

Archived Information

Department of Education

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Fiscal Year 2008 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	F-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	F-2
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	F-3
Obligations by Object Classification.....	F-4
Summary of Changes	F-5
Authorizing Legislation.....	F-7
Appropriations History.....	F-9
Significant Items in FY 2007 Appropriations Reports	F-10
Summary of request.....	F-12
Activities:	
Safe and drug-free schools and communities:	
State grants	F-15
National programs	F-25
Character education.....	F-43
Elementary and secondary school counseling.....	F-48
Physical education program.....	F-51
Civic education.....	F-55
State table.....	F-61

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

For carrying out activities authorized by part A of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, \$324,248,000, of which \$100,000,000 shall become available on July 1, 2008 and remain available through September 30, 2009¹: Provided, That \$224,248,000 shall be available for subpart 2 of part A of title IV,² of which \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the Project School Emergency Response to Violence program to provide education-related services to local educational agencies in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis³.

NOTES

A regular 2007 appropriation for this account had not been enacted at the time the budget was prepared; therefore, this account is operating under a continuing resolution (P.L. 109-289, Division B, as amended). The amounts included for 2007 in this budget reflect the levels provided by the continuing resolution.

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

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹<u>...of which \$100,000,000 shall become available on July 1, 2008 and remain available through September 30, 2009...</u></p>	<p>This language provides for funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grants.</p>
<p>²<u>...Provided, That \$224,248,000 shall be available for subpart 2 of part A of title IV...</u></p>	<p>This language earmarks funds for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Programs (subpart 2 of part A of title IV) in order to override section 4111(c) of the authorizing statute, which prohibits an increase in the appropriation for SDFSC National Programs without a 10 percent increase in the appropriation for SDFSC State Grants.</p>
<p>³<u>...of which \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the Project School Emergency Response to Violence program to provide education-related services to local educational agencies in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis.</u></p>	<p>This language earmarks \$10 million of the request for Project SERV (under Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs) and makes the funds available for obligation at the Federal level until they are expended.</p>

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

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

	2006	2007	2008
Discretionary authority:			
Annual appropriation	\$736,886	0	\$324,248
Across-the-board reduction	-7,369	0	0
CR annual rate.....	<u>0</u>	<u>\$731,660</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation	729,518	731,660	324,248
Comparative transfer from Department of Education, <u>School Improvement Programs</u> for: Safe and drug-free schools and communities National activities (Project SERV)	<u>0</u>	<u>4,832</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, comparable budget authority	729,518	736,492	324,248
Unobligated balance, start of year	7,143	5,001	0
Unobligated balance, start of year	-2	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	<u>-5,001</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations	731,658	741,493	324,248

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Obligations by Object Classification
(\$000s)

	2006	2007	2008
Printing and reproduction	\$352	\$356	\$360
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services	6,424	6,503	6,583
Peer review	987	783	879
Other services	7,553	7,862	7,873
Purchases of goods and services from other government accounts	<u>4,115</u>	<u>4,165</u>	<u>4,217</u>
Subtotal	19,079	19,314	19,552
Grants, subsidies, and contributions	712,223	721,823	304,336
Interest and dividends.....	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, obligations.....	731,658	741,493	324,248

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Summary of Changes
(\$000s)

2007	\$736,492
2008	<u>324,248</u>
Net change.....	-412,244

	<u>2007 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Increases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities to provide direct support to LEAs, in sufficient amounts to make a real difference at the local level, for drug and violence prevention activities where outcomes can be measured and grantees held accountable.	\$172,758	+ <u>\$51,490</u>
Subtotal, increases		+51,490
Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
Decrease in funding for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants because the reauthorized program would focus on building State capacity to assist school districts in creating safe, drug-free schools and a secure school environment.	351,642	-251,642
Eliminate funding for Alcohol Abuse Reduction because it is duplicative of other Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities-funded programs.	32,409	-32,409
Eliminate funding for Mentoring, which has completed its mission.	19,000	-19,000
Eliminate Character Education as a distinct program, because funding for character education activities is requested under Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities.	24,248	-24,248

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Summary of Changes (continued)

	<u>2007 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Decreases:		
<u>Program</u> (continued):		
Eliminate funding for Physical Education because the 2008 President's Budget request for the Department of Health and Human Services includes funding for a more promising approach to school wellness.	\$72,674	-\$72,674
Eliminate funding for the following small, narrowly focused programs that have only indirect or limited effect on improving student outcomes: Elementary and Secondary School Counseling (\$34,650 thousand) and Civic Education (\$29,111 thousand).	\$63,761	<u>-63,761</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-463,734
Net change		-412,244

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

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

Activity	2007 Authorized	2007 Estimate	2008 Authorized	2008 Request
Safe and drug-free schools and communities (ESEA-IV-A):				
State grants (Subpart 1)	Indefinite	\$351,642	Indefinite ¹	\$100,000
National programs (Subpart 2)				
National activities (Sections 4121 and 4122)	Indefinite ²	172,758	Indefinite ³	224,248
Alcohol abuse reduction (Section 4129)	Indefinite ²	32,409	Indefinite ^{3,4}	0
Mentoring programs (Section 4130)	Indefinite ²	19,000	Indefinite ^{3,4}	0
Character education (ESEA V-D, Subpart 3)	(5)	24,248	(4, 5)	0
Elementary and secondary school counseling (ESEA-V-D, Subpart 2)	(5)	34,650	(4, 5)	0
Physical education program (ESEA-V-D, Subpart 10)	(5)	72,674	(4, 5)	0
Civic education (ESEA II, Part C-3):				
We the People (Section 2344)	Indefinite ⁶	17,039	Indefinite ^{4,6}	0
Cooperative education exchange (Section 2345)	Indefinite ⁶	12,072	Indefinite ^{4,6}	0
<u>Unfunded authorizations</u>				
Grants directed at preventing and reducing alcohol abuse at institutions of higher education (section 2(e)(2) of P.L. 109-422)	\$5,000	0	\$5,000	0
Total definite authorization	5,000		5,000	
Total appropriation (request subject to reauthorization)		736,492		224,248

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

F-7

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Authorizing Legislation—continued

² Funds appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs in fiscal year 2007 may not be increased above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2006 unless the amount appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants in fiscal year 2007 is at least 10 percent greater than the amount appropriated in 2006.

³ Funds appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs in fiscal year 2008 may not be increased above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2007 unless the amount appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants in fiscal year 2008 is at least 10 percent greater than the amount appropriated in 2007.

⁴ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

⁵ A total of \$675,000 thousand is authorized to carry out all Title V, Part D activities.

⁶ Of the amount appropriated for Subpart 3 (Civic Education), not more than 40 percent of the amount appropriated in any fiscal year may be used to carry out Section 2345 (the Cooperative Education Exchange).

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Appropriations History (\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2004 (2004 Advance for 2005)	\$756,250 (330,000)	\$825,068 (330,000)	\$818,547	\$855,775
2005	838,897	801,369	891,460	860,771
2006	396,767	763,870	697,300	729,517
2007	266,627			731,660 ¹
2008	324,248			

¹ A regular 2007 appropriation for this account had not been enacted at the time the budget was prepared; therefore, this account is operating under a continuing resolution (P.L. 109-289, Division B, as amended). The amounts included for 2007 in this budget reflect the levels provided by the continuing resolution.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Significant Items in FY 2007 Appropriations Reports

Student Drug Testing

House: The Committee expects that the Department will use \$15,000,000 of the fiscal year 2007 amount provided for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Programs funds for school-based student drug testing programs.

Response: The Department is still developing a final number for the amount of SDFSC National Programs funds under the 2007 Continuing Resolution that will be used for student drug testing programs. The Department will promptly inform the Committees of this decision.

Underage Drinking

House: The Committee expects the Department to ensure that underage drinking prevention is included as a discrete and major priority in all substance abuse prevention programs funded under SDFSC National Programs.

Response: All Safe Schools/Healthy Students projects funded under SDFSC National Programs address alcohol prevention as part of a comprehensive strategy to prevent youth drug use and violence, support early childhood development activities, and provide need mental health services. While students in drug testing programs typically are not tested for alcohol because the body metabolizes alcohol rather quickly after consumption, in making grants for student drug testing under SDFSC National Programs the Department requires that the drug testing programs be part of a comprehensive drug and alcohol prevention program in the schools served.

National Clearinghouse for Educational Building Facilities

Senate: The Committee expects that the Department will use \$300,000 in fiscal year 2007 SDFSC National Programs funds for the continued operation of the National Clearinghouse for Educational Building Facilities to address issues related to school safety and healthy school buildings.

Response: Contingent upon the final appropriation action, the Department will use \$300,000 of the 2007 CR funding level for SDFSC National Programs to provide a continuation grant award to the National Institute for Building Sciences for this purpose.

Alcohol Abuse Reduction

Senate: The Committee directs the Department and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) in the Department of Health and Human Services to work together on this program.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Significant Items in FY 2007 Appropriations Reports (continued)

Alcohol Abuse Reduction (continued)

Response: The Department will continue its Memorandum of Understanding with SAMHSA, under which SAMHSA provides alcohol abuse resources and technical assistance to the Department's grantees under this program.

Civic Education – We the People

Senate: Within the amount for the We the People program, the Committee recommends the following: that \$2,995,000 be reserved to continue the comprehensive program to improve public knowledge, understanding, and support of American democratic institutions which is a cooperative project among the Center for Civic Education, the Center on Congress at Indiana University, and the Trust for Representative Democracy at the National Conference of State Legislatures; and that \$1,498,000 be used for continuation and expansion of the school violence prevention demonstration program including the Native American program.

Response: Contingent upon the final appropriation action, the Department intends to ensure that the Center for Civic Education uses \$2,995,000 for the comprehensive program to improve public knowledge, understanding, and support of American democratic institutions. The Department also intends to ensure that \$1,498,000 is used to continue and expand the school violence prevention demonstration program, including the Native American program.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2008 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(in thousands of dollars)						
Account, Program, and Activity	Category Code	2006 Appropriation	2007 Current Estimate	2008 President's Request	2008 President's Request Compared to 2007 Current Level	
					Amount	Percent
Safe Schools and Citizenship Education						
1. Safe and drug-free schools and communities (ESEA IV-A):						
(a) State grants (Subpart 1)	D	346,500	351,642	100,000	(251,642)	-71.6%
(b) National programs (Subpart 2)						
(1) National activities (sections 4121 and 4122)	D	141,112	172,758 ¹	224,248	51,490	29.8%
(2) Alcohol abuse reduction (section 4129)	D	32,409	32,409	0	(32,409)	-100.0%
(3) Mentoring program (section 4130)	D	48,814	19,000	0	(19,000)	-100.0%
Subtotal, National programs		222,335	224,167	224,248	81	0.0%
Subtotal		568,835	575,809	324,248	(251,561)	-43.7%
2. Character education (ESEA V-D, subpart 3)	D	24,248	24,248	0	(24,248)	-100.0%
3. Elementary and secondary school counseling (ESEA V-D, subpart 2)	D	34,650	34,650	0	(34,650)	-100.0%
4. Physical education program (ESEA V-D, subpart 10)	D	72,674	72,674	0	(72,674)	-100.0%
5. Civic education (ESEA II, Part C-3):						
(a) We the People (section 2344)	D	17,039	17,039	0	(17,039)	-100.0%
(b) Cooperative education exchange (section 2345)	D	12,072	12,072	0	(12,072)	-100.0%
Subtotal		29,111	29,111	0	(29,111)	-100.0%
Total		729,518	736,492	324,248	(412,244)	-56.0%
Outlays	D	765,714	792,184	739,685	(52,499)	-6.6%

¹ Adjusted for comparability. Includes \$4,832 thousand available for Project SERV in the School Improvement Programs account under the FY2007 Continuing Resolution, P.L. 109-289.

