. In 1997, almost half of the Nation's high school students attended schools that enrolled more than 1,500 students and three-fourths of urban high school students attended schools of that size.

Research demonstrates that, on a wide range of measures, when students are part of a smaller, more intimate learning community, they are more successful academically and socially and that the benefits are greatest for poor and minority children. Smaller schools promote stronger bonds between teachers and students and a safer and improved school climate. The benefits to students from smaller, safer, and more intimate learning environments include:

- **Increased achievement.** Research has found that students learn more in high schools with enrollments of about 600 students. In addition, enrollment size has a stronger effect on learning in schools with large concentrations of poor and minority children.

- **Greater opportunities for involvement.** Students in smaller high schools have greater opportunity to participate in clubs, teams, and student government than their counterparts in larger high schools. As a result, students are less likely to feel isolated or overlooked.

- **Improved attitude and behavior.** Studies have found lower levels of such negative behaviors as truancy, vandalism, aggressive behavior, theft, substance abuse, and gang participation in smaller schools than in larger ones. Research has also found that students in smaller high schools have better attitudes toward school in general and toward particular subjects as well.

The Department would incorporate the Smaller Learning Communities program, which was funded under the Fund for the Improvement of Education in 2000, into the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools initiative and would make continuation awards for that program from the amount appropriated for the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools initiative.

In 2001, the Department would reserve up to 5 percent of the appropriation for national activities, to support an evaluation of the reforms undertaken with program funds, to disseminate information on what is being learned from early implementation experiences, and to pay the costs of a peer review of new program applications.

Small, safe and successful high schools

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents information on performance goals and objectives and selected performance indicators and strategies for measuring the progress made toward achieving program results. Desired interim and end targets will be identified for the indicator when a baseline has been established. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the resources requested in FY 2001 and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Other performance indicators and strategies for this program are included in the Department's Annual Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

Performance goal: To assist high schools to create smaller learning communities that can prepare all students to achieve to challenging standards.

Objective: Student achievement in core subjects will show marked improvement in schools receiving Small, Safe and Successful High School funds.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
Increasing percentages of students in high schools receiving Small, Safe and Successful High School grants will meet or exceed the basic and proficient levels of performance on State and local assessments. *Baseline to be established.*				

Data for the indicators will be collected through annual performance reports and a planned evaluation of the program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
Small, safe and successful high schools	0	0	$71,250
Number of planning grants	0	0	200
Average award	0	0	$50
Number of implementation grants	0	0	199
Average award	0	0	$333
Peer review/ National activities	0	0	$6,000
Smaller Learning Communities continuation awards	0	0	$42,750

Educational technology: Technology literacy challenge fund
(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III, Part A, Subpart 2, Section 3132)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined[1]

Budget Authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
$425,000	$450,000	+$25,000

[1]The GEPA extenstion applies through September 30, 2000; new legislation is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF) helps States put into practice strategies to enable all schools to integrate technology fully into school curricula so that students become technologically literate and possess the academic, communication, and critical-thinking skills essential for success in the Information Age. These funds also support State and local efforts to achieve the goals of the Administration's Technology Literacy Challenge that: (1) all teachers have the training and support to integrate technology effectively into their classrooms; (2) all students and teachers have access to multimedia computers; (3) every classroom is connected to the Internet; and (4) effective and engaging software is an integral part of every school curriculum.

Under the statute, each State receives a share of the appropriated funds in proportion to its share of funds under Part A of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, except that no State receives less than one-half of 1 percent of the amount available. Appropriations language enacted each year has reserved one-half of 1 percent of the amount appropriated for the Outlying Areas. In addition, one-half of 1 percent is reserved for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

States award at least 95 percent of their allocations competitively to local school districts, which can use the funds for acquiring hardware, software, and connectivity linkages; providing professional development in the integration of technology into the curriculum; and applications of technology to support school reform efforts and opportunities for all students.

Prior to receiving a first-year grant, each State submitted a statewide technology plan describing its long-term goals and strategies for financing technology education in the State, including private-sector participation, and assisting school districts that have the highest number and percentage of children in poverty and the greatest need for technology within their schools. These plans provided information on how States planned to spend the funds, including benchmarks and timetables for accomplishing State goals.

Educational technology: Technology literacy challenge fund

The Administration's proposal for reauthorization of the TLCF would retain most of the current provisions, such as the formula for allocating funds to States and the requirement for State and local technology plans, but would change the focus of the program to increasing the capacity of teachers in high-poverty, low-performing schools to use technology effectively in their classrooms. The major changes proposed for the program are:

- **More explicit targeting of funds to high-poverty, high-need districts.** The current statute requires States, as a part of their statewide plans, to demonstrate how they intend to provide assistance to districts that have the highest numbers or percentages of children in poverty and that demonstrate the greatest need for technology. The statute also requires States to provide technical assistance in developing an application for TLCF funds to high-poverty districts that demonstrate a need for such assistance.

  The proposed program would retain the current provision requiring States to provide technical assistance to high-poverty districts. It would, however, go beyond the current, very limited targeting provisions and specifically limit eligibility for awards to districts with high concentrations of poor children and a demonstrated need for educational technology, or to partnerships that include such districts. Each State would determine its own criteria for identifying districts as high-poverty and high-need; however, as a part of its plan, each State would have to provide the Department with the criteria.

- **Focus local effort on improving the capacity of teachers in high-poverty, low-performing schools to use technology effectively.** The current statute does not target funds to the school level. As a part of its technology plan, a district is required to describe only how technology will help "promote equity in education." The Administration's proposal would focus the efforts grantees on high-poverty, low-performing schools.

- **Require States to provide a priority to partnerships that include high-poverty, high-need districts.** The Administration's reauthorization proposal would require States to give a priority to partnerships that include at least one high-poverty, high-need district. An example of a partnership would be a "technology-poor" district working with a "technology-rich" district so that the more technologically advanced district could mentor the less advanced district.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	($000s)
1996....................	0
1997....................	$200,000
1998....................	425,000
1999....................	425,000
2000....................	425,000

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

To enable schools to use educational technology to improve teaching and learning, the Department requests $450 million, an increase of $25 million over the fiscal year 2000 appropriation level. These funds would allow States to make approximately 3,400 grants to high-poverty districts, or to partnerships containing at least one such district. Local districts would use these funds primarily to increase the capacity of teachers in high-poverty, low-performing schools to use technology effectively. Funds would be used by these schools to, among other things, provide training activities for teachers to ensure that they are prepared to integrate technology effectively into curriculum and to increase student access to advanced technologies.

Data from the Basic Skills/Computer Education (BS/CE) program in West Virginia provide **evidence of the impact educational technology can have when used effectively**. The BS/CE program began with the kindergarten class of 1990-91. That year, the State provided every school with three or four computers for each kindergarten classroom (although schools could choose to cluster their computers in a lab) and a printer, software aligned with the State's basic skills' goals, and intensive training for teachers prior to implementation and ongoing support during the early implementation of the program. As that kindergarten class has moved up a grade, the State has supplied the computers, software, and training for classrooms and teachers of that grade.

A 1999 evaluation of the BS/CE program found that it had a positive effect on student achievement, especially in schools that implemented the components of the program most intensively. The study reported significant gains in student achievement in reading, writing, and mathematics, and that the program was especially successful with low-income and rural students as well as with girls.

When effectively used, **technology can improve several aspects of education, including student learning, classroom management and presentation, educator professional development, and assessment of student progress**. For teachers to be able to integrate technology effectively in their curricula, however, they must have classrooms that have a sufficient number of multimedia computers connected to the Internet to provide students with regular access. In addition, teachers need software aligned with State or local standards, and training in the use of the hardware and software. Districts and schools that serve high concentrations of poor children often have difficulty in providing teachers with the resources necessary to integrate technology effectively into their curricula. The Administration's proposal for reauthorization of the TLCF would more explicitly target program funds to high-poverty districts than the current statute, increasing the potential for program funds to have an impact in those places with the greatest needs.

There is substantial evidence to justify Federal support to upgrade the use of technology in high-poverty, low-performing schools. For example, **students in high-poverty schools are less likely to have access to computers than are students in low-poverty schools**. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) report, *Internet Access in Public Schools, Fall 1998* survey found a ratio of 17 students per computer with Internet access in high-poverty schools (schools with 71 percent or more of their students eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch) and 10 students per computer in low-poverty schools (schools with fewer than 11 percent of their students eligible for free- or reduced-price lunches). In addition, students from low-income households are less likely to have access to a computer at home than their wealthier counterparts. The 1998 Department of Commerce report, *Falling Through the Net II: New Data on the Digital Divide*, found that despite significant growth in computer ownership, the "digital divide" between certain groups had increased between 1994 and 1997. For example, the disparity in computer ownership between upper- and lower-income households increased during the 1994-97 period, as did the gap in computer ownership between white and Hispanic and African-American households.

In addition to not having the same access to educational technology, **high-poverty schools frequently do not possess the capacity to use technology to prepare students to achieve to challenging standards**. The 1998 Educational Testing Service report *Does It Compute? The Relationship Between Educational Technology and Student Achievement in Mathematics* found that "...the greatest inequities did not lie in how often computers were used, but in how they were used." Among eighth-graders, African-American, poor, urban, and rural students were less likely to be exposed to higher-order uses of computers, which are positively related to academic achievement in mathematics, than were non-poor and suburban students. TLCF funds support State and local efforts to help ensure that teachers in high-poverty, low-performing schools are prepared to use technology effectively in instruction.

The statutory requirement that a State or district desiring TLCF funds have in place a plan for the acquisition and use of educational technology has resulted, in many places, in a **coordinated use of Federal, State, and local funds**. Louisiana provides an example of a State that has made strategic use of Federal, State, and local funds to integrate technology into its schools. In 1994, a National Science Foundation grant allowed the Louisiana Statewide Systemic Initiative and Goals 2000 program to develop a statewide educational technology plan and to establish five pilot sites for integrating Internet resources and K-14 instruction. A year later a Technology Innovation Challenge Grant (TICG) allowed Louisiana to extend the statewide planning and development of the pilot sites. In 1997, Louisiana used the statewide technology plan as a part of its application for the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. While State funds were used to acquire the hardware and connectivity (between 1996 and 1999 Louisiana reduced its student to multimedia computer ratio from 88 students per multimedia computer to 10.5), TLCF funds were used to train teachers to use technology effectively in their classrooms. The State used TLCF funds to develop the Louisiana INTECH program, which is a sustained staff development program that provides teachers with examples of effective technology-based strategies that support and enhance curriculum and instruction. TLCF funds supported the establishment of nine regional Teaching, Learning, and Technology Centers throughout the State, which use the INTECH program.

Montgomery County, Maryland is using a TLCF grant to support the Early Childhood Technology Literacy Project (ECTLP), a program designed to improve the reading achievement of economically disadvantaged students. Montgomery County has undertaken a major budget initiative to ensure that all students are able to read independently by the end of second grade. The ECTLP supports this initiative by providing teachers in 35 Title I schools with technology tools and training on how to utilize them to implement a balanced literacy program. The funds are used to: (1) support high-quality professional development for kindergarten through second grade teachers, reading specialists, and instructional assistants; (2) purchase multimedia computers and selected software; (3) allow for technical and clerical support; and (4) provide for release time and stipends for participants. In 1999 the program will directly affect 491 teachers, reading specialists, and instructional assistants and the 9,212 students they provide reading instruction.

In FY 2001, under the authority of section 14701 of the ESEA, the Department would reserve approximately $2.25 million for the national evaluation of the program. The evaluation of the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund is part of a larger effort by the Department to evaluate the extent of progress that local educational agencies and schools have made in effectively integrating technology into classrooms and the contribution Federal support has made to that progress.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information including goals; indicators; targets; and, where possible, an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2001 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this and other programs supporting the performance goals and objectives.

Other performance indicators and strategies for this program are included in the Department's Annual Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

Performance goal: To use educational technology as part of broader education reform that will provide new learning opportunities and raise educational achievement for all students.

Objective: Provide teachers and other educators with the professional development and support they need to help students learn through the use of educational technology.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
Increasing percentages of teachers will indicate that they feel very well prepared to integrate educational technology into classroom instruction. *FY 1998 baseline: 20% of public school teachers felt very well prepared to integrate educational technology into classroom instruction.*	*30%*		*50%*	

Professional development is the key to the integration of educational technology into classrooms. However, teachers are typically not receiving the amount or types of training

Educational technology: Technology literacy challenge fund

necessary to learn to use technology effectively. For example, the NCES report *Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation and Qualification of Public School Teachers* found that, while 78 percent of teachers reported participating in professional development on the integration of educational technology into curriculum in the last year, only 23 percent of teachers felt very well prepared to integrate technology effectively. One problem with the training that many teachers are receiving is that it is not of a sufficient duration to have a lasting impact. A 1995 survey of teachers conducted by *Educational Learning* magazine found that 46 percent of technology training sessions were only half-day workshops. The Department continues to encourage States and local districts to use TLCF funds to support intensive and on-going, high-quality professional development activities that educators need to take full advantage of technology in their classrooms. Data for this indicator will be gathered through the biennial *Teacher Quality: Report on the Preparation of Public School Teachers.*

Objective: Students in high-poverty schools will have access to educational technology that is comparable to the access of students in other schools.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
The student-to-computer ratio in high-poverty schools will be comparable to that in other schools. *FY 1998 baseline: 17 students per computer with Internet access in high-poverty schools; 10 students per computer with Internet access in low-poverty schools.*	*15:1*	*10:1*	*5:1*	*5:1*

To make technology a viable instructional tool requires schools to have enough computers to provide full, easy access for all students. Federal funds are particularly important in reducing disparities in student access to educational technologies. Data gathered for the Department's *Study of Education Resource and Federal Funding* report indicate that during the 1997-98 school year, 40 percent of the computers purchased nationally by high-poverty schools were purchased with Federal funds. Federal funds were used to purchase four times as many computers in high-poverty schools as in those with low poverty. The Administration's proposal for reauthorization of the TLCF would target funds on high-poverty districts with the greatest need for technology to a greater extent than does the current statute. Data for this indicator will be gathered through future NCES *Advanced Telecommunications in United States Public Elementary and Secondary Schools* surveys.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
Internet access in classrooms in high-poverty schools will be comparable to that in other schools. *FY 1994 baseline: 2% of instructional classrooms in high-poverty schools; 4% of instructional classrooms in low-poverty schools.*	*55%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Educational technology: Technology literacy challenge fund

One of the four goals of the President's Technology Literacy Challenge is that all classrooms will be connected to the Internet. The percentage of public schools with access to the Internet has increased from 35 percent in the fall of 1994 to 89 percent in fall 1998. During the same period, the percentage of classrooms with Internet access has increased from 3 percent to 51 percent. Though the percentage of high-poverty schools (schools with 71 percent or more of their students eligible for free or reduced-price lunches) with Internet access has increased from 19 percent in 1994 to 80 percent in 1998, those schools still lag other schools in access to technology. (Ninety-four percent of schools with 11 to 30 percent of their children eligible for free or reduced-price lunches have access to the Internet.) There is continuing disparity in the number of classrooms containing Internet connections. In the poorest schools, only 39 percent of classrooms have Internet access, compared to 62 percent of classrooms in low-poverty schools. The requested funds would also help schools with high concentrations of low-income students to receive greater advantages from the discounts on Internet connections and usage provided by the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Data for this indicator will be gathered through the *National Longitudinal Survey of Schools* and future NCES *Advanced Telecommunications in United States Public Elementary and Secondary Schools* surveys.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
State Grants	$418,625	$418,625	$443,250
Range of awards	2,125- 45,942	2,125- 49,834	2,250- 54,535
Average State grant	8,050	8,050	8,524
Amount for BIA	2,125	2,125	2,250
Amount for outlying areas	2,125	2,125	2,250
Amount for national evaluation	2,125	2,125	2,250

Educational technology: Next-generation technology innovation
(Proposed legislation)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined

Budget Authority ($000s):

	2000	2001	Change
Next-generation technology innovation	0	$170,000	+$170,000
Technology innovation challenge grants	$148,255	0	-148,255
Star schools	50,550	0	-50,550
Total	196,805	170,000	-26,805

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Next-generation technology innovation (proposed legislation)

The Next-Generation Technology Innovation program is proposed to expand knowledge about, and develop new applications of, educational technologies and telecommunications for teaching and learning. The Next-Generation program replaces the Technology Innovation Challenge Grants and the Star Schools programs and builds on the successes of these programs by developing and expanding cutting-edge technologies to improve education. The program will encourage the use of technology such as Web-based instruction to provide access to challenging content.

Funds will support a variety of entities—school districts, States, colleges and universities, community-based organizations, and businesses—through competitive awards of up to 5 years. In order to receive an award, applicants must be consortia that include at least one State or local educational agency and at least one institution of higher education, for-profit business, museum, library, or other entity with relevant expertise. The Secretary can establish priorities for the program, including priorities for projects that:

- Develop innovative models that serve traditionally underserved populations, including low-income students, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency;
- Develop innovative models of effective use of educational technology;
- Serve more than one State and involve large-scale innovations; and
- Develop innovative models for using electronic networks to provide challenging courses, such as Advanced Placement courses. Recipients of funds must use the funds to develop new applications of educational technologies and telecommunications to support school reform efforts. These could include wireless and Web-based telecommunications, hand-held devices, Web-based learning resources, distributed

learning environments (including distance learning networks), and the development of educational software and other applications.

In addition, recipients could:

- Develop innovative professional development models for improving teachers' ability to integrate technology effectively into course curriculum;
- Develop high-quality, standards-based, digital content, including multimedia software, digital video, and Web-based resources;
- Use telecommunications and other technologies to make programs accessible to students with special needs (such as low-income students, students with disabilities, students in remote areas, and students with limited English proficiency);
- Provide classroom and extracurricular opportunities for female students to explore the different uses of technology;
- Promote school-family partnerships (including services for adults and families) that help parents help their children achieve to high academic standards;
- Acquire resources, including hardware and software, needed to accomplish the goals of the project; and
- Collaborate with other Department of Education and Federal information technology research and development programs.

The Next-Generation proposal also authorizes support for evaluation. The Secretary is authorized to conduct evaluations of funded activities, help recipients evaluate their own projects and activities, and disseminate findings from the evaluations. Applicants are required to submit detailed plans for an independent evaluation of the project and must include benchmarks to monitor progress toward specific project objectives.

Technology innovation challenge grants (Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III, part A, subpart 2, section 3136)

The Challenge Grants program supports partnerships among educators, business and industry, and other community organizations to develop innovative applications of technology and plans for fully integrating technology into schools. The program provides competitive 5-year awards to consortia that include at least one local educational agency with a high percentage or number of children living in poverty. Consortium members also include other local educational agencies, State educational agencies, institutions of higher education, businesses, museums, libraries, academic content experts, software designers, and others. Priority is given to consortia that serve areas with high numbers of disadvantaged students or with the greatest need for educational technology, as well as consortia that provide direct benefits to students, ensure

Educational technology: Next-generation technology innovation

sustained professional development for teachers and other educators to further the effective use of the technology acquired, and devote substantial member resources to the project.

The Challenge Grants program seeks to maximize the educational benefits of technology by integrating new technologies into high quality curricula. A wide variety of projects have been funded, including programs designed to develop standards-based curricula in a wide range of subjects, provide professional development for teachers, increase student access to technology and online resources, provide technology training and support for parents in low-income areas, devise techniques for assisting teachers in developing computer-based instruction, create strategies for accelerating the academic progress of at-risk children via technology, and develop new approaches to measuring the impact of educational technology on student learning.

Star schools (Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III, part B)

The Star Schools program uses distance education to improve instruction in a variety of subjects and to serve disadvantaged students. Among other requirements, applicants are required to describe how their projects will help achieve the National Education Goals, provide students with opportunities to learn to challenging State standards, assist with State and local school reform, and help build a high quality system of lifelong learning.

Applicants are required to form statewide or multi-state telecommunications partnerships to apply. The eligible applicants are either public agencies or corporations established to develop and operate telecommunications networks to enhance educational opportunities, or partnerships that are comprised of at least three partners, one of which is a State or local educational agency. Funds are used to obtain telecommunications facilities and equipment, develop and acquire educational and instructional programming, and obtain technical assistance in the use of facilities and programming. At least 50 percent of the funds must be used to serve local educational agencies eligible to receive Title I funds, and 25 percent of the funds must be used for instructional programming. Awards are made for up to 5 years. Recipients must provide a 25 percent match for the first 2 years of the award, 40 percent for the second 2 years, and 50 percent in the final year.

In addition to awards under the general program, three other types of awards are authorized. Funds can be used to support a special *statewide network* (which provides full motion two-way video and audio communications and links public colleges and universities and secondary schools); to support a special *local network* to demonstrate a high-technology program that includes two-way full motion audio, video, and text communications and links elementary and secondary schools with colleges and universities; and to support *continuing education* programs that provide online access to educational services, for programming that leads to a secondary school diploma.

Educational technology: Next-generation technology innovation

Funding levels for the antecedent programs for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Technology Innovation Challenge Grants:

	($ in 000s)
1996	$38,000
1997	56,965
1998	106,000
1999	115,100
2000	146,255

Star Schools:

	($ in 000s)
1996	$23,000
1997	30,000
1998	34,000
1999	45,000
2000	50,550

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests $170 million for the Next-Generation Technology Innovation program, $26.8 million less than the combined total of the FY 2000 appropriation for the Technology Innovation Challenge Grants and the Star Schools programs. These two programs are being proposed for consolidation in order to focus projects on developing "cutting edge" applications of educational technology. The current Technology Innovation Challenge Grant program serves as a catalyst for positive change in schools by supporting educators, students, parents, communities, and others to bring high quality education to every school via technology. Similarly, the Star Schools program has supported efforts to provide instruction and professional development to remote areas through the use of technology. The Next-Generation proposal seeks to draw upon the best of both programs, and will support the development and expansion of technology such as Web-based instruction in distance learning. For example, the Next-Generation proposal retains the conceptual advances that the Star Schools program has made in the field of distance learning, but updates these concepts for an environment that reflects the recent rapid advances in technology.

The new discretionary authority also responds to demands that Departmental activities demonstrate national significance, since the new authority would make it easier for entities to collaborate across State lines. As technology makes geographic distances less relevant than they were even a few years ago, the Next-Generation program will permit recipients to capitalize on these advances instead of being hampered by them. Furthermore, local Next-Generation projects offer national benefits, as project sites become laboratories for replicable models.

Educational technology: Next-generation technology innovation

Because the Next-Generation program will have a network of recipients spread throughout the country, successful innovations from these local sites can quickly be "scaled up" under the evaluation and dissemination component of the proposed program, thereby bringing these innovations in technology to schools around the Nation. It is proposed that $3.8 million be allocated toward evaluation and dissemination, demonstrating the commitment of the Federal government to improve the quality of education through both study and the communication of promising ideas. Preliminary evaluation models will be designed and implemented as soon as the Next-Generation proposal becomes operational, and evaluation will be done on an ongoing basis throughout the length of each award, with a major analysis of evaluation plans and activities occurring in the second and subsequent years.

Grantees currently receiving funding under the Star Schools and Technology Innovation Challenge Grants programs would continue to receive funding on those multi-year grants until the grants expire. A total of $113.3 million is proposed for the continuation of these grants in FY 2001.

Three competitions for new awards are proposed for FY 2001: Advanced Technology Applications, the Mississippi Delta Initiative, and Challenging Coursework On-Line.

- **Advanced Technology Application** awards will support research and development initiatives that advance state-of-the-art educational technology applications. The goal of the program is to advance our fundamental understanding of how technology can be used to improve teaching and learning as well as to produce hardware and software prototypes. Awardees will conduct research and development that combine subject matter expertise, insights from the learning sciences – e.g., cognitive science, neuroscience, educational psychology – and advances in computer and information sciences. Examples of the types of projects supported would include intelligent tutoring systems, simulation-based instruction, speech recognition, and digital manipulatives. (See box below.)

  In FY 2001, approximately $32 million would support the first year of awards under this program. Awards would be made to consortia with the combined research and development expertise needed to develop and field test state-of-the-art education technology applications. Up to 8 large-scale ($2 to 4 million per year) awards and up to 10 smaller scale awards ($500,000 to $1 million per year) would be made in FY 2001. Awards would be for up to 5 years. Each recipient would be required to conduct an evaluation of the effectiveness of the application in improving student achievement; in addition, ED would conduct an evaluation of the entire program.

- An additional $10 million will support the **Mississippi Delta Initiative**, a targeted demonstration project designed to provide training to middle school teachers in the Mississippi Delta region. Research suggests that middle school is an especially critical point for learning the technology-related skills that students will need to be successful in high school and beyond. The program will use a "train-the-trainers" approach that will prepare one or several teachers from each school to be technology leaders, serve as resident experts, and assist other teachers in their schools or districts. Awards would be restricted to applicants located in the Mississippi Delta, as defined in P.L. 100-460.

Educational technology: Next-generation technology innovation

Advanced Technology Applications for Education

Computer applications in most schools today do not begin to harness the capabilities of today's technologies. By working together across the disciplines – computer science, the learning sciences, and education – we can build applications to enhance learning for all. Examples of the types of projects upon which we would build include:

- *Intelligent Tutoring Systems*: One-on-one human tutoring can improve student performance substantially – but providing every student with a human tutor is not an option. Computer-based Intelligent Tutoring Systems, if they can be as effective, could be a viable solution. Researchers are developing intelligent tutors, using artificial intelligence, that ask questions, present problems, "understand" student answers, correct misconceptions, and provide hints. Further research will increase our understanding of how human tutors improve student performance and to what extent this can be emulated by an Intelligent Tutoring System.

