DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

PART ASSESSMENTS[1]

[1] This document contains details of the most recent program assessments as of the date the 2005 Budget was published (February 2004). Programs originally assessed for the 2004 Budget were reassessed only where evidence showed an agency's rating was likely to change. Programs not reassessed are presented in this document in the form of reprints of the original worksheets and are footnoted "FY 2004 Budget".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	89%	13%	

1.1 **Is the program purpose clear?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The purpose is to establish community learning centers that help students in high-poverty, low-performing schools meet academic achievement standards; offer a broad array of additional services designed to complement the regular academic program; and offer families of students opportunities for educational enrichment.

Evidence: Section 4201 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The antecedent program did not have a clear focus on academic achievement. The reauthorized program does.

1.2 **Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program supports local communities in providing students, particularly students who attend schools that have been identified as in need of improvement under Title I, with opportunities for academic enrichment that will reinforce classroom learning. Also, the program provides a safe haven for youth, supervised activities, and services focused on crime, violence, and substance abuse prevention.

Evidence: A 2000 study conducted by the Urban Institute found that 5 percent of 6- to 9-year-olds and 24 percent of 10- to 12-year-old children have self-care as their primary child care arrangement in the after-school hours. Also, both the current and antecedent program consistently receive 10 times the number of applications than can be funded. A majority of the applications were to fund centers focusing on improving participants academic achievement.

1.3 **Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: This is the only program that focuses on providing Federal support to create infrastructure for extended-learning programs (as opposed to providing per-capita funds for student care during non-school hours) with an emphasis on improving academic achievement of students who attend schools that have been identified as in need of improvement under Title I. This is also the only program that supports such a wide range of activities within its centers.

Evidence: Other Federal programs that support the care of students during non-school hours (but do not fund the creation of extended-learning program infrastructure) include CCDF and ESEA Title I.

1.4 **Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The reauthorized ESEA, as amended by NCLB, corrected what was perceived as flawed in the original structure of the antecedent program by improving the targeting of funds, converting the program to a State-administered grant, and requiring centers to provide academic enrichment activities to students.

Evidence: Sections 4201-4206 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Program: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	89%	13%	

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?**
Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The reauthorized program requires States to make awards that will primarily serve students who attend schools with concentrations of poor students. It also requires States to give priority to applications that propose to target services to students who attend schools identified for improvement under Title I and applications that are submitted jointly by at least one LEA that receives funds under Part A of Title I and at least one community-based organization or other public or private entity.

Evidence: Sections 4201-4205 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?**
Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program has developed performance measures that reflect the program goals regarding student achievement and behavior. In addition,to ensure that centers operate high-quality programs, the statute requires local grantees to develop programs that meet specified principles of effectiveness focusing on improving the number of students that meet State proficiency measures.

Evidence: The data for the program effectiveness measures are being collected through annual performance reports submitted by local grantees. Data regarding the long-term efficiency goals has not yet been collected. Baseline data for the program effectiveness measures, collected through annual performance reports submitted by local grantees, should be available beginning in 2005.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?**
Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Long-term performance measures aim for 100 percent of participants showing improvements in academic, social, and behavioral areas by 2012.

Evidence: These measures are included in the Department's Planning & Performance Management Database. Targets for 3 of the 4 long term measures are under development.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?**
Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department collects and reports on data about the program's performance measures on an annual basis. Measures address improvement in academic achievement, and improvement in behavioral issues such as homework completion and class participation.

Evidence: The grantee database and individual districts annual performance reports are available upon request to the Department.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?**
Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department has baseline data collected in 2000 for the antecedent program and has established ambitious targets in each area. The program assesses its progress towards its long-term goals through the annual data collection process.

Evidence: Baseline data have been collected and some annual targets have been set for the antecedent program. However, some targets need revision because the original targets have been met. Therefore, the new measures will be higher than the original targets, providing more ambitious goals.

Program: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	89%	13%	

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: All States will report on their progress toward the performance targets on an annual basis. The information reported will be posted on the internet.

