

# Archived Information

## Department of Education

### CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

#### Fiscal Year 2008 Budget Request

#### CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	M-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	M-2
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	M-4
Obligations by Object Classification.....	M-5
Summary of Changes.....	M-6
Authorizing Legislation.....	M-7
Appropriations History.....	M-9
Significant Items in FY 2007 Appropriations Reports.....	M-10
Summary of Request.....	M-11
Activities:	
Career and technical education:	
State grants.....	M-13
National programs.....	M-22
Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions.....	M-26
Tech prep education State grants.....	M-30
Adult education:	
Adult basic and literacy education State grants.....	M-35
National leadership activities.....	M-43
National Institute for Literacy.....	M-46
Smaller learning communities.....	M-50
State grants for incarcerated youth offenders.....	M-56
State tables.....	M-59

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006,<sup>1</sup> and the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, \$1,197,174,000, of which \$1,189,808,000 shall become available on July 1, 2008 and shall remain available through September 30, 2009<sup>2</sup>: *Provided*, That of the amounts made available for the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, \$7,366,000 is for postsecondary career and technical institutions under section 117<sup>3</sup>: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided for Adult Education State Grants, \$67,896,000 shall be made available for integrated English literacy and civics education services to immigrants and other limited English proficient populations<sup>4</sup>: *Provided further*, That of the amount reserved for integrated English literacy and civics education, notwithstanding section 211 of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, 65 percent shall be allocated to States based on a State's absolute need as determined by calculating each State's share of a 10-year average of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services data for immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence for the 10 most recent years, and 35 percent allocated to States that experienced growth as measured by the average of the 3 most recent years for which United States Citizenship and Immigration Services data for immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence are available, except that no State shall be allocated an amount less than \$60,000<sup>5</sup>: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available for the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, \$9,096,000 shall be for national leadership activities under section 243<sup>6</sup> and \$6,638,000 shall be for the National Institute for Literacy under section 242.<sup>7</sup>

### 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 Provisions and Changes document which follows the appropriation language.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<sup>1</sup> <u>...the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.</u>	This language replaces the language for the antecedent statute.
<sup>2</sup> <u>...\$1,197,174,000, of which \$1,189,808,000 shall become available on July 1, 2008 and shall remain available through September 30, 2009:</u>	This language provides for funds to be appropriated on a “forward-funded” basis for Adult Education programs.
<sup>3</sup> <u>...\$7,366,000 is for postsecondary career and technical institutions under section 117:</u>	This language provides funds for Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions.
<sup>4</sup> <u>Provided further, That of the amount provided for Adult Education State Grants, \$67,896,000 shall be made available for integrated English literacy and civics education services to immigrants and other limited English proficient populations:...</u>	This language earmarks funds from the Adult Education State Grants appropriation for English Literacy and Civics Education State Grants.
<sup>5</sup> <u>Provided further, That of the amount reserved for integrated English literacy and civics education, notwithstanding section 211 of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, 65 percent shall be allocated to States based on a State's absolute need as determined by calculating each State's share of a 10-year average of the Immigration and Naturalization Service data for immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence for the 10 most recent years, and 35 percent allocated to States that experienced growth as measured by the average of the 3 most recent years for which Immigration and Naturalization Service data for immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence are available, except that no State shall be allocated an amount less than \$60,000:...</u>	This language specifies an allocation formula for awarding State grants for English literacy and civics education, which are not otherwise authorized under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<sup>6</sup> <u>Provided further, That of the amounts made available for the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, \$9,096,000 shall be for national leadership activities under section 243...</u>	This language provides a specific amount for National Leadership activities authorized under section 243 of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, overriding the statutory set-aside of 1.5 percent of the Adult Education appropriation (not to exceed \$8 million).
<sup>7</sup> <u>... and \$6,638,000 shall be for the National Institute for Literacy under section 242.</u>	This language provides a specific amount for the National Institute for Literacy, authorized under section 242 of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, overriding the statutory set-aside of 1.5 percent of the Adult Education appropriation (not to exceed \$8 million).

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

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

	2006	2007	2008
<hr/>			
Discretionary appropriation:			
Appropriation	\$2,012,282	0	\$1,197,174
Across-the-board reduction	-20,123	0	0
CR annual rate	0	\$1,997,493	0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Subtotal, appropriation	1,992,159	1,997,493	1,197,174
Comparative transfers from <u>Higher Education</u> for: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Career and Technical Institutions	7,366	7,366	0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Subtotal, comparable discretionary appropriation	1,999,525	2,004,859	1,197,174
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-791,000	-791,000	0
Advance from prior year	791,000	791,000	791,000 <sup>1</sup>
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Subtotal, comparable budget authority	1,999,525	2,004,859	1,988,174
Unobligated balance, start of year	135,904	130,569	128,000
Unobligated balance expiring	-177	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	-130,569	-128,000	-37,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total, direct obligations	2,004,683	2,007,428	2,079,174

<sup>1</sup>The FY 2008 President's budget assumes that statutory language will be included in a full year 2007 Continuing Resolution to make advance appropriations available in 2008 at the same level as provided in the 2006 Department of Education Appropriations Act for use in 2007.

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

**Obligations by Object Classification**  
(\$000s)

	2006	2007	2008
Personnel compensation and benefits .....	\$1,227	\$1,228	\$1,257
Travel and transportation of things .....	86	87	90
Rental payments to GSA and others .....	394	395	400
Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges .....	166	166	173
Printing and reproduction .....	222	223	232
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services .....	1,789	6,011	6,683
Other services .....	3,539	11,032	7,816
Peer Review.....	600	700	0
Purchases of goods and services .....	17,340	17,289	8,621
Research and development contracts .....	12,719	1,003	1,842
Operation and maintenance of equipment .....	<u>179</u>	<u>180</u>	<u>188</u>
Subtotal .....	36,166	36,215	25,150
Supplies and materials .....	24	24	25
Equipment.....	6	6	6
Grants, subsidies, and contributions .....	<u>1,966,392</u>	<u>1,969,084</u>	<u>2,051,841</u>
Total, direct obligations.....	2,004,683	2,007,428	2,079,174

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

**Summary of Changes**  
(\$000s)

---

2007 .....	\$579,552
2008 .....	<u>2,004,859</u>
Net change.....	-807,685

---

	<u>2007 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<b>Decreases:</b>		
<u>Program:</u>		
Reduce funding for the Career and Technical Education State Grants in order to support proposed high school reforms.	\$1,182,420	-\$582,420
Reduce funding for Career and Technical Education National Programs in order to support proposed high school reforms.	17,369	-7,369
Eliminate funding for the separate Tech Prep State Grants program in order to support funding for proposed high school reforms.	104,755	-104,755
Eliminate funding for Smaller Learning Communities because of diminishing local interest in the program and little or no evidence of effectiveness.	90,371	-90,371
Eliminate funding for State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders to focus limited resources on high-priority programs instead of small categorical programs that have only indirect or limited impact and for which there is little or no evidence of effectiveness.	<u>22,770</u>	<u>-22,770</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-807,685
Net change		-807,685

---

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

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

Activity	2007 Authorized	2007 Estimate	2008 Authorized	2008 Request
<b>Career and technical education: (<i>Carl D. Perkins CTEA</i>)</b>				
State grants ( <i>CTEA Title I</i> )	Indefinite	\$1,182,420	Indefinite	\$600,000
National programs ( <i>CTEA section 114</i> )	Indefinite	17,369	Indefinite	10,000
Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions ( <i>CTEA section 117</i> )	Indefinite	7,366	Indefinite	7,366
Tech prep education State grants ( <i>CTEA Title II</i> )	Indefinite	104,755	Indefinite	0
<b>Adult education: (<i>Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA)</i>)</b>				
Adult basic and literacy education State grants ( <i>AEFLA and WIA section 503</i> )	To be determined <sup>1,2</sup>	564,074	To be determined <sup>1,2</sup>	564,074
National leadership activities ( <i>AEFLA section 243</i> )	To be determined <sup>1,2</sup>	9,096	To be determined <sup>1,2</sup>	9,096
National Institute for Literacy ( <i>AEFLA section 242</i> )	To be determined <sup>1,2</sup>	6,638	To be determined <sup>1,2</sup>	6,638
Smaller learning communities ( <i>ESEA V-D, subpart 4</i> )	(3)	90,371	(4)	0
State grants for incarcerated youth offenders ( <i>HEA Amendments of 1998, VIII-D</i> )	(5)	<u>22,770</u>	(5)	<u>0</u>
<b><u>Unfunded authorizations:</u></b>				
Occupational and employment information ( <i>CTEA section 118</i> )	Indefinite	0	Indefinite	0
Total definite authorization	0		0	
Total appropriation				1,197,174
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				579,808

M-7



## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Authorizing Legislation—continued (\$000s)

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 211(a) of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act requires that, of the funds appropriated for Adult Education, the Secretary reserve 1.5 percent, not to exceed \$8 million, for the National Institute for Literacy; 1.5 percent, not to exceed \$8 million, for National Leadership Activities; and 1.72 percent for incentive grants (as authorized under section 503 of the Workforce Investment Act).

<sup>2</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. The program was authorized in FY 2007 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2008.

<sup>3</sup> A total of \$675,000 thousand is authorized in fiscal year 2007 to carry out all ESEA Title V, Part D activities.

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

<sup>5</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. The program was authorized in 2007 through appropriations language. The Administration is not proposing appropriations language in FY 2008, nor seeking reauthorizing legislation.

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

**Appropriations History**  
(\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
1999	\$1,544,147	\$1,532,247	\$1,502,478	\$1,539,247
2000	1,750,250	1,582,247	1,676,750	1,681,750
2000 Advance for 2001	0	(772,000)	0	(791,000)
2001	1,751,250	1,718,600	1,726,600	1,825,600
2001 Advance for 2002	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2002	1,801,660	2,006,060	1,818,060	1,934,060
2002 Advance for 2003	0	(807,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2003	1,897,617	1,919,560	1,938,060	1,943,346
2003 Advance for 2004	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2004	1,597,532	2,101,430	2,101,430	2,109,172
2004 Advance for 2005	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2005	1,602,233	2,025,458	2,102,086	2,010,949
2005 Advance for 2006	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2006	215,734	1,991,782	1,927,016	1,992,159
2006 Advance for 2007	0	(791,000)	(791,000)	(791,000)
2007	579,552			2,004,859 <sup>1</sup>
2007 Advance for 2008	(791,000)			(791,000) <sup>2</sup>
2008	1,197,174			

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> The FY 2008 President's budget assumes that statutory language will be included in a full year 2007 Continuing Resolution to make advance appropriations available in 2008 at the same level as provided in the 2006 Department of Education Appropriations Act for use in 2007.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Significant Items in FY 2007 Appropriations Reports

#### Smaller Learning Communities

- Conference: The conferees direct that the Department consult with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations prior to the release of program guidance for the Smaller Learning Communities grant competitions for fiscal years 2006 and 2007.
- Response: The Department will consult with the Committees on plans for the FY 2006 and FY 2007 program competitions prior to the public release of program guidance.
- Conference: The conferees direct that a greater share of the 5 percent set-aside for national activities be used to support direct technical assistance to grantees through regional laboratories, university-based organizations, and other entities with expertise in high school reform, and direct that the Department submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations an operating plan outlining the planned use of the set-aside prior to the obligation of these funds.
- Response: The Department intends to submit a report on FY 2006 plans for the 5 percent set-aside before obligating any of the funds. The plans will address the conferees' belief that a greater share of funds should support direct technical assistance to grantees through regional laboratories, university-based organizations, and other entities with expertise in high school reform.

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2008 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST**

(in thousands of dollars)					2008 President's Request	
Account, Program, and Activity	Category Code	2006 Appropriation	2007 Current Estimate	2008 President's Request	Compared to 2007 Current Level Amount	Percent
<b>Career, Technical, and Adult Education</b>						
1. Career and technical education (Carl D. Perkins CTEA):						
(a) State grants (CTEA Title I):						
Annual appropriation	D	391,388	391,420	600,000	208,580	53.3%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	<u>791,000</u>	<u>791,000</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>0</u>	<u>(791,000)</u>	<u>-100.0%</u>
Subtotal		1,182,388	1,182,420	600,000	(582,420)	-49.3%
(b) National programs (section 114)	D	9,164	17,369 <sup>2</sup>	10,000	(7,369)	-42.4%
(c) Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions (CTEA section 117)	D	7,366 <sup>3</sup>	7,366 <sup>3</sup>	7,366	0	0.0%
(d) Tech prep education State grants (Title II)	D	<u>104,754</u>	<u>104,755</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(104,755)</u>	<u>-100.0%</u>
Subtotal, Career and technical education		1,303,672	1,311,910	617,366	(694,544)	-52.9%
2. Adult education (Adult Education and Family Literacy Act):						
(a) Adult basic and literacy education State grants (AEFLA and WIA section 503)	D	563,975	564,074	564,074	0	0.0%
(b) National leadership activities (AEFLA section 243)	D	9,005	9,096	9,096	0	0.0%
(c) National Institute for Literacy (AEFLA section 242)	D	<u>6,572</u>	<u>6,638</u>	<u>6,638</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
Subtotal, Adult education		579,552	579,808	579,808	0	0.0%
3. Smaller learning communities (ESEA V-D, subpart 4)	D	93,531	90,371	0	(90,371)	-100.0%
4. State grants for incarcerated youth offenders (HE Amendments of 1998, VIII-D)	D	22,770	22,770	0	(22,770)	-100.0%
<b>Total, Appropriation</b>	D	<b>1,999,525</b>	<b>2,004,859</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>1,197,174</b>	<b>(807,685)</b>	<b>-40.3%</b>
Total, Budget authority	D	1,999,525	2,004,859	1,988,174	(16,685)	-0.8%
Current		1,208,525 <sup>4</sup>	1,213,859 <sup>4</sup>	1,197,174	(16,685)	-1.4%
Prior year's advance		791,000	791,000	791,000 <sup>1</sup>	0	0.0%
Outlays	D	1,987,455	2,091,831	1,938,602	(153,229)	-7.3%

<sup>1</sup> The FY 2008 President's budget assumes that statutory language will be included in a full year 2007 Continuing Resolution to make advance appropriations available in 2008 at the same level as provided in the 2006 Department of Education Appropriations Act for use in 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$6,217 thousand reallocated from programs that are no longer funded (\$4,899 thousand from Tech-prep demonstrations and \$1,318 thousand from Occupational Employment Information); funds were available under the FY2007 Continuing Resolution, P.L. 109-289.