- *Simulation Based Instruction*: Inexpensive computers are capable of powerful simulations that can let students explore and learn in ways not possible in any classroom. Simulations can involve many kinds of phenomena in physics, engineering, chemistry, biology, and other technical areas. They can also be used for blocking out plays, choreographing dances, traveling to historic cities, and creating and playing music. Finding inexpensive ways to build powerful simulations is a major challenge, but an even greater challenge is understanding how to teach and learn using the freedom of exploration possible in these simulations.

- *Advanced Internet Applications*: As the Internet becomes faster, applications involving high-quality video, audio and images will become more feasible. Imagine a student learning about geography by being able to browse a "Digital Earth." A student would see the Earth as it appears from space, and "zoom in" at higher and higher levels of resolution – all the way to a city block or the 1-meter satellite imagery of a tropical rain forest. Geographical information systems would also allow students to understand political boundaries, demographic data, and the environmental impact of human activity on the planet.

- *Speech Recognition*: Computer applications that use advanced speech recognition technology can "listen" to and analyze a student's oral reading and intervene when the reader asks for help, makes mistakes, or gets stuck – responding with assistance that is modeled in part after expert reading teachers. Advances in speech recognition and speech understanding will increase the power of such applications.

- The **Challenging Coursework On-Line** initiative will support the development of high quality, Web-based Advanced Placement, Second Language, and other challenging courses. Today, students in many high schools in poor rural and inner city schools lack access to the challenging coursework that all students need and deserve. Increased access to the Internet and advanced telecommunications systems can help solve the problem, but only if students have access to high quality content. Unfortunately, few such high-quality courses exist today. The Challenging Coursework On-Line program will provide funding to stimulate innovative research and development efforts in partnership with local schools. This initiative complements other investments to make information technology and the Internet accessible for all schools, provide technology training for teachers, improve ESL instruction, and build the capacity of high schools to make AP courses accessible for all their students. The program will provide grants of up to 3 years to partnerships for research, development, and evaluation of innovative technologies such as on-line simulations and other Web-based instruction that can help provide high-quality learning experiences for all students no matter where their school is located. Once the AP courses are developed, States would be able to use Advanced Placement Incentives program funds to support their use for low-income students or in schools with high concentrations of low-income students.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents information on performance goals and objectives and performance indicators and strategies for measuring the progress made toward achieving program results. Because this is a new program, no baseline has been determined. Achievement of targets will be based on the resources requested in FY 2001 and future years.

The Department believes that it is appropriate to require all Next Generation projects to rigorously assess the impact of their programs, and to use the results of these evaluations to assess the impact on curriculum and, ultimately, student achievement. The Department will require each applicant to propose an evaluation design that will attempt to measure the "value added" by the project, and will provide technical assistance throughout the project to help insure the integrity of the project evaluations. Evaluations conducted by the grantees will become an integral part of the overall evaluation of the program, and the results of the evaluations will be peer reviewed. Only those evaluations that are judged to be of high quality by an external peer review process will be included in the assessment of project success.

Performance Goal: To use educational technology as part of broader education reform that will provide new learning opportunities and raise educational achievement for all students.

Educational technology: Next-generation technology innovation

Objective: Promote the availability and use of educational technology as part of a challenging and enriching curriculum in every school.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
Classroom impact: The percentage of projects that demonstrate positive impacts on curriculum and student achievement will increase. *Projects will begin in late FY 2001. Baseline data for impacts on curriculum will be determined in FY 2003; baseline data for impacts on student achievement will be determined in FY 2004.*				

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

Next-Generation Technology Innovation

	1999	2000	2001
Advanced Technology Applications	0	0	$32,155
Mississippi Delta Initiative	0	0	10,000
Challenging Coursework On-Line	0	0	10,000
Research, evaluation, and dissemination	0	0	3,800
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	700
Total	0	0	56,655

Technology Innovation Challenge Grants

	1999	2000	2001
Number of new awards	14	3	0
Number of continuation awards	82	96	56
New grant awards	$22,000	$6,236	0

Educational technology: Next-generation technology innovation

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

Technology Innovation Challenge Grants

	1999	2000	2001
Continuation awards:			
1995 awards	$16,647	$12,076	0
1996 awards	19,499	25,526	0
1997 awards	14,510	16,324	$16,624
1998 awards	31,622	33,855	32,385
1999 awards	0	21,852	23,000
2000 awards	0	0	6,224
Subtotal	82,278	109,633	78,233
Earmarks	10,400	29,655	0
Evaluation	22	731	0
Peer review of new award applications	400	0	0
Total	115,100	146,255	78,233

Star Schools

	1999	2000	2001
Distance education grants:			
New awards	$9,850	$9,795	0
Continuation awards	16,168	25,658	$34,612
Continuing education grants:			
Continuation awards	7,659	7,697	0
Dissemination project	500	500	500
Earmarks			
Iowa Statewide Network	8,000	3,700	0
University of Alaska, Fairbanks	800	0	0
Western Montana College	350	0	0
Oklahoma State University	0	925	0
Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago	0	694	0
WinstonNet, Winston Salem, North Carolina	0	231	0
Leadership activities	846	700	0
Evaluation	734	650	0
Peer review of applications for new awards	93	0	0
Total	45,000	50,550	35,112

Educational technology: Regional technology in education consortia
(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III, part A, subpart 3, section 3141)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined[1]

Budget Authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
$10,000	$10,000	0

[1] The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2000; new authorizing legislation is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The *Regional Technology in Education Consortia* (R*TEC) program supports regional centers that carry out information and resource dissemination, professional development, and technical assistance. Consortia awards are made to regional entities, which must include State educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit organizations, or a combination thereof. The R*TECs' role in education technology is unique in two ways: their emphasis is regional, and their primary goal is to ensure that technology is used effectively to support school reform. Awards are made for 5 years, and are scheduled for recompetition in 2000.

The R*TECs help States, districts, schools, and adult education programs effectively integrate technologies into kindergarten through 12th grade classrooms, library media centers, and other educational settings. The R*TECs focus their activities on three major areas: improving teaching and learning, professional development, and infrastructure development. They also disseminate information and provide policy support related to those areas. In providing technical assistance, the R*TECs collaborate with State and local educational agencies in helping schools that serve large numbers of disadvantaged students with limited access to technology. In addition, they collaborate with the grant recipients under the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and the other technology programs to provide the education community with the best sources of information and immediate technical assistance so that schools and policymakers can make informed decisions and implement these new efforts. Under the reauthorization proposal, the R*TECs would continue their work with a clear focus on serving high-poverty and low-performing schools, but would not develop onsite courses for teaching teachers.

During FY1998, the six R*TECs made available 184 discrete products, and provided some 660 services to teachers, administrators, technology coordinators, staff developers, curriculum coordinators, policymakers, students, and the public. Products are varied, and include such things as syntheses of research, professional development materials, and descriptions of best practice. Services are tailored to individual needs and include "hands-on" workshops and assistance. Three key goals of the program are:

- Expanding access to technology and telecommunications;
- Promoting quality content, software, professional development, and assessment; and
- Promoting partnerships and alliances.

Expanding access to technology and telecommunications

The consortia work with States, districts, and local communities to support the expansion of access to technology and to assist in the development of sound technology plans. Several R*TECs have developed technology planning guides and resources in a variety of formats, including Internet-based and CD-ROM, and many have provided referrals to specialized technology planning resources.

The R*TECs have a mandate to ensure that every school community is served, and they play an especially important role in helping resource-poor schools develop the internal capacity to use technology as a teaching and learning tool. R*TECs also provide assistance in cost-effective planning and implementation for districts with little experience in providing technology-enhanced learning environments. One strategy is to work in-depth with a number of "intensive sites" to provide sustained support over time. Such work aims not only to assist these schools but even more importantly to develop further knowledge to inform the field. For instance, the Southeast and Islands R*TEC (SEIR*TEC) worked with teams of teachers and administrators at 12 primarily rural resource-poor schools throughout their region to develop the sites' internal capacity to use technology as a teaching tool (http://SERVE-Line.serve.org/seir-tec/intensive/index.html). SEIR*TEC was able to use this project to develop further knowledge about how schools can make the best use of limited resources, what kinds of on-site assistance offer the most effective changes in teaching and learning, and how to help improve teachers' attitudes toward technology use. SEIR*TEC synthesized its findings into the booklet *Factors Influencing the Effective Use of Technology for Teaching and Learning.* The knowledge derived from this study is now incorporated in Leadership Academies conducted by SEIR*TEC for teachers, administrators, and State agency leaders throughout the region.

R*TECs have also assisted a number of communities in applying for funding from appropriate sources, including the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and the Universal Service Fund (E-rate). For instance, the South Central R*TEC helped develop an effective technology certification process for the E-rate applications from the State of Kansas, a tool that is highly adaptable and replicable.

Promoting quality content, professional development, software, and assessment

One of the primary responsibilities of the Consortia is to identify or produce strategies, services, and materials that promote the effective use of technology for teaching and learning. These resources are available across the country and include professional development programs, portfolios of tools and processes, descriptions of best practices, and other resources.

Course Content: Curricular resources, such as "telecollaborative" projects and on-line materials for teachers, account for nearly half the services provided by the R*TECs or developed with

R*TEC assistance. These resources not only enhance learning for students but also provide excellent professional development opportunities, as teachers explore new technology-supported instructional approaches. For example:

- Working on the assumption that models and simulations can help students understand physical phenomena, the "Learning through Dynamic Simulations" Web site (www.ncsa.uiuc.edu/edu/icm) contains pages for students and teachers on a growing number of topics such as watershed flooding, wildlife population, and gravity. Each project includes an overview, standards, students' and teachers' pages, evaluation information, a model to download, and a link to software.

- The Andale Web site (www.asset.asu.edu/andale/) assists teachers, students, and community members in locating Internet resources for English as a Second Language (ESL) and bilingual education. These resources include intercultural e-mail classroom connections, pedagogy and methods for teaching ESL, and on-line instructional materials. In addition, the site provides community resources for both English and Spanish speaking patrons.

- The Pacific and Southwest R*TEC wrote a 20-page article that appeared in "Beyond Heroes and Holidays: A Practical Guide to K-12 Anti-Racist, Multicultural Education and Staff Development" (published by the Network of Educators on the Americas (NECA)). This article describes how global learning networks can promote multicultural education and offers suggestions on creating positive learning environments for both teachers and students.

- An on-line publication designed for educators (www.4teachers.org) offers Teacher Testimony and Premier Tracks to help educators integrate technology into their curricula. The Teacher Idea Exchange Web site provides a rich environment for educators involved in technology development to share ideas and questions about their challenges and successes, providing a valuable resource and fostering collaboration among peers. This site has received up to 120,000 hits a month since its creation.

- On a national level, the six R*TECs collaborated in 1998 to publish a Summary and Resource Guide, "Fulfilling the Promise of Technologies for Teaching and Learning." This guide both provides an overview of R*TEC activities and services through fall 1998 and points readers to additional valuable resources.

- "Premier Tracks" (http://www.4teachers.org/premier/) provides links to some of the best Web-based lessons in "Track Star," a Web tool that allows teachers, curriculum developers and other educators to group Internet sites and annotate them. Lessons available include the history of the Vietnam War; facts about world population; and earthquakes, volcanoes, and other natural disasters.

Professional Development: The R*TECs design and collaborate on workshops and Web sites that provide professional development resources to education decision-makers and school leaders. For example, the "Leadership and the New Technologies" Web site (http://www.edc.org/LNT/) provides ongoing support for school district leaders who are using technology to improve teaching and learning. In another project, the North Central R*TEC collaborated with the North Central Regional Education Laboratory to provide the Learning With Technology course. This program is a 6-session course for teachers of grades 4 through 9 that goes beyond the usual software lessons to stress how teachers can integrate technology into classroom instruction in ways that will improve the performance and achievement of their students.

The R*TECs also work to improve pre-service education. For example, the R*TECs worked with deans and faculty at pre-service education institutions to help (1) reconceptualize the role of technology in pre-service education, (2) form partnerships and encourage collaboration between interested stakeholders, and (3) understand the impact of new technologies in pre-service education. Activities ranged from conducting an informal survey of institutions throughout the country to profile institutions today, to hosting a number of workshops and forums with deans and faculty to demonstrate, plan, and foster regional collaboration and change.

Software: With the number of educational software programs growing rapidly, many educators find themselves overwhelmed by the sheer amount of software from which to choose. To assist educators in identifying the best educational software programs available, several R*TECs have developed databases of educational software quality evaluations. These databases are designed to help parents, teachers, and administrators make decisions about the wide array of products available. These projects also offer guidance to educators on how to evaluate software products on their own, and many R*TECs provide links to exterior nonprofit Web sites that offer educators additional software evaluation resources.

Assessment: The R*TECs help their constituents develop assessment instruments for technology projects and consider potential next steps based on the findings of the assessments. For example, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and the SEIR*TEC developed an evaluation instrument as part of North Carolina's Technology Literacy Challenge Grant program. Although this instrument was developed for a specific application, it contains evaluation strategies that can be easily adapted for use in assessing many other types of technology grants or school district technology programs.

A number of tools have also been developed to help teams and individuals with self-assessment. For instance, "Learning With Technology Profile Tool" (http://www.ncrtec.org/capacity/profile/profwww.htm) is a computer program intended to help educators think carefully about their practice in the areas of engaged learning and technology. The program presents indicators of engaged learning and indicators of technology. For each indicator there are three choices that educators can compare to their own practice. When finished, educators can view the results in a graphical format to help identify their strengths and weaknesses.

Promoting partnerships and alliances

The R*TECs foster a number of partnerships and alliances, many of which provide either professional development and technology planning assistance or address issues of curriculum, instruction, school reform, and equity. The institutions most frequently represented in R*TEC alliances are schools, State agencies, and institutions of higher education.

Educational technology: Regional technology in education consortia

---

The R*TECs also work to create a climate for "scaling up" effective technology plans among educational systems in each region. An important goal of the alliances is fostering the opportunities in which constituents can learn about and implement effective ways to use technology in education. Alliances help build the capacity of their members, leverage resources, and develop relationships among R*TECs. These relationships facilitate other activities, including research and development, professional development, technical assistance, and broad-based dissemination of research based products and best practices.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	($ in 000s)
1996	$10,000
1997	10,000
1998	10,000
1999	10,000
2000	10,000

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department requests $10 million for FY 2001, the same level as in FY 2000. Level funding will allow the R*TECs to maintain needed services to districts. The R*TECs are an important component of the President's Technology Challenge because they provide necessary technical advice and training to States, schools, districts, and other educational institutions about the use of advanced technologies to improve teaching and student achievement. The reauthorization proposal continues the program. In FY 2000, 10 new grants will be awarded; FY 2001 funds will support continuation awards for these projects.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents information on performance goals and objectives and key performance indicators and strategies for measuring the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2001 and future years.

Other performance indicators and strategies for this program are included in the Department's Annual Program Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

Performance goal: To improve teaching and learning by providing technical assistance and professional development for the effective use of educational technology.

Objective: Promote effective use of technology for teaching and learning through professional development and technical assistance, and the leveraging and coordination of other resources.

Educational technology: Regional technology in education consortia

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
At least 85% recipients (individuals or agencies) of the R*TEC services and products—including those developed and produced through the Consortia, collaboration among RTECs, and strategic alliances—will indicate that these products and services are of overall high quality. *FY 1998 baseline: 92% of clients said products were of high quality, 93% said products were relevant to their needs, 84% said services were of high quality, and 83% said services were relevant to their needs.*		85%	85%	85%

The R*TECs have developed measurement procedures to help guide the system-wide evaluation efforts of the consortia. Data collected by the R*TECs during FY 1998 and self-reported in the consortia's "Annual Program Performance Report" (February 1999) for that year indicate that 92 percent of clients agreed or strongly agreed that R*TEC products provided during FY 1998 were of high quality, and 84 percent of clients agreed or strongly agreed that R*TEC services provided during FY 1998 were of high quality. Program staff have not conducted a systematic evaluation of the R*TECs.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

($000)	1999	2000	2001
Number of continuation awards	6	0	10
Number of new awards	0	10	0
New awards	0	$9,900	0
Continuation awards	$10,000	0	$9,950
Evaluation	0	0	50
Peer review	0	100	0
Total	10,000	10,000	10,000

Educational Technology: Technology Leadership Activities
(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III, part A, subpart 1, section 3122)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined[1]

Budget Authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
$2,000	$2,000	0

[1] The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000. New authorizing legislation is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program supports Federal leadership activities that promote the use of technology in education. The principal role of the program is to support national strategic planning in the area of educational technology; conduct studies and evaluations to determine the most effective means of developing and using educational technology; and conduct outreach activities that raise the level of awareness of technology issues and opportunities. Specifically, funds may be used to provide development grants to technical assistance providers; consult with representatives of industry, education, and technology; conduct research on, and development of, guidelines for the effective use of technology; carry out development, demonstration, and evaluation of high-performance computing and communications technologies, software, professional development strategies, and existing applications of technology in schools; and develop model programs that demonstrate the educational effectiveness of technology in urban and rural areas and economically distressed communities. The Administration's reauthorization proposal continues the authority for the program.

The Federal leadership activities first received funding in 1995, but not again until 1999.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	($000s)
1996	0
1997	0
1998	0
1999	$2,000
2000	2,000

Educational technology: Technology leadership activities

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department requests $2 million for Technology Leadership Activities in FY 2001, level funding with FY 2000. The program provides national leadership to increase access, facilitate innovation, and improve professional development in the area of educational technology. The long-term goal is to help students reach challenging academic standards and improve their chances of success in school and beyond through the effective use of technology. Additionally, these efforts provide direct and crucial support for the Administration's four goals, or Four Pillars, to meet the Technology Literacy Challenge:

- All teachers in the Nation will have the professional development and support they need to help students learn with the use of computers and the information superhighway.
- All teachers and students will have modern multimedia computers in their classrooms.
- Every classroom will be connected to the information superhighway.
- Effective software and online learning resources will be part of a challenging and enriching curriculum in every school curriculum.

In the near future, technology, including Internet II, as well as virtual communications, will reshape ways of knowing and learning. For example, the fusion of computing and communications — especially through the Internet — has broken the bounds of cost, time, and distance, launching an era of global information networking. Our schools, institutions of higher education, and communities must reshape traditional ways of delivering instruction to take full advantage of new models and new technologies. Stakeholders, including teachers, parents, students, and education policymakers, must also be aware of what works best in addressing specific problems and teaching to which populations. The Office of Educational Technology (OET), through the leadership activities, is committed to expanding and improving access to technology and serves as a catalyst in bringing effective uses of education technology into classrooms across the Nation.

Continuing this commitment requires further effort, particularly through a reinvigorated national agenda, to expand our knowledge and provide leadership. The FY 2001 request will support the Department's efforts to stimulate and coordinate public and private efforts that can enhance and expand innovative technology applications; improve technology access and quality; gain a better understanding of how students learn through technology; and assess and share effective approaches to developing, using, and evaluating educational technology.

The Department requests $2 million to continue activities designed to promote leadership in the field of educational technology and to strengthen the network of the Department's technology programs and increase the impact of these investments by linking them more closely to other Federal, State, and private sector efforts. As the role of technology in education expands, the need for leadership and collaboration among public and private sectors will become increasingly important to ensure that *all* segments of the community benefit from the investment in technology and education.

In FY 1999, these funds supported a number of important activities. Funds were used to evaluate the effectiveness of several small Challenge Grant projects, as well as to conduct an evaluation of the process that the Department uses to award technology grants—comparing that process to similar efforts in the private sector. Funds also were used for an analysis of National Assessment of Educational Progress scores to determine relationships between educational technology and achievement and to support the development of research designs that allow valid assessments of the effectiveness of educational technology. The latter project will not only support the development of research strategies that allow assessment of the impact of technology on student learning, but also will inform research programs investigating technology-supported learning. In addition, Leadership funds supported the Secretary's Conference on Educational Technology. The conference helped identify technology-intensive schools and districts that demonstrate promising results.

In FY 2000, the Office of Educational Technology (OET) is continuing efforts such as these that lead to a clearer vision of future education technology needs. In FY 2001, the OET would begin planning for long-term controlled studies on the effectiveness of the uses of educational technology that are called for in the proposed reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The OET will continue to bring together public and private entities to maximize available resources to help teachers and students develop technology skills, and will continue to investigate ways to improve access to educational technology by all Americans.

The OET will continue to serve as the Department's leader in technology and will ensure that Department activities are conducted in coordination with other Federal educational technology programs, including the Schools and Libraries Corporation's E-rate, the Department of Commerce's Telecommunications and Information Infrastructure Program, and related programs of the National Science Foundation.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department developed a single performance plan for the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, Technology Innovation Challenge Grants, and Technology National Activities, which include Technology Leadership Activities. Technology leadership activities contribute to the progress made towards meeting the indicators in that plan. Those indicators are presented in the justification for the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and are not presented separately here.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

($000)	1999	2000	2001
New awards	$2,000	$2,000	$2,000

Educational technology: Ready-to-learn digital television
(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III, Part C)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined[1]

Budget Authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
$16,000	$16,000	0

[1] The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2000; new authorization legislation is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization proposal, the current Ready-to-Learn Television program, authorized under part C of Title III, would be replaced with a new Ready-to-Learn Digital Television authority that would continue the purposes of the current program. The Ready-to-Learn Television program supports the development and distribution of educational video for preschool children, elementary school children, and their parents. Not less than 60 percent of the funds appropriated must be awarded for this purpose. Eligibility for awards is highly specified (nonprofit, nongovernment entities with a demonstrated capacity to develop and distribute high-quality educational television programming for children, and with a demonstrated capacity to contract with producers of children's television programming).

Under the current and the proposed authority, the Secretary may also establish a Special Projects of National Significance program. Eligible award recipients for this program include public and nonprofit entities, local public television stations, and public television stations in consortium with one or more State or local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, or community organizations. Projects may address the needs of children in limited English proficient households, focus on increasing family literacy skills, or (with at least 10 percent of the funds) enhance and extend innovative programs that promote school readiness. Other authorized activities include establishment of a clearinghouse to increase access to Ready-to-Learn programs and projects, and the development and dissemination of training materials for parents and adults who work with young children. Coordination with the Department of Health and Human Services is also authorized in order to maximize the use of high-quality educational television programming for children, and associated materials for adults, in Federal programs such as Head Start.

In 1995, Ready-to-Learn funds were awarded as a single grant to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB). Since that time, Ready-to-Learn has played a major role in improving literacy for children and families by promoting the use of quality children's television to enhance learning. The program has reached out to families and caregivers in communities across the Nation. The award to CPB resulted in the following activities and accomplishments:

Production of quality educational programming

Results of the 1999 Annenberg Public Policy Center survey of parents regarding children's television demonstrated that parents are most likely to cite PBS as the best source of good programming for their children. Furthermore, in the 1998 fourth quarter rankings for *all* children's programming targeted toward children ages 2 to 5, the top four programs were all broadcast by PBS. Under the Ready-to-Learn program, PBS has sought to build on its stellar track record by developing a pair of new children's shows. The first of these shows, *Dragon Tales*, premiered in the fall of 1999; the second, *Between the Lions*, will premiere in the spring of 2000.

- The Children's Television Workshop (CTW) and Columbia TriStar Television Distribution developed *Dragon Tales,* a daily animated preschool series of 40 half-hour shows that seeks to develop problem solving, cooperation, and other life skills in children ages 2 through 5. Research has shown that young children learn best both visually and when they can interact with the teaching medium. By combining interactive musical components with the animated segments, *Dragon Tales* engages young children on multiple levels and develops important learning readiness traits.

- WGBH Boston and Sirius Thinking are producing 40 episodes of a daily half-hour literacy series, called *Between the Lions*, for 4 to 7 year-olds. This series uses a mix of puppetry, animation, and live action sequences to teach children how to read English, and is designed to appeal to both English and non-English-speaking children. A related interactive component for parents will be offered on the PBS Ready-to-Learn Web site (http://www.pbs.org/kids/rtl/).

To build on the themes of these programs, CTW is also developing a series called *Parenting Moments,* brief noncommercial messages for between-program spots during prime time programming. By integrating Ready-to-Learn ideals into the overall fabric of public broadcasting, RTL hopes to create an awareness in the general community about the importance of having all children ready to learn upon entering school.

Training parents and caregivers through community partnerships

Working with local public television stations is a vital component of the Ready-to-Learn program. Each of the 130 Ready-to-Learn (RTL) stations receives a grant for local educational and community outreach activities related to school readiness. These activities may include purchasing educational materials, facilitating workshops, and distributing children's books to low-income families. Furthermore, RTL stations collaborate with organizations on the local and national levels, with some of the latter including Head Start, the International Reading Association, Junior League, the Family Literacy Alliance, and La Raza. On the local level, RTL stations around the country have formed partnerships with numerous PTAs, museums, and libraries in efforts to improve early childhood learning through innovative local collaboration.

Educational Technology: Ready-to-learn digital television

For example, KAKM in Anchorage, Alaska, is working with five elementary schools as part of Project P/Pride, an initiative to help Head Start families transition from preschool to elementary school. In Austin, Texas, KLRU broadcasts professional development programming for child care providers in both English and Spanish, and is able to offer clock hour credit through a partnership with the Texas Department of Human Services. In Boston, WGBH has created a series of workshops for parents and community partners called "Using PBS Programming to Excite Young Readers," aimed at providing low-income families with books and information on programming and family literacy activities.