F-12

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Summary of Request

The programs in the Safe Schools and Citizenship Education account help ensure that our Nation's schools offer a safe, secure, and drug-free environment for learning, and promote strong character and citizenship among our Nation's youth.

The programs in this account are authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and are, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the programs will be implemented in fiscal year 2008 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

Teaching and learning to the high standards demanded in the No Child Left Behind Act require that our schools are safe and our students are drug-free. For 2008, the Administration requests \$324.2 million for programs in the account, a \$412.2 million, or 56 percent, decrease from 2007. The request provides funding for two key programs administered by the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and eliminates funding for the remaining programs in the account, in part to reallocate scarce resources to support higher-priority programs for which funds are requested elsewhere in the Department's budget.

As part of the ESEA reauthorization, the Administration proposes to restructure the **Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grants** program because the current program is flawed, spreading funding too broadly to support quality interventions and failing to target schools and communities in greatest need of assistance. Under the reauthorized program the Department would instead allocate funds to State educational agencies to increase their capacity to provide school districts with training, technical assistance, and information regarding effective models and strategies to create safe, healthy, and secure schools, along with a limited number of subgrants to high-need districts. The budget request includes \$100 million for this more focused program.

To further support positive and safe learning environments through education and prevention activities, the reauthorization proposal would consolidate **SDFSC National Programs** into a single, more flexible discretionary grant program focused on four priority areas: Emergency Planning, Preventing Violence and Drug Use, School Culture and Climate, and Emerging Needs. The 2008 request includes a total of \$224.2 million for SDFSC National Programs. The largest increases are proposed for activities that provide direct support to LEAs, in sufficient amounts to make a real difference, for targeted projects that address key national concerns and are structured in a manner that permits grantees and independent evaluators to measure progress, hold projects accountable, and determine which interventions are most effective. Highlights of this request include:

- \$59 million for grant assistance to LEAs to support the implementation of drug prevention or school safety programs that research has demonstrated to be effective in reducing youth drug use or violence and for implementation and scientifically based evaluation of additional approaches that show promise of effectiveness;
- \$15 million for school emergency preparedness initiatives that the Department is implementing to coincide with the inclusion of the Nation's schools in the Department of Homeland Security's National Infrastructure Protection Plan;

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Summary of Request

- \$79.2 million for grants to LEAs for comprehensive, community-wide “Safe Schools/Healthy Students” drug and violence prevention projects that are coordinated with local law enforcement and also include mental health preventive and treatment services;
- \$17.850 million for school-based drug testing programs for students;
- \$24.2 million for activities to design and implement character education programs in elementary and secondary schools; and
- \$10 million for Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence), to ensure that funds are available for the Department, if called upon, to provide emergency response services to LEAs in which the learning environment has been disrupted by a violent or traumatic crisis.

No funds are requested for the existing **Character Education** program, because funding for character education activities, which can help create safe and inclusive learning environments that foster student academic achievement along with increased social responsibility and tolerance for others, is included at \$24.2 million within the overall request for SDFSC National Activities.

No funding is requested for the **Alcohol Abuse Reduction, Mentoring, Physical Education, Elementary School Counseling, or Civic Education** programs, consistent with the Administration’s effort to eliminate small categorical programs that duplicate other programs, are targeted on a narrow group of recipients, have limited impact, have completed the accomplishment of their objectives, or for which there is little or no reliable evidence of effectiveness.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

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

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite ¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$351,642	\$100,000	-\$251,642

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grants is a State-administered formula grant program intended to help create and maintain drug-free, safe, and orderly environments for learning in and around schools by supporting effective, research-based approaches to drug and violence prevention.

From the total appropriation, 1 percent or \$4.75 million (whichever is greater) is reserved for the Outlying Areas, 1 percent or \$4.75 million (whichever is greater) is reserved for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for programs for Indian youth, and 0.2 percent is reserved for programs for Native Hawaiians. The Department allocates the remaining funds by formula to States, half on the basis of school-aged population and half on the basis of State shares of ESEA Title I Concentration Grants funding for the previous year, provided that no State receives less than the greater of: (1) one-half of 1 percent of the total, or (2) the amount it received under the program in fiscal year 2001. Of each State's allocation, the Governor may elect to administer up to 20 percent of the funds; the remainder is administered by the State educational agency (SEA).

SEAs are authorized to reserve up to 5 percent of their allocations to plan, develop, and implement capacity-building, technical assistance and training, evaluation, program improvement, and coordination activities for local educational agencies (LEAs), community-based organizations, and other public and private entities. These services and activities assist LEAs in developing, implementing, and evaluating comprehensive prevention programs that are consistent with the SDFSC statutory requirements. They may include, but are not limited to, identification, development, evaluation, and dissemination of drug and violence prevention strategies, programs, and activities; training, technical assistance, and demonstration projects to address violence that is associated with prejudice and intolerance; and financial assistance to enhance drug and violence prevention resources available in areas that serve large numbers of low-income children, are sparsely populated, or have other special needs. SEAs may also reserve up to 3 percent for administrative costs but must subgrant at least 93 percent to their LEAs. LEA allocations are based 60 percent on Title I Basic and Concentration Grant funding for the preceding year and 40 percent on enrollment.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

LEAs participating in the program must use their SDFSC funds to develop, implement, and evaluate comprehensive programs and activities that are coordinated with other school and community-based services and programs and that:

- Are consistent with the SDFSC principles of effectiveness listed below.
- Foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports academic achievement.
- Are designed to: (1) prevent or reduce violence; the use, possession, and distribution of illegal drugs; and delinquency; and (2) create a disciplined environment conducive to learning, including through consultation between teachers, principals, and other school personnel to identify early warning signs of drug use and violence and to provide behavioral interventions as part of classroom management efforts.
- Include activities to: (1) promote the involvement of parents in the activity or program; (2) promote coordination with community groups and coalitions, and government agencies; and (3) distribute information to those individuals and organizations about the LEA's needs, goals, and programs funded under the SDFSC Act.

Within these program requirements, LEAs are authorized to use their SDFSC funds for a wide variety of related activities. However, an LEA may use not more than 20 percent of its SDFSC funds for school security-related activities, other than for hiring and training school security personnel, which may absorb up to 40 percent of the LEA's SDFSC allocation. In addition, not more than 2 percent of an LEA's funding under the program may be used for administrative costs.

Governors may reserve up to 3 percent of their funds for administrative costs, and must use the remainder to award competitive grants and contracts to LEAs, community-based organizations (including community anti-drug coalitions), and other public entities and private organizations (and consortia thereof). These awards must be used to carry out the State's comprehensive plan submitted to the Department jointly by the chief State school officer and the Governor for the use of funds to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities through programs and activities that complement and support the activities of LEAs. Funds may support activities to prevent and reduce violence associated with prejudice and intolerance; dissemination of information about drug and violence prevention; and development and implementation of community-wide drug and violence prevention planning and organizing.

In making grants and contracts, the Governor must give priority to programs and activities for (1) children and youth who are not normally served by SEAs or LEAs, or (2) populations that need special services or additional resources (such as youth in juvenile detention facilities, runaway or homeless children and youth, pregnant and parenting teenagers, and school dropouts). Governors must also give special consideration to grantees that pursue a comprehensive approach to drug and violence prevention that includes incorporating mental health services within their program.

Principles of Effectiveness. SEAs, LEAs, and Governors' award recipients are required to operate their State Grant programs in a manner consistent with statutory Principles of Effectiveness. These Principles require prevention programs to be: (1) based on an assessment of objective data about the drug and violence problems in the schools and communities to be served; (2) based on performance measures aimed at ensuring that these schools and

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

communities have a safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environment; (3) grounded in scientifically based research that provides evidence that the program will reduce violence and illegal drug use; (4) based on an analysis of the prevalence of “risk factors, protective factors, buffers, assets, or other variables” identified through scientifically based research that exist in the schools and communities in the State; (5) include consultation with and input from parents; and (6) evaluated periodically against locally selected performance measures, and modified over time (based on the evaluation) to refine, improve, and strengthen the program.

Uniform Management Information and Reporting System. The statute requires States to establish and maintain a Uniform Management Information and Reporting System (UMIRS) under which they must provide information on a school-by-school basis to the public on truancy rates and on the frequency, seriousness, and incidence of violence and drug-related offenses resulting in suspensions and expulsions. The UMIRS must also include information, reported publicly, on the types of curricula, programs, and services provided by grantees and on the incidence and prevalence, age of onset, perception of health risk, and perception of social disapproval of drug use and violence by youth. The Department is working collaboratively with the States to develop a uniform data set that includes the UMIRS elements. In addition, States and LEAs must develop and identify performance measures for their SDFSC-funded drug and violence prevention programs and activities, and assess and publicly report on progress toward meeting those measures.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$468,949
2004.....	440,908
2005.....	437,381
2006.....	346,500
2007.....	351.642

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grant program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2008 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

The Administration requests \$100 million for the SDFSC State Grant program in fiscal year 2008, under a reauthorization proposal that would significantly change the structure of the program.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

A 2002 PART review rated the current program as “Ineffective,” primarily because the structure of the program is fundamentally flawed and the program was unable to demonstrate effectiveness in reducing youth alcohol and drug use and violence. A second PART review, conducted in 2006, rated the program as “Results Not Demonstrated.” The 2006 review found that the structure of the SDFSC State Grant program is still flawed, spreading funding too broadly to support quality interventions and failing to target those schools and communities in greatest need of assistance. SDFSC State Grants provide more than half of local educational agencies (LEAs) with allocations of less than \$10,000, amounts typically too small to mount comprehensive and effective drug and school safety programs. In sum, the program is unable to demonstrate that it is achieving its mission.

The Administration is responding to these findings with a reauthorization proposal under which the Department would allocate SDFSC State Grant funds by formula to SEAs, which would use the funds to provide school districts within their State support for the implementation of effective models that, to the extent possible, reflect scientifically based research, for the creation of safe, healthy, and secure schools. Examples of such activities could include:

- Provision of training, technical assistance, information, evaluation, local capacity building, coordination activities, and other services to school districts to support their efforts to prepare for, prevent, mitigate, respond to, and recover from crises arising from violent or traumatic events or natural disasters, and to restore the learning environment in the event of a crisis or emergency;
- Financial assistance to enhance drug and violence prevention resources available in areas that serve large numbers of low-income children, are sparsely populated, can demonstrate a significant need as a result of high rates of drug and alcohol abuse or violence, or have other special needs so that they can develop, implement, and evaluate comprehensive drug, alcohol, or violence prevention programs and activities that are coordinated with other school and community-based services and programs and that foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports academic achievement;
- The collection, analysis, and dissemination of data on the extent to which students and schools in the State are free of drugs and violence and prepared to respond appropriately in the event of an emergency.

A key difference between the program as proposed for reauthorization and the current program is that the reauthorized program would focus on building State capacity to assist school districts in creating a safe, drug-free school, and secure school environment. While States would be authorized to make subgrants to LEAs and other entities, there would be no within-State formula and no expectation that every LEA in the State would receive a grant. As a result, States would be able to target more effectively those schools with a demonstrated need. In addition, funding for LEAs would be provided with National Programs funds, for activities in areas of major national priority.