Evidence: For the reauthorized program, all State RFPs were analyzed by ED staff to be sure that they are consistent with the mission and purpose of the program. Through this work with the States and through the program guidance all States have State-level regulations for their subgrantees. The program's website provides links to all State 21st Century program websites regulations, guidelines, and performance reports can be found.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Current evaluations include a multi-year national evaluation using rigorous methodologies to answer questions relating to program implementation, student access and participation, and student outcomes and impacts. The study is examining both in-school and out-of-school outcomes such as achievement, high school completion, crime, and drug use. In addition, the Institute for Education Sciences National Center for Evaluation is developing two after-school interventions (one each in reading and math) and will rigorously test their effectiveness through experimental studies. The Department also plans to begin funding a new evaluation of the State-administered program.

Evidence: An interim report from the national evaluation was released in early 2003. A final report is expected in the summer of 2004. Reports from IES's study and the evaluation of State implementation will be released at a later date.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The budget materials for this program show both the full cost of administering it and the cost of specific outputs related to the annual and long-term goals. In addition, the program was proposed for a cut in 2004 due to poor performance.

Evidence:

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: No strategic planning deficiencies have been identified. This program has an internal strategic plan as well as a National Activities that were created since No Child Left Behind in order to specifically address the weaknesses of the previous program.

Evidence:

Program: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	89%	13%	

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program has implemented web-based collection of data from states through annual performance reports, an innovation that is being considered for use in other programs. In addition, the States annual consolidated reports and Title I State Report Cards also provides data that the Department uses to improve the management of the program.

Evidence: In order to draw information from State-funded programs, the Department is conducting a study that examines how States and communities are implementing the reauthorized program. Supported by National Activities funds, the study focuses on how, and to what extent, funds support high-quality programs that emphasize academic content. The study also examines project activities to improve academic outcomes and maintain student engagement in programs, and how they link with State and Federal education goals.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: As part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department has implemented an agency-wide system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. As one of its program reforms, ED will monitor grantee performance on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. If this system is implemented effectively, we would expect this answer to convert to a "yes."

Evidence: States applications indicate that grantees will be required to make substantial progress each year toward the achievement of performance results and that, absent those results, States will not provide continued funding to poorly performing subgrantees. The Department will provide assistance, through a contract, to help States obtain the data they need to hold the grantees accountable for these results.

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Funds are obligated within the timeframes set out by Department schedules and used for the purposes intended. The Department reserves some funds for national activities including evaluation, which are obligated based on an approved national activities spending plan and evaluation plan.

Evidence: States appear to be drawing down funds at an acceptable rate. This evidence comes from recent reports of current drawdown awards to States (reports that are checked every quarter). To date, every State has made at least one round of subgrant awards.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: This program has established a partnership with a private Foundation (the Mott Foundation) of $100 million over 7 years to offset all technical assistance and grantee training for infrastructure development and sustainability. This partnership is so successful it won the Public Service Excellence Award. The Mott funding provided biannual training for all grantees designed to: 1) help grantees build collaborative partnerships, 2) provide comprehensive services to participants, and 3) diversify the sources of support. For the first 99 grants that received this training, approximately two-thirds are still providing services even though Federal funding ended two years ago.

Evidence: Within the next three years, Education will be analyzing the major business functions of all of its program offices. Once that analysis is complete, we will re-evaluate the extent to which this program is implementing those efficiency improvements.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program has conducted joint training forums with the Department of Health and Human Services; coordinates with State program offices; partners with the Mott Foundation for technical assistance, sustainability, and infrastructure development; works with Title I offices regarding supplemental services; and collaborates with other agencies such as NASA and the NEA for content area support.

Evidence: The Department cosponsored a meeting with all the 21st Century Community Learning Centers State coordinators, all the State HHS coordinators, HHS administrators, and TANF coordinators to various Federal efforts to support after-school programs. The Mott Foundation also funded a Finance Project to create a series of handbooks that show how to use funds across Federal agencies to support after-school programming.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Recent agency-wide audits have not identified deficiencies in the financial management of this program.

Evidence: There have been no audits of the reauthorized program.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Material internal management deficiencies within the Department have not been identified for this program.