Every RTL station also conducts a series of parenting workshops whose goals are to educate adults regarding media literacy, increase their awareness of television's impact on children, and instruct parents, teachers and caregivers in how to use the educational materials available from RTL stations to help their children learn. Preliminary research to assess the effectiveness of Ready-to-Learn workshops was conducted in 1997. These early findings indicated that parents who attended RTL workshops read with their children for longer periods, read more for educational or informational purposes, and took their children to a library or bookstore more often than they had prior to attending the workshop. Results from a more comprehensive six-month follow-up study, completed in 1999 by the Institute for Communication Research (ICR), both supported these initial hypotheses and found a number of extremely encouraging longitudinal trends. For example, the ICR study discovered a 35-percent increase in the number of times RTL parents read to their children, a 76-percent increase in the amount of time RTL parents spent watching television with their children, and a 40-percent reduction in the overall amount of television their children watched each day.

Publication of *PBS Families* and *PBS para la familia*

An important component of the program has been the distribution of *PBS Families/para la familia*, a free newsletter (published in both English and Spanish) on using public television to help children love learning. Copies are distributed through stations, partner organizations such as Head Start, elementary schools, libraries, and at community events. RTL Coordinators may insert information on local programming and events before distribution. These publications are also available on the PBS, Ready-to-Learn, and CPB Web sites, as well as on the Family Education Network.

Research on the publication during 1999 resulted in content changes made to improve the educational value of the publications. Significant changes included: publishing more photos of parents/adults -- particularly fathers -- reading with children; using poetry and short stories to build literacy; and making themes more consistent and obvious in every issue. Also, the publishers hired a Spanish-speaking early childhood expert and added Spanish-speaking professionals to their editorial board to ensure that the material is appropriate for Hispanic families of all ethnic origins.

Purchase and distribution of free children's books

Through the *First Book* program, which is organized through local television stations, more than 1.3 million free books have been distributed to children who need them. The books distributed are written not only in English, but in Spanish, Vietnamese, and any other language requested by local recipients. In addition to providing free books to each station every month, a matching book fund has been established to encourage stations to buy additional books. Federal funds are used to provide one book for every two purchased by stations.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	($ in 000s)
1996	$6,440
1997	7,000
1998	7,000
1999	11,000
2000	16,000

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department requests $16 million in FY 2001, level funding with the FY 2000 appropriation, to support the development of educational television programming and related activities aimed at cultivating a love of language, reading, and learning in young children.

In 2000, the existing award to CPB ends, and the funds will be recompeted. The requested funding level will permit continuation of RTL activities in the second year of the project, including the development of high-quality children's programming and accompanying materials and services for parents and caregivers. The funding also will assist RTL in providing targeted services with a particular emphasis on early childhood literacy and on the needs of diverse and disadvantaged children. In addition, funds will support the development of new public broadcasting capabilities in the emerging field of digital television. Digital television (DTV) permits viewers to, among other things, garner additional information about an interesting topic by halting the televised program and linking into related Web-based resources. This interactive, personalized, television holds great promise for children's programming, especially in areas such as literacy, reading, and other developmental skills. By 2002, all commercial stations will be required by the FCC to transmit via digital signal, and many of these stations will have developed innovative programming to take advantage of this opportunity.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents information on performance goals and objectives and key performance indicators and strategies for measuring the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2001 and future years. Strategies for this program are included in the Department's Annual Program Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

Educational Technology: Ready-to-learn digital television

Performance goal: To develop, produce, and distribute video programming and educational materials for preschool and elementary school children and their parents in order to facilitate the achievement of the National Education Goal for all children in America to start school ready to learn.

Objective: Develop, produce, and distribute high-quality televised educational programming and written educational materials, for preschool and elementary school children and their caregivers.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
Ready-to-Learn programs will reach an increasing number of viewers. *Baseline: To be determined.*	4.5 to 6 million viewers	Continuing increase	Continuing increase	

Information is not yet available on the number of viewers for *Dragon Tales*, and *Between the Lions* will not air until the spring of 2000. Based on A. C. Nielson data from similar children's/parenting programming, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting estimates that each RTL educational program will reach between 4.5 and 6 million adults and young viewers. In addition, the number of participating local stations has increased significantly, from 48 in 1995 to 132 in 2000. This increase will provide access to RTL programming and services for 99 percent of the Nation. This indicator will be measured by annual performance reports from CPB and from the producers of the programs, WGBH-Boston and the Children's Television Workshop.

Objective: Provide training to education personnel in the public television community so that they can train parents and caregivers to help children become ready to learn.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
The number of parents and caregivers trained annually will increase. *Baseline: In FY 1998, 119,174 parents and caregivers were trained.*	246,274	600,000	650,000	

In 1999, 563,075 parents and child-care professionals participated in RTL training. It is estimated that through parents and child-care professionals, this training has reached approximately 5 million children. These data are collected by the grantees from the Ready-To-Learn stations and the RTL Coordinators at the RTL Stations. As the number of participating stations has increased over time, the number of communities, parents, and caregivers receiving services also has increased. However, as of January 2000, CPB had 132 participating stations, which resulted in nearly universal access to programming, and the number of parents and caregivers trained is expected to rise more slowly.

EDUCATION REFORM

Educational Technology: Ready-to-learn digital television

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

($000)	1999	2000	2001
Educational programming	$6,600	$9,600	$9,600
Supplementary materials	4,400	6,400	6,400
Total	11,000	16,000[1]	16,000

[1] Includes $5,000 for field reader costs in FY 2000.

Educational technology: Telecommunications program for professional development (Proposed legislation)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined[1]

Budget Authority ($000s):

	2000	2001	Change
Telecommunications program for professional development	0	$5,000	+$5,000
Telecommunications demonstration project for mathematics	$8,500	0	-8,500
Total	8,500	5,000	-3,500

[1] The GEPA extension for the Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Mathematics applies through September 30, 2000; new legislation is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization proposal, the current Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Mathematics program, authorized under Part D of Title III, would be replaced with a new Telecommunications Program for Professional Development authority. The current program supports a telecommunications-based demonstration project designed to provide professional development to elementary and secondary school mathematics teachers. The program provides teachers with training needed to help all students achieve State content standards. Nonprofit telecommunications entities (and partnerships of such entities) are eligible. The grantee must use the existing publicly funded telecommunications infrastructure; conduct the project in cooperation with appropriate State agencies, local educational agencies, other nonprofit telecommunications entities, and a national mathematics education professional organization that developed content standards; and provide a significant portion of project services to school systems with high percentages of Title I children. The project must conduct demonstrations at school sites in at least 15 States.

The first grantee under this project, in 1995, was the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), which created the PBS Mathline program. Mathline uses on-line communication and videos to provide "anytime, anywhere" professional development to K-12 mathematics teachers. The *TeacherSource* Web site (http://www.pbs.org/teachersource/math/), of which Mathline is a part, connects teachers and educators across the Nation via the Internet. Mathline program components include videos of experienced teachers modeling standards-based instruction in the classroom, peer support and academic dialogue through facilitated on-line learning communities, on-line bulletin boards, and downloadable lesson guides and support materials. Participating teachers view the videotapes on a designated schedule and are expected to try the lessons presented in their own classrooms. At the same time, teachers participate in on-line "learning communities" of 25-30 teachers and a facilitator who is an accomplished practicing teacher. Using the video lessons as catalysts, these communities participate in discussions, sharing lesson plans and teaching strategies. Participating teachers also have access to a national on-line forum where educators can discuss any pedagogical topics of interest. Currently, the program manages 38 on-line learning communities for teachers in 41 States, and coordinators estimate that over 1.8 million students have benefited from Mathline through their teachers' participation.

Mathline offers four components: the *Elementary School Math Project* (ESMP), the *Middle School Math Project* (MSMP), the *High School Math Project--Focus on Algebra* (HSMP), and the *Algebraic Thinking Math Project.* Federal funds enabled the development of the elementary, high school, and algebraic thinking components. Other activities supported with Federal funds include the *X-Y Files*, a motivational series of videos and activities for teachers to use with students in grades 3 through 5; *the PBS Mathline Scholarship Initiative*, which covered the year-long participation costs for 7,000 teachers; and the *Mathline Preservice Initiative*, a project to adapt Mathline for preservice teacher training. Increased funding in FY 2000 will allow the program to reach more teachers, make additional resources available on-line and on-demand through new school networks, update materials for new mathematics teaching standards, and continue to offer pre-service and in-service training in the use of technology in the classroom.

The Department's reauthorization proposal would expand the program to include teaching in the core content areas, not just in mathematics, and would expand the agencies with which the grantee must work to include institutions of higher education, museums, libraries, and national education professional associations that have developed content standards in the core content areas.

Funding levels for the Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Mathematics for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	($ in 000s)
1996	$1,035
1997	1,035
1998	2,035
1999	5,000
2000	8,500

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department requests $5 million for the Telecommunications Program for Professional Development. The objective of this program is to promote excellent teaching through sustained professional development and teacher networks. Funding at this level will support the second year of one or more 5-year grants, to be awarded in 2000, for the development of such training programs. Fiscal year 2001 funds will also support activities in content areas other than mathematics that would be authorized under the proposed legislation.

Educational technology: Telecommunications program for professional development

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents information on performance goals and objectives and selected performance indicators and strategies for measuring the progress made toward achieving program results. Performance targets will be determined by the spring of 2001.

Strategies for this program and information on coordination with other programs are included in the Department's Annual Program Performance Plan and the Annual Program Performance Report.

Performance goal: To improve the learning and teaching of core content areas through the use of technology.

Objective: Promote excellent teaching through sustained professional development and teacher networks.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
Increasing participation in sustained professional development. The number of teachers sharing resources and engaged in other professional development activities through on-line learning communities will increase annually. *Baseline: Approximately 5,500 teachers shared resources and engaged in other professional development activities through Telecommunications Demonstration Project on-line learning communities in 1997.*				

In 1998 and 1999, 5,800 teachers shared resources and engaged in other professional development activities through Telecommunications Demonstration Project on-line learning communities, an increase from the baseline established in 1997. Data for this indicator are collected from the program's annual reports. The Department will set targets for future years in the spring of 2001.

An external evaluation of the ESMP program, released in September 1997, found that the project was a positive experience for all who responded, and an *extremely* positive experience for a large number of participants. Many teachers reported that participation led to changes in their teaching, while others reported that the project encouraged them to continue reform efforts that they had already begun.

More specifically, teachers reported increased use of hands-on activities and materials, and higher expectations for their students. Teachers received positive feedback from students, parents, and even principals after using Mathline lessons in their classrooms. About 70 percent of the participants described the sharing of ideas among teachers and the feeling of being part

Educational technology: Telecommunications program for professional development

of a professional community as the "highlights" of the project. Overall, the evaluation concluded that ESMP achieved its goal of providing "the structure and framework for participating teachers to improve and strengthen the teaching and learning of mathematics."

Education reform: Community technology centers
(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III, part A, subpart 1, section 3122)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined[1]

Budget Authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
$32,500	$100,000	+$67,500

[1] The GEPA extension for Community-based Technology Centers applies through September 30, 2000; new legislation is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization proposal, the current Community-based Technology Centers program, authorized under Part A, Subpart 1, Section 3122 of Title III, would be replaced with a new Community Technology Centers authority. The proposed new program would be essentially the same as the current program.

The current National Activities authority allows the Secretary to carry out a variety of activities that promote the use of technology in education. These activities include the development of model programs, such as community technology centers, that demonstrate the educational effectiveness of technology in urban and rural areas and economically distressed communities. The Department received an appropriation in FY 1999 to initiate the Community-based Technology Centers program to provide access to computers and technology, particularly educational technology, to adults and children in low-income communities who would otherwise lack such access. Grants support both the expansion of existing community technology centers and the initial start-up costs for communities that have no such centers

The Department's reauthorization proposal would establish a separate authorization for the Community Technology Centers program. Funds would be used to create or expand community technology centers in high-poverty urban and rural communities and to provide technical assistance to such centers. Eligible applicants would include State educational agencies, local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, for-profit businesses, public or private non-profit organizations, or a consortium of such entities that have the capacity to expand access to computers and related services in eligible communities. Funds would be used to (1) pay for a coordinator and staff; (2) acquire equipment and infrastructure; (3) provide after-school, adult education, and family literacy, career development, and small business activities; and (4) provide home access to computers and technology.

Educational technology: Community technology centers

Funding levels for the past 5 years for Community-based Technology Centers were as follows:

	($000s)
1996	0
1997	0
1998	0
1999	$10,000
2000	32,500

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department requests $100 million for this program, an increase of $67.5 million over the 2000 appropriation. Funds would support continuation costs for approximately 120 grants awarded in 1999 and 2000, and approximately 280 new grants in 2001. The Department plans to fund projects for 3 years.

On July 8, 1999, the Department of Commerce released *Falling through the Net: Defining the Digital Divide.* The report found that, although the number of Americans connected to the Nation's information infrastructure is soaring, a digital divide still exists, and, in many cases, is actually widening over time. Minorities, low-income persons, the less educated, and children of single-parent households, particularly when they reside in rural areas or central cities, are among the groups that lack access to information resources.

According to the report, households with incomes of $75,000 and higher are more than twenty times more likely to have access to the Internet than those at the lowest income levels, and more than nine times as likely to have a computer at home. Regardless of income level, Americans living in rural areas are lagging behind in Internet access. At the lowest income levels, people in urban areas are more than twice as likely to have Internet access than those earning the same income in rural areas.

The digital divides, based on education and income level, have markedly increased in the last year alone. Between 1997 and 1998, the divide between those at the highest and lowest education levels increased 25 percent, and the divide between those at the highest and lowest income levels grew 29 percent.

In the report's Policy Implications section, the Commerce Department said it is essential that schools, libraries, and other community access centers provide computer access. The 1998 data demonstrate that community access centers are particularly well used by those groups who lack access at home or at work. These same groups (such as those with lower incomes and education levels, certain minorities, and the unemployed) are also using the Internet at higher rates to search for jobs or take courses. Providing public access to the Internet will help these groups advance economically, as well as provide them the technical skills to compete professionally in today's digital economy. Establishing and supporting community access centers, among other steps, will help ensure that all Americans can access new technologies.

Educational technology: Community technology centers

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department is currently developing performance objectives and indicators for this program. The plan will be available later in 2000.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
New awards	$9,990	$21,337	$66,800
Number of new awards	40	80	280
Range of awards	$75-300	$75-300	$75-300
Continuation awards	0	$9,000	$28,700
Number of continuation awards	0	40	120
Range of awards	0	$75-300	$75-300
Peer review	$10	0	$1,000
Evaluation	0	$163	$500
Technical assistance	0	$2,000	$3,000

Educational technology: Preparing tomorrow's teachers to use technology
(ESEA III, Section 3122)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined[1]

Budget Authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
$75,000	$150,000	+$75,000

[1] The GEPA extension for Teacher Training in Technology, the antecedent program, applies through September 30, 2000; new legislation is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization proposal, the current Teacher Training in Technology program, authorized under Part A, Subpart 1, Section 3122, of Title III, would be reauthorized as Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology. The program will continue to assist public and private entities develop and implement teacher training programs that prepare prospective teachers to use technology to improve instructional practices and enhance student learning in the classroom.

Under the Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology program, discretionary grants of up to 5 years would be awarded to consortia of public and private institutions that are preparing future teachers to become proficient in the use of modern learning technologies. These consortia must include at least one institution of higher education and at least one State education agency or local education agency. The consortia must also include at least one or more institution of higher education; State or local educational agency; private elementary or secondary school; and non-profit organization, professional association, foundation, museum, library, for-profit business, or other entity with a capacity to contribute to the technology-related reform of teacher preparation programs.

The Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology program provides three types of competitive grants. *Capacity building grants* are 1-year grants awarded to institutions of higher education to develop a comprehensive technology-based teacher preparation initiative for implementation the next year. These grants lay the initial groundwork for a teacher preparation reform strategy. Activities may include faculty development, curriculum redesign, and the formation of cross-disciplinary courses among departments and between institutions of higher education and K-12 schools. *Implementation grants* are designed to support institutions and consortia that are ready to implement full-scale innovations to improve the preparation of technology-proficient teachers. *Catalyst grants* are awarded to regional or national partnerships of institutions with established track records and resources for systemic improvement in preparing tomorrow's teachers to use technology. Recipients of Catalyst grants must be prepared to provide technical assistance and mentoring support to Capacity Building and Implementation grantees.

The program funds may be used for the following purposes: (1) develop and implement high-quality teacher preparation programs that enable educators to learn the full range of resources that can be accessed through the use of technology and to help students develop their technical skills; (2) develop alternative teacher development paths that provide elementary and secondary schools with well prepared technology-proficient educators; and, (3) develop performance-based assessments to measure the capacity of prospective teachers to use technology effectively in classrooms.

Under the reauthorization proposal, institutions receiving these grants may not receive more than 50 percent of the total cost of any project funded by the grant under this program. The non-Federal share of the project may be in cash or in kind.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years for the Teacher Training in Technology program were:

	($000s)
1996	0[1]
1997	0[1]
1998	0[1]
1999	$75,000
2000	75,000

[1] The program was not funded prior to 1999.

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration proposes $150 million in fiscal year 2001, double the FY 2000 appropriation for the antecedent program, to prepare new teachers to use technology effectively in the classroom. These funds would support 175 new Capacity Building awards to stimulate State and local initiatives for campus-wide teacher education reform, 120 new Implementation and Catalyst grants, and 167 Implementation and Catalyst continuation grants.

The currently authorized Technology Innovation Challenge Grants and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF) programs provide support for in-service professional development, but do not have the authority to fund institutions of higher education. The Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology program would complement the efforts of the TLCF and proposed Next Generation Technology Innovation programs by focusing on pre-service teacher preparation and by supporting the creation of unique partnerships that are not now being developed. This program supports systemic institutional change in teacher preparation programs and provides the only Federal funding available to ensure that teacher preparation programs are integrating the use of technology into the pre-service development of future teachers.

A report published by The National Center for Education Statistics titled, "Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation and Qualifications of Public School Teachers," identified "... the broad elements that characterize teacher quality: teacher preparation and qualifications, and teaching practices." The first refers, in part, to pre-service learning, that is, postsecondary education and certification. Currently, only 20 percent of teachers feel comfortable integrating technology into the subjects they teach. In order to expand teachers' use of technology, there is need to incorporate technology applications, models, and assignments into the teacher preparation learning experience.

In addition, over the next 10 years, our Nation's schools will need 2.2 million new teachers to support our growing school enrollment. If these teachers are going to prepare our students for the world of the 21st century, they will need to be well versed in the use of technology. Currently, most colleges of education do not adequately prepare teachers to use educational technology. While many of today's college students are more technologically literate, incoming teachers require focused training on how to use new technologies to enhance student learning. A recent report by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) finds that "...teacher education faculty have insufficient understanding of the demands on classroom teachers to incorporate technology into their teaching." The report criticizes the majority of teacher education programs for teaching computer literacy rather than the application of technology in the classroom. If we want workers with strong skills in the world of technology, we need to focus on providing a strong grounding in the basics. If we want students who can take on the challenges of the modern workplace, we need rigorous coursework and qualified and well-trained teachers in every classroom. We must support efforts to graduate well-prepared and technology-proficient educators who are able to enhance their teaching and students' learning through the use of technology.

Grants awarded in 2001 will provide targeted funds to reach new teachers and teacher education faculty and preparation programs to help ensure that all new teachers can teach effectively with technology. Competitive grants will be available to consortia of States, colleges of education, school districts, and others to develop strategies such as online courses, new interactive teaching tools and technology-rich field experiences that focus on using technology to enhance student learning and are that connected to ongoing reform efforts.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents information on performance goals and objectives and selected performance indicators and strategies for measuring the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2001 and future years.

Other performance indicators and strategies for this program are included in the Department's Annual Program Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

Educational technology: Preparing tomorrow's teachers to use technology

Performance goal: To improve the knowledge and ability of future teachers to use technology in improved teaching practices and student learning opportunities, and to improve the quality of teacher education programs.

Objective: Strengthen teacher preparation programs so that they provide high quality training in the use of technology for instructional purposes.

	1999	2000	2001	2002
Curriculum redesign. The percentage of teacher training programs that redesign their curriculum to incorporate best practices in the use of technology in teacher education will increase. *Baseline to be determined.* **Graduation requirements**. The number of teacher preparation programs that will require teacher candidates to demonstrate proficiency in the effective use of technology in teaching and learning will increase. *Baseline to be determined.*				

Objective: Increase the technology skills and proficiency of new teachers for improved classroom instruction.

	1999	2000	2001	2002
Technology-proficient new teachers. The percentage of new teachers who are proficient in using technology and integrating technology into instructional practices will increase. *Baseline to be determined.*				

The baseline data will be obtained from the Project Performance Report, 2000 and Evaluation Report, 2001. The Department will help prepare tomorrow's teachers to use technology by promoting the use of effective practices for teacher preparation programs. The Department will also provide technical assistance to grantees on such topics as evaluation and will ensure accurate interpretation of the program activities and requirements. The Department will work with professional organizations to promote program goals and sponsor workshops to help potential applicants learn about the program.

Educational technology: Preparing tomorrow's teachers to use technology

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

($000)	1999	2000	2001
Capacity Building Grants			
New awards	$16,790	0	$25,000
Number of new awards	138	0	175
Average new award	$122	0	$143
Implementation Grants			
New awards	$23,420	$32,255	$32,000
Number of new awards	64	80	100
Average new award	$366	$403	$320
Continuation awards	0	$23,420	$56,000
Number of continuation awards	0	64	144
Average continuation award	0	$366	$388
Catalyst Grants			
New awards	$33,665[1]	$18,000[1]	$14,000[1]
Number of new awards	23	15	20
Average new award	$1,464	$1,200	$700
Continuation awards	0	0[1]	$13,500[1]
Number of continuation awards	0	0	23
Average continuation award	0	0	$587
Peer review of new award applications	$750	$750	$1,500
Program Evaluation	$375	$375	$750
Contract for Targeted Dissemination	0	$200	$7,250
Number of awards	0	1	4
Average award	0	$200	$1,813
Total number of awards	225	160	466
Total funding	$75,000	$75,000	$150,000

[1] The FY 1999 Catalyst Grants are 3-year grants. Grantees received their first 2 years of funding from FY 1999 funds, and therefore have no continuation costs in FY 2000. They will receive the third year of funding in FY 2001. The FY 2000 and FY 2001 are also 3-year grants that follow the same pattern, with the FY 2000 Catalyst Grants receiving their third year of funding in FY 2002, and the FY 2001 Catalyst Grants receiving their third year of funding in FY 2003.

Recognition and Reward
(Elementary and Secondary Education of 1965, Title X, Part A)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined[1]

Budget authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
0	$50,000	+$50,000

[1]The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000; new authorizing legislation is proposed.

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2001, the Administration requests $50 million for a new Recognition and Reward activity. This activity would be initiated under the broad authority of the Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) reauthorization proposal of the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE). It would also be the first step toward implementing the vision, embeded in Title XI of the Department's ESEA reauthorization proposal, of providing financial incentives to States to fully implement the types of standards-based accountability systems that have proven effective in improving student achievement.

Fiscal year 2001 funds would be used to reward States that: (1) demonstrate significant statewide gains in student achievement; and (2) reduce the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students in mathematics, as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). *In future years, States also would be rewarded for increasing student achievement and narrowing the achievement gap in other core academic subjects.* The Department would use NAEP results because NAEP is the only nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America's students know and can do in various subject areas. In addition, in making awards the Department could also take into consideration other criteria it considers appropriate, such as whether States have in place rigorous examinations to help ensure that all students have met prescribed standards before graduating from secondary school.

By requiring that States (1) demonstrate increases in student achievement in the core academic subjects over an extended period of time, and (2) simultaneously narrow the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students, the Administration's proposal deliberately sets a high standard for States to achieve to before receiving an award. As a result, the Department expects that a small number of States would be eligible for an award in any year.

Recognition and reward

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

Since 1994, with the passage of the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) and the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the Administration has committed to the idea that all students can achieve to challenging standards. To help ensure that all students are prepared to meet challenging standards, the Administration has focused on promoting academic equity and excellence through such strategies as:

- **Implementing high standards in every classroom.** To enable States, districts, and schools to implement high standards, the Administration initiated the Class Size Reduction program to reduce average class size in the early elementary grades to 18 students per classroom so that students can receive the individual attention they need to learn to read independently and well by the end of third grade.

- **Improving teacher and administrator quality.** Research has shown that teacher quality is the most important in-school factor affecting student learning. The Administration is committed to ensuring that all children have a talented, dedicated, well-prepared teacher in their classroom. Title II of the Higher Education Act is supporting State and local efforts to take comprehensive approaches to improving teacher quality.

The Administration's 1994 reauthorization of the ESEA required that States develop challenging content and student performance standards and assessments aligned to those standards. There are encouraging signs that States have made progress as a result those accountability provisions. For example, 48 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have developed State-level standards. Recent data also indicate that the accountability provisions in Title I are driving higher standards to poor districts and schools. States and school districts are developing accountability systems that identify and reward high-performing schools, provide assistance to low-performing schools, and sanction persistently low-performing schools. In addition, States are developing strategies to end the practices of retention and social promotion and are, instead, providing low-achieving students with opportunities to participate in high-quality learning environments that build on the regular school program.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents information on performance goals and objectives and selected performance indicators and strategies for measuring the progress made toward achieving program results. Desired targets will be identified after a baseline has been established. Achievement of targets will be based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided FY 2001 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Other performance indicators and strategies for this program are included in the Department's Annual Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

Recognition and reward

Performance goal: To increase the number of States that increase student achievement in the core academic subjects, narrow the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students, and have in place strategies for continuous improvement.