<sup>3</sup> Adjusted for comparability. Funds were appropriated in the Higher Education account in 2006 and 2007.

<sup>4</sup> Excludes an advance appropriation of \$791,000 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

M-11

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Summary of Request

Programs in the Career, Technical, and Adult Education account further State and community efforts to improve their career and technical education programs and adult education and literacy systems. The objective of these programs is to develop the academic, career, and technical skills of students in high schools and community colleges by helping States to develop challenging standards; promoting the integration of academic, career, and technical instruction; and supporting State and local program improvements. Adult education programs support local efforts to provide educational services to adults who lack the basic or English literacy skills so that they can benefit fully from job training, obtain better jobs, complete secondary education, and become full participants in their children's education. The Career and Technical Education programs were reauthorized through the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006. Adult Education is included in the pending Workforce Investment Act reauthorization. The Smaller Learning Communities program, which is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is subject to reauthorization this year, as is the State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders program, which is authorized by the Higher Education Act.

The Department requests a total of \$1.939 billion for this account, a \$808 million decrease from fiscal year 2007. This will provide \$617 million for programs under the recently reauthorized Perkins Act. The request of \$600 million for the Career and Technical Education State Grants program recognizes that changes made by the reauthorization will help improve the quality of career and technical education programs so that students can acquire the rigorous academic and technical skills they need to succeed. In addition, the request includes \$10 million for Career and Technical National Programs to support the new National Assessment of Career and Technical Education, activities to assist States in improving their data collection practices, a new national research center on career and technical education, and the continuation of the State Scholars initiative. The Department is also requesting \$7.366 million for the Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Career and Technical Institutions program under this account because Congress reauthorized it under the new Perkins Act. No funds are requested for Tech Prep Education State Grants because the program duplicates activities allowed under the Career and Technical Education State Grants program.

The request of \$579.8 million for Adult Education includes \$564.1 million for formula grants to States, \$9.1 million for National Leadership Activities, and \$6.6 million for the National Institute for Literacy. The request for Adult and Literacy Education State grants is the same amount as FY 2007 and will assist States in meeting a significant and ongoing need for adult education services. The continued high rate of high school dropouts and the growing numbers of adult immigrants generate high demand for adult education services. In addition, the request reflects the strong rating of "effective" that the program received in the 2006 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review. The request includes continuation of a \$68 million set-aside for English Literacy/Civics Education State Grants to help States and communities provide limited English proficient adults with expanded access to high-quality English literacy programs linked to civics education.

The budget request would eliminate funding for Smaller Learning Communities and State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders, in keeping with the Department's policy to focus limited resources on high-priority programs instead of small categorical programs that have only indirect or limited impact and for which there is little or no evidence of effectiveness.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Career and technical education: State grants

(Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, Title I)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$391,420	\$600,000	\$208,580
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>791,000<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-791,000</u>
Total	1,182,420	600,000	-582,420

---

<sup>1</sup> The FY 2008 President's budget assumes that statutory language will be included in a full year 2007 Continuing Resolution to make advance appropriations available in 2008 at the same level as provided in the 2006 Department of Education Appropriations Act for use in 2007.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the newly reauthorized Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV), State Grants for Career and Technical Education assist States and Outlying Areas in expanding and improving career and technical education in high schools, technical schools, and community colleges. Each State uses funds to support a variety of career and technical education programs developed in accordance with its State plan.

The Department allocates funds to States, including the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, through a formula based on State per-capita income and population in three age cohorts (15-19, 20-24, and 25-65). The formula provides for a minimum State allocation of at least 0.5 percent of the total, and a "hold-harmless" provision in the formula ensures that no State's share of the appropriation is less than its share of the fiscal year 1998 appropriation. A special provision limits the increase a State with an initial allocation of the 0.5 percent minimum may receive, resulting in a number of States that receive an allocation of less than 0.5 percent of the total. If appropriations exceed the FY 2006 appropriation, up to one-third of the additional funds would be allotted to States with FY 2006 grants that are less than the minimum grant amount of 0.5 percent, and the remainder would flow to the other States.

In addition, the Pacific territories receive 0.13 percent of the total appropriated for State Grants to operate the same kinds of career and technical education programs as the States. Within that set-aside, Guam receives \$660,000, American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands each receive \$350,000, and Palau receives \$160,000. In the first year after enactment of Perkins IV, the Pacific Regional Education Lab (PREL) receives the remaining funds generated under the set-aside to make grants for career and technical education and training in the Pacific territories; thereafter, the remaining funds are distributed among Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands in equal shares. Also, 1.25 percent of the total appropriation for State Grants is set aside for grants to federally recognized Indian tribes and tribal organizations and 0.25 percent is for competitive grants to organizations that primarily serve and represent Hawaiian Natives.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

Under the statute:

- Programs must, among other things, integrate academic and career and technical education, promote student attainment of challenging academic and career and technical standards, provide strong linkages between secondary and postsecondary education, and provide professional development for teachers, counselors, and administrators.
- The Secretary and each State must reach agreement on annual levels of performance for a number of “core indicators” specified in the law.
  - The core indicators for secondary education programs focus on student attainment of challenging academic standards, as measured by attainment of the proficient level or above on the Statewide assessments required under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB); student attainment of career and technical skill proficiencies; student attainment of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, or a proficiency credential in conjunction with a secondary school diploma; high school graduation; student placement in postsecondary education, advanced training, military service, or employment; and student participation in and completion of career and technical education programs that lead to employment in fields that are traditionally dominated by one gender.
  - The core indicators for postsecondary education programs focus on student attainment of challenging career and technical skill proficiencies; student attainment of an industry-recognized credential, certificate, or degree; student retention in postsecondary education or transfer to a baccalaureate degree program; student placement in military service or apprenticeship programs, or placement or retention in employment; and student participation in and completion of career and technical education programs that lead to employment in fields that are traditionally dominated by one gender.
- Within States, at least 85 percent of funds are allocated to local educational agencies (LEAs) and postsecondary institutions, except that a State may reserve up to 10 percent to make grant awards to local agencies in rural areas, areas with high percentages of career and technical education students, and areas with high numbers of career and technical education students. The remaining funds flow to LEAs and postsecondary institutions by formula.
- States may use up to 10 percent of their allocations to carry out State leadership activities, such as professional development, expanding the use of technology, assessing career and technical education services, integrating academic and career and technical education to improve student achievement, preparing students for employment in fields that are traditionally dominated by one gender, delivering career and technical education in correctional institutions, and providing services for special populations.

In recent years, through fiscal year 2007, this has been a forward-funded program that included advance appropriations. A portion of the funds has become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which the funds were appropriated and remained available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year. The remaining funds have become available on October 1 of the fiscal year following the appropriations act and remained available for 12 months, expiring at the same time as the forward-funded portion. Starting with the fiscal year

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

2008 appropriation, all funds would be available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which the funds are appropriated and remain available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year. No advance funds are requested for FY 2008.

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$1,192,200
2004.....	1,195,008
2005.....	1,194,331
2006.....	1,182,388
2007.....	1,182,420

### FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$600 million for the Career and Technical Education State Grant program, \$582.4 million less than the 2007 level. Funds would support grants under the newly reauthorized Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.

Although the Administration's policy in the recent past has been to request no funds for this program due to poor performance, the new Perkins Act incorporates several important changes that strengthen the program's accountability provisions and provide opportunities to improve program performance. The new Perkins Act also increases emphasis on improving the academic achievement of career and technical education (CTE) students, a purpose that is aligned with the objectives of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

In addition, the Administration is seeking a \$1.2 billion increase for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies under NCLB, with a significant portion going to high schools. These additional funds will help improve academic achievement and graduation rates for at-risk high school students, many of whom are CTE students.

The new statute requires States to use "valid and reliable" measures of the core indicators of performance and should improve program quality and results through increased State and local accountability and data reporting. In contrast, the 1998 Perkins Act gave States wide latitude in selecting their measures and in defining the students whose performance is included in those performance measures, making it difficult to gauge States' progress, as the data were often not valid, reliable, or comparable. The reauthorized Act largely resolves those problems.

To measure the academic proficiency of secondary CTE students, the new Act requires States to report CTE student performance on the assessments administered by States under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in reading and mathematics, and, specifically, to track the percentages of CTE students who reach the proficient level on those assessments. States must also measure high school completion rates as defined in the accountability requirements under ESEA Title I. Thus, for the first time, the Perkins Act would hold the achievement of CTE students to the same academic standards as is required of all students under NCLB.



## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

The reauthorized Perkins Act increases accountability at the local level as well. For the first time, States will have to negotiate with local recipients of funds to establish local adjusted levels of performance for each of the core indicators of performance, just as the Department currently does with States. In addition, States and local recipients will now be held to a higher threshold for accountability. If States and locals fail to meet at least 90 percent of their targets on one or more of their indicators of performance, they must submit an improvement plan, and they can be sanctioned financially after 3 or more years of failing to meet performance targets.

The new Perkins Act provides an opportunity to improve the quality of CTE programs so that CTE students can acquire both the rigorous academic and technical skills they need to succeed. The stricter accountability provisions will help improve data quality and drive program improvement. The Administration thus recommends \$600 million for the program in recognition of the improvements made under the reauthorization. However, due to a very tight budget environment and with other programs addressing higher priorities, a higher funding level is not requested.

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

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
State grants	\$1,155,902	\$1,163,147	\$590,220
Range of awards to States	\$627-\$128,753	\$631-\$129,608	\$332-\$63,230
Territories allocation	\$880	\$1,537	\$780
PREL	\$1,485	\$17	\$0
Indian set-aside	\$14,780	\$14,780	\$7,500
Number of grants	35	30-35	15-20
Native Hawaiian grant	\$2,956	\$2,956	\$1,500
Incentive grants	\$6,385	\$0	\$0

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The strengthened accountability provisions contained in the new Perkins Act will help address weaknesses in the program that have been identified through review and analysis of a number of sources of information on program performance. Both the 2004 National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) and the 2002 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review concluded that the performance data collected by States were poor and, therefore, compromised the integrity of the program's accountability system.

States have reported annually on core indicators of performance since the 1998 reauthorization of the Perkins Act. That law gave States wide latitude in selecting their own performance measures and in defining which students' performance to include in those measures. Thus, it has been difficult to gauge States' progress, as the data often have not been valid, reliable or comparable. Twenty-four States have measured the academic achievement of their CTE students through such indirect measures as high school graduation or completion of a specific number of courses. Some States that use State assessments to measure academic achievement have held CTE students to a low standard by using the "basic" level to determine achievement instead of the "proficient" level that States must use to measure achievement

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

under NCLB. Furthermore, many States have changed one or more of their measurement approaches, student population definitions, or performance levels, making it impossible to analyze State performance trends over time, except in the most general terms.

In addition, performance data have not been comparable from State to State, as State definitions and measures differ. For example, one State may measure academic attainment using a State assessment while another State may use grade point averages. The Department's 2006 Report to Congress on State Performance, which contains 2003-04 State data on the performance of all CTE students on each of the indicators, reiterates a previous finding that, although States have made progress in building the performance accountability systems required under the statute, the Department and States still face considerable challenges in obtaining complete, accurate, comparable, and reliable data. Although Perkins IV retained provisions that allow States to define their own measures on the statutory core indicators of performance, the Act also gives the Secretary the authority to determine if the measures are valid and reliable. The Department is developing guidance and is planning to provide technical assistance to States on improving the quality of the States' performance data and ensuring that those data are aligned with the requirements in Perkins IV. Furthermore, the Department is considering which areas of the new law should be regulated to improve comparability and reliability of performance data.