Evidence: Program staff monitor excessive draw downs of funds to prevent high-risk situations. Past technical assistance efforts have worked toward creating sustainable funding sources and now the technical assistance is focused on improving program quality.

3.BF1 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department maintains information on grantee activities through consolidated annual reports, site visits and compliance monitoring, and technical assistance activities.

Evidence: The National Evaluation is one of the Department's oversight measures. The fact that the evaluation focused on early implementation made it possible for the report to identify the issues that the Department is working on with States and grantees to prevent and remedy.

Program: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	75%	89%	13%	

3.BF2 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The performance reports are annual and will be widely disseminated.

Evidence: The public can access the Department's evaluation on the program's website (http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/21stcclc/). The grantee database and individual districts annual performance reports are available upon request to the Department.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Recent evaluations suggest that the program is not on track to meet most of its long-term goals regarding student achievement or student behavior. (see below for details)

Evidence: When Schools Stay Open Late: The National Evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program." (http://www.ed.gov/pubs/21cent/firstyear/)

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?

Answer: SMALL EXTENT — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Recent evaluations suggest that consistent attendance by students tends to drop off in these programs over the year - in part because students felt the activities did not meet their needs or were too much like the regular school day. The National Evaluation of the 21st Century program also indicates that the academic component of these programs is often inadequate. However, there were small academic gains reported for certain subgroups (African American and Hispanic students), and the program was associated with increased involvement of middle school parents.

Evidence: When Schools Stay Open Late: The National Evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program." (http://www.ed.gov/pubs/21cent/firstyear/) Evidence of academic gains for African American and Hispanic students can be found on pages xii and 70.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: SMALL EXTENT — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Under the antecedent program directly administered by the Department, grant costs decreased each year while the number of grantees increased. This means that the program is spending less money per participant while increasing the number being served and increasing the academic focus of the program. In addition, the partnership with the Mott Foundation has improved this program's cost-effectiveness by utilizing private funds to support this Federal program.

Evidence:

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: No evaluations of similar rigor have been conducted on other extended-learning programs.

Evidence:

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Recent evaluations suggest that consistent attendance by students tends to drop off in these programs over the year - in part because students felt the activities did not meet their needs or were too much like the regular school day. The National Evaluation of the 21st Century program also indicates that the academic component of these programs is often inadequate.

Evidence: When Schools Stay Open Late: The National Evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program." (http://www.ed.gov/pubs/21cent/firstyear/)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Measure: Percentage of regular program participants whose achievement test scores improved from below grade level to at or above grade level.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2002		4
2008	46	
2010	76	
2012	100	

Measure: Percentage of regular program participants whose math/English grades increased from fall to spring.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2003		
2012	100	

Measure: Percentage of regular program participants whose achievement test scores improved from below grade level to at or above grade level.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2002		4
2005	26	
2006	36	
2007	46	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Measure: Percentage of regular program participants whose math/English grades increased from fall to spring.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2003		

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Percentage of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2002		75.5
2004	78	
2005	80	
2006	82	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Percentage of students with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2003		