Objective: The achievement gap between high- and low-performing students will be reduced.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
The number of States that are able to demonstrate increased student achievement and a reduction in the gap between high- and low-performing students will increase annually. *Baseline to be established.*				

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
Estimated number of awards	0	0	10
Estimated average amount of award	0	0	$5,000

Goals 2000: State and local education systemic improvement
(Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Title III)

FY 2000 Authorization ($000s): 0[1]

Budget authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
$458,000	0	-$458,000

[1] The GEPA extension expired September 30, 1999; the authorizing statute was repealed effectve September 30, 2000.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Goals 2000 provides assistance for States to devise their own strategies for comprehensive reform of elementary and secondary education. States' reform strategies center on the creation and implementation of high standards, in the core academic subjects, that define what all students should know and be able to do at various points along the K-12 school continuum.

With the help of Goals 2000, States are establishing academic standards and coordinating their curriculum frameworks, student assessment programs, teacher preparation and licensure requirements, parental and community involvement activities, and other aspects of their education system to help children achieve to the State standards. In this way, schools can measure student progress through the new assessments, and parents and the public can get information about how well schools and school districts assist all children in reaching the standards.

The Department allocates Goals 2000 funds under a formula based on relative shares each State received the previous year under Titles I and VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. A total of 1 percent is reserved for the Outlying Areas, schools supported by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Alaska Federation of Natives. If a State chooses not to participate, the Secretary is authorized to distribute Goals 2000 funds directly (on a competitive basis) to local school districts in that State. In 1999, two States, Oklahoma and Montana, chose the direct local grants option.

States distribute at least 90 percent of their Goals 2000 funds directly to local educational agencies (LEAs) for local reform, the improvement of preservice teacher education programs, and educator professional development. At least half of this money must go to LEAs that have a greater percentage or number of disadvantaged children than the statewide average.

Goals 2000: State and local education systemic improvement

LEAs, in turn, must ensure that at least 75 percent of their first-year money and at least 85 percent of subsequent years' funds go to individual schools so that schools can tailor their own improvement plans to help students meet the State or local standards.

Academic year 1999-2000 is the sixth year of operation for Goals 2000, the program is helping schools in all 50 States mobilize to improve the future of their children by designing common-sense approaches to improve teaching and learning. To date, more than 16,000 local subgrants have been made to districts to support a broad range of local educational reform activities.

Except for the funds earmarked for evaluation, this is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	($ in 000s)
1996....................	$340,000
1997....................	476,000
1998....................	466,000
1999....................	461,000
2000....................	458,000

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

The Department is not requesting any funds for Goals 2000 in 2000. The Department's fiscal year 2000 appropriations act repealed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act effective September 30, 2000.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
State Grants	$454,640 [1]	$451,820 [1]	0
No. of States participating	48	48	0
Range of awards	$1,645-54,330	$1,634-53,993	0
Amount for BIA	$2,894	$2,875	0
Amount for Outlying Areas	$1,666	$1,655	0
Amount for Alaska Federation of Natives	$50	$50	$50

Goals 2000: State and local education systemic improvement

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES ($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
Est. school districts participating	5,000	5,000	0
Est. schools in comprehensive reform	12,000	12,000	0
Amount for evaluation	$1,500	$1,500	0
Peer Review of State Plans	$250	$100	0

[1] Includes funds awarded directly to school districts in Oklahoma and Montana.

School-to-work opportunities
(School-to-Work Opportunities Act)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): 0[1]

Budget Authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
$55,000[2]	0	-$55,000

[1] Authorizing legislation expired September 30, 1999.
[2] An identical amount is included in the budget for the Department of Labor.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

School-to-work is an educational strategy that aims to improve learning by connecting what goes on in the classroom to future careers and to real work situations and to increase student access to a range of opportunities for postsecondary education and advanced training.

Through the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, operated through a partnership between the Departments of Education and Labor, every State has access to seed money to design and implement a comprehensive school-to-work transition system. These systems are integrating academic and vocational education, linking secondary and postsecondary education, and providing learning opportunities at the work site.

Students in school-to-work systems are expected to meet challenging State academic standards and, in addition, earn portable, industry-recognized skill certificates. While States and localities have broad latitude to design their own systems, each local system must have the following core components:

School-based learning, including a coherent secondary and postsecondary program of study—typically 2 years of secondary education and at least 1 or 2 years of postsecondary education—tied to challenging State academic standards and occupational skills standards;

Work-based learning, providing students with workplace mentoring and a planned program of job training and work experiences covering a broad range of tasks in an occupational area; and

Connecting activities, to ensure coordination of the work- and school-based learning components, such as providing technical assistance in designing work-based learning, matching students with employers, and collecting information on what happens to students after they complete the program.

EDUCATION REFORM

School-to-work opportunities

School-to-work is a broad movement. Educational reforms and workforce development practices were incorporating school-to-work elements before specific Federal funding became available, and some States and localities continue to develop school-to-work systems without Federal funding. Through the following grant mechanisms, School-to-Work funds are intended to help build lasting systems in States and localities:

State development grants. Non-competitive grants were awarded to all States to assist them in putting together plans for statewide school-to-work systems. These grants ended in fiscal year 1997.

State implementation grants. The bulk of School-to-Work funds are used for 5-year grants to enable States to implement their plans. Once a State received an implementation grant, it funded local partnerships in the State. All 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have now received implementation grants.

Local partnerships. Direct grants were awarded competitively to local communities that were ready to put school-to-work systems in place but that were located in States that were still in the planning stages or that had not yet received the second year of their implementation grant funding. These grants were phased out in fiscal year 1998.

Urban/rural opportunities grants. Under the Act, 10 percent of the funds must be used for direct 5-year grants to local partnerships in urban and rural areas characterized by high poverty.

Grants for outlying areas. Non-competitive grants assist the outlying areas in developing and implementing comprehensive plans for school-to-work systems.

Programs for Indian youth. Competitive grants of up to 5 years help tribal partnerships develop and implement school-to-work systems involving BIA-funded schools.

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

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

	($ in 000s)
1996	$180,000
1997	199,973
1998	200,000
1999	125,000
2000	55,000

NOTE: An identical amount was included in the 1998 and 1999 appropriations and the 2000 predicted appropriation for the Department of Labor (DOL); $170 million was appropriated for DOL in 1996 and $200 million in 1997.

School-to-work opportunities

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

The funding authorization for this program expired September 30, 1999, and the statute's sunset provision terminates the program on October 1, 2001. As planned, the Administration is not proposing reauthorization of this program, and, therefore, no funding is requested.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

	1999 [1]	2000 [1]	2001
State implementation grants	$203,750	$89,650	0
No. of continuing awards	44	27	0
Urban/rural grants	$25,000	$11,000	0
No. of continuing awards	79	47	0
Grants to outlying areas	$1,250	$550	0
No. of continuing awards	6	6	0
Program for Indian youth	$1,250	$550	0
No. of continuing awards	15	9	0
National activities:	$18,750	$8,250	0
Evaluation studies	$5,750	$2,000	0
Learning and Information Center	$4,700	$2,500	0
Other national activities	$8,300	$3,750	0

[1] Data reflect total program, which includes funds requested by and appropriated to the Departments of Education and Labor.

EDUCATION REFORM

Technology Literacy Challenge Fund

State or Outlying Area	1999	2000	2001
Alabama	$6,977,507	$6,761,395	$7,016,402
Alaska	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
Arizona	6,290,730	6,349,707	6,826,398
Arkansas	4,177,712	4,155,152	4,429,143
California	45,942,372	49,833,809	54,534,654
Colorado	3,892,451	3,737,675	3,509,677
Connecticut	3,795,972	3,684,123	3,968,432
Delaware	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
District of Columbia	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
Florida	18,519,414	19,174,306	21,926,529
Georgia	10,762,883	11,035,407	12,541,424
Hawaii	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
Idaho	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
Illinois	18,019,068	17,298,200	17,478,626
Indiana	6,321,150	6,142,228	6,353,981
Iowa	2,877,004	2,761,599	2,627,632
Kansas	3,035,302	2,932,445	3,072,648
Kentucky	7,059,516	6,776,628	6,975,828
Louisiana	10,592,292	10,167,918	9,976,973
Maine	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
Maryland	5,486,189	5,388,264	5,777,061
Massachusetts	8,076,491	7,935,186	7,909,176
Michigan	18,069,513	17,401,424	18,043,992
Minnesota	4,801,542	4,604,715	4,308,452
Mississippi	6,903,692	6,627,314	6,376,853
Missouri	6,972,362	6,980,860	7,445,777
Montana	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
Nebraska	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
Nevada	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
New Hampshire	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
New Jersey	8,929,639	9,094,025	9,505,378
New Mexico	3,458,675	3,480,502	3,906,010
New York	37,580,311	38,534,228	43,238,739
North Carolina	7,700,987	7,738,808	8,637,251
North Dakota	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
Ohio	16,576,794	15,918,779	15,136,574
Oklahoma	4,806,262	5,014,310	5,495,754
Oregon	3,773,798	3,623,745	3,546,280
Pennsylvania	18,326,060	17,679,471	18,201,622
Rhode Island	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
South Carolina	5,209,756	5,244,846	5,818,541
South Dakota	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
Tennessee	7,123,515	6,991,296	6,943,960
Texas	34,944,672	35,170,428	38,755,410
Utah	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
Vermont	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
Virginia	6,090,035	6,119,482	6,751,017
Washington	5,999,333	5,759,388	5,570,477
West Virginia	4,063,186	3,899,015	3,965,588
Wisconsin	6,933,962	6,655,800	6,488,683
Wyoming	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
American Samoa	505,192	505,192	534,909
Guam	267,794	267,794	283,547
Northern Marianas	491,913	491,913	520,849
Puerto Rico	14,534,853	13,952,522	14,189,058
Virgin Islands	860,101	860,101	910,695
BIA	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
Other Non-State Allocations	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,250,000
TOTAL	425,000,000	425,000,000	450,000,000

EDUCATION REFORM

Goals 2000 State and Local Education Systemic Improvement

State or Outlying Area	1999 Appro. for 2000	2000 Estimate for 2001	2001 Request for 2002
Alabama	7,227,226	$7,182,398	0
Alaska	1,881,589	1,869,918	0
Arizona	7,110,330	7,066,227	0
Arkansas	4,480,990	4,453,196	0
California	54,330,111	53,993,115	0
Colorado	5,401,033	5,367,532	0
Connecticut	4,712,572	4,683,341	0
Delaware	1,706,331	1,853,359	0
District of Columbia	1,864,927	1,695,747	0
Florida	21,431,467	21,298,534	0
Georgia	12,061,944	11,987,128	0
Hawaii	1,741,900	1,731,095	0
Idaho	1,909,962	1,898,115	0
Illinois	19,575,152	19,453,733	0
Indiana	8,279,904	8,228,546	0
Iowa	3,927,458	3,903,097	0
Kansas	4,105,461	4,079,996	0
Kentucky	7,161,680	7,117,258	0
Louisiana	9,730,432	9,670,076	0
Maine	2,119,690	2,106,543	0
Maryland	7,079,280	7,035,369	0
Massachusetts	8,949,857	8,894,344	0
Michigan	18,148,531	18,035,961	0
Minnesota	6,751,988	6,710,108	0
Mississippi	6,146,713	6,108,586	0
Missouri	8,322,638	8,271,015	0
Montana	1,916,340	1,904,454	0
Nebraska	2,512,146	2,496,564	0
Nevada	1,958,953	1,946,802	0
New Hampshire	1,676,465	1,666,066	0
New Jersey	11,169,316	11,100,036	0
New Mexico	3,483,017	3,461,413	0
New York	34,832,789	34,616,732	0
North Carolina	10,057,994	9,995,607	0
North Dakota	1,689,020	1,678,543	0
Ohio	18,154,815	18,042,206	0
Oklahoma	5,484,790	5,450,769	0
Oregon	4,979,469	4,948,583	0
Pennsylvania	19,495,146	19,374,223	0
Rhode Island	1,898,410	1,886,635	0
South Carolina	5,817,170	5,781,088	0
South Dakota	1,741,190	1,730,390	0
Tennessee	8,013,648	7,963,942	0
Texas	36,968,574	36,739,269	0
Utah	3,174,086	3,154,398	0
Vermont	1,687,741	1,677,273	0
Virginia	8,490,347	8,437,684	0
Washington	8,189,027	8,138,233	0
West Virginia	3,558,069	3,536,000	0
Wisconsin	8,167,458	8,116,798	0
Wyoming	1,644,664	1,634,462	0
American Samoa	242,392	240,798	0
Guam	256,089	254,404	0
Northern Marianas	134,911	134,024	0
Puerto Rico	11,720,190	11,647,493	0
Virgin Islands	500,127	496,836	0
Palau	0	0	0
Marshall Islands	134,911	134,024	0
Micronesia	397,875	395,257	0
BIA	2,893,695	2,874,657	0
Other Non-State Allocations	1,800,000	1,650,000	0
TOTAL	461,000,000	458,000,000	0

Divider Title: **EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED**

Department of Education

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Request

CONTENTS

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For carrying out [title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and] section 418A of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $30,000,000[1] [$8,700,986,000, of which $2,461,823,000 shall become available on July 1, 2000, and shall remain available through September 30, 2001, and of which $6,204,763,000 shall become available on October 1, 2000 and shall remain available through September 30, 2001, for academic year 2000-2001:[2] *Provided*, That $6,783,000,000 shall be available for basic grants under section 1124:[3] *Provided further*, That $134,000,000 shall be allocated among the States in the same proportion as funds are allocated among the States under section 1122, to carry out section 1116(c): *Provided further*, That 100 percent of these funds shall be allocated to local educational agencies for the purposes of carrying out section 1116(c) and that local educational agencies shall provide all students enrolled in a school identified under section 1116(c) with the option to transfer to another public school within the local educational agency, including a public charter school, that has not been identified for school improvement under section 1116(c): *Provided further*, That if the local educational agency demonstrates to the satisfaction of the State educational agency that the local educational agency lacks the capacity to provide all students with the option to transfer to another public school, and after giving notice to the parents of children affected that it is not possible, consistent with State and local law, to accommodate the transfer request of every student, the local educational agency shall permit as many students as possible (who shall be selected by the local educational agency on an equitable basis) to transfer to a public school that has not been identified for school improvement under section 1116(c):[4] *Provided further*, That up to $3,500,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary on October 1, 1999, to obtain updated local-educational-agency-level census poverty data from the

Bureau of the Census:[5] *Provided further*, That $1,158,397,000 shall be available for concentration grants under section 1124A: *Provided further*, That $8,900,000 shall be available for evaluations under section 1501[6] and not more than $8,500,000 shall be reserved for section 1308, of which not more than $3,000,000 shall be reserved for section 1308(d):[7] *Provided further*, That grant awards under sections 1124 and 1124A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be made to each State and local educational agency at no less than 100 percent of the amount such State or local educational agency received under this authority for fiscal year 1999: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, grant awards under section 1124A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be made to those local educational agencies that received a Concentration Grant under the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 1998, but are not eligible to receive such a grant for fiscal year 2000: *Provided further*, That each such local educational agency shall receive an amount equal to the Concentration Grant the agency received in fiscal year 1998, ratably reduced, if necessary, to ensure that these local educational agencies receive no greater share of their hold-harmless amounts than other local educational agencies: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall not take into account the hold harmless provisions in this section in determining State allocations under any other program administered by the Secretary in any fiscal year:[9] *Provided further*, That $170,000,000 shall be available under section 1002(g)(2) to demonstrate effective approaches to comprehensive school reform to be allocated and expended in accordance with the instructions relating to this activity in the statement of the managers on the conference report accompanying Public Law 105-78 and in the statement of the managers on the conference report accompanying Public Law 105-277: *Provided further*, That in carrying out this initiative, the Secretary and the States shall support only approaches that show the most promise of enabling children served by title I to meet challenging State content standards and challenging State student performance standards based on reliable research and effective practices, and include an emphasis on basic academics and parental involvement].[10] *(Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2000, as enacted by Section 1000(a)(4) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000 (P.L.106-113).)*

Of the funds to be made available under this heading, $250,000,000 of funds for part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be allocated among the States in the same proportion as funds are allocated among them under section 1122, to carry out sections 1116(c), 1116(d), and 1117 of that Act: *Provided*, That each State shall allocate at least 70 percent of such funds to local educational agencies to carry out section 1116(c) giving priority first to local educational agencies with schools identified for corrective action under section 1116(c)(5) and second to local educational agencies with schools identified for program improvement under section 1116(c)(1) that are farthest from meeting State standards, which those agencies shall use for the benefit of students in those schools: *Provided further*, That each State shall use the remainder of such funds in the following priority: (1) to take corrective action, under section 1116(c)(6)(B), with respect to schools and local educational agencies described in that section; (2) to take corrective action with respect to local educational agencies in accordance with section 1116(d)(6); and (3) to provide technical assistance to remaining schools that are farthest from meeting State standards: *Provided further*, That a State educational agency shall require any local educational agency receiving funds under part A, title I, except where prohibited by State or local law (including school board-approved local educational agency policy), to permit students attending any school identified for corrective action under section 1116(c)(5) to transfer, at no cost to the student, to anyother public school of the agency that has not been so identified, in addition to taking at least one other action described in section

1116(c)(5)(B), except that no agency may use more than 10 percent of the funds, if any, it receives from the $250,000,000 reserved above for the costs of transportation.[11]

NOTES

FY 2001 appropriation language is provided for programs currently authorized under the Higher Education Act. However, with the exception of language relating to Title I accountability grants, no FY 2001 appropriation language is provided for programs currently authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, because the requested resources are proposed for later transmittal upon enactment of proposed legislation to revise and reauthorize programs currently authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

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

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
[1]... section 418A of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $30,000,000...	This language establishes a specific funding level in fiscal year 2001 for the High School Equivalency and the College Migrant Assistance Programs.
[2]... [$8,700,986,000, of which $2,461,823,000 shall become available on July 1, 2000, and shall remain available through September 30, 2001, and of which $6,204,763,000 shall become available on October 1, 2000 and shall remain available through September 30, 2001, for academic year 2000-2001:...]	This language provided for funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for Title I Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Capital Expenses, Even Start, State Agency Migrant and Neglected and Delinquent programs, and Demonstrations of Comprehensive School Reform. The language also provided that a portion of the funds are available in an advance appropriation that becomes available for obligation on October 1 of the following fiscal year.
[3] [...*Provided*, That $6,783,000,000 shall be available for basic grants under section 1124:...]	This language established a specific funding level for Title I Basic Grants.
[4] [...*Provided further*, That $134,000,000 shall be allocated among the States in the same proportion as funds are allocated among the States under section 1122, to carry out section 1116(c): *Provided further*, That 100 percent of these funds shall be allocated to local educational agencies for the purposes of carrying out section 1116(c) and that local educational agencies shall provide all students enrolled in a school identified under section 1116(c) with the option to transfer to another public school within the local educational agency, including a public charter school, that has not been identified for school improvement under	The language earmarked a portion of Title I Basic Grants funding, to be allocated to each State based on its share of Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies, to support interventions to improve schools identified as low-performing under section 1116(c) of Title I. The language also required agencies receiving these funds to implement a public school choice program that would allow students in schools identified for improvement under Title I to transfer to another school within the local educational agency.

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
local educational agency demonstrates to the satisfaction of the State educational agency that the local educational agency lacks the capacity to provide all students with the option to transfer to another public school, and after giving notice to the parents of children affected that it is not possible, consistent with State and local law, to accommodate the transfer request of every student, the local educational agency shall permit as many students as possible (who shall be selected by the local educational agency on an equitable basis) to transfer to a public school that has not been identified for school improvement under section 1116(c):...]	
[5] [...*Provided further*, That up to $3,500,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary on October 1, 1999, to obtain updated local-educational-agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census:...]	This language made available, on a current funded basis, $3,500,000 from Basic Grant funds to support continued work by the Census Bureau to update LEA-level poverty data.
[6] [...*Provided further*, That $1,158,397,000 shall be available for concentration grants under section 1124A: *Provided further*, That $8,900,000 shall be available for evaluations under section 1501...]	This language established specific funding levels for Title I Concentration Grants and Title I Evaluation.
[7] [...and not more than $8,500,000 shall be reserved for section 1308, of which not more than $3,000,000 shall be reserved for section 1308(d):...]	This language provided for a higher level of funding for migrant coordination activities and consortium incentive grants than the levels specified in the authorizing statute.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
[8] [...*Provided further*, That grant awards under sections 1124 and 1124A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be made to each State and local educational agency at no less than 100 percent of the amount such State or local educational agency received under this authority for fiscal year 1999: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, grant awards under section 1124A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be made to those local educational agencies that received a Concentration Grant under the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 1998, but are not eligible to receive such a grant for fiscal year 2000: *Provided further*, That each such local educational agency shall receive an amount equal to the Concentration Grant the agency received in fiscal year 1998, ratably reduced, if necessary, to ensure that these local educational agencies receive no greater share of their hold-harmless amounts than other local educational agencies:...]	This language guaranteed each State and LEA "hold-harmless" amounts for basic and concentration grant allocations that were at least 100 percent of the previous-year amounts, and provides concentration grants, equal to 1998 grant amounts, to local educational agencies that would have been ineligible for funding in fiscal year 2000. The language also provided that the 1998 grant amounts may be reduced to the same proportionate hold-harmless provided to other local educational agencies.
[9] [...*Provided further*, That the Secretary shall not take into account the hold harmless provisions in this section in determining State allocations under any other program administered by the Secretary in any fiscal year:...]	This language required that State shares of Title I used to determine allocations for other programs be based on the statutory hold-harmless rather than the 100 percent hold-harmless in appropriations language.
[10] [...*Provided further*, That $170,000,000 shall be available under section 1002(g)(2) to demonstrate effective approaches to comprehensive school reform to be allocated and expended in accordance with the	This language established a specific funding level for Demonstrations of Comprehensive School Reform, requires that the program continue to be operated in accordance with instructions in the conference reports

Language Provision	Explanation
instructions relating to this activity in the statement of the managers on the conference report accompanying Public Law 105-78 and in the statement of the managers on the conference report accompanying Public Law 105-277: *Provided further*, That in carrying out this initiative, the Secretary and the States shall support only approaches that show the most promise of enabling children served by title I to meet challenging State content standards and challenging State student performance standards based on reliable research and effective practices, and include an emphasis on basic academics and parental involvement].	accompanying the 1998 and 1999 appropriations acts, and required the Secretary and States to support only projects that meet certain criteria.
[11] Of the funds to be made available under this heading, $250,000,000 of funds for part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be allocated among the States in the same proportion as funds are allocated among them under section 1122, to carry out sections 1116(c), 1116(d), and 1117 of that Act: *Provided*, That each State shall allocate at least 70 percent of such funds to local educational agencies to carry out section 1116(c) giving priority first to local educational agencies with schools identified for corrective action under section 1116(c)(5) and second to local educational agencies with schools identified for program improvement under section 1116(c)(1) that are farthest from meeting State standards, which those agencies shall use for the benefit of students in those schools: *Provided further*, That each State shall use the remainder of such funds in the following priority: (1) to take corrective action, under section 1116(c)(6)(B), with respect to schools and local educational agencies described in that section; (2) to take	The language earmarks a portion of Title I LEA Grants funding, to be allocated to each State based on its LEA Grants share, to support interventions to improve schools and school districts identified as low performing under Title I. The language requires that each State distribute at least 70 percent of these funds to districts, giving first priority to schools identified, under Title I, as chronically failing and second priority to schools identified for school improvement. The language also sets priorities for the use of funds reserved by the State. In addition, the language requires all districts with schools identified for corrective action to implement a public school choice program that allows students in schools identified for corrective action to transfer to another school within the district, and puts a cap on the amount of these funds that can be used for transportation.

Language Provision	Explanation
corrective action with respect to local educational agencies in accordance with section 1116(d)(6); and (3) to provide technical assistance to remaining schools that are farthest from meeting State standards: *Provided further*, That a State educational agency shall require any local educational agency receiving funds under part A, title I, except where prohibited by State or local law (including school board-approved local educational agency policy), to permit students attending any school identified for corrective action under section 1116(c)(5) to transfer, at no cost to the student, to any other public school of the agency that has not been so identified, in addition to taking at least one other action described in section 1116(c)(5)(B), except that no agency may use more than 10 percent of the funds, if any, it receives from the $250,000,000 reserved above for the costs of transportation.	