The 2004 NAVE also found mixed results on the effectiveness of the program. While the assessment found that career and technical education has important earnings benefits for most secondary and postsecondary students, the benefits were less clear for high school students who do not go on to postsecondary education, the group that has historically been the focus of vocational education policy. The NAVE also concluded that, over the last decade, secondary students who participated in CTE programs increased their academic coursetaking and achievement, in some cases narrowing the gap between them and students who took few or no CTE classes. However, there is no evidence that high school CTE courses themselves contribute to either academic achievement or college enrollment.

### Performance Measures

The following 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 FY 2008 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen education achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.**

**Objective:** *Ensure that CTE concentrators, including special populations, will achieve high levels of proficiency in mathematics, science, and English.*

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of CTE concentrators meeting State-established academic standards.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2003	74	75
2004	76	75
2005	77	78
2006	78	
2007	79	
2008	80	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core indicators required under the statute. The most recent State-reported student outcomes are for the 2004-05 school year. State data show an increase from 2004 to 2005 in the percentages of CTE concentrators meeting State academic standards. Targets for 2006 and 2007 were based on expectations of incremental growth, as well as on agreements with State agencies. The Department expects to revise measures and targets based on the requirements of the new legislation.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of secondary CTE concentrators meeting State/locally adopted skill standards, using State-recognized approaches.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2003	65	64
2004	70	64
2005	79	65
2006	74	
2007	81	
2008	82	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators meeting State/locally-adopted skill standards, using State-recognized approaches.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2003	78	77
2004	80	78
2005	79	77
2006	80	
2007	81	
2008	82	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core indicators required under the statute. The most recent State-reported student outcomes are for the 2004-05 school year. The State data show a small increase between 2004 and 2005 in skill attainment among secondary CTE concentrators, from 64 percent up to 65 percent. The performance of

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

postsecondary CTE concentrators decreased slightly, from 78 percent in 2004 to 77 percent in 2005. Targets for 2006 and 2007 were based on expectations of incremental growth, as well as on agreements with State agencies. The Department expects to revise measures and targets based on the requirements of the new legislation.

**Objective:** *Ensure that concentrators, including special populations, make successful transitions to further education and employment.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of CTE concentrators who have completed high school.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2003</b>	86	84
<b>2004</b>	88	84
<b>2005</b>	87	84
<b>2006</b>	88	
<b>2007</b>	89	
<b>2008</b>	90	

<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of CTE concentrators who have transitioned to postsecondary education or employment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2003</b>	86	84
<b>2004</b>	87	87
<b>2005</b>	87	87
<b>2006</b>	88	
<b>2007</b>	89	
<b>2008</b>	90	

<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators who have a positive placement in the military or employment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2003</b>	85	83
<b>2004</b>	86	83
<b>2005</b>	88	84
<b>2006</b>	89	
<b>2007</b>	90	
<b>2008</b>	91	

<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators who have completed a postsecondary degree or certification.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
<b>2003</b>	42	41
<b>2004</b>	45	41
<b>2005</b>	44	42
<b>2006</b>	45	
<b>2007</b>	46	
<b>2008</b>	47	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core indicators required under the statute. The most recent State-reported student outcomes are for the 2004-05 school year. The data show no change in high school completion for secondary program participants since 2001, and no change from 2004 to 2005 in the percentage of CTE concentrators who have transitioned to postsecondary education or employment. The data also show a small increase in the percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators who have a positive placement in employment or military service (from 83 percent in 2004 to 84 percent in 2005) and in the percentage of postsecondary CTE concentrators who have completed a postsecondary degree or certification (from 41 percent in 2004 to 42 percent in 2005). Targets for 2006 and 2007 were based on expectations of incremental growth, as well as on agreements with State agencies. The Department expects to revise measures and targets based on the requirements of the new legislation.

The percentages provided in each of the above charts are composites of State-reported data; they do not represent either a national average or the results of any single national evaluation. Because States have had considerable latitude to set their own measures, measurement approaches, and data definitions, these data vary greatly from State to State. For example, States set their own definitions of dropout rates. This limits the validity and usefulness of these data at the national level.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department has adopted cost per participant as the efficiency measure for this program. This is also the efficiency measure for the job training common measures adopted by the Administration. Although the Department is able to calculate this measure at the national and State levels, the validity and reliability of the data used for these calculations are questionable. State definitions of participants vary widely, limiting the validity of comparisons across States. The following chart shows national-level costs per secondary student and per postsecondary student for fiscal years 2003 and 2004. Data for fiscal year 2005 will be available in late 2007.

	FY 2003	FY 2004
Cost per secondary student	\$83	\$64
Cost per postsecondary student	\$75	\$79

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: State grants

---

#### Follow-Up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Career and Technical Education State Grants program was reviewed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) in 2002, and was rated “ineffective.” The PART review identified a number of weaknesses in the program, including unavailability of data on program outcomes, few positive findings on effectiveness from the most recent National Assessment of Vocational Education, and a lack of demonstrated State progress on the core indicators of performance specified in the statute.

The changes in the accountability provisions in the new Perkins Act provide the Department with an opportunity to address more effectively the PART findings and recommendations, which focused largely on improving data quality. The 1998 Perkins Act gave States the authority to define their own measures for reporting against core indicators of performance; however, the new Perkins Act requires that measures of the core indicators of performance be “valid and reliable.” This change, along with other changes in the accountability requirements, gives the Department broader authority to define data elements, improve data quality, and ensure comparability of data across States. The Department will pursue regulatory and administrative actions to implement these changes and will also continue to provide technical assistance to States on improving the quality of performance data.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Career and technical education: National programs

(Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, Section 114)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$17,369	\$10,000	-\$7,369

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The recently reauthorized Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV) maintains an authority for National Programs to support research, development, demonstration, dissemination, evaluation, and assessment activities aimed at improving the quality and effectiveness of career and technical education. Within this authority, Perkins IV specifically calls for the operation of a national center to carry out scientifically based research in career and technical education and a national assessment of career and technical education programs operated under the Act. An interim report on the national assessment is due to Congress on January 1, 2010, and a final report is due on July 1, 2011.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$11,922
2004.....	11,852
2005.....	11,757
2006.....	9,164
2007.....	17,369

### FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2008, the Administration requests \$10 million for Career and Technical Education National Programs, a \$7.4 million decrease from the 2007 level. The decrease is largely due to the fact that the continuing resolution generated an artificially high level of funding (because of the amount of funds obligated during the base year, 2006). The 2007 funds will be used to fund much of the cost of the new National Assessment of Career and Technical Education as well as other one-time activities. In 2008, National Programs funds will support implementation of the recently reauthorized Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 and continued funding of State Scholars partnerships.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: National programs

---

New accountability provisions in the Perkins Act will require investment in improvements in data collection and data quality. The new law requires that States adopt valid and reliable measures of their performance, and also requires States to negotiate performance targets on those measures with local recipients. In fiscal year 2008, National Programs funds will continue to support activities that assist States in improving their data collection practices.

Funds would also support the new national research center on career and technical education required under the Act, as well as other activities geared to improving career and technical education programs in high schools and community colleges.

In addition, the Department would use approximately \$4 million of National Programs funds to continue the State Scholars initiative, which supports State-level business and education partnerships that encourage high school students to complete a rigorous curriculum in the core academic subjects: 4 years of English, 3 years each of mathematics and science, 3½ years of social studies, and 2 years of a foreign language. This activity is key to the success of the Department's Academic Competitiveness Grants program, which provides additional financial aid to college students who have taken a rigorous academic high school program. The State Scholars program encourages students, while they are still in high school, to take such coursework, thereby increasing the number of students who are eligible for Academic Competitiveness grants.

Furthermore, the business and education partnerships forged through the State Scholars program have been actively promoting redesigned curriculum and the alignment of rigorous coursetaking patterns with postsecondary admissions standards, and engaging additional members of the business community and parents in their activities. To date, the Department has provided support to State Scholars partnerships in 24 States. The budget request for \$4 million will enable the Department to fund approximately 8 new State partnerships, along with providing technical assistance to existing partnerships.

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

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Research and analysis	\$3,500	\$4,500	\$3,500
Strengthening accountability	950	950	950
Improving program quality	2,714	2,919	1,550
Program evaluation	2,000	5,000	0
State Scholars	0	4,000	4,000

### 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



## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: National programs

cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2008 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To increase access to and improve programs at the high school, and community and technical college levels that raise academic achievement, strengthen workforce preparation, and promote economic development and lifelong learning.**

***Objective:** The use of rigorous research findings to inform program direction and improve State and local practices, through the identification of research-based education practices, and communicating what works to practitioners, parents and policymakers, will increase.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of research studies conducted by the National Center for Research in Career and Technical education that meet the Department's definition of evidence-based research.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		83
2004	100	100
2005	100	100
2006	100	
2007	100	
2008	100	

**Assessment of progress:** The National Center for Research in Career and Technical Education has met the target for using rigorous research designs (as set forth in the Department's definition of evidence-based research) for all of its research studies. Independent review panels determine whether the research studies are based on rigorous designs.

<b>Measure:</b> The number of customers receiving electronic materials or information from the National Centers for Research and Dissemination in Career and Technical Education.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		6,054,535
2004	2,300,000	19,904,845
2005	2,300,000	32,393,646
2006	2,300,000	
2007	2,300,000	

<b>Measure:</b> The number of customers receiving print materials or information from the National Centers for Research and Dissemination in Career and Technical Education.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		13,567
2004	100,000	412,000
2005	50,000	319,000
2006	25,000	
2007	25,000	

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: National programs

---

**Assessment of progress:** Although dissemination is a significant component of the National Centers for Research and Dissemination in Career and Technical Education activities, the Department emphasizes the use of electronic methods for disseminating materials over disseminating print media. This strategy facilitates efficient dissemination of materials at minimal cost, making more resources available for production of research materials. Targets reflect expectations that the number of customers receiving electronic materials will stabilize immediately, while the number of customers receiving print materials will decrease and stabilize at 25,000.

The availability of products in electronic form has enabled the centers to increase considerably the number of customers served. The number of customers accessing electronic materials has increased substantially in the last 3 years, from approximately 6 million in 2003 to over 32 million in 2005. In addition, the number of customers receiving print materials decreased by almost 100,000, from 412,000 in 2004 to 319,000 in 2005. Data for these indicators are self-reported, and the number of customers does not represent an unduplicated count of individuals receiving information through the Centers. The Department does not verify these data.

The Department plans to discontinue use of these measures and to create a new performance measure when the grant for the next research and technical assistance center is awarded later this year.

**Objective:** *Improve and expand the use of accountability systems and effective program strategies at the high school and postsecondary levels that promote student achievement, performance, and successful transition.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of States that have data systems with the capacity to include information on all indicators and subindicators for secondary and postsecondary programs.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		98
2004	100	98
2005	100	98
2006	100	
2007	100	
2008	100	

**Assessment of progress:** The program approached, but did not meet, the target for 100 percent of States having data systems in place by 2004, and did not increase the percentage of States meeting the target in 2005. The current performance measure is based on the percentage of States able to report data in their annual performance reports on each of the four core indicators included in the Perkins statute. The Department does not gather information on the percentage of all school systems, school districts, and community colleges included in the States' data. Furthermore, the most recent National Assessment of Vocational Education found that although implementation of accountability systems for career and technical education is progressing, these systems are generating data of limited validity and reliability. The Department will provide technical assistance to help States improve data quality and implement the strengthened accountability provisions contained in the recently reauthorized Perkins Act.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions

---

### Career and technical education: Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions

(Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, Section 117)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$7,366	\$7,366	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program makes grants to tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions to provide career and technical education to Indian students.

In order to be eligible for a grant, a tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institution must:

- Be formally controlled (or have been formally sanctioned or chartered) by a governing body of an Indian tribe or tribes;
- Offer a technical degree or certificate granting program;
- Demonstrate that it adheres to a philosophy or plan of operation that fosters individual Indian economic opportunity and self-sufficiency by providing, among other things, programs that relate to stated tribal goals of developing individual entrepreneurship and self-sustaining economic infrastructures on reservations;
- Have been operational for at least 3 years;
- Be accredited, or be a candidate for accreditation, by a nationally recognized accrediting authority for postsecondary career and technical education; and
- Enroll at least 100 full-time equivalent students, the majority of whom are Indians.
- Receive no funds under the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act of 1978 or the Navajo Community College Act.

Funds may be used by a grantee to train teachers; purchase equipment; provide instructional services, child-care and other family support services, and student stipends; and for institutional support.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions

---

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$6,955
2004.....	7,185
2005.....	7,440
2006.....	7,366
2007.....	7,366

### FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2008, the Department requests \$7.4 million for the Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Career and Technical Institutions (TCPCTI) program, the same amount as the 2007 level. The institutions that receive funds under this program serve an especially needy population. The institutions receive limited financial support from such sources as student tuition, endowments, and State assistance; therefore, they rely on Federal assistance to help them provide postsecondary career and technical education services to their students.

The statute limits eligibility to institutions that receive no funds under either the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act of 1978 or the Navajo Community College Act. As a result of this limitation, only two institutions, Crownpoint Institute of Technology and United Tribes Technical College, are eligible to receive support. Institutional support and capital expenditures are allowable uses of funds, and the statute requires the use of unrestricted indirect cost rates for grants under this program.