Measure Term: Annual

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Block/Formula Grants

Name of Program: Adult Education State Grants

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The purpose of this program is to create a partnership among the federal government, states and localities, to provide adult education and literacy services in order to: (i) assist adults to become literate and obtain the skills necessary to become employed and self sufficient; (ii) obtain skills necessary to be full partners in the educational development of their children; (iii) and to complete secondary school education.	Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, Section 202.	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	There are extensive adult populations with low levels of literacy skills in the U.S. Further, the non-English speaking population is growing. The literacy skills of these populations are too low to be effective members of the workforce and to participate as citizens in our democratic society.	National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS), International Survey of Adults (IALS), Census.	20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Available performance data indicate that the program has some positive impacts on individuals served with these Federal dollars. Because Federal dollars make up a significant percentage of adult education funding, eliminating these funds would dramatically reduce these impacts.	Although the Department is working to improve the strategic planning and performance reporting for this program, the current performance reporting framework does demonstrate some positive impacts on adult literacy, skill attainment, and job placement.	20%	0.2
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	This program is not duplicative with any other Federal program designed to address adult literacy. However, the Department of Labor's adult job training programs are a separate Federal funding stream that serve this same population.	Federal money represents a large percent of the dollars in many state programs. Thus, eliminating or reducing funds for this program would dramatically reduce current literacy services to the target population.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	While the program has design advantages (e.g. state flexibility), there are a number of program features that warrant improvement, including increased accountability, and more rigorous performance target setting. However, there is no conclusive evidence that an alternative approach would be more effective.		20%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**100%**
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	No	The program has one long-term goal -- to significantly reduce illiteracy in the United States. This goal, however, is not linked to short term goals and is unnecessarily broad given program scope and activities. Consistent with measures established under the job training common measures framework, the Department is working to develop several long-term indicators that are tied to short term goals and are consistent with the program's scope and activities.		14%	0.0
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	No	Through the common measures matrix, the program has established a limited set of performance indicators designed to measure program impacts, including for example, placement in employment, degree attainment, and skill attainment. However, the Department must establish numerical targets and ensure that performance data exists to report on those targets. In addition, any short-term measures (whether the common measures or additional measures) must be linked to long-term goals. To the extent performance targets are set by states, a process should be put in place to ensure that state-defined targets are appropriately rigorous and that a methodology can be developed for aggregating performance data at the national level.		14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	No	While the program receives regular and timely annual performance information from grantees, the information cannot yet be tied to a strategic planning framework where a limited number of annual performance goals demonstrate progress toward achieving long-term goals.	Instructions for this question indicate that a "no" is required if the program received a "no" for both questions 1 and 2 of this section.	14%	0.0
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	Considerable collaboration and coordination occurs at both the Federal level (e.g., with DOL) and at the grantee level (e.g., with WIA title I one-stops)		14%	0.1
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	No	Research and evaluation funds are used to measure the distribution of literacy in the United States and projects focus on researching how adults learn to read and what types of instruction are effective. No current research efforts address the issue of program performance or return on Federal investment.		14%	0.0
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	The program does not have a strategic planning framework where a limited number of annual performance goals demonstrate progress toward achieving long-term goals. Thus, at this time, performance goals are not currently aligned with budget policy.		14%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	The Department has undertaken a process to make strategic planning improvements. This process is being coordinated with the Department's ongoing development of a reauthorization proposal as well as the development of the common measures framework.		14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**29%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	Yes	Grantees provide regular and timely performance information for a series of existing performance measures. Although this information is not currently linked to a strategic goals framework (see Sec II, q 1 & q 2), nor is it consistent with the common measures, the information does provide some relevant information on program impacts and the program has used this information to improve management of the program. For example, the program has used recent performance information as a foundation to negotiate with States to be accountable for more rigorous performance targets.		11%	0.1
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	This program has not instituted an appraisal system that holds Federal managers accountable for grantee performance. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is planning to implement an agency-wide system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. Grantee performance is monitored on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. Grantees that do not meet Federal requirements are required to submit improvement plans and can have grants reduced or discontinued for serious or persistent failures to comply.		11%	0.0
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	Funds are obligated within the timeframes set out by Department schedules and used for the purposes intended.		11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	No	This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.	The common measures framework includes an efficiency measure -- cost per participant. The Department estimates that the cost per participant is $165. However, the lack of valid outcome data makes it impossible to link these costs to the achievement of program goals.	11%	0.0
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	Education's 2004 Budget satisfies the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute less than 1% percent of the program's full costs. However, Education has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess the impact of the Federal investment.		11%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	The program has a positive audit history, with no evidence of internal control weaknesses.		11%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	The program has taken meaningful steps to work with states to raise state-defined performance targets.		11%	0.1
8 (B 1.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	Program oversight includes documentation of grantees use of funds and site visits.		11%	0.1
9 (B 2.)	*Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	Yes	Data are collected and compiled from annual reports and used for mandated reports to Congress. The most recent of these reports are on the Department's website. While such data in the future should be linked to the common measures and an improved strategic planning framework, the Department has a process in place to ensure that relevant performance information is made available to the public.		12%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**67%**