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Amounts Available for Obligation
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
Discretionary authority:			
Annual appropriation	$8,426,897	$8,700,986	$9,146,500
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-6,204,763	-6,204,763	-6,204,763
Advance from prior year	1,448,386	6,204,763	6,204,763
Subtotal, budget authority	3,670,520	8,700,986	9,149,500
Spending authority from offsetting collections from: Non-Federal sources	62	0	0
Subtotal, gross budget authority	3,670,582	8,700,986	9,149,500
Recovery of prior-year obligations	521	0	0
Unobligated balance, start of year	70,538	16,456	0
Unobligated balance expiring	-1,480	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	-16,456	0	0
Subtotal, obligations	3,723,705	8,717,442	9,149,500
Reimbursable obligations	-62	0	0
Total direct obligations	3,723,643	8,717,442	9,149,500

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Obligations by Object Classification
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
Contractual services and supplies:			
Travel and transportation of persons	$22	$25	$25
Printing and reproduction	54	60	60
Advisory and assistance services	8,594	10,500	20,000
Peer review	64	61	54
Other services	7,790	8,939	8,946
Purchases of goods and services from Government accounts	3,694	3,510	3,510
Subtotal	20,218	23,095	32,595
Grants, subsidies, and contributions	3,703,425	8,694,347	9,116,905
Total, direct obligations	3,723,643	8,717,442	9,149,500

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes
($000s)

2000	$8,700,986
2001	9,149,500
Net change	+448,514

	2000 base	Change from base
Increases:		
Program:		
Increase in Grants to Local Educational Agencies to implement the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposals to reduce the number of failing schools and provide initial funding for LEA Targeted Grants that would direct additional funds and assistance to high-poverty and low-performing schools.	$7,941,397	$416,103
Increase in State Agency Migrant program to meet the higher costs of serving additional migrant children and helping them meet challenging State standards.	354,689	+25,311
Increase in Demonstrations of Comprehensive School Reform to allow additional schools serving low-income students to implement comprehensive, research-based education reforms.	170,000	+20,000
Increase in Migrant Education (HEP and CAMP) to increase the number of migrant students completing high school and going to college.	22,000	+8,000
Subtotal, increases		+469,414

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Changes -- Continued
($000s)

	2000 base	Change from base
Decreases:		
Program:		
Eliminate separate categorical funding for Capital Expenses reflecting the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal, which would repeal the the program.	$12,000	-$12,000
Eliminate separate categorical funding for Title I Evaluation reflecting the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal, which would permit the Secretary to reserve, for evaluation and other national activities, .3 percent from all Title I programs.	8,900	-8,900
Subtotal, decreases		-20,900
Net change		+448,514

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Authorizing Legislation
($000s)

Activity	2000 Authorized	2000 Estimate	2001 Authorized	2001 Request
Grants to LEAs *(ESEA-I-A)*:				
Basic Grants *(1124)*	Indefinite [1,2]	$6,783,686	To be determined [1]	$5,683,100
Concentration Grants *(1124A)*	Indefinite [1,2]	1,158,397	To be determined [1]	1,002,900
Targeted Grants *(1125)*	Indefinite [1,2]	0	To be determined	1,671,500
Capital expenses for private school children *(ESEA-I-1120(e))*	Indefinite	12,000	0 [3]	0
Even Start *(ESEA-I-B)*	Indefinite [1]	150,000	To be determined [1]	150,000
State agency programs *(ESEA-I)*:				
Migrant *(C)*:	Indefinite [1]	354,689	To be determined [1]	380,000
Neglected and delinquent *(D)*	Indefinite [1]	42,000	To be determined [1]	42,000
Evaluation *(ESEA-I-E-1501)*	Indefinite	8,900	0 [4]	0 [4]
Demonstrations of comprehensive school reform *(ESEA-I-E-1502)*	Indefinite	170,000	To be determined [1]	190,000
Migrant education *(HEA-IV-A-5-418A)*:				
High school equivalency program	Indefinite	15,000	Indefinite	20,000
College assistance migrant program	Indefinite	7,000	Indefinite	10,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Authorizing Legislation
($000s)

Activity	2000 Authorized	2000 Estimate	2001 Authorized	2001 Request
Unfunded authorizations:				
State school improvement grants *(ESEA-I-A-1116 and 1117)*	Indefinite	0	0 [3]	0
Education Finance Incentive Grants *(ESEA I-A-1125A)*	Indefinite	0	Indefinite [2]	0
Total definite authorization				
Total appropriation		$8,700,986		$9,149,500

[1] The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000; new authorizing language as proposed.

[2] Of the total funds appropriated for Grants to LEAs, 90 percent of the fiscal year 1995 appropriation of $6,698,000 thousand is to be distributed through the Basic Grants formula and 10 percent is to be distributed through the Concentration Grants formula. Amounts appropriated in excess of the fiscal year 1995 appropriation are to be distributed through the Targeted Grants formula.

[3] The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000. No new authorizing language is proposed.

[4] Reflects reauthorization proposal to fund evaluation as a set-aside from Title I programs.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations History
($000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
1992	$6,224,334	$7,075,750	$6,436,526	$6,706,254
1993	6,828,207	6,759,924	6,770,943	6,708,986
1993 Suppl.	734,805	734,805	0	0
1994	7,110,155	6,871,147	6,971,620	6,924,497
1995	7,578,514	7,245,655	7,233,411	7,232,722
1995 Rescission	0	-148,570	-7,900	-4,606
1996	7,543,316	6,049,113	6,513,511	5,929,691
1996 Advance for 1997	0	961,000	814,489	1,298,386
1997	7,679,000	5,926,744	5,926,863	6,400,054
1997 Supplemental	0	0	0	101,133
1997 Advance for 1998	1,298,386	1,298,386	1,298,386	1,298,386
1998	6,778,880	6,905,831	6,508,963	6,573,411
1998 Advance for 1999	1,298,386	1,298,386	1,298,386	1,448,386
1999	7,047,506	6,607,746	5,834,781	2,222,134
1999 Supplemental Advance for 2000	0	0	0	56,377
1999 Advance for 2000	1,448,386	1,448,386	2,500,000	6,148,386
2000	2,505,534	2,213,134	2,546,223	2,496,223
2000 Advance for 2001	6,204,763	6,204,763	6,204,763	6,204,763
2001	2,944,737			
2001 Advance for 2002	6,204,763			

(in thousands of dollars)

Office, Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	1999 Appropriation	2000 Appropriation	2001 President's Request	President's Request Compared to FY 2000 Appropriation: Amount	President's Request Compared to FY 2000 Appropriation: Percent
OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION (OESE)						
Education for the Disadvantaged						
1. Grants to local educational agencies (ESEA I-A):						
(a) Basic grants (section 1124)	D	6,574,000	6,783,000 [1]	5,683,100	(1,099,900)	-16.2%
(b) Concentration grants (section 1124A)	D	1,158,397	1,158,397	1,002,900	(155,497)	-13.4%
(c) Targeted grants (section 1125)	D	0	0	1,671,500	1,671,500	---
Subtotal		7,732,397	7,941,397	8,357,500 [1]	416,103	5.2%
Annual appropriation	D	1,527,634	1,736,634	2,152,737	416,103	24.0%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	6,204,763	6,204,763	6,204,763	0	0.0%
2. Capital expenses for private school children (ESEA I section 1120(e))	D	24,000	12,000	0	(12,000)	-100.0%
3. Even start (ESEA I-B)	D	135,000	150,000	150,000	0	0.0%
4. State agency programs:						
(a) Migrant (ESEA I-C)	D	354,689	354,689	380,000	25,311	7.1%
(b) Neglected and delinquent (ESEA I-D)	D	40,311	42,000	42,000	0	0.0%
Subtotal		395,000	396,689	422,000	25,311	6.4%
5. Evaluation (ESEA I-E section 1501)	D	7,500	8,900	0	(8,900)	-100.0%
6. Demonstrations of comprehensive school reform (ESEA section 1502)	D	120,000	170,000	190,000	20,000	11.8%
Subtotal, ESEA I		8,413,897	8,678,986	9,119,500	440,514	5.1%
7. Migrant education (HEA IV-A-5):						
(a) High school equivalency program	D	9,000	15,000	20,000	5,000	33.3%
(b) College assistance migrant program	D	4,000	7,000	10,000	3,000	42.9%
Subtotal		13,000	22,000	30,000	8,000	36.4%
Total, Appropriation		8,426,897	8,700,986	9,149,500	448,514	5.2%
Total, Budget authority		3,670,520	8,700,986	9,149,500	448,514	5.2%
Current		2,222,134 [2]	2,496,223 [2]	2,944,737 [1]	448,514	18.0%
Prior year's advance		1,448,386 [3]	6,204,763 [3]	6,204,763 [2]	0	0.0%
Outlays, Total		*7,554,155*	*8,379,320*	*8,564,331*	*185,011*	*2.2%*
Outlays, current		*6,088,755*	*2,422,967*	*2,454,724*	*31,757*	*1.3%*
Outlays, advance		*1,465,400*	*5,956,353*	*6,109,607*	*153,254*	*2.6%*

[1] *Includes funds for Title I Accountability Grants: $134,000 thousand in 2000 and $250,000 thousand in 2001.*

[2] *Excludes an advance appropriation of $6,204,763 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.*

[3] *Reflects an advance appropriation that was included in the prior year's appropriations act, to become available on October 1 of the fiscal year shown.*

NOTE: All activities in this account authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and for which funds are proposed in fiscal year 2001, are requested under proposed legislation.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Summary of Request

The programs in the Education for the Disadvantaged account help ensure that poor and low-achieving children are not left behind in the Nation's effort to raise the academic performance of all children and youth. Title I, the largest Federal elementary and secondary education program, supplements State and local funding for disadvantaged children to enable them to meet the same high standards as their more advantaged peers. Title I programs influence what happens in over one-half of the schools in the country and touch one of every four school-age children, including children of migratory workers, homeless children, and children and youth in State-run institutions for the neglected and delinquent.

All Title I programs focus on improving the academic performance of disadvantaged children who do not have access—either at home or at school—to the same resources as the general student population. Title I funds help schools give disadvantaged students extra instruction at all grade levels, with an emphasis on extended learning time through such activities as before- and after-school programs and intensive summer programs.

Title I is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). This authority expires on September 30, 2000, and the Administration has proposed to reauthorize the ESEA through the Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would continue Title I's emphasis on helping all students meet high standards and targeting Federal funds to schools with high concentrations of poverty. The proposal also would strengthen Title I by encouraging the use of research-based strategies for improving teaching and learning, dedicating more resources to professional development, and demanding greater accountability for improving student achievement.

The fiscal year 2001 budget request for this account, which assumes enactment of the Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999, totals $9.1 billion, an increase of $449 million or 5.2 percent over the 2000 appropriation.

Most of the request would be allocated as **Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies** (LEAs), which would receive an increase of $416.1 million, or 5.2 percent, over the 2000 appropriation. In addition to the new funds, the request for Grants to LEAs would provide greater resources to the highest-poverty schools by allocating $1.7 billion through the Targeted Grants formula.

The increase for Title I Grants to LEAs also would help States, LEAs, and schools carry out the changes called for in the Administration's reauthorization bill, such as improving professional development and expanding peer review of school improvement plans. In addition, the request would make available $250 million to support State and local efforts to improve accountability and turn around failing schools.

The request provides a significant increase for the **Comprehensive School Reform Demonstrations** program, which is helping thousands of schools to capitalize on research findings on the effectiveness of school reform models and bringing about widespread improvements in teaching and learning. The $190 million request for the Title I portion of the program, an increase of $20 million or 11.8 percent, would support a new round of awards to some 1,900 schools as well as 675 continuation awards.

Summary of Request — Continued

The budget includes $150 million for the **Even Start** family literacy program, the same as the 2000 level. Even Start focuses on a population—poor children with parents who demonstrate low levels of literacy—that research suggests is most likely to experience reading problems in the early grades. The request would permit States to fund continuation costs for approximately 719 projects and to make an estimated 178 new awards.

The request also provides $380 million for **Migrant State Grants**, a $25.3 million or 7.1 percent increase to help meet the high costs of identifying highly mobile migratory children and youth and providing special support services and learning arrangements that meet the needs of this especially disadvantaged, hard-to-serve population. Hispanic children account for 85 percent of all currently eligible migrant students, making this program one of the largest efforts to improve the educational status of the Hispanic school-age population and a key component of the Administration's effort to improve Hispanic education. This effort includes $30 million, an increase of $8 million or 36.4 percent, for the **High School Equivalency Program** (HEP) and **College Assistance Migrant Program** (CAMP) to help improve educational opportunities for Hispanics and other limited English proficient individuals. The request would support an additional 11 HEP projects serving more than 2,100 additional students, as well as 9 new CAMP projects serving nearly 500 additional students.

Finally, the Department is proposing level funding of $42 million for the **Neglected and Delinquent** program, which helps institutionalized school-aged youth gain academic and employment skills so that they can return to school and obtain employment after they are released from State institutions.

The Administration's reauthorization proposal replaces the separate authorization of appropriations for **Title I evaluation activities** with a provision that permits the Secretary to reserve up to .3 percent of funds appropriated for Title I programs for evaluations and other national activities. The 2001 request assumes that the Secretary will reserve approximately $22.5 million to fund evaluations, management improvement activities undertaken in partnership with the States, technical assistance and dissemination efforts, and biennial updates of the poverty and population data used to make Title I allocations. The set-aside would fund evaluations of Even Start (currently financed through a separate set-aside) and Reading Excellence (which would be folded into Title I under the reauthorization proposal), as well as the Grants to LEAs, Migrant, and Neglected and Delinquent programs.

All Title I programs focus on improving the academic outcomes of disadvantaged children at the preschool, elementary, and secondary school age-levels. The budget request would help States, LEAs, and schools carry out Title I programs in a way that achieves the ambitious results called for in the Department's Strategic Plan and in the program performance plans created in response to the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).

The request also continues the policy, established by Congress in the appropriations acts for the four previous years, of delaying the availability of a portion of the funds until the following fiscal year. Under the request, $6.2 billion of fiscal year 2001 funding in the Education for the Disadvantaged account would become available for obligation in fiscal year 2002 and thus would be scored as 2002 budget authority.

Grants to local educational agencies
(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part A)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined[1]

Budget authority ($000s):

	2000	2001	Change
Basic Grants	$6,783,000 [2]	$5,683,100	-$1,099,900
Concentration Grants	1,158,397	1,002,900	-155,497
Targeted Grants	0	1,671,500	+1,671,500
Total, Grants to LEAs	7,941,397	8,357,500 [3]	+416,103
Annual Appropriation	1,736,634	2,152,737	+416,103
Advance for Succeeding Fiscal Year	6,204,763	6,204,763	0

[1] The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000; new authorizing legislation is proposed.
[2] Includes $134,000 thousand for accountability grants.
[3] Includes $250,000 thousand for accountability grants.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) provide supplemental education funding to LEAs and schools, especially in high-poverty areas, to help some 13 million students learn to the same high standards as other students. Nearly all school districts and more than half of all public schools—including two-thirds of the Nation's elementary schools—receive Title I Grants to LEAs.

To enable LEAs and schools to significantly raise the academic achievement of disadvantaged children and youth, the Title I statute requires that each State create a framework to integrate Title I with State and local reforms stressing high academic performance for all children. State frameworks must include:

- Challenging content standards that describe what all students should know and be able to do in at least reading and mathematics, and student performance standards that describe three levels of proficiency for meeting the State content standards. These standards are intended to stimulate State and local reforms in curriculum and instruction and to challenge disadvantaged children and improve their achievement.

- Statewide assessments to measure the performance of Title I participants against the State standards. The final assessments, required by school year 2000-01, must be valid and reliable, include multiple measures for evaluating progress, and enable achievement results to be disaggregated by gender, major racial and ethnic groups, English proficiency status, and other categories.

- Statewide technical assistance, including (1) mechanisms to recognize "distinguished" schools, and (2) State school support teams to assist with the design and implementation of schoolwide programs and help schools in need of improvement.

The State assessments are used to hold schools and LEAs accountable for meeting State definitions of adequate progress towards the State standards. State educational agencies (SEAs) use annual assessment results to recognize high-performing schools, target technical assistance to low-performing LEAs, identify consistently failing LEAs for corrective actions, and fulfill Federal accountability requirements. LEAs must hold schools accountable using a similar process.

In addition to the statewide framework, Title I stresses local "schoolwide" reform as a strategy for raising the achievement of poor and low-achieving students. Schools in which poor children account for at least 50 percent of enrollment are eligible to operate schoolwide programs, which allow schools to use Title I funds—in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds—to improve the overall instructional program for all children in a school. About 17,000 of the roughly 26,000 Title I schools eligible for this approach operate schoolwide programs. All other Title I schools must provide "targeted assistance" to supplement the regular education program of children deemed most in need of special assistance.

Within schools, Grants to LEAs are used, for example, to give disadvantaged children more individualized and accelerated instruction, smaller classes, extra time to learn after school and during the summer, computer-based instruction, and preschool programs. To increase the amount and quality of student learning, schools are required to give primary consideration to instructional arrangements—such as after-school, weekend, and summer programs—ensuring that participating children receive Title I services in addition to, and not instead of, all the classroom instruction that other children receive. Schools also are required to provide ongoing professional development for staff working with disadvantaged students and to implement programs and activities designed to increase parental involvement.

Title I Grants to LEAs is a forward-funded program that includes advance appropriations. A portion of the funds provided becomes available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remains available for 15 months, or through September 30 of the following year. The remaining funds become available on October 1 of the fiscal year following the appropriations act and remain available for 12 months, expiring at the same time as the forward-funded portion.

Allocations

One percent of the total LEA Grant appropriation is set aside for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Outlying Areas. From the amount for the Outlying Areas, $5 million is reserved for a program of discretionary grants to LEAs in Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the

Grants to local educational agencies

Marshall Islands. A Hawaii-based non-profit organization, Pacific Resources for Education and Learning (PREL), provides technical assistance in administering the competition for this program.

The authorizing statute specifies three separate formulas to be used in allocating remaining Title I LEA Grant funds, all of which are based primarily on the number of children from low-income families in each LEA, weighted by State per-pupil expenditures for education. Basic Grants are awarded to school districts with at least 10 poor children who make up at least 2 percent of enrollment, and thus spread funds thinly across virtually all LEAs. Funding for Basic Grants is statutorily fixed at the 1995 appropriation of roughly $6 billion, but this limit has been modified by appropriations language in recent years.

Concentration Grants provide additional funds to LEAs in which the number of poor children exceeds 6,500 or 15 percent of the total school-age population. Funding for Concentration Grants is statutorily fixed at the 1995 appropriation of roughly $670 million, but as with Basic Grants this limit has been modified by appropriations language.

The Targeted Grants formula weights child counts to make higher payments to school districts with high numbers or percentages of poor students. For example, the number of poor children exceeding 36.5 percent of the school-age population in an LEA is assigned a weighting factor of 4.0, generating a higher per-child award than the 1.0 factor applied when the number of poor children represents 14.3 percent or less of an LEA's school-age population. The authorizing statute requires the Targeted Grants formula to be used for allocating all LEA Grant funds in excess of the 1995 combined appropriation of $6.7 billion for Basic and Concentration Grants. However, this requirement has been overridden by appropriations language, and no funding has been appropriated for Targeted Grants.

In determining allocations under each of these formulas, the Department uses biennial Census Bureau estimates of the number of children from low-income families in each local educational agency. In fiscal year 1999, the Department for the first time used LEA-level poverty data to allocate Title I funds. In prior fiscal years allocations were based on county-level poverty data, with States using their own poverty measures— such as the number of children receiving free or reduced-price lunch—to make sub-allocations to LEAs.

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

States must withhold from their LEA Grant allocations amounts generated by annual counts of delinquent children in local institutions in order to operate State-administered projects in LEAs that have the highest dropout rates and that are located in areas serving large numbers of children in local correctional facilities. In fiscal year 1999, the 47 States with these counts reserved about $54 million for this purpose.

In addition, States are permitted to reserve up to 1 percent, or $400,000, whichever is greater, to cover SEA costs of administering Title I programs, and an additional 0.5 percent for State school improvement activities.

In fiscal year 2000, the Administration and the Congress also agreed to a separate $134 million appropriation for school improvement activities at the LEA level. The Department will allocate this appropriation to States in the same proportion as LEA Grants; States will then distribute all funds to LEAs with one or more schools identified for improvement or corrective action. These funds must be used for technical assistance and other activities designed to improve low-performing schools and to help such schools enable all students to meet challenging State standards. In addition, all LEAs receiving these funds must provide students enrolled in schools identified for improvement with the option to transfer to another public school within the LEA that has not been identified for improvement.

The Administration's Reauthorization Proposal

The Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999, the Administration's proposal to revise and reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), includes several changes designed to improve the effectiveness of the Title I Grants to LEAs program.

The reauthorization proposal would maintain the focus of Title I—first established in the 1994 reauthorization—on raising standards for all children, including the requirement that States implement assessments aligned with their standards by the 2000-01 school year. Title I schools would continue to use State standards and assessments to measure student performance and to guide changes in instruction, curriculum, and professional development aimed at improving that performance. Standards and assessments also would help States and districts better identify schools in need of help.

The reauthorization proposal would continue the emphasis on schoolwide programs as an effective way to help students in high-poverty schools meet challenging State standards. The proposal would retain the 50 percent poverty threshold for schoolwide programs, while encouraging greater use of comprehensive, research-based approaches for raising student achievement by reforming the entire school.

The major changes in the reauthorization proposal are in the areas of accountability, school improvement, and teacher quality.

Our proposal would encourage each State to develop a single, rigorous accountability system that holds all LEAs and schools, including Title I schools, accountable for making continuous and substantial gains in student performance and in the performance of the lowest-performing students. This statewide accountability system would be based on the State's content and student performance standards, and would include procedures for identifying and intervening in LEAs and schools that are not making gains in student performance, as well as recognition and rewards for successful LEAs and schools. States that do not operate such a system for all their schools would be required to develop one for their Title I schools.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

A critical component of the emphasis on accountability in the reauthorization bill is increased support for school improvement efforts. The proposal would require States to reserve 2.5 percent of their LEA Grant allocations (rising to 3.5 percent in 2003) for accountability and school improvement activities aimed at strengthening State and local capacity to turn around low-performing schools. At least 70 percent of these funds would go to districts to support more intensive interventions and stronger corrective actions in consistently low-performing districts and schools. States would give first priority in distributing the local share to LEAs with schools subject to corrective action and second priority to LEAs with schools identified for school improvement.

The remaining funds would help finance a State support system that could include, for example, school support teams, assistance from distinguished educators, and a peer review process to help districts and schools develop effective school improvement plans. States would be required first to assist LEAs subject to corrective action before providing support to LEAs identified as in need of improvement.

The Administration's school improvement proposal includes strong corrective actions to turn around consistently low-performing schools. Once a school is designated for corrective action, the LEA would be required to carry out one of the following measures: (1) implement a new curriculum that research has shown offers substantial promise of improving student achievement; (2) redesign or reconstitute the school, which may include reopening it as a charter school; or (3) close the school and allow its students to transfer. Districts also could allow students in schools subject to corrective action the option of transferring to a new school.

Teacher quality is the greatest single in-school factor in determining student success, and the Administration's reauthorization proposal includes several measures to improve instruction in Title I schools. First, the proposal would require all LEAs to use 5 percent of their allocations—rising to 10 percent in 2003—for professional development linked to challenging State standards. (Under current law, only schools identified for school improvement are required to devote a specific amount to professional development.) Second, all new teachers paid by Title I or working in a Title I school operating a schoolwide program would have to be certified in the field in which they teach, or have a bachelor's degree and be working toward full certification within three years. Third, all paraprofessionals would be required to hold at least a high school diploma or its equivalent, and by July 1, 2002, only paraprofessionals with at least two years of college would be able to assist teachers in the classroom by providing appropriate instructional help, such as one-on-one tutoring.

The three funding formulas used to make allocations under Title I Grants to LEAs—Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, and Targeted Grants—remain unchanged in the Administration's reauthorization proposal. The reauthorization proposal would improve targeting on the highest poverty schools and students by ensuring that at least 20 percent of Title I funds are allocated through the Targeted Grants formula. The proposal also would phase in a change that would make allocations to Puerto Rico on the same basis as allocations to the 50 States.

Grants to local educational agencies

Finally, the reauthorization proposal replaces the separate authorization of appropriations for evaluation with a National Activities provision that permits the Secretary to reserve up to .3 percent of funds appropriated for Title I programs for evaluations, management improvement activities undertaken in partnership with the States, technical assistance and dissemination efforts, and biennial updates of the poverty and population data used to make Title I allocations.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	Basic Grants ($000s)	Concentration Grants ($000s)	Targeted Grants ($000s)
1996	$6,046,266	$684,082	0
1997	6,273,212	1,022,020	0
1998	6,273,212	1,102,020	0
1999	6,574,000	1,158,397	0
2000	6,783,000[1]	1,158,397	0

[1] Includes $134,000 thousand for accountability grants.

FISCAL YEAR 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2001, the Administration requests $8.358 billion for Title I Grants to LEAs, an increase of $416.1 million or 5.2 percent over the 2000 appropriation level. The request would target greater resources to the highest-poverty schools and students, as recommended by the recently completed National Assessment of Title I, and help States, districts, and schools implement the changes called for in the Administration's ESEA reauthorization bill. In particular, the request would support expanded State and local accountability efforts aimed at turning around failing Title I schools.

The National Assessment showed that while the academic performance of low-achieving students in high-poverty schools has improved in recent years, a substantial achievement gap remains between students in high-poverty and low-poverty schools. In 1998, only one-third of students in high-poverty schools met or exceeded the Basic level in reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), compared to three-quarters of students in low-poverty schools. In mathematics the story was only slightly better, with just two-fifths of students in high-poverty schools scoring at or above the Basic level, compared with three-quarters of students in low-poverty schools. NAEP data also confirm that the concentration of poverty in a school, and not individual economic status, is the key factor in student academic performance. Poor students in low-poverty schools, while not reaching the levels of their non-poor peers, do achieve scores in reading and mathematics that are comparable to the national average for all students.