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

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Range of awards	\$3,000-\$4,375	\$3,000-\$4,375	\$3,000-\$4,375
Number of awards	2	2	2

### 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 FY 2008 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions

---

**Goal:** To increase access to and improve career education that will strengthen workforce preparation, employment opportunities, and lifelong learning in the Indian community.

**Objective:** Ensure that career and technical education (CTE) students served in tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions make successful transitions to work or continuing education.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of career and technical education students in the Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Career and Technical Institutions Programs who earn an associate's degree or certificate.				
Year	Target	Average for both recipients	Crownpoint Institute of Technology	United Tribes Technical College
<b>2003</b>	47	48	60	28
<b>2004</b>	49	44	73	22
<b>2005</b>	52	49	75	28
<b>2006</b>	57	42	68	21
<b>2007</b>	42			
<b>2008</b>	43			

**Assessment of progress:** Although there was a decrease in the percentage of students who earned an associate's degree or certificate between 2005 and 2006, both the averaged data for the two recipients and the individual recipient data show no clear trend in performance over time. The individual recipient data show that Crownpoint Institute of Technology consistently awards associate's degrees and certificates to a higher percentage of its students than United Tribes Technical College does. Note that the percentages above are based on degree completers relative to the number of all students in their final semester, rather than on a cohort of students entering a program together. In addition, the two grantees do not use the same methodology to calculate this measure. Results for this measure can vary greatly from year to year because of the small student population served by this program (about 1,097 total full-time equivalent students in October 2005). Source of data are grantee performance reports. The Department may revise measures and targets based on the requirements of the new legislation.

#### Efficiency Measures

The Department has adopted cost per participant as the efficiency measure for this program. Although the Department can also calculate the cost per successful outcome, the recipients do not use the same methodology to determine degree completion, making these data unreliable. The program office is revising reporting procedures to help ensure that the data are comparable and thereby allow the Department to reliably calculate the cost per successful outcome in the future.

The following table shows total costs per participant for fiscal years 2003 through 2005. Data for fiscal year 2006 will be available by the end of calendar year 2007.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions

---

	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005
<b>Cost per participant</b>	\$8,705	\$8,297	\$6,782

#### Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

This program was reviewed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) in fiscal year 2004 and received a rating of “results not demonstrated.” Even though Congress reauthorized the program last year under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, the Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Career and Technical Institutions program complements a number of programs for minority-serving institutions currently authorized under the Higher Education Act. In response to a PART recommendation to explore whether efficiencies could be gained by combining the program with other programs serving similar objectives, the Department will implement coherent and coordinated strategies to support reform and innovation across programs for minority-serving postsecondary institutions.

The PART review also recommended that the Department increase grantee accountability, improve performance reporting, and focus the program on strengthening the academic and technical skills of Indian postsecondary students. The program office is currently revising its data collection and reporting procedures to address data quality, improve data collection, and set annual and long-term performance targets. In addition, program staff continue to provide technical assistance to grantees on improving the quality of their data. The Department is also assessing whether rulemaking or administrative actions are necessary to ensure that grantees comply with new reporting requirements.

Furthermore, the Department is reviewing the feasibility of adopting the Department’s common measures for minority-serving postsecondary institutions, which assess program outcomes related to enrollment, persistence, and graduation rates. These measures seem more appropriate than using the common measures for job-training programs because they would permit comparison of the TCPCTIs with more clearly comparable activities, such as the HEA Title III Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities program.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

(Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, Title II)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$104,755	0	-\$104,755

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Tech-Prep Education program was recently reauthorized by the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV). The program provides grants to States, which in turn provide subgrants to consortia of local educational agencies and postsecondary institutions. The purpose of tech-prep is to develop a structural link between secondary and postsecondary institutions that integrates academic and career and technical education and better prepares students to make the transition from high school to college and from college to careers. Each tech prep project is carried out under an articulation agreement between the participants in the consortium and consists of at least 2 years of high school followed by 2 years or more of higher education or apprenticeship. Tech prep programs help students to attain a common core of required proficiencies in mathematics, science, reading, writing, communications, and technological skills. The programs are designed to lead to an associate's degree or a postsecondary certificate in a technical career field and, where appropriate, link to courses of study at 4-year institutions.

The Department distributes Tech Prep funds to States using the Career and Technical Education State Grants formula. States may target their Tech Prep funds to programs by awarding funds to local consortia through a competition, or they may subgrant the funds on a formula basis.

Under Perkins IV, tech prep programs are subject to the same accountability measures as the Career and Technical Education State Grants. These measures require tech-prep programs to continuously improve students' academic and technical skill proficiencies and their placement and retention in further education and employment. In addition, States must require local recipients that have failed to meet their performance targets for three consecutive years to resubmit their applications for Tech Prep funds. States also have the option of terminating these subgrants.

Perkins IV includes a new provision that allows States to consolidate the Tech Prep funds they receive under the Act with the funds they receive for Career and Technical Education State Grants. States that choose to consolidate Tech Prep funds must distribute these funds in accordance with the requirements of the Career and Technical Education State Grants program, to carry out activities authorized under that program. These States are not required to report performance data separately for the funds they receive under the Tech Prep program.

## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

---

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

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$107,298
2004.....	106,665
2005.....	105,812
2006.....	104,754
2007.....	105,755

### FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2008, the Administration requests no funding for the Tech Prep Education State Grants program. The request is consistent with the Administration's policy of not funding duplicative programs or programs that have only indirect or limited impact or for which there is little or no evidence of effectiveness. Although the new Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 reauthorized Tech Prep Education State Grants as a separate grant program, the program duplicates activities allowed under the Career and Technical Education State Grants program. In addition, the Administration's No Child Left Behind reauthorization proposal will support creation of stronger linkages between secondary and post-secondary institutions.

The 2004 National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) identified several weaknesses in the Tech Prep program. According to the NAVE, States did not generally use Tech Prep State Grants funds to support programs that were substantively different from those funded with Career and Technical Education State Grants. The study also found that the Tech Prep program has not been successful in creating distinct, rigorous programs of technical study that link high school and postsecondary education. In addition, the NAVE determined that Tech Prep programs were less likely to be offered in secondary schools with high proportions of economically disadvantaged, minority, or disabled students. Furthermore, the study found that the Tech-Prep program has not lived up to its promise of creating rigorous programs of study.

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

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Number of grants	53	53	0
Range of grants	\$57-\$11,260	\$57-\$11,673	0



## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

---

#### 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.

Currently, the Department is able to report disaggregated data on the performance of tech prep students against two of the program measures, secondary academic attainment and transition from secondary to postsecondary education. Below is performance information for these two measures.

**Goal: Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen education achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.**

**Objective:** *Ensure that concentrators, including special populations, make successful transitions to further education and employment.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Tech Prep students who have completed high school.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2003		86
2004	88	87
2005	87	86
2006	88	
2007	89	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Tech Prep students who have transitioned to postsecondary education.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
2003		58
2004	87	66
2005	87	86
2006	61	
2007	89	
<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.		

## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Tech Prep students who meet State-established academic standards.		
Year	Target <sup>1</sup>	Actual
<b>2003</b>		79
<b>2004</b>	76	75
<b>2005</b>	77	77
<b>2006</b>	78	
<b>2007</b>	79	

<sup>1</sup> Performance targets reflect agreements with State agencies.

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core indicators required under the statute. The State-reported student outcomes for the 2004-05 school year showed a small decrease in the percentage of Tech Prep students who completed high school from 87 percent in 2004 to 86 percent in 2005, which was slightly below the target of 87 percent. The reported percentage of Tech Prep students who transitioned to postsecondary education grew from 66 percent in 2004 to 86 percent in 2005, almost meeting the target of 87 percent. There was a small increase in the academic performance of Tech Prep students; in 2004, 75 percent of Tech Prep students met State-established academic standards, and in 2005, that figure was 77 percent. Targets for 2005 and 2006 were based on agreements with State agencies. The Department expects to revise the targets for 2007 based on the requirements of the new legislation; the program is proposed for elimination in 2008.

The percentages provided above are composites of State-reported data; they do not represent either a national average or the results of any single national evaluation. Because States have had considerable latitude to set their own measures, measurement approaches, and data definitions, these data vary greatly from State to State. This limits the validity and usefulness of these data at the national level.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department has adopted cost per participant as the efficiency measure for this program. This is also the efficiency measure for the job training common measures adopted by the Administration. Although the Department is able to calculate this measure at the national and State levels for fiscal years 2001 to 2003, the validity and usefulness of the data used for these calculations are questionable. State definitions of participants vary widely, limiting the validity of comparisons across States. Furthermore, States do not consistently identify the number of Tech Prep program participants separately from the number of participants under the Career and Technical Education State Grant program. The table below shows national level costs per Tech Prep participant for fiscal years 2003 and 2004. Data for fiscal year 2005 will be available in late 2007.

	FY 2003	FY 2004
<b>Cost per participant</b>	\$47	\$41

## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and technical education: Tech prep education State grants

---

#### Follow-Up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Tech Prep Education State Grants program underwent the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review in 2002, and received a rating of “results not demonstrated.” The review found that the program is duplicative of the Career and Technical Education State Grants program and lacks data demonstrating that it has a significant impact on participating high school students.

The PART review also noted that the Tech Prep Education State Grants program suffers from performance data integrity problems. Many States are not able to provide complete data on the performance of their tech prep students even though States receive separate grant awards for Tech Prep State program funds and are required to report separately on the performance of tech prep students. Eighteen States did not provide complete data to the Department on the performance of their secondary tech prep students for program year 2003-04, and 24 States did not provide complete data on the performance of their postsecondary students for the same year.

The changes in the accountability provisions in the new Perkins Act provide the Department with an opportunity to address more effectively the PART findings and recommendations, which focused largely on improving data quality. The Act now requires that measures of the core indicators of performance be “valid and reliable.” This change, along with other changes in accountability requirements, gives the Department broader authority to define data elements, improve data quality, and ensure comparability of data across States. The Department will pursue regulatory and administrative actions to implement these changes, and will also continue to provide technical assistance to States on improving the quality of performance data. Even if these actions are taken, however, the program will still be duplicative of Career and Technical Education State Grants.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

(Adult Education and Family Literacy Act and Workforce Investment Act, Section 503)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$564,074 <sup>2</sup>	\$564,074 <sup>2</sup>	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004; the program was authorized in FY 2007 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2008.

<sup>2</sup> FY 2006 appropriations language provided a \$68 million set-aside for English Literacy and Civics Education grants. This policy would be continued under the terms of the current FY 2007 continuing resolution that lasts through February 15, 2007. The request for FY 2008 assumes continuation of this policy.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA), adult education grants to the States and Outlying Areas support programs that assist adults in becoming literate and obtaining the knowledge and skills necessary for employment and self-sufficiency; assist adults who are parents in obtaining the educational skills necessary to become full partners in the educational development of their children; and assist adults in the completion of a secondary education.

### Adult Education State Grants

The Department awards formula grants to States and Outlying Areas. The formula provides an initial allotment of \$250,000 for each State and \$100,000 to each Outlying Area. Any additional funds are distributed on the basis of population aged 16 and older who are without a high school diploma or the equivalent, who are beyond the age of compulsory education, and who are not currently enrolled in secondary school. AEFLA also includes a "hold-harmless" provision that ensures that each State receives at least 90 percent of its previous year's amount. If funding is insufficient to satisfy the hold-harmless provision, each State is ratably reduced to receive the same proportion of available funding as in the previous year.

States may use up to 12.5 percent of their grant for State leadership activities and an additional 5 percent, or \$65,000 (whichever is greater), for State administration. At least 82.5 percent of a State's grant must be used for local awards; of this amount, up to 10 percent may be used to educate incarcerated and other institutionalized individuals. Of the funds provided by the State agency to eligible entities, at least 95 percent must be used for instructional activities.

States make grants to local entities that provide adult basic education, English literacy, adult secondary education, workplace literacy, and family literacy services. Local service providers include local educational agencies, community colleges, and community- and faith-based organizations. In distributing funds, States must give equitable access to all types of agencies and institutions that have the ability to provide adult education programs. States, in awarding funds to

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### **Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants**

---

local providers, must consider the extent to which these providers offer programs that, among other things, have measurable goals for client outcomes, can demonstrate past effectiveness in improving the literacy skills of adults and families, serve individuals who are most in need of literacy services, are built on a strong foundation of research about effective practices, and coordinate with other available resources in the community.

The State's leadership funds are used for State activities to improve adult education and literacy services, including professional development to improve the quality of instruction, technology assistance for local providers, and monitoring and evaluating the quality of local programs. States can also use a portion of their State leadership funds for financial incentives to reward local programs for high performance or exemplary program coordination.

To promote continuous program improvement, the Secretary and each State must reach agreement on annual performance targets for a number of "core indicators" in the areas of literacy skill improvement; placement in, retention in, or completion of postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment, or career advancement; and attainment of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent.

The Secretary reserves 1.72 percent of the total Adult Education appropriation to award incentive grants to States that exceed the agreed-upon performance levels for the AEFLA and other employment programs. Funds are transferred to the Secretary of Labor and are awarded along with funds reserved from the other programs.