The Administration believes that this more focused objective can be accomplished with less funding than is currently available under SDFSC State Grants and that a \$100 million request will be sufficient to meet that objective.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Grants to States	\$336,307	\$341,439	\$99,000
Amount for SEAs and LEAs	269,718	273,834	99,000
Amount for Governors	66,589	67,605	0
Average State award	6,467	6,566	1,904
Range of awards	1,682- 41,540	1,707- 42,174	248- 12,833
 Set-Aside for Outlying Areas	 4,750	 4,750	 500
Set-Aside for BIA schools	4,750	4,750	500
Programs for Native Hawaiians	693	703	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2008 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department's strategy for assessing whether the current SDFSC State Grant program is making an investment toward positive outcomes uses (1) data on the extent to which recipients of SDFSC State Grant funds are implementing research-based practices, coupled with (2) national survey data on the prevalence of youth drug use and violence. The Department is also carrying out an evaluation using rigorous methodology for measuring the impact of promising interventions (which is discussed in the budget request for SDFSC National Programs), and supporting grants and technical assistance to help States improve the collection, analysis, and use of data to improve the quality, and report the outcomes, of their SDFSC programs.

Data on the Extent to which Recipients of SDFSC State Grant Funds are Implementing Research-Based Practices

The Department is conducting a Study of the Implementation of Research-Based Programs and Practices in Schools to Prevent Youth Substance Abuse and School Crime (which is being

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

funded under SDFSC National Programs) to collect data on the following two additional performance measures. Data for these two measures are expected to be available later in 2007:

- Percentage of drug and violence prevention programs and practices supported with SDFSC State Grant funds that are research-based; and
- Percentage of SDFSC-funded research-based drug and violence prevention programs and practices that are implemented with fidelity to the research on which they are based.

National Survey Data on the Prevalence of Youth Drug Use and Violence

The Department is also using the following five measures on the prevalence of drug use and violence as a component of measuring the performance of the SDFSC State Grant program. Data for these measures are collected from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System, conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention every 2 years, using a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.

Goal: Develop safe, disciplined, and drug-free learning environments

Objective: *To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of programs that reflect scientifically based research.*

Measure: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who were offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months.

Year	Targets	Actual
2001		28.5
2003		28.7
2005	28	25.4
2007	27	

Measure: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who used marijuana one or more times during the past 30 days.

Year	Targets	Actual
2001		23.9
2003		22.4
2005	21	20.2
2007	19	

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

Measure: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who had five or more drinks of alcohol in a row (that is, within a couple of hours) one or more times during the past 30 days.

Year	Targets	Actual
2001		29.9
2003		28.3
2005	27	25.5
2007	26	

Assessment of progress: The 2005 targets for the above indicators were exceeded.

Measure: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who were in a physical fight on school property one or more times during the past 12 months.

Year	Targets	Actual
2001		12.5
2003		12.8
2005	12	13.6
2007	12	

Measure: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property one or more times during the past 30 days.

Year	Targets	Actual
2001		6.4
2003		6.1
2005	5	6.5
2007	5	

Assessment of progress: The 2005 targets for the above two indicators were not met. The data show a non-statistically significant increase in fights and weapons carrying since 2001.

Efficiency Measures

To improve the operational efficiency of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants program, the Department developed two measures of efficiency. We believe achievement of targets has the potential to lead to more rapid correction of identified program problems and, as a result, improved operations.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

Measure: The (average) number of days it takes the Department to send monitoring reports to States after monitoring visits.

Year	Targets	Actual
2004	NA	46
2005	NA	46
2006	45	
2007	43	
2008	41	

Measure: The (average) number of days it takes States to respond satisfactorily to findings in the monitoring reports.

Year	Targets	Actual
2004	NA	78
2005	NA	78
2006	77	
2007	75	
2008	72	

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants was among the programs rated in 2002 and 2006 using the “Program Assessment Rating Tool” (PART). The 2002 PART rated SDFSC State Grants as “Ineffective” and the 2006 PART rated the program as “Results Not Demonstrated.” The PART recommendations for the program, along with the Department’s response and timeline for implementing those recommendations, are as follows.

PART recommendation: Collect and report data on the extent to which program funds are being used to support high-quality, research-based strategies at the local level.

Response: The Department (via contract) is collecting data concerning the extent to which program funds are being used to support high-quality, research-based programs. Specifically, later in 2007, the contractor expects to be able to report data concerning the extent to which SDFSC State Grant program funds were used to support research-based strategies during the 2004-05 school year. The results of this data collection will provide baseline data for one of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measures for the program. The contractor is also collecting data on a second, related GPRA measure: the extent to which these programs are being implemented with fidelity to the research. Baseline data (also for the 2004-05 school year) for this second measure will be available later in 2007 as well.

PART recommendation: Provide training and technical assistance to States on issues related to data quality and use of data for program management.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

Response: Under SDFSC National Programs, the Department awarded a total of 16 3-year grants in two cohorts (beginning in fiscal years 2004 and 2005, respectively) to support States in their efforts improve both the quality of data collected related to youth drug use and violence, as well as the use of these data in managing youth drug and violence prevention programs in the States. Final funding was awarded to the 2004 cohort of sites in fiscal year 2006, and final funding will be awarded to 2005 cohort sites in fiscal year 2007. Grantees are reporting to the Department on the following GPRAs measures for these projects (for which baseline data are provided in the accompanying budget justification for SDFSC National Programs):

- The proportion of local recipients of SDFSCA State Grants program funding that are using data related to youth drug and violence to manage youth drug, alcohol, and violence prevention programs by: (1) incorporating these data in needs assessment processes; (2) using the data to develop performance measures for their SDFSCA-funded programs; (3) considering the data in selecting schools and, where applicable, community-based interventions for implementation; (4) monitoring the success of interventions in reducing drug and alcohol use and violence and in building stronger communities; and (5) sharing data with their leadership and the public;
- The proportion of local recipients of SDFSCA State Grants program funding that have received training about collecting, analyzing, and using data to manage and improve drug and violence prevention programs; and
- The proportion of local recipients of SDFSCA State Grants program funding that submit complete responses to data collections.

The Department also provided training and technical assistance to States related to these efforts, and will continue to do so, as part of the contract activity described in connection with the following PART recommendation.

PART recommendation: Implement a project with States to develop a uniform data set that they can use as a model in meeting the requirements of the Uniform Management Information and Reporting System (UMIRS).

Response: During 2005, the Department met with representatives from 49 States and territories to obtain input for a uniform data set that addresses the requirements of the UMIRS. The contractor for the project also interviewed staff in other Federal agencies that collect or use data about youth alcohol and drug use and violence to identify potential common data elements or definitions that could inform this project. Based on this input, the contractor developed a draft uniform data set, which the Department will release in final to the States later this year.

Upon the release of the data set, the Department will host regional meetings for States to respond to questions and concerns about its implementation. We will also begin to introduce “best practices” in data collection and use, garnered in part from the cohorts of grantees discussed above in the Department’s response to the preceding PART recommendation. Also in 2007, the contractor will provide targeted technical assistance to individual States to help them implement the uniform data set.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

Beginning with the 2006-2007 school year, the Department will ask States to provide data for the ESEA Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) using some of the data elements and definitions contained in the uniform data set. Information from the CSPR and other sources will be used to produce a biennial report to Congress, as required for the SDFSC State Grants program. The first biennial report using these data elements will be sent to Congress in December 2008.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite ^{1,2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
National activities	\$172,758 ³	\$224,238	+\$51,490
Alcohol abuse reduction	32,409	0	-32,409
Mentoring program	<u>19,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-19,000</u>
Total	224,167	224,238	+81

¹ The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008; however, additional authorizing legislation is sought.

² Funds appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs in 2008 may not be increased above the amount appropriated in 2007 unless the funding appropriated for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants in 2008 is at least 10 percent greater than the amount appropriated in 2007.

³ Adjusted for comparability. Includes \$4,832 thousand available for Project SERV in the School Improvement Programs account under the FY 2007 Continuing Resolution, P.L. 109-383.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Programs statute authorizes funding for several programs and activities to help promote safe and drug-free learning environments for students and address the needs of at-risk youth. These include alcohol abuse reduction, mentoring programs, and other national programs (Federal activities and impact evaluation).

Alcohol Abuse Reduction (Section 4129)

Under this program, the Department, in consultation with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) in the Department of Health and Human Services, awards competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to develop and implement innovative and effective programs to reduce alcohol abuse in secondary schools. The Department may reserve up to 20 percent of the appropriation to enable SAMHSA to provide alcohol abuse resources and start-up assistance to the LEAs receiving these grants. The Department may also reserve up to 25 percent of the funds to award program grants to low-income and rural LEAs. As a condition of funding, all grantees are required to implement one or more strategies for reducing underage alcohol abuse that SAMHSA has determined are effective.

Mentoring program (Section 4130)

Under this program, the Department awards grants to LEAs, non-profit community-based organizations, and partnerships of the two to establish and support mentoring programs and

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

activities for children who are at risk of educational failure, dropping out of school, or involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong, positive role models. The programs must be designed to link these children (particularly those living in rural areas, high-crime areas, or troubled home environments, or children experiencing educational failure or attending schools with violence problems) with mentors who have received training and support in mentoring and are interested in working with such children. Mentors provide general guidance and emotional support; promote personal and social responsibility; offer academic assistance and encouragement to excel in school and plan for the future; discourage illegal use of drugs and alcohol, violence, and other harmful activity; and encourage participation in community service and community activities. Grant funds must be used for activities that include, but are not limited to, hiring and training mentoring coordinators and support staff; recruiting, screening, and training mentors; and disseminating outreach materials. However, the mentors may not be compensated directly with grant funds. In awarding grants, the Department is required to give priority to projects that propose school-based mentoring programs. The Department may also use funds under this program to provide technical assistance to grantees in implementing their projects effectively.

Federal Activities (Section 4121)

The Department is authorized to carry out a wide variety of discretionary activities designed to prevent the illegal use of drugs and violence among, and promote safety and discipline for, students. These activities may be carried out through grants to or contracts with public and private organizations and individuals, or through agreements with other Federal agencies, and may include, but are not limited to:

- The development and demonstration of innovative strategies for the training of school personnel, parents, and members of the community;
- The development, demonstration, scientifically based evaluation, and dissemination of innovative and high-quality drug and violence prevention programs and activities;
- The provision of information on drug abuse education and prevention to the Department of Health and Human Services for dissemination;
- The provision of information on violence prevention and education and school safety to the Department of Justice for dissemination;
- Technical assistance to Governors, State agencies, local educational agencies, and other recipients of SDFSC funding to build capacity to develop and implement high-quality, effective drug and violence prevention programs;
- Assistance to school systems that have particularly severe drug and violence problems, including hiring drug prevention and school safety coordinators, or assistance to support appropriate responses to crisis situations;
- The development of education and training programs, curricula, and instructional materials, and professional training and development for preventing and reducing the incidence of crimes and conflicts motivated by hate in localities most directly affected by hate crimes; and

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

- Activities in communities designated as empowerment zones or enterprise communities that connect schools to community-wide efforts to reduce drug and violence problems.

The statute (in section 4124) also establishes a Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee composed of representatives of Federal agencies, State and local governments (including school districts), and researchers and expert practitioners to advise the Secretary of Education and to help coordinate Federal school- and community-based substance abuse and violence prevention programs.