The National Assessment also showed that the program changes made by the 1994 Title I reauthorization improved targeting significantly, particularly at the within-district level. In the

1997-98 school year, 95 percent of the highest-poverty schools received Title I funds, up from 79 percent in the 1993-94 school year. However, while the number of schools served by Title I has grown, there appears to have been little increase in the intensity of services provided to Title I students. Average awards to schools have remained largely the same, strongly suggesting that the Title I allocation process continues to spread funds too thinly to make a real difference in helping disadvantaged students reach the same high standards as other students.

For this reason the Administration's request would allocate $1.668 billion through the Targeted Grants formula. The emphasis on Targeted Grants would deliver a larger share of Title I funds to high-poverty LEAs. For example, the request would provide a 12 percent increase in funding per formula child in high-poverty (51-75 percent) school districts, while reducing per-child allocations in the lowest poverty (0-25 percent) districts by 2.8 percent. Of the remaining funds, 85 percent would be distributed as Basic Grants and 15 percent as Concentration Grants, consistent with recent practice by Congressional appropriators.

In addition to driving more dollars to the highest-poverty districts and schools, Targeted Grants are a more equitable way to target funds than Concentration Grants. The 15-percent cut-off in Concentration Grants creates an inequitable "cliff effect" that provides funds to districts just above the 15 percent threshold but not for similar districts that fall a percentage point or two short of that threshold.

The distribution of Grants to LEAs under the Department's request assumes the application of the statutory hold-harmless provisions, which set a floor of 85 to 95 percent of prior year Basic Grant allocations, depending on LEA poverty rate. Fair targeting of LEA Grant funds depends on using the most current reliable data on the distribution of poor children—a principle recognized by the Congress in the 1994 ESEA reauthorization, which required the use of poverty data that are updated every two years rather than once a decade.

However, beginning in fiscal year 1998, when the biennial updates first took full effect, Congress has overridden the statutory provisions with a 100-percent hold-harmless requirement in appropriations law. This 100-percent hold-harmless negates the impact of the Census poverty updates and prevents Title I funds from flowing to States and school districts that are gaining poor children. In fiscal year 1999, Congress went a step further and required the continuation of Concentration Grant awards to LEAs that, because of declining percentages of poor students, are no longer eligible to receive such awards.

These provisions undermine the effectiveness of the Title I program by preventing larger awards, and in some cases any awards, to the high-poverty districts and schools that research shows have the greatest difficulty helping all students to reach challenging State standards. The Title I program can reach the ambitious goals set for it by the Congress only if Congress permits funds to flow—in accordance with the authorizing statute—to the neediest districts and schools based on the most recent poverty data.

The $416.1 million increase requested by the Administration also would provide significant new resources to help States, LEAs, and schools carry out the improvements in Title I called for in the Administration's reauthorization bill without reducing the level or intensity of services to students. For example, the additional funds would help LEAs meet the proposed requirement to use at least 5 percent of their allocations for professional development. The increase also would help pay for the expanded peer review process included in the Administration's reauthorization bill, which involves State-level review of LEA Title I plans and improvement plans and district-level review of all schoolwide and school improvement plans.

Accountability Grants

The request also would increase to $250 million the amount available to accelerate State and district efforts to improve accountability and turn around failing schools. In 1996-97, more than 7,000 schools, or about 16 percent of all Title I schools, were identified for improvement due to low student achievement and other factors. Unfortunately, the recent National Assessment of Title I specifically found that "the lack of capacity of state school support teams to assist schools in need of improvement under Title I is a major concern." The National Assessment also reported that less than half of schools identified as in need of improvement had received additional professional development or assistance.

The Administration believes that as more States phase in student performance standards and implement final assessments, it is more important than ever that low-performing schools have the resources needed to help their students meet those standards. This priority was reflected in the $134 million fiscal year 2000 appropriation for accountability grants, and the Administration is again proposing appropriations language to ensure continued and expanded support for school improvement efforts regardless of the outcome of reauthorization.

The $250 million request for accountability grants would help make sure that once schools are identified for improvement, States, LEAs, and schools have the resources needed to make significant changes to reverse declines in student achievement. The Administration's proposal would require States to distribute at least 70 percent of their accountability grants to LEAs, giving first priority to LEAs with schools in corrective action and second priority to LEAs with those schools identified for improvement that are farthest from meeting State standards. States would use their 30-percent share of accountability grants to take corrective action against LEAs and schools and to provide technical assistance to schools identified for improvement.

In addition to school improvement efforts, the accountability language would help make sure that no Title I student is trapped in a chronically failing school. All school districts participating in Title I, whether or not they receive accountability grant funds, would be required to implement public school choice programs that allow students in Title I schools identified for corrective action to transfer to another school within the LEA that is not subject to corrective action. LEAs would be required to take at least one other corrective action in addition to providing a choice option, and would not be permitted to use more than 10 percent of any accountability grant funds to pay transportation costs. LEAs would not be required to implement choice plans if prohibited by State or local law or LEA policy.

Grants to local educational agencies

National Activities

The Department is requesting $20 million under Title I Grants to LEAs for National Activities, less than the .3 percent permitted under the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal. A total of approximately $22.5 million would be reserved from the total amount of funds requested for all Title I programs, including Grants to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), Even Start, the State Migrant and Neglected and Delinquent programs, and programs funded under the Reading Excellence Account. Funds would be allocated according to evaluation needs and not in proportion to each program's contribution to the .3 percent set-aside.

National Activities funds would be used for evaluations, management improvement activities undertaken in partnership with the States, technical assistance and dissemination efforts, and biennial updates of the poverty and population data used to make Title I allocations.
In particular, the new authority would emphasize evaluation activities consistent with the need to determine program effectiveness under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, as well as the development of data systems that support continuous improvement at the State, LEA, and school levels.

Approximately $10 million would be used for a long-term plan for evaluating Title I programs that is currently under development. The plan will build on the recently completed National Assessment of Title I, with an emphasis on using student outcomes to assess program performance, building evaluation capacity at the State and local levels, and identifying exemplary practices for improving the performance of students and schools.

In particular, the required implementation of final assessments in 2000-01 will bring a new focus on State assessment results in tracking student performance outcomes under Title I. The Department also will take a more comprehensive look at the quality of State standards and accountability systems, with the goal of creating a set of benchmarks by which to measure the degree to which States are implementing rigorous and effective standards and assessment systems. At the school level, studies will focus on the development of performance indicators for measuring overall school quality, classroom instruction, and professional development. A related area of investigation will be further examination of programs and strategies for improving the achievement of low-performing students, with a specific emphasis on the effectiveness of research-based school reform models, scientifically based reading instruction, and extended learning time. Finally, the Department will continue to look at the impact and effectiveness of Title I funding formulas in targeting resources to the highest-poverty LEAs and schools.

These funds also would support technical assistance efforts aimed at building evaluation capacity at the State and local levels. These efforts would include the development and implementation of an Integrated Performance and Benchmarking System that would use electronic data transmission to assemble and analyze more timely and useful data on program participation and performance, while at the same time reducing the data collection burden on States, districts, and schools. Other capacity-building activities include the improvement of data disaggregation and reporting for special populations, including migrant and neglected or delinquent students.

In addition, the National Activities set-aside under LEA Grants would help finance Title I evaluations of the Migrant, Neglected and Delinquent, Even Start, and Reading Excellence programs, which would be authorized under Title I of the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal and make important contributions to the success of the LEA Grants program. For example, the LEA Grant set-aside would help pay for the first year of the fourth national evaluation of the Even Start program, which offers family literacy services in Title I schools. Funds also would be used to expand the Even Start Experimental Design Study to include an assessment of the effectiveness of research-based early reading programs.

LEA Grant funds also would support a $3.8 million request for evaluation of the Reading Excellence program, which focuses on the helping children read well—a goal of the LEA Grants program. Funds would support continuation of an implementation study, as well as new activities such as an early childhood longitudinal study that will track program outcomes and studies to determine the effectiveness of professional development and reading practices drawn from scientifically based reading research.

The National Activities request also includes up to $3.5 million to support ongoing biennial Census updates of LEA poverty levels.

The request for Title I Grants to LEAs would continue the policy, established by recent Congressional appropriations practice, of delaying the availability of most funding until the following fiscal year. Under the request, approximately $6.2 billion of fiscal year 2001 funding (the same as the 2000 level) would become available for obligation, and thus be scored as budget authority, in fiscal year 2002.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information, including goals; indicators; targets; and, where possible, an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2001 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Other performance data for this program are included in the Department's Annual Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

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

Objective: Performance of the lowest-achieving students in the highest-poverty public schools will increase substantially in reading and math.

Grants to local educational agencies

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
Between 1994 and 2002, the performance of the lowest-achieving students in the highest-poverty public schools will increase substantially on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading and math.				
Reading				
■ In 2002, reading scale scores for 4th grade students in the bottom 25th percentile will increase by one grade level, or 10 scale score points. *1998 baseline: 192*				202
■ In 2002, reading scale scores for 8th grade students in the bottom 25th percentile will increase by one grade level, or 10 scale score points. *1998 baseline: 239*				249
■ In 2002, 50% of 4th grade students in the highest-poverty public schools will score at or above the *Basic* level. *1998 baseline: 32%*				50%
Mathematics				
■ In 2000, math scale scores for 4th grade students in the bottom 25th percentile will increase by one grade level, or 10 points. *1996 baseline: 201*		211		
■ In 2000, math scale scores for 8th grade students in the bottom 25th percentile will increase by one grade level, or 10 points. *1996 baseline: 247*		257		
■ In 2000, 50% of 4th grade students in the highest-poverty schools will score at or above the *Basic* level. *1996 baseline: 42%*		50%		

Children in the highest-poverty schools, where at least 75 percent of students are from low-income families, tend to start school academically behind children in low-poverty schools (those with less than 25 percent poverty). Test scores reported by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), a set of standardized exams given regularly to a representative sample of 9-, 13-, and 17-year olds, show that average achievement levels in high-poverty schools are two to four grades behind those in low-poverty schools.

Objective: Increase the number of Title I schools using standards-based reform and effective strategies to enable all students to reach State and local performance standards.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to local educational agencies

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
By the year 2000, all schools receiving Title I funds will report the use of content standards to guide curriculum and instruction. *1998 baseline: 72%*		100%		

The use of content and performance standards to guide curriculum and instruction is at the heart of the effort to improve the effectiveness of Title I and help disadvantaged students meet the same challenging academic standards as other students. Data are based on reports by school principals from the National Longitudinal Survey of Schools.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
By the year 2001, 70% of Title I schools will operate programs offering extended learning time. 1998 baseline: 41%			70%	

Under Title I, LEAs and schools must give primary consideration to instructional arrangements that allow participating children to receive Title I services in addition to all the classroom instruction that other children receive. An effective way to achieve this goal is through extended learning time such as before- and after-school programs, weekend instruction, and summer school, yet most Title I schools do not offer such programs. Performance data will be available from the 1999 National Longitudinal Survey of Schools.

Objective: States and districts will implement standards-based accountability systems and provide effective support for school improvement efforts.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
By the year 2001, 80% of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement will report receiving effective assistance from their districts and States. 1999 baseline: 47%			80%	

The National Longitudinal Survey of Schools will continue to be the source of data for this indicator.

Grants to local educational agencies

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands, except per-child amounts)

LEA Poverty Rate		1999	2000	2001
0 – 25%	# of LEAs	10,438	10,438	10,438
	Dollars	$3,353,977	$3,384,722	$3,294,060
	% of Total $	44.13	44.13	41.44
	$ Per Formula Child	$755	$762	$741
26 – 50%	# of LEAs	2,614	2,614	2,614
	Dollars	$3,430,952	$3,463,111	$3,731,909
	% of Total $	45.15	45.15	46.95
	$ Per Formula Child	$762	$769	$829
51 – 75%	# of LEAs	229	229	229
	Dollars	$807,324	$815,488	$914,331
	% of Total $	10.62	10.63	11.50
	$ Per Formula Child	$652	$658	$738
76 – 100%	# of LEAs	16	16	16
	Dollars	$7,177	$7,260	$8,521
	% of Total $	.09	.09	.11
	$ Per Formula Child	$782	$883	$928
LEA Allocation Subtotal		$7,599,430	$7,670,581	$7,948,821
BIA/Outlying Areas		71,734	79,379	83,375
Part D, Subpart 2		57,733	53,937	55,304
Accountability Grants		0	134,000	250,000
Census Updates		3,500	3,500	0
National Activities		0	0	20,000
Grants to LEAs Total		7,732,397	7,941,397	8,357,500
Schools receiving Title I funds		45,500	46,000	46,500
Schoolwide programs:				
Number of eligible schools		26,190	26,190	26,190
Percent of participating schools		74.1%	74.5%	75.2%
Number operating programs		19,400	19,500	19,700
Targeted assistance programs				
Number of participating schools		28,607	27,822	26,905

Grants to local educational agencies

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES - continued

	1999	2000	2001
Students served (in millions):[1]			
In schoolwide programs	9.7	9.9	10.1
In targeted assistance programs	3.0	3.0	3.1
Total	12.7	12.9	13.2

[1] The most recent State-reported participation data indicate that approximately 11.3 million children received Title I services in the 1996-97 school year. Participation has increased sharply since the poverty threshold for schoolwide programs was lowered from 75 percent to 60 percent in 1995 and to 50 percent in 1996.

Capital expenses for private school children
(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Section 1120(e))

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): 0[1]

Budget authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
$12,000	0	$12,000

[1] The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000; no new authorizing language is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the Title I statute, school districts must provide services for eligible private school children that are equitable in comparison to the services and other benefits provided for public school participants. The extra administrative costs of providing equitable Title I services for private school children are taken "off the top" of the district's Title I allocation. However, after a 1985 Supreme Court ruling (Aguilar v. Felton) prohibited public-school employees from providing instructional services on the premises of a religious school, school districts needed to create alternative arrangements to provide Title I services to private school students at neutral classroom sites.

The Capital Expenses program was created in 1989 as a response to the Court's 1985 decision. The program provides formula funds to State educational agencies (SEAs) to help local educational agencies (LEAs) pay for the capital costs incurred in providing Title I services for private-school students in a manner allowable under the original Court decision. Until 1995, the program focused on reimbursing LEAs for past expenditures associated with Felton. This objective had largely been accomplished when the program was reauthorized in 1994 to refocus on the current costs of serving private-school children; since 1995, reimbursement for prior-year expenditures has been allowed only if an LEA demonstrates to the SEA that its current costs have been met. LEAs have used program funds for such costs as transporting private-school students to and from neutral classroom sites and purchasing and leasing portable classrooms and vans.

In 1997, in Agostini v. Felton, the Supreme Court overturned the original Felton decision. Under the more recent decision, LEAs can now provide Title I services "on site" at religious schools. Since that time, however, Congress has continued to appropriate funds for Capital Expenses in order to enable districts to pay the remaining costs (for vans and other rental sites) under long-term commitments they entered into prior to the new decision.

State allocations are based on the count of private school children served by Title I in the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available. In 1996-97, about 135,400 private-school children participated in Title I programs.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	($000s)
1996	$38,119
1997	41,119
1998	41,119
1999	24,000
2000	12,000

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

Because the Capital Expenses program would not be continued as a categorical authority under the Administration's reauthorization bill, no funds are requested for 2001.

The Supreme Court's June 1997 Agostini v. Felton decision removed the constitutional necessity for costly arrangements to provide Title I services to private school children at neutral sites. The Department proposed phasing out the program, and Congress has agreed with this approach, reducing the Capital Expenses appropriation from $41million in 1998 to $24 million in 1999 to $12 million in 2000. Following that decision, the need for Capital Expenses dropped very significantly. In 1998, about half of the States turned back all or some of their Capital Expenses funds to the Department.

Capital Expenses appropriations for the four years since the Court's action, fiscal years 1997 through 2000, provided more than $118 million to make arrangements to implement the new decision. The Department believes that a 4-year transition period is sufficient to give districts the time they need to terminate leases and complete the transition to serving private school children at more convenient and less costly locations. School districts may continue to reserve funds "off the top" of their annual Title I allocations to cover extra expenses involved in providing services to private-school students.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
Average State award	$462	$233	0
Range of awards	0 - $3,966	0 - $1,983	0

Even Start
(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part B)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined[1]

Budget authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
$150,000	$150,000	0

[1] The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2000; new authorizing language is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Even Start program supports projects that provide educational services to low-income families, including parents eligible for services under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act and their children from birth through age 8. The program improves the educational opportunities of children and their parents in low-income areas by integrating early childhood education, adult education, and parenting education into "family literacy" programs.

The Department allocates Even Start funds to States, based on their relative shares of Title I, Part A funds. State educational agencies (SEAs) make competitive subgrants to partnerships of local educational agencies and other organizations, giving priority to proposals that target areas designated by the Administration as empowerment zones or enterprise communities under Pub. L. 103-66 or propose to serve families in other high-poverty areas.

The statute also requires that grant funds be equitably distributed among urban and rural areas and that local projects assume an increasing share of program costs over the 4-year subgrant period, beginning with 10 percent in the first year and ending with 40 percent in the fourth. (For projects receiving a second grant, the match is held at 50 percent in years 5 through 8. A new amendment to the Even Start statute in the Omnibus Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2000 (P.L. 106-113) limits the Federal cost share to 35 percent after 8 years.) SEAs may reserve up to 5 percent for costs incurred in administering the program.

Five percent of the annual appropriation is set aside for programs serving migrant children, the Outlying Areas, Indian tribes and tribal organizations, and a grant to a women's prison. Up to 3 percent is reserved for evaluation and technical assistance. Currently, the statute also authorizes $10 million for competitive grants to States for Even Start statewide family literacy initiatives; these grants are required to be funded from the appropriation for Reading Excellence programs.

Even Start

The Administration's Reauthorization Proposal

The Administration's reauthorization proposal would:

- Bring the purposes, program elements, and application requirements in line with 1998 amendments to Even Start that emphasize research-based literacy instruction and stronger State and local accountability for improved family literacy outcomes.

- Broaden the categories of special populations eligible for funding under the 5 percent set-aside, thus permitting ED to fund projects benefiting a wider range of isolated, hard-to-reach populations, such as families that are homeless or that have children with severe disabilities. The proposal deletes the requirement for one project in a prison housing women and their young children.

- Add requirements to strengthen the qualifications of instructional staff recruited for local Even Start projects. Newly hired teachers would be required to have a bachelor's degree and be certified in the field in which they teach, or be enrolled in a program to obtain certification within 2 years. In addition, within 4 years after the enactment of a reauthorized ESEA, any Even Start staffer providing instruction would be required to hold a bachelor's degree. Also, by July 1, 2002, all paraprofessionals would be required to have at least a high school diploma or its equivalent, and only paraprofessionals with at least two years of college could provide instructional support services (under a teacher's direction).

- Authorize States to continue funding for two additional years, beyond the previous limit of 8 years, for not more than two projects that are highly successful and that have the potential to serve as models for other projects. The Federal share for those projects would be limited to 40 percent the first year and 30 percent the second.

- Hold States accountable for improving the quality of local programs by: (1) specifying a deadline for the development of State program quality indicators that local programs will use to measure progress; and (2) requiring a one-time State plan that includes (or describes progress toward developing) the indicators and describes how the State will use the indicators to help projects implement program elements, conduct subgrant competitions, and coordinate resources to improve family literacy services.

- Delete requirements that the Secretary carry out research into the components of successful family literacy services and disseminate the results through the National Institute for Literacy.

- Permit a reservation of 1 percent for technical assistance, program improvement, and replication activities, but deletes evaluation from the list of authorized activities. (Evaluation of all Title I programs, including Even Start, would be supported through a reservation of up to 0.3 percent of the total Title I appropriation.)

Even Start

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	($000s)
1996	$101,997
1997	101,992
1998	124,000
1999	135,000
2000	150,000

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2001, the Administration requests $150 million, the same amount as the 2000 appropriation, to provide States with funding for over 900 State-awarded projects. Because the Even Start program has received a 47 percent increase since 1997, States now have the ability to fund many more projects than was the case three years ago. Level funding will give States the opportunity to absorb those increases and to focus on developing and implementing State performance indicators for all projects, as required by 1998 amendments in Even Start.

The Department's 2001 request also includes funding, under the School Improvement Programs account, for a proposed new Early Childhood Educators Professional Development Grants program that will complement Even Start. By focusing on professional development for early childhood educators and caregivers who are working with young children in high-poverty communities, this program would reinforce Even Start aims and the Department's response to national efforts to improve school readiness, empower parents, and help every child read independently by the end of third grade.

The National Academy of Sciences' 1998 report, Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children, provides strong evidence that children who receive early support from parents and early childhood educators in language and cognitive development have much higher reading achievement in elementary school. The report also notes that children with reading problems in the primary grades are likely to come from poor families and have parents with low levels of literacy. Even Start focuses on those families, reaching a high-need population that requires extensive support to promote family literacy. At least 70 percent of Even Start families earn less than $10,000 a year, approximately 90 percent live below the poverty line, and most receive public assistance. In 1997-98, each project served an average of 46 families, a decrease from 54 families in 1995-96. The Department is encouraging projects to provide intensive services, even if it means serving fewer families.

As a preliminary plan, the Department would reserve about $800,000 from Even Start funds for national technical assistance, including: training for local project personnel and State Even Start coordinators; short-term projects to address identified needs and problems across sites; and assistance to help States identify and adapt quality and performance indicators to monitor and evaluate local projects. In addition, funds would support distance learning approaches to help projects intensify adult literacy services and parenting education for parents in isolated rural areas and in urban areas that, because of welfare-to-work programs, have less time for center-based instruction.

Under the Administration's Title I reauthorization proposal, Even Start evaluation activities would be funded from a set-aside of up to 0.3 percent from the combined appropriation for all Title I programs. Up to $2 million from that set-aside (including $450,000 in Even Start funds, or 0.3 percent of the total Even Start request) would be used to support fiscal year 2001 national Even Start evaluation activities. These funds would cover two major activities: the first year of the fourth national evaluation of the program and an impact evaluation of promising research-based early reading programs in Even Start.

Research has shown that early literacy skills obtained by young children before school are the best predictor of later school success. Consequently, in addition to the national evaluation of the program, fiscal year 2001 funds will also be used to fully fund an addition to the current Even Start Experimental Design Study (EDS) to include an impact study of promising research-based early reading programs. These promising programs are selected using criteria for high-quality programs that support early literacy based on research findings of effectiveness. Even Start State coordinators nominate promising projects based on these criteria, and then outside experts validate the nominated programs for their conformity with the criteria. Validated programs and sites are incorporated into the data collection for the EDS starting in 2000-01. The original EDS sites will be used as a comparison group for the new research-based reading sites.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information, including goals; indicators; targets; and, where possible, an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2001 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Other performance data for this program are included in the Department's Annual Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

Performance goal: To help break the cycle of poverty and illiteracy by improving the educational opportunities of the Nation's low-income families, through a unified family literacy program that integrates early childhood education, adult literacy or adult basic education, and parenting education.

Objective: The literacy of participating families will improve.

Even Start

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
By fall 2001, 60 percent of Even Start children will attain significant gains on measures of language development and reading readiness. *Baseline: In 1995-96, 45% of children achieved moderate to large gains on a test of language development.*			60%	

Objective: Local Even Start projects will provide high-quality, comprehensive instructional and support services to all families in a cost-effective manner.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
By fall 2001, half of projects will offer at least 60 hours of adult education per month, at least 20 hours of parenting education per month, and at least 65 hours of early childhood education per month. *Baseline: In 1995-96, half of projects offered at least 32 hours of adult education per month, at least 13 hours of parenting education per month, and at least 34 hours of early childhood education per month.*			Adult Ed. -- 60 hrs. Parenting Ed. -- 20 hrs. Early Childhood Ed. -- 65 hrs.	

Data for both of the indicators above will be collected through the Department's ongoing National Even Start Evaluation.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
Amount distributed to States:	$125,250	$139,500	$141,250
Average State award	$2,409	$2,683	$2,716
Range of awards	$626 - $14,930	$697 - $16,672	$706 - $17,436
Reservation for State administration	$6,263	$6,975	$7,062
New State-awarded projects:			
Total funding	$45,337	$36,975	$26,338
Average award	$150	$150	$150
Number of projects	302	247	178

Even Start

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (continued)
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
Continued projects:			
Total funding	$73,650	$95,550	$107,850
Average award	$150	$150	$150
No. second-year projects	170	302	247
No. third-year projects	165	170	302
No. fourth-year projects	156	165	170
Number of projects:			
Migrant projects	16	23	23
Indian tribes projects	13	13	14
State-awarded projects	793	884	897
Total	822	920	934
Evaluation and technical assistance	$3,000	$3,000	$1,250 [1]
Set-aside for migrant children, the Outlying Areas, and Indian tribes	$6,736	$7,475	$7,475
Set-aside for State literacy initiatives	0	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	$14	$25	$25

[1] This amount reflects an estimated $800,000 for technical assistance, and $450,000 for evaluation (equal to 0.3 percent of the total 2001 Even Start request). Under the Administration's Title I reauthorization proposal, the Department may reserve up to 1 percent from the Even Start appropriation for technical assistance. Evaluation of all Title I programs, including Even Start, would be funded from a reservation of up to 0.3 percent of the combined total appropriation for these programs.