### **English Literacy and Civics Education (EL/Civics) State Grants**

The Department also awards formula grants to States for English literacy and civics education from funds set aside from the Adult Education appropriation. Using Immigration and Naturalization Service data on the number of legal immigrants, the Department allocates 65 percent of funds based on each State's share of a 10-year average of immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence. The remaining 35 percent is allocated to States that have experienced recent growth in immigration, as measured by the average of the number of immigrants in the 3 most recent years. No State receives an award of less than \$60,000. States received EL/Civics formula grants for the first time in fiscal year 2000.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$571,262
2004.....	574,372
2005.....	569,672
2006.....	563,975
2007.....	564,074

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### **Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants**

---

#### FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$564 million for Adult Education State Grants, the same as the 2007 level, with the expectation that new authorizing legislation will have been enacted by fiscal year 2008. The Department believes that level funding will be sufficient to help States implement a bill that would largely reauthorize current law but with stronger accountability provisions. The request also assumes a \$68 million set-aside for English Literacy/Civics Education State Grants.

This request reflects the significant and ongoing need for adult education services. Specifically, the need persists for services for high school dropouts and the growing population of adult immigrants without the necessary English language skills to be successful in school and the workplace. According to a recently released summary of findings from the 2003 National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL), certain subgroups of adult learners showed little or no progress on measures associated with fundamental English language skills. In addition, the overall percentage of adults who scored as “proficient” in prose and document literacy on the NAAL declined between 1992 and 2003.

High school dropout rates provide another continuing rationale for adult education programs. The national dropout rate remains high, particularly among certain groups. The 2000 Census reported a national dropout rate of nearly 13 percent, with higher rates for Hispanic (36 percent) and black (16 percent) youths. Furthermore, immigration to the United States continues at a rapid pace. According to the Department of Homeland Security, almost 5 million immigrants entered the United States from 2000 to 2004, creating more demand for adult education services. Existing programs that serve the immigrant population tend to have long waiting lists.

Finally, the Department has ample evidence that Adult Education is an effective program. A new Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) assessment of the program conducted in 2006 documents significant improvements in program management, increased participant data quality, and greater flexibility in addressing emerging issues in adult education, such as increased demand for English literacy in geographical regions that have not traditionally experienced high levels of immigration. The program has also demonstrated consistent improvements on measures of student performance and other program goals, such as job attainment and retention.

While the program has not met all performance targets, data for every performance measure show an increase between 2004 and 2005. The program also compares favorably with other Federal programs serving out-of-school youth and adult participants by demonstrating better student outcomes and a lower Federal cost per participant. The program received an “effective” rating in the PART review, making it one of only a few ED grant-making programs to receive the highest possible rating.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

---

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

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Adult basic and literacy State grants	\$486,111	\$486,206	\$486,206
Range of awards	\$843-\$63,035	\$844-\$63,076 <sup>1</sup>	\$844-\$63,076 <sup>1</sup>
Total participants (estimated)	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
English literacy and civics education			
State grants	\$67,896	\$67,896	\$67,896
Range of awards	\$60-\$17,490	\$60-\$17,490 <sup>1</sup>	\$60-\$17,490 <sup>1</sup>
Number of students served (estimated)	230,450	230,450	230,450
Incentive grants (maximum)	\$9,968	\$9,973	\$9,973
Range of awards	\$650-\$1,500	\$600-\$1,000	\$600-\$1,000

<sup>1</sup> Grant estimates for 2007 and 2008 assume formulae under current law.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA), enacted as Title II of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998, identifies three core indicators that must be used to assess State performance. These are: (1) demonstrated improvements in reading, writing, and speaking English, numeracy, problem-solving, English language acquisition, and other literacy skills; (2) placement in, retention in, or completion of postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment, or career advancement; and (3) receipt of a secondary school diploma or recognized equivalent. The statute requires that the Department report annually to the Congress on State performance. The Department's 2005 report provides 2003-04 State data on the performance of all adult education students on each of the indicators.

#### Performance Measures

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

**Goal: To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.**

**Objective:** *Provide adult learners with opportunities to acquire basic foundation skills (including English language acquisition), complete secondary education, and transition to further education and training and to work.*

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults in Adult Basic Education programs who acquire the level of basic skills needed to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003	41	38
2004	42	38
2005	42	40
2006	39	
2007	42	
2008	44	

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core measures required under the statute. While GPRA targets for 2001-2005 have not been met, the most recent State-reported student outcomes from 2005 reflect improvements over 2004 data. The improvements in performance on this measure suggest that the adjusted targets for 2007 and 2008, while ambitious, reflect attainable goals.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults enrolled in English literacy programs who acquire the level of English language skills needed to complete the levels of instruction in which they enrolled.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003	44	36
2004	45	36
2005	45	37
2006	38	
2007	40	
2008	42	

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core measures required under the statute. The most recent State-reported student outcomes are for the 2004-05 school year. State data show a continued improvement in the percentage of adults acquiring the necessary English language skills to complete the level instruction in which they enrolled. While the GPRA targets have not been met, performance has improved over the last 4 years. Targets for 2007 and 2008 have been adjusted to reflect realistic, yet ambitious, goals for this measure.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003	41	44
2004	42	45
2005	45	51
2006	46	
2007	52	
2008	53	



## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

---

**Assessment of progress:** States report data annually against the core measures required under the statute. For the past 4 years, the program has exceeded its GPRA targets; State data show an increase of 18 percentage points between 2001 and 2005. The most recent State-reported student outcomes are for the 2004-05 school year. The target for 2006 could not be changed, but targets for 2007 and 2008 have been revised and reflect ambitious performance goals based on recent data.

In addition to the measures that address the three statutory indicators, the Department is collecting data for two additional measures. All five measures are the Department's job training common measures.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003	26	30
2004	27	30
2005	30	34
2006	33	
2007	37	
2008	39	

**Assessment of progress:** Long-term targets were set in 2005 and reflect an annual increase of about 5 percent per year. The program has exceeded the targets set for four consecutive years.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003	37	37
2004	38	36
2005	40	37
2006	40	
2007	41	
2008	41	

**Assessment of progress:** Long-term targets were set in 2005 and reflect an annual increase of about 3 percent per year. The rise in the unemployment rate would likely have impacted this measure and contributed to the small decline in the percentage of adult learners who met this target.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants

---

#### Efficiency Measures

The Department has developed two efficiency measures for the Adult Education State Grants Program.

<b>Measure:</b> The annual Federal cost per participant.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2003</b>		\$210
<b>2004</b>		\$219
<b>2005</b>	\$217	
<b>2006</b>	\$215	
<b>2007</b>	\$215	
<b>2008</b>	\$215	

**Assessment of progress:** This measure reflects the average annual Federal cost per participant for Adult Education programs. It was established under the Administration's common performance measures initiative for job training programs, and the Department has collected sufficient data to report this measure through the National Reporting System, the uniform data collection and reporting system created by the previous reauthorization of the Adult Education program in 1998. Data do not include State and local resources, which account for a large proportion of Adult Education funds. Data for 2005 will be available in late February 2007.

<b>Measure:</b> The annual Federal cost per student learning gain or high school diploma/GED attainment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2003</b>		\$516
<b>2004</b>		\$474
<b>2005</b>	\$475	
<b>2006</b>	\$451	
<b>2007</b>	\$428	
<b>2008</b>	\$407	

**Assessment of progress:** This measure examines the annual Federal cost for Adult Education students who advance to at least the next higher educational level or who attain a high school diploma or GED certificate. As improved assessment and scientifically based curricula are implemented in more Adult Education programs, it is anticipated that the cost per learning gain or high school/GED attainment will decrease. Data for 2005 will be available in late February 2007.

#### Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Adult Education State Grants program received an "effective" rating in 2006 on the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review, significantly improving upon its 2002 PART rating of "results not demonstrated." The improved PART rating reflects the program's response to weaknesses identified through the earlier PART and underscores significant improvements made in data collection, application of standardized assessments, and the use of data to improve program performance and management. While the 2002 PART rating for this program reflected a lack of quality participant data and performance management, the 2006 review of the program noted gains made in program performance and student outcomes, and evaluations that demonstrate the program's effectiveness when compared to other Federal programs serving the same population. For example, the percentage of Adult education students who obtained a GED or high school

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### **Adult education: Adult basic and literacy education State grants**

---

diploma increased by 55 percent from 2001 to 2006. In addition, the 2006 review noted that the program recruits, retains, and assists more people from its target population at a lower cost than other job training programs.

One recommendation from the 2002 PART review focused on implementing reforms to the program that included increased grantee accountability, improved performance reporting, and a clear focus on improving participants' reading, math, and literacy skills so that they can earn a degree or certificate and obtain employment leading to economic self-sufficiency. The Administration's blueprint for reauthorization of Adult Education programs proposed reforms in those areas. The Department continues to use National Leadership Activities funds to assist States in identifying or adapting rigorous curriculum frameworks to guide instruction; developing technical assistance for local programs to help them apply scientifically based research; and using student outcome data to improve program performance. The Department has worked closely with States to improve the quality of participant data, and all States are now using standardized assessments to measure student-learning gains.

Another PART recommendation from the 2002 review called for the Department to adopt common job training performance measures (including a new measure to gauge cost-effectiveness), short- and long-term targets based on the common measures, and a data collection strategy for the common measures. The Department has established short- and long-term targets based on the common measures. In addition, in fiscal year 2002, the Department began collecting data on the common measures related to degree or certificate attainment, literacy and numeracy skills attainment, and employment placement and retention. Under current law, the Department does not have the authority to require States to report data for the common measure related to increase in earnings. The Department supports legislative changes that would allow these data to be collected.

In the interim, the Department has encouraged States to use unemployment insurance (UI) wage records to identify the employment outcomes of adult education participants. However, privacy restrictions prevent some States from accessing UI records for this purpose.

The 2006 PART review highlights a few areas to improve the performance of the program. The Department has agreed to make program performance data available to the public in such a way that comparisons can be made across States and individual programs. The Department has begun this process and will continue to verify and publicize past years' data in addition to sharing current data. Also, the Department will make sure that revised performance targets reflect ambitious and attainable goals and that data will be used for program improvement, as suggested in the review. Finally, the Department will continue to pursue reauthorizing legislation that would enable the Department to collect participants' earnings data, either through UI records or other means allowed by State law.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Adult education: National leadership activities

(Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, section 243)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$9,096	\$9,096	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004; the program was authorized in FY 2007 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2008.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Adult Education national leadership and evaluation activities, as authorized under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA), address major policy priorities in adult education, including program improvement, accountability, professional development, and increasing access to learning opportunities for adults. Under this authority, the Department supports applied research, development, dissemination, evaluation, and program improvement activities to assist States in their efforts to improve the quality of adult education programs. Examples of activities include: evaluations of the effectiveness of adult education programs, training institutes, national and international adult literacy surveys, and technical assistance on using technology to improve instruction.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$9,438
2004.....	9,169
2005.....	9,096
2006.....	9,005
2007.....	9,096

### FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2008, the Administration requests \$9 million for National Leadership Activities, the same as the 2007 level, in expectation that a reauthorized program will take effect in fiscal year 2008.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National leadership activities

---

While specific National Leadership activities are subject to change upon reauthorization of the AEFLA, the 2008 request would support the continuation of activities that are closely aligned with the Department's goals of strengthening accountability, expanding options, increasing flexibility, and funding what works. A key goal will be to utilize the most rigorous evaluation methods, including randomized experimental designs, to study the effectiveness of adult education interventions in improving adult literacy and helping disadvantaged adults find success in the workforce.

The Department has completed the design for a major evaluation of the impact of the effectiveness of adult literacy interventions for English as a Second Language (ESL) learners, which would likely be supported with fiscal year 2008 funds. In addition, 2008 funds may support some of the activities outlined in the Administration's Blueprint for Adult Education reauthorization, including:

- An independent evaluation and assessment of adult basic education and literacy programs, addressing such issues as the effectiveness of instructional strategies, learning gains, and outcomes achieved by participants, and the effectiveness of the Federal investment in improving student outcomes.
- Technical assistance to State agencies, eligible providers, and other private and public organizations involved in the provision of basic and literacy education services for adults, particularly in the areas of performance accountability, standards and assessments, technology, workplace education, and professional development. For example, in order to strengthen accountability, the Department will continue to implement and provide technical assistance to States on the National Reporting System (NRS), the uniform data collection and reporting system created by the previous reauthorization of the Adult Education program in 1998.

Other activities may include projects designed to: expand knowledge of effective teaching practices; work with State and local programs to develop career pathways to improve employability of program completers; encourage new partnerships between traditional adult education providers and other community agencies in order to increase the numbers of adults who can be served; and encourage greater employer involvement in adult education service delivery.

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

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Research and evaluation	\$5,041	\$5,045 <sup>1</sup>	\$5,045 <sup>1</sup>
Technical assistance	3,964	4,051 <sup>1</sup>	4,051 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Specific program activities may change upon reauthorization of the program.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National leadership activities

---

#### 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 FY 2008 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To support research, evaluation, information dissemination and other activities to help States improve adult education, and literacy programs.**

**Objective:** *To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of States yielding high-quality learner assessment data under the National Reporting System (NRS).		
Year	Target	Actual
2003	75	65
2004	95	75
2005	96	80
2006	100	
2007	100	
2008	100	

**Assessment of progress:** The 2004 target of 95 percent of States was not met, although 75 percent of States reported success on this measure, up from 65 percent in 2003. Steady progress continued in 2005 with 80 percent of States reporting success. The 2006 target for this measure is that 100 percent of States will provide consistent high-quality assessment data regarding adult learners. The Department offers technical assistance and guidance designed to help all States meet high standards for the collection and reporting of adult education data. Data for 2006 will be available in late February 2007.