Questions		Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)						
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	Consistent with measures established under the job training common measures framework, the Department is working to develop several long-term indicators that are tied to short term goals and are consistent with the program's scope and activities.	As demonstrated below, there is some data for 2001 on job placement, retention, degree attainment, and skill attainment. However, without established targets, it is impossible to assess progress.	20%	0.0

Long-Term Goal I:	Participants placed in employment.
Target:	X%
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	In 2001, 31% of participants with an employment goal had entered unsibsidized employment by the end for the first quarter after program exit.
Long-Term Goal II:	Participants retaining employment.
Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	In 2001, 62% of relevant participants retained unsibsidized employment in the third quarter after program exit. Relevant participants are those who were employed at program entry with a retention goal or those not employed at entry, had an emplyment hoal and obtained employments by the end of the first quarter after program exit.
Long-Term Goal III:	Earnings increase
Target:	Earnings will increase by X%
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal IV: (optional)	Attainment of a degree or certificate by participants.
Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	In 2001, 33% of participants with a goal to complete high school.
Long-Term Goal V: (optional)	Attainment of literacy and numeracy skills by participants.
Target:	Literacy and numeracy skills of participants will increase by X%.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	In 2001, 36% of participants advanced one or more education functioning levels during the program year. (educational functioning level is determined using a uniform, standardized assessment procedure approved by the state)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	No	Through the common measures matrix, the program has established a limited set of performance indicators designed to measure program impacts, including for example, placement in employment, degree attainment, and skill attainment. However, the Department must establish numerical targets and ensure that performance data exists to report on those targets. In addition, any short-term measures (whether the common measures or additional measures) must be linked to long-term goals.	As demonstrated below, there is some data for 2001 on job placement, retention, degree attainment, and skill attainment. However, without established targets, it is impossible to assess progress.	20%	0.0

Key Goal I:	Participants placed in employment.
Performance Target:	X%
Actual Performance:	In 2001, 31% of participants with an employment goal had entered unsibsidized employment by the end for the first quarter after program exit.
Key Goal II:	Participants retaining employment.
Performance Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Performance:	In 2001, 62% of relevant participants retained unsibsidized employment in the third quarter after program exit. Relevant participants are those who were employed at program entry with a retention goal or those not employed at entry, had an emplyment hoal and obtained employments by the end of the first quarter after program exit.
Key Goal III:	Earnings increase
Performance Target:	Earnings will increase by X%
Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Key Goal IV: (optional)	Attainment of a degree or certificate by participants.
Performance Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Performance:	In 2001, 33% of participants with a goal to complete high school.
Key Goal V: (optional)	Attainment of literacy and numeracy skills by participants.
Performance Target:	Literacy and numeracy skills of participants will increase by X%.
Actual Performance:	In 2001, 36% of participants advanced one or more education functioning levels during the program year. (educational functioning level is determined using a uniform, standardized assessment procedure approved by the state)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	No	The common measures framework includes an efficiency measure -- cost per participant. The Department estimates that the annual cost per participant is $165. However, the lack of performance targets and comprehensive outcome data makes it impossible to link these costs to the achievement of program goals.		20%	

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	No	To date, the Department has been unable to provide comprehensive data to inform on the common measures or establish performance targets. Without this information, it is difficult to compare performance of this program with other Federal programs.		20%	0.0
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	No	No evaluations have been conducted under the current program. Research and evaluation funds are used to measure the distribution of literacy in the United States and research on effective methods and types of instruction.		20%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**0%**

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Block/Formula Grants

Name of Program: Comprehensive School Reform (CSR)

