

Andrew Rotherham
Domestic Policy Council
Box 3 of 3

Miscellaneous education policy files and publications.

Enclosures filed in
Oversize Attachments #

21294

NARA 19978

9.95 - 7.85

EDUCATION REFORM

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):

<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$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 expanded 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 expanded 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.

EDUCATION REFORM

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: (1) converts this 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) requires States to distribute funds within the State through competitive subgrants; (3) allows States to use up to 10 percent of their formula allocations to make awards to community-based organizations; (4) requires States, in making competitive grants, to give priority to applications from LEAs that are in Title I "corrective action" or "school improvement" status; (5) requires grantees to pay 50 percent of the cost of any project; (6) requires that local projects take place principally in a public elementary or secondary school building; and (7) provides the Secretary with the authority to reserve up to 2.5 percent of the appropriation for national activities such as evaluation and technical assistance.

The Administration's proposal to give a funding priority to schools in Title I corrective action or school improvement status would direct funds to schools that have the greatest need for extended learning services. 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*,

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

found that 86 percent of the high-performing, high-poverty schools offered extended instructional time in reading and 66 percent in mathematics.

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 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 directly 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

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

focusing on crime, violence, and substance abuse prevention. For example, the 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

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

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.

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

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.

EDUCATION REFORM**21st Century community learning centers**

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>
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. <i>FY 1999 Baseline: 80.5 percent.</i>		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

<u>(\$000s)</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
<u>Competitive Awards</u>			
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

Title I Accountability Language

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

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: <i>Provided further</i>, 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 requires the Secretary and States to support only projects that meet certain criteria.
<u>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: <i>Provided</i>, 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: <i>Provided further</i>, 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</u>	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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED**Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes**

Language Provision	Explanation
<u>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; <i>Provided further</i>, 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.</u>	

EDUCATION REFORM

Analysis of Language and Provisions

Language Provision	Explanation
¹⁰ <u>... 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.]</u>	This language earmarks 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds for specific projects.
¹¹ <u>\$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.</u>	This language allows the use of funds appropriated for this account for grants under the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools program.
¹² <u>...of which up to 5 percent may be available for evaluation, technical assistance, and school networking activities;</u>	This provision authorizes the Secretary to reserve up to 5 percent of the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools funds for national activities.
¹³ <u>... 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;</u>	This language specifies that Small, Safe and Successful High Schools funds be used only for creating smaller learning communities in high schools.
¹⁴ <u>... 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.</u>	This language specifies that Small, Safe and Successful High Schools program is forward funded.

EDUCATION REFORM

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):

<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>Change</u>
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.
- **Ninth grade house plan.** In this arrangement, ninth graders have their own "house" within a large high school. Schools then provide their ninth-grade students with smaller classes and counseling services to help ease the transition to high school.

EDUCATION REFORM

Small, safe and successful high schools

- **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.

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 384 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 high schools to create learning environments of no more than 600 students, through such strategies as schools-within-schools, career academies, or magnet schools. 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 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

EDUCATION REFORM

Small, safe and successful high schools

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 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.** Small schools need greater percentages of students to participate in activities to make them successful. 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 \$6 million 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.

EDUCATION REFORM

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.

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>
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. <i>Baseline to be established.</i>				

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

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
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	184
Average award	0	0	\$333
Peer review/ National activities	0	0	\$6,000
Smaller Learning Communities continuation awards	0	0	\$42,750

9.75 - 7.85

EDUCATION REFORM

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):

<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$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 expanded 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 expanded 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.

EDUCATION REFORM

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: (1) converts this 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) requires States to distribute funds within the State through competitive subgrants; (3) allows States to use up to 10 percent of their formula allocations to make awards to community-based organizations; (4) requires States, in making competitive grants, to give priority to applications from LEAs that are in Title I "corrective action" or "school improvement" status; (5) requires grantees to pay 50 percent of the cost of any project; (6) requires that local projects take place principally in a public elementary or secondary school building; and (7) provides the Secretary with the authority to reserve up to 2.5 percent of the appropriation for national activities such as evaluation and technical assistance.

The Administration's proposal to give a funding priority to schools in Title I corrective action or school improvement status would direct funds to schools that have the greatest need for extended learning services. 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*,

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

found that 86 percent of the high-performing, high-poverty schools offered extended instructional time in reading and 66 percent in mathematics.

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 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 directly 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

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

focusing on crime, violence, and substance abuse prevention. For example, the 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

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

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.

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

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.

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>
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. <i>FY 1999 Baseline: 80.5 percent.</i>		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

<u>(\$000s)</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
<u>Competitive Awards</u>			
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

Title I Accountability Language

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

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: <i>Provided further</i>, 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 requires 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: <i>Provided</i>, 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: <i>Provided further</i>, 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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED**Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes**

Language Provision	Explanation
<u>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: <i>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.</i></u>	

EDUCATION REFORM

Analysis of Language and Provisions

Language Provision	Explanation
¹⁰ <u>... 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.]</u>	This language earmarks 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds for specific projects.
¹¹ <u>...\$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.</u>	This language allows the use of funds appropriated for this account for grants under the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools program.
¹² <u>...of which up to 5 percent may be available for evaluation, technical assistance, and school networking activities;</u>	This provision authorizes the Secretary to reserve up to 5 percent of the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools funds for national activities.
¹³ <u>... 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;</u>	This language specifies that Small, Safe and Successful High Schools funds be used only for creating smaller learning communities in high schools.
¹⁴ <u>... 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.</u>	This language specifies that Small, Safe and Successful High Schools program is forward funded.