State agency programs: Migrant program
(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part C)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined[1]

Budget Authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
$354,689	$380,000	+$25,311

[1] The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000; new authorizing language is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Migrant Education program (MEP) provides financial assistance to State educational agencies (SEAs) to establish and improve programs of education for children of migratory farmworkers and fishers that enable them to meet the same high academic standards as other children. To help achieve this objective, program services assist migratory children overcome the educational disruption and other problems that result from repeated moves. Program funds also promote coordination of needed services across States, and encourage greater access for migratory children to services available under the Title I LEA Grants and other ESEA programs, so that MEP funds can be used for services not already available from those programs to meet the unique needs of migrant students. The most recent child count data reported by States indicate that, in the 1997-98 school year, 752,689 migrant children were eligible to receive services.

Funds are allocated through a statutory formula on the basis of each State's per-pupil expenditure for education and its count of migratory children, aged 3 through 21, residing within the State and an adjustment for those students receiving summer services. Migratory children who have made a "qualifying move" within the last three years are generally eligible to be counted and served by the program. The statute also authorizes the Secretary to set aside up to $6 million from the annual appropriation for contracts and grants to improve inter- and intra-State migrant coordination activities, including academic credit accrual and exchange programs for migrant students. Appropriations language for the last several fiscal years permitted up to $8.5 million for inter and intra-State coordination contracts and grants.

The Department is required to consult with States receiving allocations of $1 million or less about increasing the cost-effectiveness of their programs by entering into inter-state consortium arrangements. By law, the Secretary reserves up to $1.5 million a year from coordination funds for incentive grants to such consortia, and must award at least 10 of those grants to States with small allocations. Appropriations language for the last several fiscal years permitted up to $3 million for incentive grants. In fiscal year 1995, when incentive grants were first awarded, 15 SEAs received grants as a result of their participation in 5 multi-State consortia. These consortia reduced administrative costs of individual States by almost $1 million, thus increasing the amount of funds available for services to migratory children. Most recently, 36 SEAs received fiscal year 1999 incentive grants as a result of their participation in 12 consortia. All of the incentive grant funds are used for direct services to eligible migrant children. Overall, the grantees reported that approximately 44,000 children in fiscal year 1996 and 49,000 children in fiscal year 1997 received additional instructional support services through the incentive grants.

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

The Administration's Reauthorization Proposal

The Administration's reauthorization proposal would change provisions relating to the count of migratory children, which are currently based on estimates and full-time equivalents (FTE) of these children. Instead, the child count would be based on the number of eligible children aged 3 through 21 residing in the State in the previous year, plus the number of those children who received services under the program in summer or intersession programs provided by the State. The revised formula would be simple to understand and administer, minimize the data-collection burden on States, and encourage the identification and recruitment of eligible children. The double weight given to children served in summer or intersession programs would reflect the greater cost of those programs and would encourage States to provide intensive summer services.

The reauthorization proposal would establish minimums and maximums for annual State allocations. No State would be allocated more than 120 percent, or less than 80 percent, of its allocation from the previous year, except that each State would receive at least $200,000. These changes would ameliorate the disruptive effects of substantial increases and decreases in State child counts from year to year. The $200,000 minimum would ensure that each participating State receives enough funds to carry out an effective program.

Current law limits Puerto Rico's allocation by capping its average per pupil expenditure at 32 percent of the lowest average per pupil expenditure of any of the 50 States. The Administration's proposal would also phase in a change that would make allocations to Puerto Rico on the same basis as allocations to the 50 States.

Finally, the reauthorization proposal would make changes to improve interstate coordination activities. Chief among these changes would be an increase in the maximum amount that the Secretary could reserve each year from the appropriation to support coordination activities, from $6 million to $10 million. The reauthorization bill would also increase the maximum amount that could be reserved for incentive grants from $1.5 million to $3 million, to allow grants to more States. The increased levels would be consistent with the higher amount provided in the Department's appropriation acts in recent fiscal years, and would increase the amount available for State incentive grants and for other inter-State or intra-State coordination activities, including efforts to assist States and LEAs in transferring the school records of migratory children.

State agency programs: Migrant program

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	($000s)
1996	$305,473
1997	305,473
1998	305,473
1999	354,689
2000	354,689

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2001, the Administration proposes $380 million for Migrant Education, a $25.3 million (7 percent) increase over the 2000 appropriation level, to support programs that promote coordination of Federal resources for migratory children and provide services that address their unique needs. The request reflects the high costs of identifying highly mobile migratory children and youth and providing special support services and learning arrangements that meet the needs of this especially disadvantaged, hard-to-serve population. From 1994 to 1998, the number of eligible migrant children increased from 696,000 to almost 753,000. The requested increase would allow the Migrant Education Program to reach more of this population and increase the intensity of services to migrant children. Hispanic children account for 85 percent of all currently eligible migrant students, making this program one of the largest efforts to improve the educational status of the Hispanic school-age population and a key component of the Administration's effort to improve Hispanic education.

The poverty and mobility (and often limited English proficiency) of the migrant student population combine to result in a need for educational services that go well beyond services traditionally supported with State and local education budgets. Over two-thirds of migratory children come from households with incomes below the Census poverty level. About one in four enroll in school more than 30 days after the academic year begins and leave before it ends. More than 40 percent of migrant children lack proficiency in oral English to an extent that it interferes with their classroom work. An estimated 45 to 65 percent of migrant students drop out of school while, nationally, only 25 percent of children fail to graduate. With over 36 percent one or more years behind grade level, migrant students begin to drop out as early as the middle-school grades.

Most importantly in terms of need, migrant children, by definition, move across school district and State boundaries. This movement, connected to the production of food distributed in interstate commerce, provides a classic rationale for Federal intervention. Without Federal legislation and support, school districts have historically been unlikely to: (1) find and enroll migrant children, (2) provide the normal range of services to children who live in their communities and attend their schools for brief periods of time; or (3) grapple with either the school interruption problems faced by migrant children or their needs for special summer programs. The migrant program has significant costs not usually covered by regular Title I Grants to LEAs, since no single school district or State is responsible for the education of the most highly mobile children. These special costs include those associated with serving out-of-school teenagers and "emancipated youth" who travel without a parent or guardian to obtain migratory work in the fields and processing plants.

State agency programs: Migrant program

The total eligible population is increasing, since many States are conducting aggressive activities to identify and recruit migrant children into educational programs. With the requested increase, States would be able to expand programs and services to current participants and to eligible migrant children not currently served by the program. For example, the additional funds could be used to expand the hours of operation of after-school and summer programs and to mount services where none exist. States would have funds to expand family literacy programs to provide child care for children too young for school (thus enabling older siblings to attend classes or summer programs), or to provide services that extend the day for existing programs such as Head Start or locally funded summer pre-school programs. Since mounting summer services involves extraordinary costs, the increased funding would permit programs to lease facilities convenient to work sites or to migrant housing, pay for transportation essential to bring children to services, pay the costs of insurance involved in operating programs for young children, provide two meals a day, and hire staff essential to conducting successful programs.

Additional funds could also support efforts at the secondary level to raise migrant students' graduation rate. Examples of services made possible include systems to keep track of credits needed for graduation, after school tutoring, and portable courses of instruction.

At the 2001 request level, $370 million would support the basic State Grants program. In addition, as a preliminary plan, the Department would reserve about $10 million for Migrant Coordination activities, including $3 million for consortium incentive grants. Incentive grants must be used for additional direct services. These grants would encourage participation in consortium arrangements that reduce administrative costs. The remaining coordination funds would support projects across States to identify and recruit migratory children, facilitate State consortium arrangements, support States' efforts to transfer the school records of migratory children, and carry out other "networking" and training projects to serve migratory children more effectively and efficiently.

Under the Administration's Title I reauthorization proposal, evaluation of the Migrant program would be funded from a set-aside of up to .3 percent from the combined appropriation for all Title I programs. As a preliminary plan, about $900,000 would be used to help identify, collect, and analyze data for program performance and student outcomes and assist staff in monitoring key indicators.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information, including goals; indicators; targets; and, where possible, targets, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2001 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Other performance data for this program are included in the Department's Annual Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

State agency programs: Migrant program

Performance goal: To assist migrant students reach challenging standards.

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

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
Increasing percentages of migrant students will meet or exceed the basic and proficient levels in State and local assessments (where in place). *School Year 1996-97 interim baseline: At least 60% scored at or above basic levels in reading in the elementary and middle grades and at or above basic levels in math in the elementary and middle grades.*				

In 1996-97, statewide assessment data disaggregated by migrant status were available for two of the three States serving the greatest number of migrant students. Data for the school year 1997-98 will become available in early 2000. Targets will be established when a second data point is available, with more States reporting disaggregated data for migrant students. The Council of Chief States School Officers' (CCSSO) State Education Indicators Report will be the continuing source of data for this indicator.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
The number of States that include migrant children in State assessments linked to high standards will increase, reaching all States that receive MEP funds in 2001. *School Year 1995-96 baseline: 11 States.*			52	52

The CCSSO State Education Indicators Report shows that, for school year 1996-97, 15 States had disaggregated assessment data for migrant students. These reports are the continuing source of data for this indicator; an update for the 1997-98 school year will be available in January 2000.

Objective: States and local districts will provide education services outside the regular school term to help migrant students achieve to high standards.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
The number of migrant out-of-school youth served during summer, intersession, and extended time programs will increase. School Year *1995-96 baseline: 7,593 eligible youth served.*	14,500	15,000	15,500	16,000

The number of out-of-school migrant youth participating in summer programs continues to increase. For school year 1996-97 13,504 out-of-school youth were served in summer programs. The most recent MEP State Performance Report shows another increase to 14,297 for school year 1997-98. MEP State reports will be the continuing source of data for this indicator.

Objective: The MEP will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of services to migrant children through more effective coordination at the State level.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
States will demonstrate increased interstate coordination to improve educational continuity for migrant students by increasing the number of students served by States receiving incentive grants. *Baseline: In FY 95 approximately 22,000 students were served by State incentive grants. In FY 96 the number of students served increased to 44,000.*	54,000	58,000	62,000	66,000

The number of States receiving incentive grants continues to increase. In fiscal year 1997, approximately 49,000 students were served by State incentive grants. The objective calls for coordination to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of services. The above indicator addresses efficiency but not necessarily effectiveness. Improvements designed to assess effectiveness will be addressed in the 2000 Data Improvement Plan. The data for this indicator are collected from the annual performance reports on each State's migrant program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
Number of students served	718,000	718,000	762,660
SEA program:	$346,189	$346,189	$370,000
Average State award	$6,657	$7,144	$7,500
Range of awards	$108 - $103,467	$108 - $103,467	$200- $107,143
Coordination activities:			
Consortium Incentive grants	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000
Migrant technology projects	$3,400	$3,400	0
Other inter- and intra-State activities	$2,100	$2,100	$6,100
Evaluation	0	0	$900

State agency programs: Neglected and delinquent
(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I, Part D, Subpart 1)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined[1]

Budget Authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
$42,000	$42,000	0

[1] The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000; new authorizing language is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

Like other Title I programs, this program requires institutions to gear their services to the high State standards that all children are expected to meet. All juvenile facilities may operate institutionwide education programs in which they use Title I funds in combination with other available Federal and State funds. The institutionwide option allows juvenile institutions to serve a larger proportion of their eligible population and also to align their programs more closely with other education services in order to meet participants' educational and occupational preparation needs. States may reserve not more than 10 percent of their allocation for projects to help N and D participants make the transition from State institutions to locally operated programs. The Administration's reauthorization proposal would make only minor changes to the program.

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

State agency programs: Neglected and delinquent

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	($000s)
1996	$39,311
1997	39,311
1998	39,311
1999	40,311
2000	42,000

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2001, the Administration proposes $42 million for the N and D program, which helps institutionalized school-aged youth gain academic and employment skills so that they can return to school and obtain employment after they are released from State institutions. The request would maintain services for an extremely needy and isolated population. At the requested level, State institutions will have sufficient resources to maintain institutionwide programs, first authorized in 1995, in order to integrate N and D activities with other education programs supported with Federal, State, and local funds.

This program ties in closely with the Administration's educational goals related to reading and math, professional development, and clear standards of accountability. The population served is extremely disadvantaged and isolated, and continues to grow. Most have experienced failure in school before entering the program and need skills that will help them reenter school or obtain a job after release. The most recent evaluation of the program (1991) showed that: (1) about half of program participants enrolled in school when they left the institution, but many subsequently dropped out; and (2) most participants found jobs after being released, but they were typically low-paying, and about two-thirds of employed youth had more than one job. Data from the National Center for Juvenile Justice show that the number of juvenile delinquency cases has increased by 20 percent between 1990 and 1995. In terms of academic achievement, the youth in this group are on average three years behind in grade level and generally lack job skills.

Under the Administration's reauthorization bill, the Department would be permitted to retain, from all Title I programs, .3 percent for evaluation. For 2001, the Department plans to reserve about $300,000 for evaluation activities. Funds would be used to provide technical assistance to States to help improve State evaluations of the effects of services funded by the Title I Neglected and Delinquent program and also improve State capacity to collect and use data on services being provided to incarcerated youth and their impact following release.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information, including goals; indicators; targets; and, where possible, targets, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the

State agency programs: Neglected and delinquent

resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2001 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Other performance data for this program are included in the Department's Annual Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

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

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

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
An increasing number of States will show that Neglected or Delinquent students are obtaining General Equivalency Diplomas and high school course credits. *Baseline will be established in 2000.*				

A 1998 feasibility study conducted by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, of seven States, found available data to inform the design of substantive evaluations to ascertain the impact of correctional education services on incarcerated youth. For example, the study determined that, with assistance, some States could provide reliable data on drop-out rates, recidivism, diploma and degree completions, and employment. A one-time study of State agency activities will provide baseline data on the number of GED's and course credits completed by students served by this program. Data to measure subsequent progress will be obtained through periodic surveys of State agencies.

Objective: Institutions and programs will demonstrate overall educational reform that better meets the needs of N, D, and at-risk children.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
Increased percent of institutions will operate institution-wide programs. *School Year 1996-97 baseline: Approximately 9% of N or D facilities are institution-wide programs.*				

A 1996 survey conducted by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, of seven youth authorities in five States, showed that two jurisdictions used "targeted assistance" programs exclusively, three operated institutionwide programs, and two operated a mix of programs. Data on the institutionwide option, first authorized in 1994, will be obtained from annual State performance reports and Title I surveys of State implementation. The 1998 feasibility study, conducted by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, found that, with assistance,

State agency programs: Neglected and delinquent

States could make reliable data available to evaluate the relative benefits of targeted-assistance versus institution-wide programming. The baseline is from the 1998 Title I State performance report. Targets will be established after the 1997-98 data are available.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

	1999	2000	2001
Number of participating institutions	400	400	400
Estimated number of students served	197,000	200,000	200,000
Average Federal contribution			
Per child	$205	$210	$210

Evaluation
(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Section 1501)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): 0[1]

Budget authority ($000s):

	2000	2001	Change
	$8,900	0	-$8,900

[1] The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000; no new authorizing legislation is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

The Evaluation appropriation supports large-scale national evaluations that examine how Title I is contributing to improved student performance at the State, local educational agency (LEA), and school levels; short-term studies that document promising approaches or models; and other activities to help States and LEAs implement Title I requirements.

Mandated major evaluation activities include a longitudinal study to track the progress of schools in improving student performance, as well as an iterative National Assessment of Title I that focuses on how well schools, school districts, and States are implementing the Title I Grants to LEAs program.

Title I evaluations help provide data for indicators to assess the progress and end results of Title I reforms, support the creation of performance measurement systems, and encourage improvements in State and local practices.

The Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999, the Administration's proposal for reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, would replace the separate authorization of appropriations for evaluation activities with a provision that permits the Secretary to reserve for this purpose up to .3 percent of funds appropriated for all Title I programs.

Evaluation

Funding levels for the past 5 years were:

	($000s)
1996	$3,359
1997	6,977
1998	6,977
1999	7,500
2000	8,900

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2001, the Administration's request would eliminate direct funding for Evaluation and instead fund Title I evaluation and management improvement activities through the .3 percent set-aside authorized by the Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999. The Administration's request under this new authority is discussed under Grants to Local Educational Agencies.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001[1]
Implementation of Title I Accountability and Standards	$1,500	$2,000	-
National Longitudinal Study of Title I Schools	3,500	4,400	-
Impact and Strategies of Effectiveness for Disadvantaged Students	2,000	2,000	-
Impact of Title I Targeting	500	500	-
Total	7,500	8,900	-

[1] Title I evaluation and management improvement activities would be funded through a .3 percent set-aside from all Title I programs; activity requests for each program include proposed evaluation amounts.

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

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined[1]

Budget authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
$170,000	$190,000	+$20,000

[1] The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2000; new authorizing legislation is proposed.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Demonstrations of Comprehensive School Reform (CSRD) program, created through the Department's 1998 appropriations act, is funded under the Title I Demonstrations authority (with additional funding under the Fund for the Improvement of Education in the Education Research, Statistics, and Improvement account). This program provides schools with funding to develop or adopt, and implement, comprehensive school reforms, based on reliable research and effective practices, that will enable children in participating schools to meet challenging State standards. These reforms must be structured to address nine critical elements listed in the conference report accompanying the 1998 appropriations act. The elements establish, among other things, that each participating school will base its proposed reforms on a comprehensive design that employs innovative strategies and methods grounded in reliable research and practice, aligns reforms with the school's regular program and a school needs assessment, and utilizes high-quality external technical support and assistance from entities with experience and expertise in school-wide reform and improvement.

The Department allocates Title I Comprehensive School Reform funds to States, based on their relative shares of the previous year's Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies funds. State educational agencies (SEAs) then make competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) eligible for funds under Title I, Part A, which then use these funds to implement comprehensive school reform programs in schools with Title I programs. The amount of an award must be at least $50,000 for each school that is to receive program funds. Grants are renewable for up to 3 years. The Secretary may reserve up to 1 percent of formula funds for grants to Bureau of Indian Affairs schools and the Outlying Areas, and up to 1 percent to conduct national evaluation activities. In addition, each SEA may reserve up to 5 percent of the funds it receives for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance, including expenses necessary to inform LEAs and schools about research-based approaches to comprehensive school reform.

As a condition for receiving initial State allocations under this program, SEAs were required to submit applications to the Department, beginning in the spring of 1998, that describe the process and selection criteria they would use in making competitive grants to LEAs; how the

Demonstrations of Comprehensive School Reform

SEA would ensure that school reform programs are based on rigorous research and meet the nine criteria specified in the report language, and how the SEA would disseminate materials on comprehensive reform models and approaches, provide technical assistance to LEAs and schools, and evaluate reform implementation and results.

State educational agencies are encouraged to award grants to LEAs that will use program funds in schools in Title I "program improvement" status, to award grants to LEAs in urban and rural communities, and to serve schools at different grade levels. In applying to SEAs for funds, LEA applicants must identify the Title I-eligible schools and the levels of funding they would receive, and describe the reforms to be implemented and how the LEA will provide technical assistance and evaluate reform implementation and results.

In addition to the funds provided through Title I, States receive formula funds under the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE), based on each State's share of school-aged children. All LEAs may compete for the State's allocation of FIE funds, but only LEAs eligible for Title I may receive the Title I CSRD funds. In addition, the Department's Regional Education Laboratories receive funds under the Education Research, Statistics, and Improvement account to assist schools in selecting, evaluating, and implementing comprehensive school reforms. Other Department activities to assist local districts and schools to undertake successful comprehensive reform efforts are also underway, such as the creation of a new national clearinghouse on comprehensive school reform and funding for the development of new research-based comprehensive reform models.

The Administration's proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 would retain the Title I Demonstration authority and the Fund for the Improvement of Education, under which the Department carries out the CSRD program.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	($000s)
1996	[1]
1997	[1]
1998	$120,000
1999	120,000
2000	170,000

[1]Program was not yet established.

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2001, the Administration requests $190 million for the Title I portion of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstrations program to support the program's fourth year of operation. This request would be an increase of $20 million over the fiscal year 2000 appropriation.

Demonstrations of Comprehensive School Reform

This program is one of the most significant efforts ever to capitalize on research findings on the effectiveness of school reform models and help bring about widespread, effective improvement in schools. After years of trying piecemeal reforms, schools are taking advantage of the program's comprehensive approach, which focuses on helping schools improve their entire educational operation, through, for example, curriculum changes, sustained professional development, and stronger parent involvement, based on a careful identification of local needs and adoption of research-based reform strategies. In addition, many schools have adopted externally developed school improvement models that are based on solid research and demonstrated effective. These models also generally are supported by technical assistance and training provided by model developers. The program also allows schools operating Title I "schoolwide" programs to make more effective use of Federal funds for improvements in curriculum and instruction.

The Department's *Hope For Urban Education* report, released in December 1999, studied nine urban elementary schools that have achieved impressive academic results. The study found that all nine of the schools had engaged in comprehensive efforts to improve student achievement and that each of the schools demonstrated considerable evidence of the nine components of the CSRD program. The schools use research-based practices, provide intensive professional development, and sought the support of teachers and other school staff for the reforms. Nationally, there are many examples of schools that have implemented comprehensive reforms improved student achievement.

The Harriet S. Tubman Elementary School in New York City, where 99 percent of the children are eligible for a free- or reduced-price lunch, was one of the lowest-performing schools in the city has successfully implemented comprehensive reforms. A few years after implementing the *Success for All* reading program as a part of its reform effort, the school was removed from the State's list of low-performing schools and the number of children performing at or above grade level on the citywide assessments had risen by more than 50 percent. In the four years after the Nathaniel Hawthorne Elementary School in San Antonio implemented the *Core Knowledge* program, the number of students who passed all portions of the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills increased from 24 percent to 63 percent.

CSRD is leveraging other Federal, State, and local funds to help schools implement comprehensive reforms. For example, beginning with the 1999-2000 school year, the Maryland School Accountability Funding for Excellence program will allocate about $320 million ($260 million in existing State and Federal resources and $60 million in new State money) using criteria similar to the CSRD criteria. California is investing $80 million over 5 years in its comprehensive school reform initiative.

States are awarding program funds to those schools most in need of implementing comprehensive reforms. To date, States have made slightly more than 1,750 awards. Data provided by States show that 65 percent of the schools receiving grants are operating Title I schoolwide programs and 42 percent have been identified as in need of improvement under Title I. The average poverty rate in the schools receiving grants is 70 percent. The data also demonstrate the great demand for program funds, as States were only able to fund about half of all applicants in 1998. There is a wide variation in the amount of funds being awarded to schools. Many States are providing the minimum award of $50,000 per school, while a few

States are providing awards of as much as $100,000 per school; nationally, the average grant is $68,944.

A department wide effort is being undertaken to help ensure successful implementation of the CSRD program. The Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers have assisted States, local districts, and schools to implement their comprehensive reform efforts. In addition, the Department's Office of Education Research and Improvement (OERI) is funding several efforts to improve the understanding of schools, States, and districts about comprehensive school reform. OERI also is providing support for the development of new reform models and increasing the capacity of developers to serve the needs of schools across the Nation. OERI's efforts include:

- **Increasing schools' understanding of comprehensive reform.** The Department has provided several sources of information and technical assistance to help ensure that schools make an informed choice when choosing comprehensive reform model.
- **Supporting the development of models.** Middle and high schools planning to implement comprehensive school reform have a limited number of models of proven effectiveness from which to choose. To increase the number of models available to these schools, OERI recently awarded contracts to support research on, and development of, models of comprehensive school reform for middle and high schools.
- **Increasing the capacity of comprehensive school reform model developers to serve more schools.** OERI had made multiple awards to help model developers to increase their ability to assist schools to implement reform models.

The Department's evaluation of this program includes a longitudinal study that will evaluate local demonstrations on the basis of program implementation and evidence of effectiveness. Also, to help spread early findings widely to the 45,000 schools receiving Title I funding for use in their own reforms, the evaluation includes an electronic data base on all participating schools. Evaluation plans also include other studies that, for example, examine research-based and effective school reform models and the capacity of districts, States, and other resources to provide technical assistance to CSRD schools.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information including goals; indicators; targets; and, where possible, an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2001 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this and other programs supporting the performance goals and objectives.

Other performance indicators and strategies for this program are included in the Department's Annual Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

Demonstrations of Comprehensive School Reform

Performance Goal: Low-performing students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Objective: Student achievement generally will show marked improvement in core subjects in Comprehensive School Reform (CSRD) schools.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
Increasing percentages of students in CSRD schools will meet or exceed the basic and proficient levels on State and local assessments in reading and mathematics. *Baseline to be established in 2000.*				

Baseline and outcome data for this indicator will be obtained from the national evaluation of CSRD schools and annual State performance reports. The evaluation will begin collecting achievement data during the 1999-2000 school year. The evaluation will be linked with the Department's National Longitudinal Survey of Schools (NLSS), a multi-year study tracking standards-based reform efforts in a nationally representative sample of Title I schools. The NLSS will provide student achievement data and data on the extent to which Title I provisions support school improvement, including the use of research-based models. The first performance reports from the States will be submitted in December of 2000 and will contain achievement data from the 1998-1999 and 1999-2000 school years.

Objective: The number of participating schools providing high-quality curriculum and instruction will increase each year.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
The number of CSRD schools meeting objectives for implementation will increase annually. *1999 Baseline: 36 percent of CSRD schools report that reform models are mostly implemented in their schools.*				

Evaluations of comprehensive school reform models have found that the effects of the models on student achievement are strongly related to the quality and completeness of implementation. During the 1998-99 school year, the first year of implementation of CSRD, 36 percent of principals in CSRD schools reported that their reform model was mostly implemented and 25 percent reported that the chosen model was partially implemented. Twelve percent of principals in CSRD schools reported that their schools were still selecting their reform models and 26 percent reported initial training and professional development aligned to the model. Data for this indicator are obtained from the National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, which will be conducted annually.