Impact evaluation (Section 4122)

The statute authorizes the Department to reserve up to \$2 million in SDFSC National Programs funds to conduct a required biennial evaluation of the impact of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program “and of other recent and new initiatives to combat violence and illegal drug use in schools.” The evaluation is to report on whether community and local educational agency programs funded under SDFSC State Grants: (1) comply with the SDFSC principles of effectiveness set forth in the statute; (2) have appreciably reduced the level of illegal drug, alcohol, and tobacco use, school violence, and the illegal presence of weapons at schools; and (3) have conducted effective parent involvement and training programs.

Section 4122 also requires the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to collect data to determine the incidence and prevalence of illegal drug use and violence in elementary and secondary schools in the States, and for the Secretary, every 2 years, to submit to the President and Congress a report on the findings of the biennial impact evaluation and the NCES data collection, along with data available from other sources on drug use and violence in elementary and secondary schools in the States.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$197,404
2004.....	233,295
2005.....	234,580
2006.....	222,335
2007.....	224,167

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Programs is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The budget request assumes that the program will be implemented in fiscal year 2008 under reauthorized legislation, and the request is based on the Administration's reauthorization proposal.

For 2008, the Administration requests \$224.3 million for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) National Programs, an \$81 million increase from 2007. Within the amount

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

requested, no funds are requested for (1) the Mentoring Program, because the phase-out of the mentoring program will be completed in 2007; and (2) the Alcohol Abuse Reduction program, because it is duplicative of other SDFSC programs for which funds are requested in 2008. The Administration will not propose that these two programs be reauthorized.

Drug use, violence, and crime continue to be serious problems for school-aged youth. Students cannot be expected to learn to the high standards envisioned by No Child Left Behind in schools where they are threatened drugs or violence. The public also continues to be extremely concerned about school safety, overall, in part because of the tragic school shootings in public schools across the Nation in recent years and also as a result of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States.

As part of the ESEA reauthorization, the Administration proposes to consolidate SDFSC National Programs into a single, flexible discretionary program focused on four priority areas: (1) emergency management planning, (2) preventing violence and drug use, including student drug testing, (3) school culture and climate, including character education, and (4) other needs related to improving students' learning environment to enable those students to meet high academic standards. Grantees would be required, to the extent possible, to implement interventions that reflect scientifically based research.

Because the reauthorization would replace an array of narrowly conceived, but overlapping authorities with a single program focused on critical areas of national concern, the Department would have greater authority to respond to new and emerging needs in drug prevention and school safety, and potential grantees would have the opportunity to develop more comprehensive proposals rather than piecing together activities from multiple grant streams and responding to multiple application notices, implementation rules, and reporting and accountability requirements. Because the reauthorized National Programs will explicitly authorize the support of character education activities, the Administration is not recommending reauthorization of a separate Character Education program.

Major elements of the budget request for SDFSC National Programs follow. The largest increases are provided for activities that provide direct support to LEAs, in sufficient amounts to make a real difference, for targeted projects that address key national concerns and are structured in a manner that permits grantees and independent evaluators to measure progress, hold projects accountable, and determine which interventions are most effective:

- \$59 million for research-based grant assistance to local educational agencies (LEAs) to support the implementation of drug prevention or school safety programs, policies, and strategies that research has demonstrated to be effective in reducing youth drug use or violence and for implementation and scientifically based evaluation of additional approaches that show promise of effectiveness. Under this activity, grantees would be required either to carry out (1) one or more drug or violence prevention programs, practices, or interventions that rigorous evaluation has demonstrated to be effective, or (2) a rigorous evaluation of a promising program, practice, or intervention to test its effectiveness and thereby increase the knowledge base on what works in the field. In making awards, the Department would ensure the equitable distribution of grants among urban, suburban, and rural LEAs.

Of the \$59 million requested, approximately \$30 million would be used for continuation grant awards for similar projects that begin in fiscal year 2007. An applicant would be required to

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

identify a problem or set of problems, directly related to school safety, the management of emergencies, alcohol or drug use, or violent behavior, and in areas of national concern identified by the Department. Problems to be addressed would have a particularly significant impact on the ability of one or more of the LEA's schools to provide students with high-quality educational services and propose activities, programs, or strategies designed to address the problem. Applicants would be required to (1) provide data related to the identified problem(s) and demonstrating that schools or students that are the target of their proposed project are experiencing high rates of youth drug use or violence compared to other schools or students in their State, and (2) select GPRA measures from a list of core outcomes related to youth drug use and violence (provided by the Department so as to ensure the use of common definitions, instruments, and protocols to collect comparable data) that most closely match the identified critical need. Examples of such potential projects could include those designed to mitigate the effects of re-emerging gang activity in areas such as Los Angeles, or reduce unusually high rates of methamphetamine use in adolescent populations in Midwestern cities such as Indianapolis. Another example might involve districts with schools identified as "persistently dangerous" under the Unsafe School Choice Option provisions of No Child Left Behind, or those included on State-maintained "watch lists" for such a designation. If the intervention selected has not demonstrated effectiveness through rigorous evaluation, the applicant would implement such an evaluation as part of the grant.

- \$15 million to continue a variety of school emergency preparedness initiatives that the Department is developing and implementing to coincide with the inclusion of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools in the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS's) National Infrastructure Protection Plan (NIPP).

As part of the Administration's efforts to enhance our national readiness to respond to terrorist threats and other crises, the NIPP involves the identification of vulnerabilities in key "sectors" of the U.S. infrastructure. DHS has incorporated elementary and secondary schools into the government facilities sub sector of the NIPP. Education and DHS have also identified a number of challenges that continue to face elementary and secondary schools as they prepare to prevent, mitigate, respond to, and recover from crisis events. Those challenges include the lack of expertise in the school community related to terrorism and crisis response; limited available technical assistance capacity for crisis response that is specific to elementary and secondary schools (such as strategies for ensuring the safety of the more than 24 million students who travel to school via school bus each day); lack of resources to develop that expertise and to support appropriate planning and practice simulation; failure of States and communities to include elementary and secondary schools in their planning activities; use of communications equipment by schools that is incompatible with communications devices for first responders; and lack of procedures or capacity to share credible information about imminent threats and actual crisis incidents. Other challenges specific to preparing schools to deal effectively with crisis situations are related to school governance and organization, including the strong tradition of local control of education, lack of contiguous boundaries between municipal entities and school districts, and lack of needed regional coordination among school districts located in metropolitan areas that include multiple municipalities and school districts.

Funds for this initiative will continue to be used to support a combination of direct grants and technical assistance that respond to the challenges related to elementary and secondary

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

schools identified via the NIPP vulnerability assessment. The initiative will encompass planning and preparation for the entire constellation of threats (not only terrorist attacks but also natural disasters, shootings, and gang-related activity) that face elementary and secondary schools. Grants provide resources that permit local school districts, in coordination with public health and safety agencies, to help shape their individual crisis planning and response activities to conform with DHS' National Incident Management System (NIMS), helping to ensure that during crises schools can communicate and coordinate activities with first responders who have responsibility for assisting them. Grants are supplemented by technical assistance, training activities, and a communications system designed to (1) expand the number of State and local educational agency personnel who are qualified to help schools plan and respond to threats and crises, and (2) support the efficient sharing of accurate information about threats and incidents, especially to the most vulnerable schools and school districts. Funds may also be used to assist institutions of higher education in developing and improving their emergency response and crisis management plans.

- \$79.2 million for the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative, which shows great promise in helping to create safe, disciplined and drug-free learning environments, promote healthy childhood development, and provide needed mental health services in the communities served. This initiative, which the Department of Education funds jointly with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and administers in collaboration with both HHS and the Department of Justice, supports LEAs and communities in developing and implementing a comprehensive set of programs and services designed to prevent youth drug use and violence, support early childhood development activities, and provide needed student mental health services.

Beginning in 2007, Education and SAMHSA plan to implement some significant changes to improve the operation of this initiative. Most significant among these changes is to strengthen the grant application requirements to ensure that applicants not only can demonstrate the commitment of the required partners (the LEA, local law enforcement and juvenile justice agencies, and the local public mental health authority) to support the project if it receives funding, but also to demonstrate a preexisting partnership among these entities on issues of school safety, drug and violence prevention, and/or healthy childhood development, so that projects can begin program implementation as soon as they receive their grant award. Along these lines, applications would need to include a "logic model" that reflects, by project element, needs and gaps, goals, objectives, performance indicators, partners' roles, and proposed activities, curricula, and programs. We also plan to increase the project period of the grants from 3 to 4 years to give grantees more time to accomplish their stated goals and objectives.

- \$17.850 million for grants to LEAs and public and private entities and other activities to support the development, implementation, or expansion of school-based drug testing programs for students. The drug testing funded by these grants must be part of a comprehensive drug prevention program in the schools served and must provide for the referral to treatment or counseling of students identified as drug users. The projects must also be consistent with recent Supreme Court decisions regarding student drug testing and must ensure the confidentiality of testing results. Within the amount requested, approximately \$1 million would be used to continue the national impact evaluation of

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

random mandatory drug testing programs that the Department began in 2006, and \$1 million would be used to establish a Student Drug Testing Institute to provide training, technical assistance, and outreach to school districts in carrying out student drug testing programs.

- \$24.248 million for activities to design and implement character education programs in elementary and secondary schools, which will: (1) assist schools in creating a positive school culture and climate that helps students feel connected to their schools and communities, (2) promote social and personal responsibility, and (3) foster a safe environment that is conducive to improved learning and achievement.
- \$1.146 million to continue the longitudinal Impact Evaluation of a School-Based Violence Prevention Program, which will determine whether (1) aggressive and violent behaviors decrease for students in schools that receive a selected violence prevention program compared to students in schools that do not receive the selected program; (2) the program improves other in-school outcomes, such as truancy, school attendance, and on-time promotion, or results in a reduction in other disruptive and delinquent behaviors, such as vandalism; and (3) the effects of the program vary by students' risk profiles (that is, whether program impacts differ based on whether students are at a high risk or low risk for different outcomes).
- \$7.348 million to continue to provide financial and technical assistance to institutions of higher education (IHEs) for drug prevention and campus safety programs for students attending such institutions. SDFSC National Programs is the only Department of Education program that provides funding for campus-based drug and violence prevention program at IHEs. No funds are requested for the IHE National Recognition Awards program, which will be funded in 2007, because it does not attract enough high-quality grant applications to warrant funding on an annual basis.
- \$10 million for Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence), which provides education-related services, including increased safety and security, to LEAs in which the learning environment has been disrupted by a violent or traumatic crisis. The \$10 million request is proposed to ensure that funds are available to provide crisis response services to LEAs in the event that the Department is called upon to do so.

Consistent with previous appropriations, funds for Project SERV are requested on a no-year basis, to remain available for obligation at the Federal level until expended. In the hoped-for event that there are no school-related crises, the unobligated funds would be carried over into the next fiscal year, preventing the funds from expiring. Examples of services provided include mental health assessments, referrals, and services for victims and witnesses of violence; enhanced school security; technical assistance on developing a short-term and long-term response to the crisis; and training for teachers and staff in implementing the response.