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The purpose of the program is to improve student achievement by supporting the implementation of comprehensive school reform, especially in low-performing, high poverty schools	Statutory purpose: "to provide incentives for schools to undertake comprehensive school reform based upon scientifically based research and effective practices" (Section 1601 of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001).	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	With increasing numbers of schools being identified as in need of improvement, this program addresses a relevant and clearly defined problem	Currently nearly 8,700 schools nationwide have been identified as in need of improvement.	20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Funds are for start-up costs of implementing comprehensive reform at the school level. Therefore this program provides an organizing framework to improve the use of all other State and local dollars in the school.	Early findings from the National Longitudinal Survey of Schools indicate that CSR may be helping to leverage Title I funds to undertake strategies associated with successful schools	20%	0.2
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	No	CSR is duplicative of Title I Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This program supports comprehensive school reform, which is also the purpose of Title I schoolwide programs, and helps improve low-performing schools, which is the purpose of the State school improvement set-aside in Title I.	Title I schoolwide project statutory provisions (sec. 1114 of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001) and State school improvement set-aside (sec. 1003 of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001).	20%	0.0
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	The program design provides for formula distribution to States who then compete the funds, giving priority to lowest-performing schools which have assurance of district support for reform. No evidence indicates there is a better design for the program. This does not mean that program improvements are not needed.	Section 1604(c)(1) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires SEAs to give priority to applications that plan to use program funds in schools identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Section Score					**100%**	**80%**
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	Yes	The program has two long-term performance goals: (1) by 2014 all students in schools that have received CSR funding will meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics; (2) by 2014 no schools that have received CSR funds will be designated as in needs of improvement.	GPRA performance report	17%	0.2
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	Yes	(1) The percentage of students in schools that have received CSR funds who meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in Reading and Math will increase by 2% annually (3% in Reading at High School). (2) the number of schools that have received CSR funds designated as in need of improvement will decrease by 2.5% annually. Education collects data from States on the performance measures.	GPRA performance report	17%	0.2
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	Yes	In its consolidated application each State describes how it will measure the extent to which the reforms have resulted in increased student achievement; subgrant process gives priority to schools in need of improvement.	Annual consolidated performance report from each State provides data that addresses program outcome indicators; statute requires that State conduct program evaluations and share them with the Department	17%	0.2
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	The program collaborates with related programs and technical assistance providers that target low-performing schools in need of improvement. These programs share similar school improvement and student achievement goals. The program also works with Education's Institute of Education Sciences to evaluate whole school reform models.	CSR co-sponsors technical assistance initiatives with student achievement and school accountability program for State staff related to both programs. Activities include co-presentations and shared publications. The program also partners with regional educational labs on technical assistance and product creation.	17%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	Yes	Statute requires national evaluation and a report to Congress; the Department may reserve up to 1% of the amount appropriated each year for evaluation activities. The statute requires each State to evaluate annually the implementation of reforms and measure the extent to which reforms have resulted in increased student achievement. These evaluations must be submitted to the Department.The statute also requires that each LEA evaluate the implementation of comprehensive reforms and measure the results achieved.	National Longitudinal Study of Schools (NLSS); Field-Focused Study; Longitudinal Assessment of comprehensive School Reform Implementation and Outcomes (LACIO)	17%	0.2
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	The database on CSR grantees identifies the number of awards made, the actual and average amount of awards, and the number of awards made to low-performing schools. However, the Department has not determined a direct relationship between funding levels and performance goals.		17%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	N/A	The Department has not identified any strategic planning deficiencies related to this program.		0%	
Total Section Score					**100%**	**83%**
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	Yes	States report information annually to the Department and provide data on grantees to a contractor for inclusion in a grantee database. Performance information provided by SEAs is used to shape technical assistance provided by program office. Program guidance is key to program management and improved performance.	The program collects information about subgranting procedures, timelines, priorities. It also collects data from States through annual consolidated report. States are now required to submit annual subgrantee evaluations to the Department of Education.	13%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	The Department of Education has not instituted an appraisal system that holds Federal managers accountable for grantee performance. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is planning to implement an agency-wide system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. In that context, the CSR program staff have created seven common performance standards aligned with the Department Strategic Plan goals, objectives and strategies. These standards, along with an individualized work plan, dictate the performance results that will be the basis for each employee's evaluation when that system is fully implemented. If sub-grantees do not make adequate implementation progress annually, continuation funds are withheld. Grantee performance is monitored annually through review and approval of application for funds, compliance reviews and site visits.		13%	0.0
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	Federal funds are obligated July 1 as required by law. The program office provides guidance and encourages States to create subgrant competition timelines that allow subgrantees adequate time to obligate funds. States held accountable for performance results.		13%	0.1
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	No	This program has not yet implemented measures and procedures to improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing and agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.		13%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	Education's 2004 Budget satisfies the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute 1% percent of the program's full costs. However, ED has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels.		13%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	Recent agency-wide audits have not identified deficiencies in the financial management of this program; the program follows the Departmental guidelines for financial management		13%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	N/A	Material internal management deficiencies have not been identified for this program		0%	
8 (B 1.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	Reporting system is in place that documents grantees' distribution of funds to subgrantees. Program guidance available. State program coordinators maintain contact with program office through regularly scheduled outreach meetings and communication.	SEDL database tracks subgrant and funding distribution by school; annual evaluation submitted by States.	13%	0.1
9 (B 2.)	*Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	Yes	The Department collects data annually from States, including whether the number of funded schools that have been identified for improvement has decreased.	Consolidated performance report; report to Congress (years one and three); GPRA indicators; grantee database; required submission of States' evaluation	13%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**63%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section IV: Program Results	**(Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)**					
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	Small extent	Performance information shows improvements in elementary school, but mixed results in middle and high schools. However, these data are self-reported, are based on responses from 26 states, and are not nationally representative. They therefore should be considered to be only a preliminary measure of the progress of CSR grantees.	Consolidated state reports	33%	0.1