Demonstrations of Comprehensive School Reform

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
Amount distributed to States	$117,600	$166,600	$186,200
Average State award	$2,262	$3,204	$3,581
Range of State awards	$271 - $13,146	$373 - $20,517	$416 - $23,580
Reservation for State administration	$5,880	$8,330	$9,310
State-awarded subgrants to schools (through LEAs)[1]			
New grants	0	675	1,891
Continued grants	1,620	1,620	675
Set-aside for evaluation	$1,200	$1,700	$1,900
Set-aside for Bureau of Indian Affairs schools and the Outlying Areas	$1,200	$1,700	$1,900

[1] Estimated number of State-awarded subgrants to schools is based on an average grant size of $68,944. This is the average amount of award that has been reported to the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory's CSRD database.

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

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority ($000s):

	2000	2001	Change
High school equivalency program	$15,000	$20,000	+$5,000
College assistance Migrant program	7,000	10,000	+3,000
Total	22,000	30,000	+8,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

Migrant education: High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	HEP ($000s)	CAMP ($000s)
1996	$7,441	$2,028
1997	7,441	2,028
1998	7,634	2,081
1999	9,000	4,000
2000	15,000	7,000

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2001, the Administration requests $30 million for these two programs, an increase of $8 million (36 percent) over the 2000 appropriation. This request would support the Administration's initiative to increase funding for programs that improve educational opportunities for Hispanics and other limited English proficient individuals. The 2001 request will provide funding for an additional round of HEP and CAMP projects, thus increasing services to an especially needy student population.

No other adult basic education or college assistance program specifically targets migrant and seasonal farmworkers. The HEP projects, located in college or university settings, operate residential and commuter programs of instructional services for out-of-school migrant youth. HEP projects have been successful in attracting back into education older youth (most of whom are Hispanic) who have, for one reason or another, experienced frustration and failure in school. The CAMP projects provide supportive college environments for migrant students starting college, many of whom later serve as role models for younger siblings or others in the migrant community.

Many HEP and all CAMP projects use an on-campus residential design and provide a high level of support services in order to assist participants, virtually all of whom have had no prior contact with a college campus, to adjust to life at an institution of higher education. Alternatively, some HEP projects employ a commuter model in which students attend GED classes after work. In addition to recruiting, project personnel provide such services as direct instruction, tutoring, counseling, mentoring, and for CAMP participants, tuition, room and board, and small stipends for books during the first year of college.

HEP and CAMP target migrant students who do not already have access to scholarships and other support. Instead, both HEP and CAMP focus on finding and assisting migrant youth who have potential but who have not been able -- due to lack of positive role models, lack outreach on the part of local school authorities, or other obstacles, such as interrupted schooling -- to complete high school or go on to postsecondary education. For example, several HEP/CAMP projects have reported success with gang members: convincing them to return to school and, as a result of their education, helping them become law abiding and productive citizens.

HEP and CAMP emphasize services to out-of-school-youth by conducting extensive outreach in locations where such youth live and work (e.g., farms, production facilities, and labor camps); and providing services at locations and times that meet the needs of an out-of-school, working population. For example, most HEP projects do not operate year-round in a single location but run programs in the seasons when migrants are in the area to work.

Three national studies of HEP/CAMP (conducted in 1974, 1985, and 1989) have noted the high rate of successful program participation. A 1995 report prepared by the HEP/CAMP grantees concluded that CAMP participants completed their first academic year in good standing and eventually graduated from college at considerably higher rate than the rate for Hispanics aged 18-38.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected program performance information, including goals; indicators; targets; and, where possible, targets, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2001 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Other performance data for this program are included in the Department's Annual Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

Performance goal: To help migrant and seasonal farmworker students obtain the equivalent of a high school diploma and, subsequently, to begin postsecondary education, enter military service, or get a job.

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

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
The percentage of HEP participants who receive a GED will continue to remain high, if not increase. *FY 1998 baseline: 72% of HEP participants earned GEDs.*	72%	74%	74%	76%

A 1999 report prepared by the HEP/CAMP grantees found that 72 percent of HEP participants in 1997-98 earned their GEDs. A 1995 report found that 69 percent of HEP participants earned their GEDs as compared to 30 percent of national participants in Secondary-level Adult Education. HEP/CAMP Association reports and performance reports submitted by grantees will be the continuing sources of data for this indicator.

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

Migrant education: High school equivalency and College assistance migrant programs

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
The percentage of CAMP participants who successfully complete the first year of an academic or postsecondary education program will either equal or exceed that achieved the previous year. *School Year 1997-98 baseline: 88% of CAMP participants completed their first year in good standing.*	88%	90%	90%	92%

A 1999 report prepared by the HEP/CAMP grantees found that 88 percent of CAMP participants in 1997-98 completed their first academic year in good standing at an institution of higher education. A 1995 report also found that 74 percent of CAMP participants eventually graduate from college, compared with 8 percent of Hispanics ages 18-38. HEP/CAMP Association reports, performance reports submitted by grantees, and reports from other programs such as TRIO Student Support Services will be the continuing sources of data for this indicator.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

	1999	2000	2001
HEP:			
Number of students served	3,811	6,352	8,469
Number of awards	23	39	50
Average Federal contribution per student	$2,362	$2,362	$2,362
Peer review of new award applications ($000s)	$30	$21	$14
CAMP:			
Number of students served	664	1,162	1,660
Number of awards	12	21	30
Average Federal contribution per student	$6,024	$6,024	$6,024
Peer review of new award applications ($000s)	$20	$15	$15

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Grants to Local Educational Agencies

State or Outlying Area	1999 Appro. for 2000	2000 Estimate for 2001	2001 Request for 2002
Alabama	$128,529,675	$129,090,318	$130,596,926
Alaska	18,885,685	19,060,304	18,790,401
Arizona	121,033,087	122,609,867	126,441,272
Arkansas	78,656,312	79,251,448	81,145,591
California	940,850,248	954,428,259	1,024,032,278
Colorado	71,277,595	71,273,679	67,460,725
Connecticut	69,293,940	70,361,792	71,611,451
Delaware	21,087,579	21,265,852	19,202,764
Florida	360,645,739	367,400,402	412,049,428
Georgia	207,637,592	211,130,415	227,095,596
Hawaii	20,119,987	20,152,502	21,819,855
Idaho	23,355,862	23,528,062	22,847,357
Illinois	326,647,862	327,214,458	343,108,976
Indiana	116,147,429	117,182,060	115,026,256
Iowa	53,276,464	53,329,199	48,573,426
Kansas	55,734,882	56,257,051	55,147,752
Kentucky	127,598,779	127,591,546	131,275,586
Louisiana	191,246,371	191,235,510	195,268,744
Maine	31,403,006	31,656,925	29,578,513
Maryland	102,232,556	103,048,698	108,373,293
Massachusetts	152,228,989	153,416,181	144,823,388
Michigan	333,880,357	336,920,374	337,587,965
Minnesota	87,876,278	87,872,199	81,471,657
Mississippi	124,767,905	124,761,041	121,374,008
Missouri	133,471,311	134,587,209	134,642,885
Montana	26,073,019	26,310,228	25,939,502
Nebraska	32,183,426	32,182,191	30,689,000
Nevada	22,831,797	23,335,059	25,373,286
New Hampshire	19,451,320	19,622,691	18,085,702
New Jersey	175,150,980	177,461,221	171,951,562
New Mexico	65,464,085	66,411,564	72,513,986
New York	725,737,516	738,286,981	823,762,168
North Carolina	146,132,809	148,005,650	154,325,822
North Dakota	19,639,414	19,818,220	19,572,574
Ohio	302,179,405	302,162,990	290,214,295
Oklahoma	95,179,222	96,486,238	99,635,089
Oregon	68,522,619	68,519,286	64,984,008
Pennsylvania	335,111,657	337,883,421	337,646,211
Rhode Island	24,637,724	24,781,218	24,942,653
South Carolina	98,915,241	100,212,435	105,087,571
South Dakota	19,730,276	19,729,151	20,199,010
Tennessee	134,263,765	134,573,900	131,444,011
Texas	661,699,092	669,768,015	722,191,102
Utah	35,295,233	35,293,100	30,543,712
Vermont	17,699,100	17,698,145	17,986,509
Virginia	115,969,508	117,684,409	121,107,046
Washington	108,934,314	108,928,508	102,684,726
West Virginia	73,470,916	73,466,635	74,684,685
Wisconsin	125,823,721	125,819,303	126,625,646
Wyoming	17,419,534	17,579,564	17,461,002
District of Columbia	24,977,616	25,457,385	29,065,259
Puerto Rico	262,430,237	262,415,173	276,062,770
American Samoa	5,355,481	5,629,054	6,309,880
Guam	5,022,895	5,279,478	5,918,024
Northern Mariana Islands	2,848,339	2,993,840	3,355,941
Virgin Islands	9,117,834	9,583,598	10,742,721
Bureau of Indian Affairs	49,389,651	50,893,000	57,048,436
Title I Accountability Grants (Non-add)	0	134,000,000 [1]	250,000,000 [1]
Other non-State allocations	7,853,764	8,500,000	20,000,000
TOTAL	7,732,397,000	7,807,397,000	8,107,500,000
TOTAL with Title I Accountability Grants	7,732,397,000	7,941,397,000	8,357,500,000

[1] State distribution of Title I Accountability Grants is displayed on a separate table.

Title I Accountability Grants

State or Outlying Area	1999 Appro. for 2000	2000 Estimate for 2001	2001 Request for 2002
Alabama	$0	$2,239,376	$4,079,051
Alaska	0	330,646	586,897
Arizona	0	2,126,958	3,949,253
Arkansas	0	1,374,803	2,534,493
California	0	16,556,811	31,984,517
Colorado	0	1,236,410	2,107,061
Connecticut	0	1,220,591	2,236,705
Delaware	0	368,906	599,777
Florida	0	6,373,427	12,869,909
Georgia	0	3,662,555	7,093,080
Hawaii	0	349,593	681,519
Idaho	0	408,150	713,612
Illinois	0	5,676,307	10,716,630
Indiana	0	2,032,799	3,592,718
Iowa	0	925,121	1,517,137
Kansas	0	975,911	1,722,479
Kentucky	0	2,213,377	4,100,248
Louisiana	0	3,317,431	6,099,003
Maine	0	549,164	923,852
Maryland	0	1,787,623	3,384,920
Massachusetts	0	2,661,366	4,523,398
Michigan	0	5,844,679	10,544,187
Minnesota	0	1,524,351	2,544,677
Mississippi	0	2,164,275	3,790,983
Missouri	0	2,334,733	4,205,422
Montana	0	456,413	810,192
Nebraska	0	558,276	958,537
Nevada	0	404,802	792,507
New Hampshire	0	340,402	564,887
New Jersey	0	3,078,484	5,370,717
New Mexico	0	1,152,065	2,264,894
New York	0	12,807,331	25,729,301
North Carolina	0	2,567,507	4,820,197
North Dakota	0	343,794	611,328
Ohio	0	5,241,730	9,064,523
Oklahoma	0	1,673,782	3,111,992
Oregon	0	1,188,629	2,029,704
Pennsylvania	0	5,861,386	10,546,006
Rhode Island	0	429,889	779,056
South Carolina	0	1,738,421	3,282,294
South Dakota	0	342,249	630,894
Tennessee	0	2,334,502	4,105,508
Texas	0	11,618,707	22,556,841
Utah	0	612,242	953,999
Vermont	0	307,016	561,789
Virginia	0	2,041,514	3,782,645
Washington	0	1,889,622	3,207,244
West Virginia	0	1,274,452	2,332,694
Wisconsin	0	2,182,633	3,955,012
Wyoming	0	304,959	545,375
District of Columbia	0	441,618	907,821
Puerto Rico	0	4,552,211	8,622,516
TOTAL	0	134,000,000	250,000,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Capital Expenses for Private School Children

State or Outlying Area	1999 Appro. for 2000	2000 Estimate for 2001	2001 Request for 2002
Alabama	$72,426	$36,213	0
Alaska	1,004	502	0
Arizona	283,681	141,840	0
Arkansas	89,493	44,746	0
California	2,978,936	1,489,468	0
Colorado	52,778	26,389	0
Connecticut	170,811	85,405	0
Delaware	107,850	53,925	0
Florida	342,195	171,098	0
Georgia	41,448	20,724	0
Hawaii	6,454	3,227	0
Idaho	10,039	5,020	0
Illinois	1,597,533	798,767	0
Indiana	216,131	108,065	0
Iowa	259,013	129,506	0
Kansas	180,707	90,353	0
Kentucky	212,259	106,129	0
Louisiana	856,636	428,318	0
Maine	17,210	8,605	0
Maryland	191,606	95,803	0
Massachusetts	557,609	278,805	0
Michigan	387,229	193,614	0
Minnesota	549,148	274,574	0
Mississippi	290,421	145,211	0
Missouri	530,360	265,180	0
Montana	50,483	25,242	0
Nebraska	186,587	93,293	0
Nevada	9,752	4,876	0
New Hampshire	16,636	8,318	0
New Jersey	1,000,197	500,099	0
New Mexico	136,677	68,339	0
New York	3,966,226	1,983,114	0
North Carolina	85,190	42,595	0
North Dakota	73,573	36,787	0
Ohio	1,007,798	503,899	0
Oklahoma	35,281	17,640	0
Oregon	114,734	57,367	0
Pennsylvania	2,627,993	1,313,996	0
Rhode Island	203,654	101,827	0
South Carolina	20,222	10,111	0
South Dakota	42,308	21,154	0
Tennessee	41,591	20,796	0
Texas	974,525	487,263	0
Utah	22,660	11,330	0
Vermont	0	0	0
Virginia	82,609	41,304	0
Washington	127,212	63,606	0
West Virginia	39,583	19,792	0
Wisconsin	476,435	238,217	0
Wyoming	20,509	10,254	0
District of Columbia	250,264	125,132	0
Puerto Rico	2,384,324	1,192,162	0
TOTAL	24,000,000	12,000,000	0

Even Start

State or Outlying Area	1999 Appro. for 2000	2000 Estimate for 2001	2001 Request for 2002
Alabama	$2,025,650	$2,211,098	$2,223,665
Alaska	626,250	697,500	706,250
Arizona	1,902,312	2,151,211	2,152,907
Arkansas	1,244,844	1,395,767	1,381,660
California	14,929,736	17,185,574	17,436,125
Colorado	1,119,772	1,106,010	1,148,649
Connecticut	1,103,728	1,250,573	1,219,323
Delaware	626,250	697,500	706,250
Florida	5,744,440	6,909,719	7,015,937
Georgia	3,306,103	3,952,186	3,866,741
Hawaii	626,250	697,500	706,250
Idaho	626,250	697,500	706,250
Illinois	5,182,377	5,510,729	5,842,092
Indiana	1,840,153	2,002,340	1,958,544
Iowa	827,349	828,055	827,056
Kansas	878,533	968,289	938,997
Kentucky	2,030,214	2,198,305	2,235,220
Louisiana	3,046,212	3,144,105	3,324,827
Maine	626,250	697,500	706,250
Maryland	1,614,273	1,820,527	1,845,264
Massachusetts	2,377,307	2,492,435	2,465,897
Michigan	5,213,301	5,686,231	5,748,086
Minnesota	1,379,529	1,357,732	1,387,212
Mississippi	1,985,480	2,009,586	2,066,627
Missouri	2,091,399	2,346,397	2,292,555
Montana	626,250	697,500	706,250
Nebraska	626,250	697,500	706,250
Nevada	626,250	697,500	706,250
New Hampshire	626,250	697,500	706,250
New Jersey	2,724,484	2,995,440	2,927,807
New Mexico	1,042,726	1,230,907	1,234,691
New York	11,544,488	13,625,844	14,026,140
North Carolina	2,318,473	2,721,864	2,627,695
North Dakota	626,250	697,500	706,250
Ohio	4,769,115	4,770,056	4,941,458
Oklahoma	1,502,240	1,731,885	1,696,480
Oregon	1,085,639	1,117,543	1,106,478
Pennsylvania	5,296,602	5,735,897	5,749,078
Rhode Island	626,250	697,500	706,250
South Carolina	1,571,306	1,833,604	1,789,319
South Dakota	626,250	697,500	706,250
Tennessee	2,094,526	2,188,277	2,238,088
Texas	10,536,726	12,213,033	12,296,698
Utah	626,250	697,500	706,250
Vermont	626,250	697,500	706,250
Virginia	1,833,339	2,127,451	2,062,081
Washington	1,725,458	1,755,430	1,748,405
West Virginia	1,168,108	1,249,687	1,271,651
Wisconsin	1,994,015	2,044,807	2,156,045
Wyoming	626,250	697,500	706,250
District of Columbia	626,250	697,500	706,250
Puerto Rico	4,180,043	4,471,406	4,700,502
Set-aside for migrant children, Indian tribes, the Outlying Areas	6,750,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
Other non-State allocations	3,000,000	3,000,000	1,250,000
TOTAL	135,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000

State Agency Programs – Migrant

State or Outlying Area	1999 Appro. for 2000	2000 Estimate for 2001	2001 Request for 2002
Alabama	$2,792,000	$2,792,000	$3,003,803
Alaska	8,007,340	8,007,340	7,254,341
Arizona	6,681,457	6,681,457	8,017,748
Arkansas	4,729,484	4,729,484	5,097,428
California	103,467,225	103,467,225	107,143,207
Colorado	5,431,805	5,431,805	6,518,166
Connecticut	2,981,373	2,981,373	3,177,575
Delaware	321,689	321,689	373,696
Florida	23,842,645	23,842,645	24,180,721
Georgia	5,587,230	5,587,230	6,515,016
Hawaii	194,980	194,980	200,000
Idaho	4,391,869	4,391,869	4,584,312
Illinois	1,758,313	1,758,313	2,109,976
Indiana	3,885,903	3,885,903	4,663,084
Iowa	935,443	935,443	1,122,532
Kansas	9,965,786	9,965,786	9,557,578
Kentucky	10,647,585	10,647,585	11,243,821
Louisiana	2,772,254	2,772,254	3,019,896
Maine	4,604,716	4,604,716	4,892,677
Maryland	448,979	448,979	538,775
Massachusetts	2,967,291	2,967,291	3,318,697
Michigan	11,055,417	11,055,417	13,081,064
Minnesota	2,600,292	2,600,292	3,120,350
Mississippi	1,109,299	1,109,299	1,074,201
Missouri	1,628,423	1,628,423	1,744,524
Montana	724,570	724,570	869,484
Nebraska	4,456,764	4,456,764	4,784,655
Nevada	267,912	267,912	268,791
New Hampshire	107,721	107,721	200,000
New Jersey	1,678,624	1,678,624	2,014,349
New Mexico	1,113,481	1,113,481	1,219,657
New York	7,986,814	7,986,814	8,322,508
North Carolina	5,890,589	5,890,589	6,574,135
North Dakota	356,049	356,049	427,259
Ohio	2,057,159	2,057,159	2,468,591
Oklahoma	2,079,142	2,079,142	2,068,557
Oregon	12,385,695	12,385,695	14,231,420
Pennsylvania	8,773,893	8,773,893	9,202,666
Rhode Island	118,581	118,581	200,000
South Carolina	471,160	471,160	565,392
South Dakota	776,372	776,372	737,798
Tennessee	338,301	338,301	405,961
Texas	51,492,634	51,492,634	56,341,504
Utah	1,435,572	1,435,572	1,613,933
Vermont	842,282	842,282	874,337
Virginia	746,164	746,164	895,397
Washington	13,965,296	13,965,296	14,744,923
West Virginia	117,608	117,608	200,000
Wisconsin	661,653	661,653	793,984
Wyoming	178,952	178,952	214,742
District of Columbia	408,570	408,570	479,073
Puerto Rico	3,948,644	3,948,644	3,727,696
Other non-State allocations	8,500,000	8,500,000	10,000,000
TOTAL	354,689,000	354,689,000	380,000,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

State Agency Programs - Neglected and Delinquent

State or Outlying Area	1999 Appro. for 2000	2000 Estimate for 2001	2001 Request for 2002
Alabama	$544,777	$567,603	$567,001
Alaska	149,649	155,920	155,754
Arizona	904,903	942,818	941,819
Arkansas	280,280	292,023	291,714
California	3,253,704	3,390,032	3,386,438
Colorado	331,173	345,049	344,684
Connecticut	905,904	943,861	942,861
Delaware	123,623	128,803	128,667
Florida	1,005,595	1,047,729	1,046,619
Georgia	2,037,382	2,122,747	2,120,497
Hawaii	72,694	75,740	75,660
Idaho	114,448	119,243	119,116
Illinois	1,808,208	1,883,971	1,881,974
Indiana	721,786	752,028	751,231
Iowa	355,745	370,650	370,257
Kansas	331,703	345,601	345,235
Kentucky	633,678	660,228	659,528
Louisiana	587,253	611,858	611,210
Maine	144,522	150,578	150,418
Maryland	1,373,677	1,431,233	1,429,716
Massachusetts	895,859	933,395	932,406
Michigan	893,456	930,892	929,905
Minnesota	279,087	290,781	290,473
Mississippi	292,625	304,886	304,563
Missouri	780,684	813,394	812,531
Montana	66,343	69,123	69,050
Nebraska	242,486	252,646	252,378
Nevada	145,260	151,346	151,186
New Hampshire	297,494	309,958	309,630
New Jersey	2,310,552	2,407,362	2,404,810
New Mexico	350,016	364,682	364,295
New York	2,660,656	2,772,136	2,769,197
North Carolina	1,404,970	1,463,837	1,462,286
North Dakota	39,706	41,370	41,326
Ohio	2,261,134	2,355,873	2,353,376
Oklahoma	206,640	215,298	215,069
Oregon	1,158,197	1,206,724	1,205,445
Pennsylvania	787,006	819,981	819,111
Rhode Island	352,352	367,115	366,726
South Carolina	880,769	917,672	916,699
South Dakota	238,572	248,568	248,304
Tennessee	524,190	546,153	545,574
Texas	2,575,281	2,683,183	2,680,339
Utah	761,624	793,535	792,694
Vermont	125,162	130,406	130,268
Virginia	584,807	609,309	608,664
Washington	750,601	782,050	781,221
West Virginia	311,090	324,125	323,781
Wisconsin	1,007,790	1,050,016	1,048,902
Wyoming	303,451	316,165	315,830
District of Columbia	639,138	665,918	665,212
Puerto Rico	503,298	524,386	568,350
TOTAL	40,311,000	42,000,000	42,000,000

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Demonstrations of Comprehensive School Reform

State or Outlying Area	1999 Appro. for 2000	2000 Estimate for 2001	2001 Request for 2002
Alabama	$2,021,049	$2,762,313	$3,017,100
Alaska	294,000	406,507	453,901
Arizona	1,805,226	2,588,911	2,968,610
Arkansas	1,218,279	1,716,366	1,902,930
California	13,146,160	20,517,488	23,580,454
Colorado	1,148,855	1,552,825	1,606,015
Connecticut	1,100,447	1,507,213	1,768,915
Delaware	294,000	544,587	645,710
Florida	5,307,373	7,846,843	9,291,668
Georgia	3,120,607	4,562,898	5,365,431
Hawaii	327,496	442,653	505,144
Idaho	362,321	504,468	548,897
Illinois	5,280,982	7,137,926	7,655,737
Indiana	1,900,564	2,603,688	2,886,651
Iowa	891,204	1,204,576	1,238,228
Kansas	908,374	1,235,707	1,364,879
Kentucky	2,045,127	2,764,252	2,985,464
Louisiana	3,064,340	4,141,850	4,264,458
Maine	478,688	688,630	748,938
Maryland	1,612,713	2,237,988	2,541,205
Massachusetts	2,309,925	3,213,886	3,539,154
Michigan	5,241,212	7,110,967	7,948,426
Minnesota	1,454,883	1,966,462	2,003,890
Mississippi	2,010,563	2,717,534	2,785,266
Missouri	2,040,005	2,895,315	3,261,261
Montana	411,328	567,083	631,107
Nebraska	546,153	738,196	744,540
Nevada	366,780	513,252	604,708
New Hampshire	294,000	399,701	446,172
New Jersey	2,589,386	3,752,562	4,249,143
New Mexico	997,512	1,426,074	1,651,344
New York	10,777,377	15,758,755	18,582,705
North Carolina	2,272,609	3,231,563	3,735,863
North Dakota	294,000	416,500	465,248
Ohio	4,880,121	6,596,112	6,756,782
Oklahoma	1,398,722	2,083,586	2,380,365
Oregon	1,126,656	1,522,821	1,619,509
Pennsylvania	5,318,856	7,232,361	8,030,183
Rhode Island	399,547	543,191	620,231
South Carolina	1,514,027	2,163,846	2,496,166
South Dakota	315,879	426,951	465,500
Tennessee	2,064,113	2,871,393	3,024,614
Texas	10,090,656	14,425,294	16,648,454
Utah	558,931	755,467	713,218
Vermont	286,194	386,828	425,172
Virginia	1,809,011	2,571,096	2,977,032
Washington	1,765,036	2,385,674	2,544,825
West Virginia	1,171,659	1,583,648	1,681,166
Wisconsin	2,156,484	2,914,765	2,961,947
Wyoming	271,104	372,636	416,211
District of Columbia	342,831	416,500	465,036
Puerto Rico	4,196,635	5,672,292	5,984,427
Other non-State allocations	2,400,000	3,400,000	3,800,000
TOTAL	120,000,000	170,000,000	190,000,000