- \$10.456 million for other activities that support and improve drug and violence prevention efforts, such as evaluation, data collection and analysis, joint projects with other Federal agencies, the national clearinghouse for educational facilities, development and dissemination of materials and information, and other forms of technical assistance.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

No funds are requested for data management improvement grants because these projects will be concluded with fiscal year 2007 funds. Under this activity, begun in 2004, the Department has provided resources to States to develop, enhance, or expand the capacity of States and LEAs (and other State agencies and community-based entities currently receiving SDFSC State grant funds) to collect, analyze, and use data to improve the management, and report the outcomes, of drug and violence prevention programs. Examples of these activities include using data to assess needs, establish performance measures, select appropriate interventions, and monitor progress toward established performance targets.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
National Activities			
<u>Research-Based Grant Assistance to LEAs</u>			
Grant award funds (new)	0	\$29,700	\$29,000
Grant award funding (continuations)	0	0	29,700
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>300</u>
Total budget authority	0	30,000	59,000
Number of new awards	0	85	83
Number of continuation awards	0	0	85
Average award	0	\$349	\$349
<u>School Emergency Preparedness Initiative</u>			
Grant award funds (new)	\$24,175	\$24,387	\$7,900
Grant award funds (prior-year supplement)	711	0	0
Other school safety initiatives	2,215	2,714	7,000
Peer review of new award applications	<u>112</u>	<u>112</u>	<u>100</u>
Total budget authority	27,213	27,213	15,000
Number of new awards	77	80	26
Average award	\$314	\$305	\$304
<u>Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative</u>			
Grant award funding (new)	\$17,079	\$22,106	\$40,015
Grant award funding (continuations)	<u>62,121</u>	<u>57,094</u>	<u>39,185</u>
Total budget authority	79,200	79,200	79,200
Number of new awards	19	30	55
Number of continuation awards	63	59	49
Average award	\$966	\$890	\$762

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

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

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
<u>Drug Testing Initiative</u>			
Grant award funding (new)	\$1,692	0	\$14,500
Grant award funding (continuations)	6,945	\$8,113	1,163
Evaluation and data collection	1,738	2,267	1,000
Student Drug Testing Institute	0	0	1,000
Peer review of new award applications	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>187</u>
Total budget authority	10,380	10,380	17,850
Number of new awards	11	0	100
Number of continuation awards	55	64	11
Average award	\$131	\$127	\$141
<u>Character Education</u>			
Grant award funds (new)	0	0	\$5,660
Grant award funds (continuations)	0	0	17,446 ¹
Other initiatives	0	0	900
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>242</u>
Total budget authority	0 ¹	0 ¹	24,248
Number of new awards	0	0	12
Number of continuation awards	0	0	38
Average award	0	0	\$462
<u>Data Management Improvement Grants</u>			
Grant award funding (new)	0	0	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	\$7,511	\$2,529	0
Technical assistance	<u>663</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total budget authority	8,174	2,529	0
Number of new awards	0	0	0
Number of continuation awards	16	6	0
Average award	\$469	\$422	0
<u>Impact Evaluation (section 4122)</u>	\$1,500	\$1,534	\$1,146

¹ Character education activities in fiscal years 2006 and 2007 were supported under ESEA, Title V, Part D, Subpart 3, the Partnerships in Character Education program authority.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

**PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)
(Continued)**

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
<u>Postsecondary Education Drug and Violence Prevention Programs</u>			
Grant award funds (new)	\$1,669	\$2,396	\$2,402
Number of awards	12	18	18
Grant award funds (continuations)	\$2,585	\$1,605	\$2,396
Number of awards	20	12	18
Training and technical assistance center	\$2,252	\$2,455	\$2,500
National recognition awards program	\$842	\$842	0
Number of new awards	4	4	0
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>\$50</u>	<u>\$50</u>
Total budget authority	\$7,348	\$7,348	\$7,348
<u>Project SERV</u>	\$3,000	\$4,832 ¹	\$10,000
<u>Other Activities</u>	\$4,297	\$9,722	\$10,456
 Alcohol Abuse Reduction			
Grant award funding (new)	0	\$5,892	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	\$30,166	24,929	0
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)	2,243	1,528	0
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>0</u>
Total budget authority	32,409	32,409	0
Number of new awards	0	15	0
Number of continuation awards	81	71	0
Average award	\$372	\$358	0

¹ Adjusted for comparability. Includes \$4,832 thousand available for Project SERV in the School Improvement Programs account under the FY 2007 Continuing Resolution, P.L. 109-383.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

**PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)
(Continued)**

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Mentoring Program			
Grant award funding (continuations)	\$46,006	\$16,592	0
Technical assistance center	1,108	1,108	0
Evaluation	<u>1,700</u>	<u>1,300</u>	<u>0</u>
Total budget authority	48,814	19,000	0
Number of new awards	0	0	0
Number of continuation awards	252	90	0
Average award	\$181	\$186	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2008 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Alcohol Abuse Reduction

Goal: To help reduce alcohol abuse among secondary school students.

Objective: *Support the implementation of research-based alcohol abuse prevention programs in secondary schools.*

Measure: The percentage of Alcohol Abuse Reduction grantees whose target students show a measurable decrease in binge drinking. (2004 cohort)		
Year	Targets	Actual
2005		
2006		50
2007	70	

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

Measure: The percentage of Alcohol Abuse Reduction program grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who believe that binge drinking is harmful to their health. (2004 cohort).

Year	Targets	Actual
2005		
2006		56
2007	76	

Measure: The percentage of Alcohol Abuse Reduction program grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who disapprove of alcohol abuse. (2004 cohort)

Year	Targets	Actual
2005		
2006		67
2007	87	

Assessment of progress: No 2006 targets were established for the indicators because 2006 is the baseline year. Baseline data for the 2005 cohort will become available later in 2007.

Mentoring Program

Goal: To support mentoring programs and activities for children who are at risk of educational failure, dropping out of school, or involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models.

Objective: Provide grants to community-based organizations and local school districts to support mentoring programs for high-risk youth.

Measure: The percentage of student-mentor matches that are sustained by the grantees for a period of 12 months.

Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005				
2006			44.9	
2007	56.1	44.9		

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

Measure: The percentage of mentored students who demonstrate improvement in core academic subjects as measured by grade point average after 12 months.

Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005				
2006			49.6	
2007	52.1	49.6		

Assessment of progress: An assessment of progress for these indicators can be made in 2007, after the Department has a third year of data for these performance measures.

Measure: The percentage of mentored students who have unexcused absences from school.

Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			39.4	
2006	35.5		47.8	44.0
2007	27.6	39.6		

Assessment of progress: The 2006 target (for the 2004 cohort of grants) was not met. An assessment of progress cannot be made until later in 2007 for this measure for the 2005 cohort, as no 2006 target was established for this measure for the 2005 cohort.

Safe Schools/Healthy Students

Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug- and violence-prevention strategies.

Objective: *Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in improving student behaviors and school environments.*

Measure: The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that experience a decrease in the number of violent incidents at schools during the 3-year grant period.

Year	Targets			Actual		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005						
2006				70		
2007	90					
2008		80.5				

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

Measure: The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that experience a decrease in substance abuse during the 3-year grant period.

Year	Targets			Actual		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005						
2006				75		
2007	90					
2008		86.25				

Measure: The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that improve school attendance during the 3-year grant period.

Year	Targets			Actual		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005						
2006				33		
2007	90					
2008		38				

Assessment of progress: An assessment of progress for these indicators will be made later in 2007, after the Department has data for the third year of these projects.

Student Drug Testing

Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug- and violence-prevention strategies.

Objective: Student drug testing grantees will make substantial progress in reducing substance abuse incidence among target students.

Measure: The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a 5 percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-month drug use by students in the target population.

Year	Targets			Actual		
	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005						
2006				33		
2007	50	33				
2008		50	33			

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

Measure: The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a 5 percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-year drug use by students in the target population.						
Year	Targets			Actual		
	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005						
2006				25		
2007	50	25				
2008		50	25			

Assessment of progress: An assessment of progress can be made later in 2007 for the 2003 and 2005 grant cohorts. No 2006 targets were established for these indicators because 2006 was the baseline year for the first cohort of student drug testing grants.

Emergency Response and Crisis Management

The Department will have baseline data later in 2007 on the following performance measures for the fiscal year 2004 cohort of Emergency Response and Crisis Management grants: (1) demonstration by grantees of the number of hazards addressed by the improved school emergency response plan as compared to the baseline plan; (2) demonstration of improved response time and quality of response in practice drills and simulated crises; and (3) a plan for and commitment to the sustainability and continuous improvement of the school emergency response plan beyond the period of Federal financial assistance signed by all community partners.

Postsecondary Prevention

The Department will have baseline data later in 2007 on the following performance measures for the fiscal year 2005 cohort of postsecondary prevention grants: (1) at the end of these 2-year projects, the percentage of grantees that achieve a 5 percent decrease in high-risk drinking among students served by the project; and (2) at the end of these 2-year projects, the percentage of grantees that achieve a 5 percent decrease in violent behavior among students served by the project.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

Data Management Improvement

Measure: The proportion of local recipients of SDFSCA State Grants program funding that are using data related to youth drug and violence to manage youth drug, alcohol, and violence prevention programs by: (a) incorporating these data in needs assessment processes; (b) using the data to develop performance measures for their SDFSCA-funded programs; (c) considering the data in selecting schools, and where applicable, community-based interventions for implementation; (d) monitoring the success of interventions in reducing drug and alcohol use and violence and in building stronger communities; and (e) sharing data with their leadership and the public.

Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			43	
2006			96	94
2007	97	95		

Measure: The proportion of local recipients of SDFSCA State Grants program funding that have received training about collecting, analyzing, and using data to manage and improve drug and violence prevention programs.

Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			43	
2006			65	77
2007	80	82		

Measure: The proportion of local recipients of SDFSCA State Grants program funding that submit complete responses to data collections.

Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			93	
2006			91	100
2007	95	100		

Assessment of progress: An assessment of progress can be made in 2007, after the Department has 2007 data for these projects. No 2005 or 2006 targets were established for this indicator.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

Efficiency Measures

The Department has established, and is collecting data, on the following efficiency measures for the Mentoring program:

Measure: The cost per student mentored for each student-mentor match that is sustained for a period of 12 months. (2004 cohort)		
Year	Targets	Actual
2006		\$1,948
2007	\$1,851	

Measure: The cost per student mentored for each student-mentor match that is sustained for a period of 12 months. (2005 cohort)		
Year	Targets	Actual
2006		
2007	\$1,948	

Assessment of progress: An assessment of progress can be made in 2007, after the Department has 2007 data for this performance measure for the above two cohort or grantees.

Other Performance Information

In addition to collecting data on the above performance measures directly from grantees, the Department has launched several evaluations to assess the impact of programs and interventions supported with SDFSC National Programs funds.

Mentoring Program Evaluation

In 2005, the Department launched a 4-year evaluation to assess the impact of school-based mentoring programs supported with SDFSC National Programs grant funds. Using the 2005 cohort of grantees, under which students were randomly assigned either to participate or not participate in a mentoring program, the evaluation will address whether students enrolled in mentoring programs are less likely to engage in risky and dangerous behaviors and whether their academic performance is higher than that of students not enrolled in mentoring programs. The evaluation will also examine the relative effectiveness of different aspects of school-based mentoring.

Drug Testing Evaluation

In 2006, the Department launched an impact evaluation, using grants supported with SDFSC National Programs funds, to assess the effectiveness of student drug testing programs. The evaluation will be rigorously designed to determine whether students subject to random mandatory drug testing policies use drugs less frequently than other students.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: National programs

Safe Schools/Healthy Students Evaluation

A national evaluation of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative is currently underway. The evaluation is being conducted through a cooperative agreement with the Department of Justice and jointly managed by the Departments of Education, Justice, and Health and Human Services. The main goal of the evaluation is to document the effectiveness of collaborative community efforts to promote safe schools and provide opportunities for healthy childhood development. The evaluation seeks to demonstrate whether and how these efforts develop, function, and facilitate change within community institutions and within individuals.