Long-Term Goal I:	Percentage of all elementary school students in schools that have received CSR funds that meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics.
Target:	By 2014, 100% of all students in elementary school in CSR schools will be proficient in reading and math.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Reading: 75% / Math: 74% (2001)
Long-Term Goal II:	Percentage of all middle and high school students in schools that have received CSR funds that meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics.
Target:	By 2014, 100% of all students in middle and high school in CSR schools will be proficient in reading and math.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Middle school - Reading: 77% / Math: 74% (2001) High School - Reading: 64% / Math: 74% (2001).
Long-Term Goal III:	Percentage of schools that have received CSR funds that are designated as in need of improvement.
Target:	By 2014, 0% of CRS schools will be in school improvement
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	30% of CSR schools are in school improvement (2001)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	Small extent	Performance information shows improvements in elementary school, but mixed results in middle and high schools. However, these data are self-reported, are based on responses from 26 states, and are not nationally representative. They therefore should be considered to be only a preliminary measure of the progress of CSR grantees.	Consolidated state reports.	33%	0.1

Key Goal I:	Percent of all elementary school students in schools that have received CSR funds that meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics.
Performance Target:	2% annual increase
Actual Performance:	(Base year 2000/performance year 2001) Reading: 75% proficient, 8% increase / Math: 74% proficient, 12% increase.
Key Goal II:	Percent of all middle and high school students in schools that have received CSR funds that meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics.
Performance Target:	2% annual increase

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Actual Performance:	(Base year 2000/performance year 2001) Middle school - Reading: 77% proficient, 21% increase / Math: 74% proficient, 0% increase. High school - Reading: 64%, 8% decrease / Math: 74%, 13% increase.				
	Key Goal III:	Percentage of schools that have received CSR funds that are designated as in need of improvement.				
	Performance Target:	2.5% annual decrease				
	Actual Performance:	3% decrease from 2000 to 2001.				
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	N/A	This program does not lend itself to the development of efficiency measures that link the Federal investment to program outcomes because it's combined with a significant amount of other program dollars from the Federal, State, and local levels to achieve its goals.		0%	
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	N/A	No comparable data are available for other programs.		0%	
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	Small extent	The Department of Education evaluations of both comprehensive reform models and of this program are incomplete. Early implementation data show that the program seems to be helping to catalyzes some changes in how States think about and support school improvement efforts. However, little rigorous evaluation of evidence is available to document that comprehensive school reforms are effective interventions for improving student achievement. One study found that only 3 of 24 comprehensive approaches met the criteria for having "strong evidence of positive effects on student achievement" while another study found that 3 of the 29 most commonly used comprehensive reform models had the "strongest evidence of effectiveness."	Department of Education's NLSS (National Longitudinal Survey of Schools), consolidated State reports, Longitudinal Assessment of Comprehensive School Reform Implementation and Outcomes (data collection has not yet begun); An Educators' Guide to Schoolwide Reform (1999; American Institutes for Research); Comprehensive School Reform and Student Achievement: A Meta-Analysis (2002; Center for Reserach on the Education of Students Placed At Risk)	33%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**33%**