While the adult education field has made considerable progress in meeting the variety of skill needs of U.S. adults, the program serves a small percentage of eligible adults annually. New technology-based instructional strategies and mechanisms will help provide greater access to programs and services. Therefore, a second measure, currently under development, may track the Department's efforts to help States increase their capacity to serve more adults with low basic literacy skills.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Adult education: National Institute for Literacy

(Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, Section 242)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$6,638	\$6,638	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004; the program was authorized in FY 2007 through appropriations language. Reauthorizing legislation is sought for FY 2008.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The National Institute for Literacy (NIFL) was created in 1991 to: (1) provide national leadership on issues related to literacy; (2) coordinate literacy services and policy; and (3) serve as a national resource for adult education and literacy programs through dissemination of the best and most current information and by supporting the creation of new ways to offer services of proven effectiveness. Through a variety of capacity-building activities, NIFL supports the development of State, regional, and national literacy services. NIFL's activities incorporate the input of adult learners in planning and implementation, build on and enhance existing efforts in the field, leverage resources from agency and private-sector partners, and promote collaborations among individuals and groups who have an interest in adult and family literacy.

The appropriation for NIFL supports both program activities and administrative expenses, including operational costs as well as personnel compensation and benefit costs. The appropriation also supports the work of NIFL's Advisory Board, which is appointed by the President. In addition, an interagency group, composed of the Secretaries of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services, helps develop administrative and programmatic plans for NIFL. The Board is responsible for providing independent advice on NIFL's operations and works with the interagency group to help set NIFL's goals and plan its programs. NIFL also receives a \$5 million set-aside from the Reading First appropriation for the dissemination of information related to scientifically based reading research and effective programs.

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

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National Institute for Literacy

---

Funding levels for the past 5 years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$6,517
2004.....	6,692
2005.....	6,638
2006.....	6,572
2007.....	6,638

### FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$6.6 million for the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL), the same amount as the FY 2007 level, in expectation that the program will be reauthorized in fiscal year 2007. The Administration believes that level funding will be sufficient for NIFL's continued leadership in improving literacy instruction. The budget request for NIFL assumes reauthorization of the program.

NIFL, a quasi-independent agency, has developed partnerships with adult literacy service providers through its dissemination, professional development, and technical assistance activities. NIFL also has created Web-based resources focusing on literacy and has worked to synthesize findings from scientifically based reading research. Since enactment of the Reading Excellence Act of 1998, NIFL's role has expanded to include synthesis and dissemination of evidence-based research on children's reading. NIFL administers the Partnership for Reading, a joint effort with the Department of Education and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development in the Department of Health and Human Services' National Institutes of Health. The Partnership's mission is to provide information to literacy instructors and parents regarding the most successful instructional techniques.

While specific NIFL activities are subject to change upon reauthorization of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, the 2008 request would support activities that are closely aligned with NIFL's priorities, established by NIFL with guidance from the Board. Those activities include the dissemination of information and resources, translation of research into guidance and tools that can be used in practice, identification of high-performing programs, development of practices and policies that produce desirable outcomes, and support for research on literacy acquisition. Ongoing initiatives supported with funds appropriated to NIFL include, among other things:

- Reading - Since FY 2001, NIFL has supported the development and maintenance of a research-based online diagnostic reading tool intended to enable adult education practitioners to base their instruction on students' reading strengths and weaknesses. In FY 2008, NIFL expects to continue its support of student reading achievement by completing and piloting a new online reading course using new content organized around the tool. NIFL anticipates reaching a significantly larger number of practitioners with the addition of online instruction to supplement the existing face-to-face professional development sessions.
- Learning Disabilities/Bridges to Practice - The *Bridges to Practice* project helps adult educators learn to recognize learning disabilities in adult students, screen for learning



## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National Institute for Literacy

---

disabilities, and identify appropriate academic and job preparation activities for adults with learning disabilities. In FY 2008, NIFL expects to begin implementing an updated, streamlined system of professional development using new materials based on the findings of a comprehensive literature review currently underway. Very preliminary results suggest the need to restructure the current training to use both online and face-to-face components.

- Literacy Information and Communications System (LINCS)* - At the end of fiscal year 2005, NIFL completed a comprehensive review of *LINCS*, an online library of more than 10,000 catalogued literacy resources, 12 electronic discussion lists, and 12 “special collections” of materials on specific topics, as well as training and technical assistance for States and local providers who are seeking to improve the use of technology in teaching and learning. Based on the results of the review, NIFL has begun a redesign of *LINCS* to narrow the range of resources provided, emphasizing information and materials based on scientific research; improve the site’s architecture and navigation; and focus technical assistance offered through three regional centers on using *LINCS* resources in classroom instruction. The redesigned system will promote the dissemination of online resources and training modules to State-level organizations and professional development networks. In 2007, the foundation tasks for the new system, including needs assessments, maps of professional development systems, and dissemination plans, will be completed and dissemination activities will begin.

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

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Disseminating high-quality information	\$2,830	\$2,840	\$2,840
Translating research into practice	969	980	1,000
Supporting rigorous research	<u>140</u>	<u>140</u>	<u>100</u>
Total program costs	3,939	3,960 <sup>1</sup>	3,940 <sup>1</sup>
Personnel, compensation, and benefits	1,763	1,770	1,778
Other (non-personnel costs)	<u>870</u>	<u>908</u>	<u>920</u>
Total administrative costs	2,633	2,678	2,698
Number of full-time equivalent personnel	16	16	16

<sup>1</sup> Specific program activities may change upon reauthorization of the program.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance data; and an assessment of the progress made toward

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult education: National Institute for Literacy

---

achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2008 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

In 2006, the Department worked with NIFL staff to develop performance measures that will more accurately gauge NIFL's effectiveness in serving its target populations. The new measures are partially adapted from a set of common measures developed as part of a cross-Department effort to achieve consistency in assessing the performance of the Department's technical assistance programs. The new measures are:

- For those who receive technical assistance through NIFL programs, the percentage of recipients who report that they are prepared to implement instructional practices grounded in scientifically based research (or the most rigorous research available);
- The percentage of those assisted who can demonstrate that they implemented instructional practices grounded in scientifically based research within 6 months of receiving the technical assistance; and
- The number of products disseminated by NIFL that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent panel of qualified scientists.

The Department intends to work with NIFL to establish baseline levels for the new measures using data collected in 2006. Long-term performance indicators are still under development.

The previous measures used by NIFL focused on several specific program activities. For example:

- For the *Literacy Information and Communications System* (LINCS): Increasing annually the percentage of LINCS users judging its information and communications resources useful in improving the quality and availability of literacy services. In 2000, 83 percent of users rated the usefulness of LINCS as "excellent" or "very good."
- For *Bridges to Practice*: Increasing the percentage of individuals trained in the use of *Bridges to Practice* who report satisfaction with the training as a means of improving services and the quality of instruction for learning-disabled adults. In 2002, 89 percent of trained individuals reported satisfaction, and in 2003, the target was set that 90 percent of individuals trained would report satisfaction with the training.
- For NIFL's Web site: Increasing the number of visitors to the Web site. In 2005, there were 1.8 million visitors.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### Smaller learning communities

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 4)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): \$675,000<sup>1, 2</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$90,371	0	-\$90,371

---

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

<sup>2</sup> A total of \$675,000 thousand is authorized in fiscal year 2007 to carry out all Part D activities.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Smaller Learning Communities program supports competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to enable those agencies to create smaller, more personalized learning environments in large schools. LEAs use the funds to, among other things: (1) study the feasibility of creating a smaller learning community or communities; (2) research, develop, and implement strategies for creating smaller learning communities; and (3) provide professional development for school staff in innovative teaching methods that would be used in the smaller learning community or communities.

In fiscal years 2000 through 2006, appropriations language has directed the Department to make awards only to support the creation of smaller learning communities in large high schools. For purposes of this program, the Department has defined a large high school as a school that includes grades 11 and 12, and serves at least 1,000 students in grades 9 and above. Strategies for creating smaller learning communities within large high schools include establishing "houses" or career academies, block scheduling, and teacher advisory systems. In fiscal years 2000 through 2006, appropriations language also authorized the Department to reserve a portion of program funds for evaluation, technical assistance, school networking, peer review of applications, and program outreach activities.

The Department has made two types of awards under this program: (1) implementation grants, which provide 3-year grants to support the creation or expansion of smaller learning communities; and (2) planning grants, which provide 1 year of funding to help LEAs plan smaller learning communities. Fiscal year 2003 was the fourth and last year that the Department made planning grants.

This is a forward-funded program that includes current-year appropriations. A portion of the funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which the funds are appropriated and remain available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year. The remaining funds become available for obligation on October 1 of the fiscal year in which the funds are appropriated and remain available for 12 months.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$160,947
2004.....	173,967
2005.....	94,476
2006.....	93,531
2007.....	90,371

### FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST

The Smaller Learning Communities (SLC) 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.

The Administration believes that there is little need for a specific Federal program to support the creation of smaller learning communities because of the ready availability, since 2000, of non-Federal funds for such purposes. Over the life of the SLC program, it has largely duplicated private-sector efforts of the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, as well as other foundations that have supported multi-year high school reform initiatives that focused, in part, on creating smaller learning communities. Recently, there appears to be less duplication, but only because grantmakers and others have come to question the value of smaller learning communities as an education reform strategy and have reduced their support. For example, in 2005, the Gates Foundation indicated that its grants at the high-school level would no longer focus on structural change as a first step in fostering the transformation of high schools, in part because evaluations had shown that “the disruptive process of structural change has distracted leaders, teachers, and students from the end goal” and that “extraordinary levels of time and political capital have been spent on restructuring, with little change in curriculum and instruction—and ultimately in student achievement” (Education Week, June 22, 2005: *Commentary: Achieving ‘Success at Scale’*, by Tom Vander Ark, pp. 46-47, 56).

The private efforts and the Federal program have more than met the demand for support for smaller learning communities among LEAs. Evidence shows limited interest in the Federal grants. By the end of fiscal year 2006, the Department will have made about 900 planning and implementation grants to LEAs and supported the implementation of SLCs in about 30 percent of the 4,700 high schools eligible for SLC support. Many eligible schools have not chosen to create smaller learning communities, which is one indication that the program has already reached the LEAs with eligible high schools that have commitment to, and support for, the SLC restructuring strategy. In the most recent competition (summer 2006), 41 percent of applicants (up from 35 percent last year) had received previous implementation grants. Interest in the program continues to be narrowly concentrated geographically: applications from nine States constitute 55 percent of the total applications, and about a quarter of the applications are from California and Texas.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

The Department believes that a separate program to create smaller learning communities is unnecessary and that the remaining need for assistance in creating smaller learning communities can be adequately supported by State formula grant funds and other sources. For example, the Department's 2008 request includes several proposals specifically to improve academic achievement and graduation rates for at-risk high school students. The Administration seeks a \$1.2 billion increase for Title I, with a significant portion going to high schools. Depending on local priorities, LEAs would be able to use Title I funds, and those from other formula programs, to promote academic achievement by, among other things, restructuring schools into smaller learning communities. Also, a more than \$68 million increase for the Striving Readers program would significantly expand the development and implementation of research-based interventions to improve the skills of secondary school students who are reading significantly below grade level. In addition, the Department's proposed \$90 million increase to expand the availability of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate programs in schools with large populations of low-income students would help ensure that such students are able to prepare for and successfully complete challenging, college-level curricula.

Finally, available research studies are unable to shed much light on the effects of smaller learning communities on student achievement. One general finding is that, in poorer communities, smaller schools exhibit higher achievement than larger schools, but in more affluent communities, bigger seems to be better. Another general finding is that students are more engaged in school activities in smaller schools and feel more connected to their schools. However, in a recent analysis of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, a federally funded survey of 72,000 adolescents in grades 7–12, a group of researchers at the University of Minnesota found that while a sense of "connectedness" to school is critical to a teenager's well-being, the effects of school size and class size are minimal. Instead, the report found that school climate, teacher empathy, consistency of application of rules and regulations, and classroom management are important. Currently, no findings are available from research using random assignment designs that allow strong conclusions about the effects of smaller schools on performance.

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

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Number of implementation grants	44 <sup>1,2</sup>	43 <sup>1,2</sup>	0
Average implementation grant	\$2,000	\$2,000	0
Average grant length (years)	3-5	3-5	0
Number of schools served	139	136	0
Peer review/national activities	\$4,677	\$4,519	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The Department intends to provide each grant with funding for up to 3 years from a single year's appropriation.