The evaluation will describe how, and at what cost, the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative has affected local planning and implementation of comprehensive, integrated strategies to provide for healthy child and adolescent development and a safe school environment. The results are expected to be available later in 2007.

Based on the data collection and analysis plan for the evaluation, separate reports, also expected to be available in 2007, are being prepared addressing such topics as youth violence-related outcomes; youth substance abuse; school climate; mental health services; early childhood development; partnership formation, collaboration, and service integration; and programs, services, and policies implemented by Safe Schools/Healthy Students projects. The preparation of these reports is underway using three waves of data from 97 sites funded under this initiative spanning fiscal years 1999 through 2004. In addition, several Safe Schools/Healthy Students grantees funded in fiscal years 2002 and 2003 have formed State or regional consortia for the purpose of studying particular topics of relevance to the initiative, such as the role of law enforcement partners and the provision of mental health services.

Violence Prevention Program Evaluation

The Department is conducting a longitudinal impact evaluation of a school-based violence prevention program. Specifically, the evaluation is assessing the overall impact of a combining "Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways," a curriculum-based (instructional) program, with "Best Behavior," a whole-school program that aims to increase the clarity, fairness, and consistency of school enforcement policies and to improve teachers' classroom management skills. Approximately 40 middle schools are taking part in this evaluation, half of which have been randomly assigned to receive the hybrid program, which is being implemented over three consecutive school years. Within each middle school, students are being sampled and their violent and aggressive behaviors measured. Student and teacher surveys, observation of intervention activities, interviews with school administrators, and school records will be used to assess student outcomes in both treatment and control schools as well as to assess the quality of program implementation. A final report on the evaluation is expected in early 2010.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Character education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 3)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): \$675,000^{1, 2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$24,248	0 ³	-\$24,248 ³

¹ A total of \$657,000 thousand is authorized for fiscal year 2008 to carry out all Part D activities.

² The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

³ The Administration intends to allocate \$24.248 million to support character education activities in FY 2008 under the proposed Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs authority.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Character Education program provides support for the design and implementation of character education programs in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. Programs must be: (1) capable of being integrated into classroom instruction, (2) consistent with State academic content standards, and (3) carried out in conjunction with other educational reform efforts. Grantees may select the elements of character that will be taught, and must consider the views of parents and students to be served by the program. The elements of character from which grantees may choose include, but are not limited to caring, civic virtue and citizenship, justice and fairness, respect, responsibility, trustworthiness, and giving. Grants may be awarded for up to 5 years, of which up to 1 year may be for planning and program design. The Department may require matching funds.

State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) are eligible to receive grants. SEAs must form partnerships with one or more LEAs or nonprofit entities, including institutions of higher education (IHEs). LEAs may apply alone or in consortia with other LEAs or nonprofit organizations, including IHEs. The minimum SEA award is \$500,000, and SEAs may not use more than 3 percent of their funds for administrative costs.

Applicants must demonstrate that proposed programs have clear objectives that are grounded in scientifically based research. In addition, they must describe:

- Partnerships and collaborative efforts,
- Program activities, including how parents, students (including those with disabilities), and community members will be involved in the program; the curriculum and instructional practices that will be used or developed; and methods of teacher training and parent education, and

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Character education

- How the program will be linked to other efforts to improve academic achievement, including broader education reform efforts and State academic content standards.

SEAs must also describe in their applications how they will provide technical and professional assistance to LEA partners in developing and implementing character education programs, as well as how they will assist other interested LEAs that are not part of the original partnership.

All applicants must describe how they will evaluate the success of their programs and agree to cooperate with any national evaluations. Grantee evaluations must be designed to assess the impact of the project(s) on students, students with disabilities (including those with mental or physical disabilities), teachers, administrators, parents, and others. Applicants must also agree to provide the Department with information that is necessary to determine program effectiveness.

The Department may reserve up to 5 percent of funds for national research, dissemination, and evaluation activities. Allowable activities include:

- Conducting research and development,
- Providing technical assistance to State and local programs, particularly on matters of program evaluation,
- Conducting evaluations of State and local programs receiving program funding, and
- Compiling and disseminating information on model character education programs, high quality character education materials and curricula, research findings, and other information of use to program participants.

The Department is committed to supporting the development and implementation of high-quality character education programs, and testing their effectiveness through rigorous evaluations. Because grantee evaluations play such an important role in measuring the effectiveness of any single character-based intervention strategy, the Department supports a variety of technical assistance activities for all current grantees on evaluation design and implementation. For example, starting in fiscal year 2004, a portion of the annual national activities set-aside is being used to support a National Service Center for Character and Civic Engagement (approximately \$850,000 each year over the course of 1 base year and 4 option years (through FY 2008)). The service center's role, in large part, is to provide ongoing technical assistance to grantees implementing the program's rigorous evaluation requirements.

In fiscal years 2003 and 2004, the Department used a portion of the national activities set-aside to support a "What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Study" that provides a high-quality scientific review of the published and unpublished research literature on character education intervention strategies designed for use in elementary, middle, or high schools with attention to student outcomes related to positive character development, pro-social behavior, and academic performance (see: <http://www.whatworks.ed.gov>). This study provides detailed reviews of 14 character education interventions, including: Building Decisions Skills; Facing History and Ourselves; Heartwood Ethics Curriculum for Children; and Lessons in Character. Results of this study will be used to shape the agenda of the proposed national service center, future grant

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Character education

competitions under the program, and future data collections and program measurement strategies.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$24,838
2004.....	24,691
2005.....	24,493
2006.....	24,248
2007.....	24,248

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Character Education program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year.

For fiscal year 2008, the Administration is not requesting any funds for Character Education as a distinct program. However, as part of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the Administration is proposing to broaden the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs authority to include character education. In place of the current, separate program authorities under the ESEA for character education, physical education, mental health integration, elementary and secondary school counseling, and safe and drug-free schools, the Administration is seeking broader authority, under one flexible program, to design and carry out grant competitions and other activities in these areas. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs supported activities will include the design and implementation of character education programs in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. The Administration intends to allocate approximately \$24.2 million in fiscal year 2008 to support character education activities under the National Programs authority.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Number of new awards:			
LEA partnerships	32	4	0
SEA partnerships	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Sub-total	36	6	0
Number of continuation awards:			
LEA partnerships	11	37	0
SEA partnerships	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>
Sub-total	14	42	0
Total number of awards	50	48	0

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Character education

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

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Funding for new awards:			
LEA partnerships	\$13,574	\$2,059	0
SEA partnerships	<u>2,565</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Total new awards	16,139	3,059	0 ¹
Funding for Supplements	300	0	0
Funding for continuation awards:			
LEA partnerships	4,511	16,241	0
SEA partnerships	<u>2,018</u>	<u>3,726</u>	<u>0</u>
Total continuation awards	6,529	19,967	0 ¹
Peer review of new award applications	242	242	0
Total award funding	23,210	23,268	0
National activities:			
National Center for Character Education and Civic Engagement	830	845	0
Reports (development, printing, translating)	<u>208</u>	<u>367</u>	<u>0</u>
Total national activities	1,038	1,212	0 ¹

¹ Funding for new awards, continuation awards, and existing contracts in the area of character education in FY 2008 will be supported through the new Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs authority.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

In 2005, the Department developed a new measure for the Character Education program. This measure provides data on the percent of Character Education program grantees that demonstrate predicted student effects through valid, rigorous evaluations. The first cohort of grantees for which data are being collected was funded in 2002. Initial data from grantee evaluation reports will not be available until spring 2007. In addition, because most of these grantees requested no cost extensions, final evaluation reports will not be available until fall 2007. Of 39 grantees from this cohort, 18 are using experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation designs to evaluate the impact of their program.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Character education

Other Performance Information

The Character Education program contains rigorous evaluation requirements for all grantees. Grantees must reserve a portion of their awards to evaluate the effectiveness of their activities and to disseminate information about their programs. Up to 5 percent of the program's funding may be reserved by the Department to conduct research on the effectiveness of character-related programs and materials, provide technical assistance to grantees on program evaluation, and conduct evaluations of State and local character education programs.

Since fiscal year 2002, a subset of grantees has been using experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation designs to measure the effectiveness of their programs. Preliminary reports from these evaluations were submitted in FY 2004. These reports indicate that several of grantees are starting to demonstrate satisfactory student effects through valid, rigorous evaluations. Many of these grantees are working with independent evaluation experts, and it is likely that some of the evaluations will ultimately yield important insights into the effectiveness of the various character education strategies being supported through this program. However, because most of these grantees exercise the option to use the first full year of their grant as a planning period, preliminary findings from the 2002 cohort of grantees (submitted in 2004) typically include either no data, or baseline data only. Final evaluation reports from this cohort of grantees are expected in fall 2007.

Examples of preliminary evaluation results provided by grantees include the following:

- The Jefferson County Public School District, located in Kentucky, implemented the Child Development Project (CDP) curriculum for its character education program. CDP is designed to promote academic, social, and ethical growth in all students, and the program's emphasis is on enhancing pro-social characteristics in children, as reflected in attitudes and behaviors. Jefferson County reports that in year 3 of a 4-year intervention there was a significant impact on student attitudes and small, but significant, program effects on student reading test scores. In this quasi-experimental study, data were collected from eight treatment and eight carefully matched control schools (matching was based on demographic, cognitive, and non-cognitive characteristics). The student attitudes questionnaire consisted of five scales: a) student autonomy and influence in the classroom; b) classroom supportiveness; c) liking for school; d) trust and respect for teachers; and e) concern for others.
- The State of Missouri is implementing a 4-year study of the impact of the *Characterplus* program in 64 public K-12 schools. The 64 schools were stratified and randomly selected for participation in the project, and the study utilized a pre-test/post-test control group design with baseline (pre-test) administered prior to the intervention in all participating schools. After three years, the grantee reports significant pro-social results in students at the secondary level. More specifically, the evaluation preliminary report demonstrates increases in student feelings of belonging, sense of autonomy and influence, and self-reported altruism in treatment schools compared to control schools in 8th and 11th grades. Student feelings of competence increased significantly for the treatment schools at the 8th grade level, and student perceptions of parent involvement increased at the 11th grade level. There were no significant changes in student achievement for any of the curricular areas tested.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Elementary and secondary school counseling

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 2)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): \$675,000 ^{1,2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007.</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$34,650	0	-\$34,650

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

² A total of \$675,000 thousand is authorized for fiscal year 2008 to carry out all Title V, Part D activities.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program provides grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to enable them to establish or expand elementary school and secondary school counseling programs. In awarding grants, the Department must give consideration to applications that demonstrate the greatest need for services, propose the most promising and innovative approaches, and show the greatest potential for replication and dissemination. The Department awards grants for up to 3 years that may not exceed \$400,000 and must be used to supplement, not supplant, existing counseling and mental health services. The statute requires that any amount appropriated up to \$40 million for this program in any fiscal year be limited to elementary school counseling programs.

Funding levels for the past 5 years were:

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$32,289
2004.....	33,799
2005.....	34,720
2006.....	34,650
2007.....	34,650

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The Administration is not recommending reauthorization for this program and, accordingly, the budget provides no funding for it. This request is consistent with the Administration's policy of increasing resources for high-priority programs by eliminating small, narrow categorical programs that have limited impact, for which there is little or no evidence of effect, and programs that do not reflect an appropriate Federal role in education.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Elementary and secondary school counseling

School counselors are primarily supported with non-Federal funds. In the 2005-06 school year, grants under this program paid the cost of only about 500 counselors and other school mental health professionals (social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists), roughly one-half of one percent of the approximately 100,000 elementary and secondary school guidance counselors in the country. A small Federal categorical program can have, at best, a marginal impact on the number of counselors employed in schools or the availability of counseling for students, much less on the quality of the counseling provided. Thus, school counseling is a clear example of an area that has historically been a State and local responsibility and where the addition of Federal dollars has little impact.