EDUCATION REFORM

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):

<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>Change</u>
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.
- **Ninth grade house plan.** In this arrangement, ninth graders have their own "house" within a large high school. Schools then provide their ninth-grade students with smaller classes and counseling services to help ease the transition to high school.

EDUCATION REFORM

Small, safe and successful high schools

- **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.

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 384 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 high schools to create learning environments of no more than 600 students, through such strategies as schools-within-schools, career academies, or magnet schools. 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 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

EDUCATION REFORM

Small, safe and successful high schools

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 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.** Small schools need greater percentages of students to participate in activities to make them successful. 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 \$6 million 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.

EDUCATION REFORM

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.

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>
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. <i>Baseline to be established.</i>				

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

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
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	184
Average award	0	0	\$333
Peer review/ National activities	0	0	\$6,000
Smaller Learning Communities continuation awards	0	0	\$42,750

9.75 - 7.85

EDUCATION REFORM

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):

<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$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 expanded 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 expanded 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.

EDUCATION REFORM

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: (1) converts this 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) requires States to distribute funds within the State through competitive subgrants; (3) allows States to use up to 10 percent of their formula allocations to make awards to community-based organizations; (4) requires States, in making competitive grants, to give priority to applications from LEAs that are in Title I "corrective action" or "school improvement" status; (5) requires grantees to pay 50 percent of the cost of any project; (6) requires that local projects take place principally in a public elementary or secondary school building; and (7) provides the Secretary with the authority to reserve up to 2.5 percent of the appropriation for national activities such as evaluation and technical assistance.

The Administration's proposal to give a funding priority to schools in Title I corrective action or school improvement status would direct funds to schools that have the greatest need for extended learning services. 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*,

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

found that 86 percent of the high-performing, high-poverty schools offered extended instructional time in reading and 66 percent in mathematics.

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 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 directly 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

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

focusing on crime, violence, and substance abuse prevention. For example, the 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

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

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.

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

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.

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>
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. <i>FY 1999 Baseline: 80.5 percent.</i>		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

<u>(\$000s)</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
<u>Competitive Awards</u>			
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
<u>New Awards</u>			
Amount for States	0	0	\$584,489
National activities	0	0	\$10,000
Total funding	0	0	\$594,489
<u>Program awards and impact</u>			
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

Title I Accountability Language

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

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: <i>Provided further</i>, 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 requires the Secretary and States to support only projects that meet certain criteria.
<i>J</i> <u>"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: <i>Provided</i>, 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: <i>Provided further</i>, 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</u>	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.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED**Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes**

Language Provision	Explanation
<u>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.</u>	

EDUCATION REFORM

Analysis of Language and Provisions

Language Provision	Explanation
¹⁰[... <i>Provided further</i>, 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<u>...\$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.</u>	This language allows the use of funds appropriated for this account for grants under the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools program.
¹²<u>...of which up to 5 percent may be available for evaluation, technical assistance, and school networking activities;</u>	This provision authorizes the Secretary to reserve up to 5 percent of the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools funds for national activities.
¹³<u>...<i>Provided</i>, 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;</u>	This language specifies that Small, Safe and Successful High Schools funds be used only for creating smaller learning communities in high schools.
¹⁴<u>...<i>Provided further</i>, That funds to be made available for section 10105 shall become available on July 1, 2001, and remain available through September 30, 2002.</u>	This language specifies that Small, Safe and Successful High Schools program is forward funded.

EDUCATION REFORM

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):

<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>Change</u>
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.
- **Ninth grade house plan.** In this arrangement, ninth graders have their own "house" within a large high school. Schools then provide their ninth-grade students with smaller classes and counseling services to help ease the transition to high school.

EDUCATION REFORM

Small, safe and successful high schools

- **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.

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 384 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 high schools to create learning environments of no more than 600 students, through such strategies as schools-within-schools, career academies, or magnet schools. 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 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

EDUCATION REFORM

Small, safe and successful high schools

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 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.** Small schools need greater percentages of students to participate in activities to make them successful. 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 \$6 million 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.

EDUCATION REFORM

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.

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>
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. <i>Baseline to be established.</i>				

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

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
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	184
Average award	0	0	\$333
Peer review/ National activities	0	0	\$6,000
Smaller Learning Communities continuation awards	0	0	\$42,750

9.95 - 17.85

EDUCATION REFORM

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):

<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$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 expanded 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 expanded 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.

EDUCATION REFORM

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: (1) converts this 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) requires States to distribute funds within the State through competitive subgrants; (3) allows States to use up to 10 percent of their formula allocations to make awards to community-based organizations; (4) requires States, in making competitive grants, to give priority to applications from LEAs that are in Title I "corrective action" or "school improvement" status; (5) requires grantees to pay 50 percent of the cost of any project; (6) requires that local projects take place principally in a public elementary or secondary school building; and (7) provides the Secretary with the authority to reserve up to 2.5 percent of the appropriation for national activities such as evaluation and technical assistance.

The Administration's proposal to give a funding priority to schools in Title I corrective action or school improvement status would direct funds to schools that have the greatest need for extended learning services. 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*,

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

found that 86 percent of the high-performing, high-poverty schools offered extended instructional time in reading and 66 percent in mathematics.

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 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 directly 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

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

focusing on crime, violence, and substance abuse prevention. For example, the 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

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

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.

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

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.

EDUCATION REFORM

21st Century community learning centers

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>
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. <i>FY 1999 Baseline: 80.5 percent.</i>		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

<u>(\$000s)</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>
<u>Competitive Awards</u>			
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