<sup>2</sup>The data provided are projections only. Since this is a forward-funded program, the Department will award grants in 2007 using the FY 2006 appropriation. In 2008, the Department will make grants using the FY 2007 appropriation.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

#### 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 FY 2008 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To assist high schools to create smaller learning communities that can prepare all students to achieve to challenging standards and succeed in college and careers.**

***Objective:** Students in schools receiving smaller learning communities implementation grants will demonstrate continuous improvement in achievement in core subjects, as well as exhibit positive behavioral changes.*

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of students scoring at or above proficient on State mathematics assessments.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2001		57.1
2003	58.1	50.5
2004	60.0	48.0
2005	63.0	
2006	63.0	
2007	64.5	

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of students scoring at or above proficient on State reading assessments.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2001		65.7
2003	66.7	54.9
2004	70.0	54.0
2005	74.0	
2006	78.0	
2007	79.0	

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of students who graduate from high school (based on ninth grade enrollment).		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2001		59.2
2003	60.2	56.6
2004	63.0	86.0
2005	87.0	
2006	88.0	
2007	89.0	

**Assessment of progress:** The data for performance measures are provided by grantees in their annual performance reports. The Department does not verify these data, although the Department is providing its grantees with assistance to improve the quality of the data provided

## **CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

### **Smaller learning communities**

---

in the reports. The grantee-reported data for the percentage of students graduating from high schools show a marked increase in 2004. However, data provided for the percentages of students scoring proficient or better on the reading and mathematics assessments indicate that the program has fallen far short of its targets for two years in a row. The Department collects data by cohorts of grantees, which may explain significant increases or decreases in the actual data. The targets for these measures are tied to the NCLB goal of achieving proficiency by 2014 and have been set accordingly.

To gauge program performance, the Department has added two job training common measures: (1) the percentage of students enrolling in postsecondary education or advanced training, and (2) the percentage of students employed by the end of the first quarter after graduation. The Department has baseline data for the percentage of students enrolling in postsecondary education or advanced training (78 percent), and will collect baseline data for the percentage of graduates who are employed by the end of February 2007.

### **Efficiency Measures**

The Department recently established a cost per successful outcome measure to assess the program's efficiency. The measure is the cost per student participating in an SLC program demonstrating proficiency or better in mathematics and reading. The Department calculates the cost by dividing the amount of program funds granted in a given year by the number of students served by the SLC program who score at proficient or above on State reading and mathematics assessments. Baseline data indicate that the cost is \$416 per successful outcome in reading and \$475 per successful outcome in mathematics.

### **Other Performance Information**

Many districts implementing Smaller Learning Communities projects have focused on the ninth grade, particularly through an intervention called "freshman academies" that provides tailored, intensive programs of study designed to ease the transition to high school for ninth-grade students. In 2004, the Department began a study to assess the impact of two supplemental reading interventions for struggling ninth-grade students that, as part of the study, will be implemented within participating freshman academies. The evaluation is examining: whether the interventions in the freshman academies improve reading proficiency, the effects on students' attendance and coursetaking, students' achievement in subsequent grades, and the characteristics of students who benefit most from participation in the interventions. The Department expects to publish the first interim report on findings from this evaluation in late February 2007.

In addition, the Department concluded a descriptive evaluation of the Smaller Learning Communities program in 2005 that examined FY 2001 grantees' implementation of smaller learning communities, school data on students' academic and behavioral outcomes, and differences in SLC approaches. Among other things, the study measured the extent to which schools funded in FY 2001 implemented all of the key features of the SLC program by the end of the grant period, rating them as high, moderate, or low implementers after assessing a set of defined features, such as common planning time for teachers. Most schools examined for the study adopted freshman or career academies as the primary approach for creating smaller

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

learning communities. The study rated, as high or moderately implementing, 46 out of 58 freshman academies and 34 of 44 career academies. But the annual performance report data reviewed for the evaluation showed little change in academic and behavioral outcomes. The Department plans to release this evaluation, based on an implementation survey, case studies, and analysis of grantee annual performance reports, later this year.

### Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The 2005 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review gave the program a rating of “results not demonstrated” and called attention to other deficiencies, in addition to the program’s significant overlap with private efforts. For example, the program has not addressed some strategic planning deficiencies or met its targets for increasing academic achievement in reading and mathematics, and grantees’ performance data are not publicly available. Specifically, the PART review recommended that the Department:

- Use program data to establish baselines and long-term and annual targets for performance measures that do not yet have them. In response to this recommendation, the Department has established baselines and long-term targets (through FY 2012) for six of its seven performance measures.
- Create a mechanism for making program performance data more widely available to the public. In response to this recommendation, the program office has developed a strategy to begin publicizing grantee performance data by late February and annually thereafter on the Department’s Web site. This year’s report will identify aggregate and grantee-level outcome data for SLC grantee cohorts first funded in fiscal years 2002 through 2004.
- Establish and implement an efficiency measure for the program. In response to this recommendation, the Department recently established two efficiency measures of the cost per successful program outcome: (1) the cost per participating student who demonstrates proficiency or better in reading, and (2) the cost per participating student who demonstrates proficiency or better in mathematics. Baseline data are now available.



## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

---

### State grants for incarcerated youth offenders

(Higher Education Amendments of 1998, Title VIII, Part D)

FY 2008 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$22,770	0	-\$22,770

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2004. The program is expected to be funded in FY 2007 under the Continuing Resolution. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under this program, the Department makes grants to State correctional agencies to assist and encourage incarcerated youth to acquire functional literacy skills as well as life and job skills. These youth are provided an opportunity to pursue a postsecondary education certificate or an associate or bachelor's degree. During and following their release from prison, they also receive employment counseling and other related services in order to help ensure their successful reintegration into society.

In order to receive services under this program, a student must be 25 years of age or younger and be eligible to be released or paroled from prison within 5 years. Services may be provided to students for up to 5 years. On an annual basis, grantees may receive up to \$1,500 per eligible student for tuition, books, and materials, and up to \$300 per student for related services such as career development, substance abuse counseling, parenting skills training, and health education.

The Department distributes funds to States under a formula based on the number of eligible students in each State. In order to receive a grant, a State correctional agency must demonstrate how it will integrate the proposed programs with existing State correctional programs—such as adult education, vocational training, and graduate education degree programs—and State industry programs. In addition, the statute requires States to integrate activities funded under this authority with any school-to-work programs in the State.

State correctional agencies receiving grants must provide annual evaluation reports to the Secretary of Education and the Attorney General. These reports must include measures of program completion, student academic and vocational skill attainment, success in job placement and retention, and recidivism.

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

**CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION**

**Smaller learning communities**

---

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

	(\$000s)
2003.....	\$18,380
2004.....	19,882
2005.....	21,824
2006.....	22,770
2007.....	22,770

**FY 2008 BUDGET REQUEST**

No funds are requested for the State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders program for fiscal year 2008. This request is consistent with the Administration’s policy to eliminate small categorical programs that have only indirect or limited effect on improving student outcomes. States may use up to 1 percent of the funds they receive from the Department under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education State Grants program to serve individuals in State institutions, including State correctional institutions.

Moreover, the Reintegration of Ex-Offenders (REO) program at the Department of Labor can serve many of the needs of this population. REO will offer a range of job training, housing, and mentoring services for juveniles and adults. For juvenile offenders, REO will provide a greater focus on building basic literacy and numeracy skills and the completion of secondary education through alternative education pathways, leading to career opportunities through postsecondary credentialing programs or pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship programs. In total, the 2008 Budget includes \$39.6 million in the Department of Labor and \$25 million in the Department of Housing and Urban Development for ex-offender activities to address the problems faced by ex-offenders in a more effective and coordinated way. In addition, non-Federal funds, including State appropriations and prisoner self-funding, are available to support corrections education.

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

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Average State award	\$436	\$436	0
Range of awards	\$25 – 2,678	\$25 – 2,678	0
Number of awards	49	49	0

**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 this program.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Smaller learning communities

---

**Goal:** Contribute to the reduction of recidivism by providing incarcerated youth offenders with educational services.

**Objective:** Improve the vocational and academic achievement of students served through State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students in the facility participating in the program completing a postsecondary education certificate, associate of arts, or bachelor's degree during the program year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2003		44.1
2004		50.0
2005	50.0	23.5
2006	23.5	23.5
2007	25.5	

**Assessment of progress:** The 2005 target was not met. However, the 2005 target was based on trend data from 2004 and previous years, which included participants who completed only individual courses, in addition to those obtaining degrees and certificates. In 2005, the data was limited to participants who completed only degrees or certificates, which is not comparable to the earlier data but is a more useful baseline. Targets for 2006 and 2007 have been revised accordingly. The target was met in 2006. The 2007 target continues to be modest because of the high annual turnover rate of students served by the program.

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Career and Technical Education State Grants

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	19,991,327	19,796,295	11,207,092	(8,589,203)
Alaska	4,214,921	4,216,490	2,463,460	(1,753,030)
Arizona	24,414,621	25,071,405	10,566,342	(14,505,063)
Arkansas	12,539,958	12,570,201	6,665,082	(5,905,119)
California	128,752,910	129,659,496	63,230,535	(66,428,961)
Colorado	15,639,857	15,882,873	7,831,535	(8,051,338)
Connecticut	10,135,690	10,285,606	4,883,026	(5,402,580)
Delaware	4,808,404	4,809,391	2,463,460	(2,345,931)
District of Columbia	4,214,921	4,216,490	2,463,460	(1,753,030)
Florida	63,435,918	64,413,607	27,063,183	(37,350,424)
Georgia	36,586,606	38,015,258	17,276,915	(20,738,343)
Hawaii	5,779,511	5,779,547	2,951,100	(2,828,447)
Idaho	6,792,111	6,862,428	3,506,491	(3,355,937)
Illinois	44,823,514	45,163,793	22,755,536	(22,408,257)
Indiana	25,916,214	25,898,662	13,844,683	(12,053,979)
Iowa	12,320,501	12,163,243	6,992,469	(5,170,774)
Kansas	11,504,307	11,348,214	5,988,049	(5,360,165)
Kentucky	18,133,250	18,081,097	10,465,166	(7,615,931)
Louisiana	21,534,373	21,669,347	12,298,211	(9,371,136)
Maine	5,779,511	5,779,547	2,953,157	(2,826,390)
Maryland	16,843,943	16,936,064	8,657,227	(8,278,837)
Massachusetts	18,419,302	18,413,283	10,125,170	(8,288,113)
Michigan	39,304,090	39,840,085	20,465,206	(19,374,879)
Minnesota	18,257,070	18,194,987	9,751,532	(8,443,455)
Mississippi	13,923,447	13,818,073	7,810,484	(6,007,589)
Missouri	23,774,909	23,928,143	12,238,524	(11,689,619)
Montana	5,457,128	5,457,479	2,870,969	(2,586,510)
Nebraska	7,138,285	7,089,347	3,984,213	(3,105,134)
Nevada	8,203,523	8,433,651	2,964,256	(5,469,395)
New Hampshire	5,779,511	5,779,547	2,951,100	(2,828,447)
New Jersey	24,715,756	25,062,606	12,291,341	(12,771,265)
New Mexico	9,263,582	9,310,620	4,685,877	(4,624,743)
New York	59,744,109	59,667,205	30,018,854	(29,648,351)
North Carolina	34,797,248	35,256,400	16,821,379	(18,435,021)
North Dakota	4,214,921	4,216,490	2,463,460	(1,753,030)
Ohio	45,570,129	45,758,878	24,985,741	(20,773,137)
Oklahoma	15,943,221	15,727,319	8,821,971	(6,905,348)
Oregon	14,267,348	14,403,643	7,253,209	(7,150,434)
Pennsylvania	45,576,290	45,550,145	23,800,907	(21,749,238)
Rhode Island	5,779,511	5,779,547	2,951,100	(2,828,447)
South Carolina	18,784,249	18,971,073	9,722,347	(9,248,726)
South Dakota	4,372,228	4,373,643	2,463,460	(1,910,183)
Tennessee	23,934,853	24,059,438	12,540,889	(11,518,549)
Texas	95,086,963	95,535,633	47,156,476	(48,379,157)
Utah	12,346,005	12,670,521	6,718,528	(5,951,993)
Vermont	4,214,921	4,216,490	2,463,460	(1,753,030)
Virginia	25,807,260	25,961,709	13,586,991	(12,374,718)
Washington	22,629,487	23,104,337	11,446,242	(11,658,095)
West Virginia	8,428,617	8,431,676	4,926,204	(3,505,472)
Wisconsin	22,186,512	22,128,247	11,830,491	(10,297,756)
Wyoming	4,214,921	4,216,490	2,463,460	(1,753,030)
American Samoa	190,000	350,000	180,502	(169,498)
Guam	500,000	660,000	337,807	(322,193)
Northern Mariana Islands	190,000	350,000	180,502	(169,498)
Puerto Rico	18,977,363	18,547,491	10,788,278	(7,759,213)
Virgin Islands	627,079	623,745	331,702	(292,043)
Freely Associated States (PREL)	0	160,000	81,189	(78,811)
Indian set-aside (BIA)	14,779,846	14,780,256	7,500,000	(7,280,256)
Other (non-State allocations)	10,825,638	2,973,198	1,500,000	(1,473,198)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,182,387,690</b>	<b>1,182,420,449</b>	<b>600,000,000</b>	<b>(582,420,449)</b>