In addition, under the 2008 budget request and the ESEA reauthorization proposal, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs includes \$59 million for Research-Based Grants to LEAs for drug and violence prevention programs and \$79.2 million in grants to LEAs for Safe Schools/Healthy Students projects, which LEAs may use to fund counseling as part of a comprehensive, research-based focus on the school environment.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Grant award funding (new)	\$17,169	\$12,258	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	17,135	22,392	0
Peer review of new award applications	346	0 ¹	0
Number of new awards	51	40	0
Number of continuation awards	49	65	0
Average award	\$350	\$350	0

¹ The Department plans on funding additional applications from the fiscal year 2006 grant award slate.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

Goal: To increase the availability of counseling programs and services in elementary schools.

Objective: *Support the hiring of qualified personnel to expand available counseling services for elementary school students.*

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Elementary and secondary school counseling

Measure: The percentage of grantees closing the gap between their student/mental health professional ratios and the student/mental health professional ratios recommended by the statute. (2004 cohort)

Year	Targets	Actual
2005		75
2006		60
2007	100	

Assessment of progress: The data above suggest that grantees are not likely to achieve the 2007 performance target for this measure.

Measure: The average number of referrals per grant site for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program. (2004 cohort)

Year	Targets	Actual
2005		607
2006		342
2007	257	

Assessment of progress: An assessment of progress can be made later in 2007, as no 2006 target was established for this measure. Note: The Department originally established this measure as the total number (rather than as the average per grant site) of referrals for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the program. In 2007 the Department adjusted the measure to make the data more comparable from 1 year to the next, because not all grantees have reported data each year.

Measure: The average number of suspensions per grant site for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program. (2004 cohort)

Year	Targets	Actual
2005		179
2006		153
2007	138	

Assessment of progress: An assessment of progress can be made later in 2007, as no 2006 target was established for this measure. Note: The Department originally established this measure as the total number (rather than as the average per grant site) of suspensions for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the program. In 2007 the Department adjusted the measure to make the data more comparable from 1 year to the next, because not all grantees have reported data each year.

Beginning with the new cohort of grantees in 2006, the Department has dropped the third measure above in order to reduce burden on grantees.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Physical education program

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 10)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): \$675,000 ^{1,2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2007.</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$72,674	0	-\$72,674

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

² A total of \$675,000 thousand is authorized in fiscal year 2008 to carry out all Title V, Part D activities.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program provides grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) and community-based organizations to pay the Federal share of the costs of initiating, expanding, and improving physical education programs (including after-school programs) for students in kindergarten through 12th grade, in order to make progress toward meeting State standards for physical education. Funds may be used to provide equipment and support to enable students to participate actively in physical education activities and for training and education for teachers and staff. Awards are competitive, and the Federal share may not exceed 90 percent of the total program cost for the first year of the project and 75 percent for each subsequent year. Funds must be used to supplement, and may not supplant, other Federal, State, and local funding for physical education activities.

Funding levels for the past 5 years were:

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$59,610
2004.....	69,587
2005.....	73,408
2006.....	72,674
2007.....	72,674

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Physical Education program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The Administration is not recommending reauthorization for this program and, accordingly, the budget provides no funding for it. Rather, the President's 2008 budget includes \$17 million within the request for the Department of Health and Human Services to support grants to school districts that have

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Physical education program

completed physical education and nutrition assessments as part of the School Health Index. These grants will be available to support technical assistance and implementation of science-based curriculum tools to encourage physical education and healthy eating, reaching young people and their families across the Nation. Because this new program targets resources to identified needs and supports the dissemination of proven interventions, the Administration believes it is a more promising approach.

The effectiveness of the Department's Physical Education program is unknown. In its first few years, it appeared that most of the money was being spent for equipment. In response, the Department has focused on making the grants more effective, and is now collecting data on them, but there is, as yet, no evidence that the program is making a difference in terms of youth physical activity, reduction in obesity, or any other desired outcome. In fact, there is no evidence that it is doing more than, in a handful of districts, paying for what States and localities have financed in the past.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Grant award funding (new)	\$18,320	\$45,005	0
Grant award funding (continuations)	54,072	27,669	0
Peer review of new award applications	282	0 ¹	0
Number of new grant awards	60	145	0
Number of continuation grant awards	285	144	0
Average grant award	\$210	\$251	0

¹ The Department plans on funding additional applications from the fiscal year 2006 grant award slate.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

Goal: To promote physical activity and healthy lifestyles for students.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Physical education program

Objective: Support the implementation of effective physical education programs and strategies.

Measure: The percentage of students served by the Physical Education Program grants actively participating in physical education activities.

Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			70	
2006			71	73
2007	90	80		

Measure: The percentage of students served by the Physical Education Program grants who make progress toward meeting State standards for physical education.

Year	Targets		Actual	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			74	
2006			65	70
2007	90	77		

Assessment of progress: The performance data above suggest that 2004 cohort grantees are not making progress toward the 2007 performance targets established for that cohort of grants. Beginning with the 2006 cohort of grants, the Department revised the performance measures for this program as the percentage of students served by the grant who engage in (1) 150 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week (for elementary school students) or (2) 225 minutes per week (for middle and high school students). The Department will have baseline data on the new measure in late 2007.

Efficiency Measures

The Department developed and is implementing the following efficiency measure: the cost per student who achieves 150 minutes (for elementary school students) or 225 minutes (for middle and high school students) of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week. The Department will have baseline data for this measure in late 2007.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Physical Education program was among the programs assessed in 2005 by the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART). The program received a rating of "Results Not Demonstrated." While the program has an overall strong purpose and design, and is managed well, it has weaknesses and deficiencies with regard to demonstrating results. Following is a brief status report on areas where the PART review indicated that follow-up is needed to improve the program.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Physical education program

PART Recommendation: Revise existing performance measures and data collection efforts so that grantees report data that are comparable across sites and provide a better assessment of the program's overall effectiveness.

Response: Although Physical Education program projects often include a comprehensive range of strategies designed to help students meet State standards, the Department determined that the significant majority of projects focus, at least in part, on increasing the amount and intensity of physical activity for project participants. As a result, we identified a single new GPRA outcome measure for the program (for which data can be aggregated across projects more meaningfully than was the case for the Department's previous measures for the program) that identifies the proportion of students meeting developmentally appropriate targets for moderate to vigorous activity.

As discussed above under the Assessment of Progress for the current measures, in response to recommendations from the PART, the Department established a new measure: the percentage of students served by the grant who engage in (1) 150 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity per week (for elementary school students) or (2) 225 minutes per week (for middle and high school students). These are the amounts of weekly physical activity adopted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). In 2006, the Department announced the new measure to all applicants for new awards under the program, and applicants that receive new awards in 2006 and 2007 will adopt the revised measure. The Department has provided all 2006 grantees detailed information about this performance measure, including definitions, recommended data collection methods, and directions for reporting results.

PART recommendation: Refine and implement an efficiency measure for the program.

Response: The Department has established the following efficiency measure for this program: the cost, per child, of implementing a physical education program that results in children engaging in the CDC-endorsed amount of weekly physical activity. Beginning with the 2006 cohort of grantees the Department has operationalized the efficiency measure for this programs as the cost per student who achieves the outcome measure level (150 or 225 minutes per week) of moderate to vigorous physical activity. As grantees provide data annually to the Department on their progress toward the outcome objectives for this program, the Department will be able to calculate the data for the corresponding efficiency measure.

PART recommendation: Develop options for a national evaluation to identify needed improvements to, and assess the effectiveness of, the program.

Response: The Physical Education program statute authorizes the use of funds only for grants. As a result, the only available source of funding to support a national evaluation of the program is the 0.5 percent reservation of program funds permitted under Title IX, Part F of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Department is developing options for funding evaluation activities with that level of funding.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Civic education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part C, Subpart 3)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite^{1,2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
We the People	\$17,039 ³	0	-\$17,039
Cooperative Education Exchange	<u>12,072³</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-12,072</u>
Total	29,111	0	-29,111

¹ ESEA section 2343(b)(1) requires that of the total appropriated for Civic education, not more than 40 percent may be used for the Cooperative Education Exchange portion of the program.

² The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

³ Assumes the 40 percent statutory limitation will not apply.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Civic Education program supports grants to improve the quality of civics and government education, foster civic competence and responsibility, and improve the quality of civic and economic education through exchange programs with emerging democracies. The program consists of two parts, *We the People* and the *Cooperative Education Exchange*. By statute, not more than 40 percent of the funds appropriated may be used for the *Cooperative Education Exchange* component of the program.

We the People

The statute authorizes a noncompetitive grant to the nonprofit Center for Civic Education in Calabasas, California to support the *We the People* program. *We the People* has two key program components: the *Citizen and the Constitution* and *Project Citizen*.

The *Citizen and the Constitution* project provides teacher training and curricular materials for upper elementary, middle, and high school students. The program curriculum, titled *We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution*, seeks to promote civic competence and responsibility among students, including support for the constitutional rights and civil liberties of dissenting individuals and groups (<http://www.civiced.org/programs.html>). For upper elementary and secondary school students, the program also provides simulated Congressional hearings that give students the opportunity to show their understanding of the basic principles of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. For secondary students, these hearings culminate in a national competition in Washington, D.C., where the winning class from each State and their teachers visit members of Congress. The competition serves as a model for assessing higher levels of student learning. Working in teams, students prepare oral responses to questions that test their understanding of facts and concepts, along with their ability to conduct research, think

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Civic education

critically, and remain poised under pressure. Public officials and community members serve as judges in the competition.

Project Citizen, a program for middle school students, focuses on the role of State and local governments in the American Federal system. *Project Citizen* requires participating students to choose a social problem, evaluate alternative policies to address the problem, and then develop an action plan to encourage implementation of their policy. Students create a portfolio and binder displaying their work, which they present to school and community leaders in simulated legislative hearings.

The Center for Civic Education also recently worked with Wheeling Jesuit University's Center for Educational Technologies to produce an interactive CD-ROM/DVD training tool that provides an overview of the U.S. Constitution and related components of the *We the People...* curriculum. A series of interactive discs have been developed and large-scale teacher training began during the 2003-04 academic year.

Cooperative Education Exchange

The statute authorizes noncompetitive grants to the nonprofit Center for Civic Education and the National Council on Economic Education to support program activities. Of the funds appropriated for this program, the authorizing statute requires 37.5 percent to be awarded to the Center for Civic Education, and 37.5 percent to the National Council on Economic Education. The remaining 25 percent must be used for competitive awards to organizations experienced in civics, government, and economic education.

Competitive grants under the *Cooperative Education Exchange* program support education exchange activities in civics and economics between the United States and eligible countries in Central and Eastern Europe, the Commonwealth of Independent States, any country that was formerly a republic of the Soviet Union, the Republic of Ireland, the province of Northern Ireland in the United Kingdom, and any developing country that has a democratic form of government.

Grantees facilitate exchange programs for students, educators and leaders that include seminars on the basic principles of U.S. constitutional democracy, visits to school systems and institutions of higher education, and related activities on the culture, governance, and history of eligible countries.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Civic education

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	<i>We The People</i>	<i>Cooperative Education Exchange</i>
	(\$000s)	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$16,890	\$11,922
2004.....	16,790	11,852
2005.....	17,211	12,194
2006.....	17,039	12,072
2007.....	17,039	12,072

FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Civic Education program is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and is, therefore, subject to reauthorization this year. The Administration is not recommending reauthorization for this program and, accordingly, the budget provides no funding for it. This request is consistent with the Administration's intent to increase resources for higher priority programs by eliminating small categorical programs that have limited impact, and for which there is little or no reliable evidence of effectiveness.

While *We the People* supports worthwhile activities, the program's contribution to the Department's mission is marginal, and the Administration does not believe additional Federal funding is necessary for the successful operation of this program. The Center for Civic Education is an established non-profit organization with a broad network of program participants, alumni, volunteers, and financial supporters at the local, State, and national levels. Districts in nearly every State and major urban area participate in *We the People* program activities (see: <http://www.civiced.org/wethepeople.php?link=state>). The Center also has a long history of success raising additional financial support through such vehicles as selling program-related curricular materials, trainings, and workshops (e.g., <http://store.yahoo.com/civiced-store>), partnering with non-profit groups on core activities (see: <http://civiced.org/about.php?link=support>), lobbying, and seeking support from foundations. For example, the Center has received financial support from such organizations as the Pew Charitable Trusts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation, the Lincoln and Therese Filene Foundation, Inc., and an increasing number of State and local entities. Also, with a national board that includes Supreme Court justices and other well-known public figures, the Center will have many opportunities to generate additional support for core program activities.

Likewise, the *Cooperative Education Exchange* program's contribution to the Department's mission to improve the excellence of education in the United States is minimal. The primary purpose of this program is to support democracy and free market economies in foreign countries. While supporting and promoting the foundational principles of democracy and free market economies in foreign countries is an undeniably important mission (particularly in the post-September 11th world), the Department of Education is not very well positioned to administer programs that are designed to accomplish this critical goal. Unlike the U.S. Department of State and U.S. Agency for International

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Civic education

Development, both of which have played a key role in promoting democracy in foreign countries by providing billions in support and critical expertise in everything from revitalizing infrastructure to promoting democratic reforms of education and the media, the Department of Education has limited experience in this area.

The program authority directs that the bulk of funds available through this authority must provide support to two organizations (the Center for Civic Education and the National Council on Economic Education), both of which already receive significant financial support from alternate sources. For example, among the numerous corporations and private foundations that support the National Council on Economic Education are: 3M, American Express, AT&T, MCI, Moody, the Vanguard Group, Allstate Insurance, Ameritech, Bank of America, the Carson Group, McGraw Hill, Merrill Lynch, State Farm Insurance, UPS, and Wells Fargo (see: <http://www.ncee.net/contributors/>).

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
We the People:			
Statutory earmark to Center for Civic Education	\$17,039	\$17,039	0
Statutory earmarks to:			
Center for Civic Education	\$4,527	\$4,527	0
National Council on Economic Education	<u>4,527</u>	<u>4,527</u>	<u>0</u>
Earmark total	9,054	9,054	0
Number of competitive awards:			
New awards	0	2	0
Continuations	3	1	0
Competitive award funding:			
New awards	0	\$1,999	0
Continuations	\$3,018	1,000	0
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>0</u>
Competitive total	3,018	3,018	0
Total funds, Cooperative Education Exchange	\$12,072	\$12,072	0

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Civic education

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

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

Goal: To educate students about the U.S. Constitutions and the Bill of Rights.

Objective: *Provide high quality civic education curricula to elementary and secondary school students through the "We the People: Citizen and the Constitution" program.*

Measure: The percentage of teachers participating in training or professional development activities provided as part of the "We the People" program that have demonstrated improved quality of instruction through an evaluation.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2005		92.7
2006		96
2007	94	

Assessment of progress: Working with consultants, the grantee created a 12-question survey to collect data on the extent to which participating teachers report that professional development improved the quality of classroom instruction. The survey was administered after teachers returned to their respective classrooms. In 2006, the survey was provided to 669 teachers, with approximately 29 percent responding. Of that group, 96 percent reported that the training provided by this program had improved the quality of their classroom instruction. All data are self-reported by the grantee.

Other Performance Information

We the People

The Department has not conducted any evaluations of this program. The Center for Civic Education has conducted a number of its own studies of *We the People*. While these studies yield some information on the performance of participants in this program, none of the studies or evaluations conducted to date are sufficiently rigorous to yield reliable information on the overall effectiveness or impact of *We the People*. For example, a recent survey analysis (published in April 2005) conducted to gauge the knowledge and attitudes of *We the People* program national competition finalists concludes that "*We the People* finalists are better informed in every aspect of political knowledge measured than national samples of high school seniors, college freshman, and adults." However, the students included in this survey represent a highly select, non-representative sample of high-achieving students. In another study, conducted in 2001, the Center for Civic Education compared the scores of *We the People* competition finalists to the

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Civic education

national sample of students who participated in the 1998 NAEP Civics assessment component. The study finds that *We the People* national finalists outperformed a national sample of students participating in the NAEP Civics component by approximately 24 percent. Since *We the People* national finalists represent only a very select sample of program participants, however, neither study provides reliable information on the impact of the program generally.

In 2003, the Center for Civic Education recently hired MPR Associates to evaluate certain aspects of the *We the People* program. The findings of this evaluation are not yet available, except for the results of a pilot study conducted on one curriculum, *We the People: the Citizen and the Constitution*. The key purpose of this pilot study was to measure the effectiveness of the instruments to be used in the upcoming evaluation, such as surveys or assessments, and to gauge the relative impacts on treatment and comparison groups. A brief report of the results of a pilot test suggests that the curriculum is well established in the States, and that students participating in *We the People* may demonstrate improvements in specific learning outcomes compared to students who did not participate. This preliminary report suggests that the factors most likely to make a difference in student performance include (ranked in order of effects) AP course enrollment, overall achievement, participation in *We the People*, parent educational level, and ethnicity. However, due to limitations in the sample size and comparison methodology of the pilot study, the extent to which participation in *We the People* may actually affect student performance cannot yet be reliably demonstrated. No timeline has yet been established for completion and publication of this evaluation. MPR planned to conduct data collection for this evaluation during the 2005-2006 academic year, and results should be available by fall 2007.

Cooperative Education Exchange

While a number of interesting studies and research papers have been written on various aspects of the Center for Civic Education's Cooperative Education Exchange program, no recent evaluations reliably demonstrate the efficacy of these interventions. A recent evaluation of the *Civitas Latin America* conducted by WestEd identifies some key barriers to effective program implementation, but unfortunately tells us very little about the overall effectiveness of the programs being supported with respect to such key variables as student outcomes and teacher classroom practice.

Program activities implemented by the National Council on Economic Education (NCEE) focus on providing additional training to: a) educators who train economics teachers, or b) classroom economics teachers. Such training is designed to reinforce content knowledge and provide exposure to additional instructional methods. In recent years, NCEE has conducted multiple evaluations of these activities. Unfortunately, none are of sufficient scope or rigor to provide reliable information on key program outcomes, such as the extent to which teacher classroom practice actually changes as a result of participating in NCEE-supported interventions, or the extent to which students of teachers who participate in classrooms of teachers participating in NCEE-supported interventions demonstrate improved academic outcomes.

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	5,116,189	5,194,254	1,450,855	(3,743,399)
Alaska	1,681,535	1,707,193	251,663	(1,455,530)
Arizona	5,561,230	5,646,085	2,049,888	(3,596,197)
Arkansas	3,197,966	3,246,762	893,086	(2,353,676)
California	41,539,958	42,173,786	12,832,908	(29,340,878)
Colorado	3,792,828	3,850,700	1,537,382	(2,313,318)
Connecticut	3,429,259	3,481,583	1,141,351	(2,340,232)
Delaware	1,681,535	1,707,193	257,034	(1,450,159)
District of Columbia	1,681,535	1,707,193	247,500	(1,459,693)
Florida	16,479,849	16,731,303	5,394,327	(11,336,976)
Georgia	9,400,001	9,543,429	3,054,716	(6,488,713)
Hawaii	1,681,535	1,707,193	383,205	(1,323,988)
Idaho	1,681,535	1,707,193	490,481	(1,216,712)
Illinois	13,804,325	14,014,955	4,285,323	(9,729,632)
Indiana	5,879,751	5,969,466	2,144,540	(3,824,926)
Iowa	2,683,536	2,724,482	896,380	(1,828,102)
Kansas	2,777,819	2,820,204	889,594	(1,930,610)
Kentucky	4,856,913	4,931,021	1,299,576	(3,631,445)
Louisiana	6,605,996	6,706,792	1,509,449	(5,197,343)
Maine	1,681,535	1,707,193	383,534	(1,323,659)
Maryland	5,210,438	5,289,941	1,868,455	(3,421,486)
Massachusetts	6,383,004	6,480,398	1,941,319	(4,539,079)
Michigan	12,756,555	12,951,198	3,427,983	(9,523,215)
Minnesota	4,649,215	4,720,154	1,635,285	(3,084,869)
Mississippi	4,166,529	4,230,103	981,634	(3,248,469)
Missouri	6,106,703	6,199,881	1,833,593	(4,366,288)
Montana	1,681,535	1,707,193	277,001	(1,430,192)
Nebraska	1,681,535	1,707,193	563,794	(1,143,399)
Nevada	1,681,535	1,707,193	818,121	(889,072)
New Hampshire	1,681,535	1,707,193	421,351	(1,285,842)
New Jersey	8,199,705	8,324,818	2,890,315	(5,434,503)
New Mexico	2,629,797	2,669,923	649,506	(2,020,417)
New York	26,349,783	26,751,835	6,030,395	(20,721,440)
North Carolina	7,809,292	7,928,449	2,807,728	(5,120,721)
North Dakota	1,681,535	1,707,193	247,500	(1,459,693)
Ohio	12,407,972	12,597,296	3,708,544	(8,888,752)
Oklahoma	4,132,146	4,195,195	1,114,617	(3,080,578)
Oregon	3,299,708	3,350,056	1,142,168	(2,207,888)
Pennsylvania	13,541,830	13,748,456	3,826,332	(9,922,124)
Rhode Island	1,681,535	1,707,193	331,134	(1,376,059)
South Carolina	4,444,833	4,512,653	1,364,388	(3,148,265)
South Dakota	1,681,535	1,707,193	248,863	(1,458,330)
Tennessee	5,737,796	5,825,345	1,834,795	(3,990,550)
Texas	27,461,832	27,880,852	8,148,705	(19,732,147)
Utah	2,145,458	2,178,194	928,169	(1,250,025)
Vermont	1,681,535	1,707,193	247,500	(1,459,693)
Virginia	6,414,756	6,512,634	2,399,055	(4,113,579)
Washington	5,591,988	5,677,312	1,994,294	(3,683,018)
West Virginia	2,456,684	2,494,169	513,206	(1,980,963)
Wisconsin	5,661,778	5,748,167	1,748,756	(3,999,411)
Wyoming	1,681,535	1,707,193	247,500	(1,459,693)
American Samoa	900,459	900,459	94,785	(805,674)
Guam	1,934,732	1,934,732	203,656	(1,731,076)
Northern Mariana Islands	606,862	606,862	63,880	(542,982)
Puerto Rico	8,400,553	8,528,731	1,415,202	(7,113,529)
Virgin Islands	1,307,947	1,307,947	137,679	(1,170,268)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	4,750,000	4,750,000	500,000	(4,250,000)
Other (non-State allocations)	693,000	703,284	0	(703,284)
Total	346,500,000	351,641,761	100,000,000	(251,641,761)