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Tech Prep Education State Grants

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	1,995,785	1,995,785	0	(1,995,785)
Alaska	360,311	360,866	0	(360,866)
Arizona	1,971,294	1,984,239	0	(1,984,239)
Arkansas	1,186,934	1,186,934	0	(1,186,934)
California	11,260,242	11,260,242	0	(11,260,242)
Colorado	1,394,658	1,394,658	0	(1,394,658)
Connecticut	869,581	869,581	0	(869,581)
Delaware	435,763	442,893	0	(442,893)
District of Columbia	321,637	309,316	0	(309,316)
Florida	5,121,965	5,097,919	0	(5,097,919)
Georgia	3,076,714	3,076,714	0	(3,076,714)
Hawaii	523,769	523,775	0	(523,775)
Idaho	624,444	624,444	0	(624,444)
Illinois	4,052,360	4,052,360	0	(4,052,360)
Indiana	2,465,494	2,465,494	0	(2,465,494)
Iowa	1,245,235	1,245,235	0	(1,245,235)
Kansas	1,066,366	1,066,366	0	(1,066,366)
Kentucky	1,863,662	1,863,662	0	(1,863,662)
Louisiana	2,190,094	2,190,094	0	(2,190,094)
Maine	525,905	525,905	0	(525,905)
Maryland	1,541,700	1,541,700	0	(1,541,700)
Massachusetts	1,649,446	1,649,446	0	(1,649,446)
Michigan	3,644,492	3,644,492	0	(3,644,492)
Minnesota	1,736,576	1,736,576	0	(1,736,576)
Mississippi	1,390,909	1,390,909	0	(1,390,909)
Missouri	2,179,465	2,179,465	0	(2,179,465)
Montana	494,553	500,147	0	(500,147)
Nebraska	709,518	709,518	0	(709,518)
Nevada	662,372	667,469	0	(667,469)
New Hampshire	523,769	523,775	0	(523,775)
New Jersey	2,188,871	2,188,871	0	(2,188,871)
New Mexico	834,472	834,472	0	(834,472)
New York	5,246,770	5,246,770	0	(5,246,770)
North Carolina	2,995,591	2,995,591	0	(2,995,591)
North Dakota	336,516	338,537	0	(338,537)
Ohio	4,449,520	4,449,520	0	(4,449,520)
Oklahoma	1,571,037	1,571,037	0	(1,571,037)
Oregon	1,291,669	1,291,669	0	(1,291,669)
Pennsylvania	4,238,522	4,238,522	0	(4,238,522)
Rhode Island	523,769	523,775	0	(523,775)
South Carolina	1,731,379	1,731,379	0	(1,731,379)
South Dakota	396,234	399,258	0	(399,258)
Tennessee	2,233,311	2,233,311	0	(2,233,311)
Texas	8,397,736	8,397,736	0	(8,397,736)
Utah	1,196,451	1,196,451	0	(1,196,451)
Vermont	342,548	341,861	0	(341,861)
Virginia	2,419,604	2,419,604	0	(2,419,604)
Washington	2,038,374	2,038,374	0	(2,038,374)
West Virginia	877,270	877,270	0	(877,270)
Wisconsin	2,106,802	2,106,802	0	(2,106,802)
Wyoming	274,390	276,943	0	(276,943)
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	1,921,202	1,921,202	0	(1,921,202)
Virgin Islands	56,829	56,155	0	(56,155)
Freely Associated States (PREL)	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>104,753,880</b>	<b>104,755,089</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(104,755,089)</b>

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	9,047,077	9,048,838	9,048,835	(3)
Alaska	967,882	968,026	968,025	(1)
Arizona	8,607,310	8,608,984	8,608,981	(3)
Arkansas	5,457,078	5,458,121	5,458,119	(2)
California	63,063,484	63,076,064	63,076,042	(22)
Colorado	5,635,412	5,636,491	5,636,489	(2)
Connecticut	4,944,877	4,945,817	4,945,816	(1)
Delaware	1,408,845	1,409,077	1,409,077	0
District of Columbia	1,272,286	1,272,490	1,272,490	0
Florida	27,583,913	27,589,388	27,589,378	(10)
Georgia	14,812,630	14,815,546	14,815,541	(5)
Hawaii	1,825,194	1,825,510	1,825,509	(1)
Idaho	2,029,458	2,029,814	2,029,814	0
Illinois	19,617,731	19,621,610	19,621,604	(6)
Indiana	9,542,384	9,544,245	9,544,242	(3)
Iowa	3,960,713	3,961,456	3,961,455	(1)
Kansas	3,709,273	3,709,966	3,709,965	(1)
Kentucky	8,488,224	8,489,874	8,489,871	(3)
Louisiana	9,142,008	9,143,789	9,143,786	(3)
Maine	1,948,522	1,948,862	1,948,861	(1)
Maryland	7,538,602	7,540,062	7,540,060	(2)
Massachusetts	8,574,304	8,575,971	8,575,968	(3)
Michigan	14,606,756	14,609,631	14,609,626	(5)
Minnesota	5,990,608	5,991,758	5,991,756	(2)
Mississippi	6,239,748	6,240,947	6,240,945	(2)
Missouri	9,088,943	9,090,714	9,090,711	(3)
Montana	1,369,058	1,369,282	1,369,282	0
Nebraska	2,394,647	2,395,076	2,395,076	0
Nevada	3,565,914	3,566,578	3,566,577	(1)
New Hampshire	1,717,472	1,717,766	1,717,766	0
New Jersey	12,948,463	12,951,006	12,951,002	(4)
New Mexico	3,441,694	3,442,333	3,442,332	(1)
New York	32,708,040	32,714,541	32,714,529	(12)
North Carolina	14,556,451	14,559,316	14,559,311	(5)
North Dakota	1,150,412	1,150,592	1,150,592	0
Ohio	16,982,047	16,985,398	16,985,392	(6)
Oklahoma	5,945,797	5,946,937	5,946,936	(1)
Oregon	4,950,076	4,951,017	4,951,015	(2)
Pennsylvania	19,018,291	19,022,050	19,022,044	(6)
Rhode Island	2,081,474	2,081,841	2,081,840	(1)
South Carolina	7,832,424	7,833,943	7,833,941	(2)
South Dakota	1,304,169	1,304,380	1,304,380	0
Tennessee	11,148,633	11,150,816	11,150,812	(4)
Texas	40,803,263	40,811,385	40,811,372	(13)
Utah	2,921,533	2,922,068	2,922,068	0
Vermont	1,004,246	1,004,397	1,004,397	0
Virginia	11,153,767	11,155,951	11,155,947	(4)
Washington	7,552,239	7,553,702	7,553,699	(3)
West Virginia	3,842,198	3,842,917	3,842,916	(1)
Wisconsin	7,474,008	7,475,455	7,475,452	(3)
Wyoming	843,956	844,075	844,075	0
American Samoa	216,564	216,588	216,588	0
Guam	371,159	371,213	371,213	0
Northern Mariana Islands	277,791	277,827	277,827	0
Puerto Rico	10,926,932	10,929,070	10,929,067	(3)
Virgin Islands	404,827	404,888	404,888	0
Freely Associated States	43,048	38,743	34,869	(3,874)
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	10,025,245	10,033,962	10,037,829	3,867
<b>Total</b>	<b>496,079,100</b>	<b>496,178,164</b>	<b>496,178,000</b>	<b>(164)</b>

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### English Literacy and Civics Education State Grants

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	155,172	176,121	176,121	0
Alaska	99,409	98,026	98,025	(1)
Arizona	1,036,449	1,066,630	1,066,627	(3)
Arkansas	146,305	151,526	151,525	(1)
California	17,541,572	16,684,912	16,684,868	(44)
Colorado	781,706	776,479	776,477	(2)
Connecticut	808,764	845,123	845,121	(2)
Delaware	118,596	133,946	133,945	(1)
District of Columbia	210,300	197,165	197,165	0
Florida	5,960,635	6,291,489	6,291,472	(17)
Georgia	1,153,994	1,305,315	1,305,311	(4)
Hawaii	473,178	458,258	458,256	(2)
Idaho	152,645	157,990	157,990	0
Illinois	3,193,595	3,214,583	3,214,574	(9)
Indiana	411,201	417,162	417,161	(1)
Iowa	286,138	278,829	278,829	0
Kansas	303,827	303,871	303,870	(1)
Kentucky	248,855	263,785	263,784	(1)
Louisiana	231,643	232,261	232,261	0
Maine	82,688	91,139	91,139	0
Maryland	1,533,558	1,508,004	1,507,999	(5)
Massachusetts	1,880,029	1,903,513	1,903,508	(5)
Michigan	1,346,112	1,363,197	1,363,194	(3)
Minnesota	780,076	807,972	807,970	(2)
Mississippi	79,862	88,689	88,689	0
Missouri	489,651	499,263	499,262	(1)
Montana	60,000	60,000	60,000	0
Nebraska	212,212	204,937	204,937	0
Nevada	602,775	609,190	609,188	(2)
New Hampshire	154,688	162,983	162,982	(1)
New Jersey	3,747,552	3,674,871	3,674,862	(9)
New Mexico	255,160	250,291	250,290	(1)
New York	8,646,066	8,544,231	8,544,208	(23)
North Carolina	750,264	814,047	814,045	(2)
North Dakota	60,000	60,000	60,000	0
Ohio	842,170	883,551	883,548	(3)
Oklahoma	259,596	263,891	263,890	(1)
Oregon	647,770	626,656	626,654	(2)
Pennsylvania	1,325,355	1,431,112	1,431,108	(4)
Rhode Island	223,169	228,091	228,091	0
South Carolina	187,651	214,686	214,686	0
South Dakota	60,000	60,000	60,000	0
Tennessee	357,643	402,690	402,689	(1)
Texas	5,584,835	5,672,805	5,672,790	(15)
Utah	309,460	311,234	311,234	0
Vermont	60,000	60,000	60,000	0
Virginia	1,652,132	1,661,738	1,661,734	(4)
Washington	1,547,603	1,550,378	1,550,373	(5)
West Virginia	60,000	60,000	60,000	0
Wisconsin	395,832	411,785	411,784	(1)
Wyoming	60,000	60,000	60,000	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	328,287	301,765	301,764	(1)
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0
Total	67,896,180	67,896,180	67,896,000	(180)

## CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

### State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders

State or Other Area	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate	2008 Estimate	Change from 2007 Estimate
Alabama	428,154	428,154	0	(428,154)
Alaska	44,587	44,587	0	(44,587)
Arizona	709,397	709,397	0	(709,397)
Arkansas	301,594	301,594	0	(301,594)
California	2,677,875	2,677,875	0	(2,677,875)
Colorado	456,392	456,392	0	(456,392)
Connecticut	418,893	418,893	0	(418,893)
Delaware	117,757	117,757	0	(117,757)
District of Columbia	90,661	90,661	0	(90,661)
Florida	1,442,689	1,442,689	0	(1,442,689)
Georgia	760,273	760,273	0	(760,273)
Hawaii	92,147	92,147	0	(92,147)
Idaho	159,943	159,943	0	(159,943)
Illinois	1,074,443	1,074,443	0	(1,074,443)
Indiana	477,886	477,886	0	(477,886)
Iowa	193,555	193,555	0	(193,555)
Kansas	177,664	177,664	0	(177,664)
Kentucky	201,558	201,558	0	(201,558)
Louisiana	774,106	774,106	0	(774,106)
Maine	41,615	41,615	0	(41,615)
Maryland	378,536	378,536	0	(378,536)
Massachusetts	133,877	133,877	0	(133,877)
Michigan	850,934	850,934	0	(850,934)
Minnesota	226,596	226,596	0	(226,596)
Mississippi	380,136	380,136	0	(380,136)
Missouri	543,052	543,052	0	(543,052)
Montana	67,453	67,453	0	(67,453)
Nebraska	110,554	110,554	0	(110,554)
Nevada	218,936	218,936	0	(218,936)
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	641,030	641,030	0	(641,030)
New Mexico	119,814	119,814	0	(119,814)
New York	1,203,289	1,203,289	0	(1,203,289)
North Carolina	659,208	659,208	0	(659,208)
North Dakota	34,984	34,984	0	(34,984)
Ohio	990,756	990,756	0	(990,756)
Oklahoma	401,744	401,744	0	(401,744)
Oregon	25,495	25,495	0	(25,495)
Pennsylvania	710,998	710,998	0	(710,998)
Rhode Island	65,967	65,967	0	(65,967)
South Carolina	509,783	509,783	0	(509,783)
South Dakota	95,806	95,806	0	(95,806)
Tennessee	0	0	0	0
Texas	2,027,470	2,027,470	0	(2,027,470)
Utah	97,063	97,063	0	(97,063)
Vermont	0	0	0	0
Virginia	432,841	432,841	0	(432,841)
Washington	317,371	317,371	0	(317,371)
West Virginia	109,754	109,754	0	(109,754)
Wisconsin	441,416	441,416	0	(441,416)
Wyoming	45,502	45,502	0	(45,502)
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	288,446	288,446	0	(288,446)
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0
Other (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>22,770,000</b>	<b>22,770,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(22,770,000)</b>