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Block/Formula Grants

Name of Program: Even Start

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	Purpose is to help break the cycle of poverty and illiteracy for low-income families by integrating early childhood education, adult literacy, and parenting education into a unified family literacy program.	Section 1231 of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	About 4% of adults cannot read at all and 21 % have only rudimentary reading and writing skills. 56% of beginning kindergarteners are at risk of school failure because of factors such as low family income and low parent education.	1992 U.S. Department of Education survey and ED's Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, 2000.	20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	No	There is no evidence indicating that increases or decreases in Federal funding for this program would have a clear impact on family literacy.	Third National Evaluation of Even Start.	20%	0
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	No	The program is duplicative of several other programs including: Head Start, Adult Education, Early Reading First, Reading First, and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).	Head Start, Early Reading First, and Even Start serve similar early childhood populations; Adult Education and Even Start serve similar adult populations. In Title I and Reading First, family literacy efforts are allowable activities.	20%	0
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	yes	There is no evidence indicating that the structure of the program -- formula grants to States, competitive grants to the local level -- is the wrong design for the program. This does not mean that program improvements are unnecessary.		20%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**0.6**

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	No	The program has two outcome goals for adults and two for children that directly support the program's mission and purpose. However, the program lacks numerical targets for its long-term goals.	Even Start indicators of program quality and Section 1240 of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.	14%	0
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	No	The program must set numerical targets for its annual goals and ensure that data exist to report on whether those targets have been met.		14%	0
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	No	SEAs are required to develop indicators of program quality to monitor, evaluate, and improve their programs.	While States have begun to implement the statutory requirements to set performance goals around specified measures, they do not fit into a strategic framework since the Department has not established numerical targets for its performance goals. (see Q. 1 and 2 in this section). A process should be put in place to ensure that State goals are rigorous and that would help ensure achievement of national goals set by the Department.	14%	0
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	Program staff at the national, state, and local levels coordinate with Title I of ESEA, Vocational Education, and Head Start programs.	Even Start has conducted 2 National Forums jointly with Vocational Education and Head Start programs. The first brought together local teams representing the three programs that wrote action plans for how to promote family literacy. The second culminated in the publication of research papers representing each program.	14%	0.143

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	yes	Education conducts independent evaluations of this program every 3-5 years.		14%	0.143
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	no	The program does not have a strategic planning framework where a limited number of annual performance goals demonstrate progress toward achieving long-term goals. Thus, at this time, performance goals are not currently aligned with budget policy.		14%	0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	Even Start has developed an action plan addressing the program's long term planning deficiencies.		14%	0.16
Total Section Score					**100%**	**0.446**

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	yes	The program collects annual data through an extensive data collection system and uses it to target technical assistance activities.		13%	0.13

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, sub grantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	no	This program has not instituted an appraisal system that holds Federal managers accountable for grantee performance. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is planning to implement an agency-side system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. Grantee performance is monitered on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits.		13%	0
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	yes	Grants for the State formula grant program are obligated on schedule. In addition, evaluation and technical assistance funds are obligated on schedule based on a spending plan. However, the funds for the competitive portion of the program are often not obligated in a way to meet Education's internal schedule, even though they are obligated before the legal deadline.		12%	0.12
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	no	This program has not yet implemented measures and procedures to improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.		12%	
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	no	ED's 04 budget submission satisfies the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute 1% percent of the program's full costs. However, ED has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess the impact of the Federal investment.		12%	
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	yes	Recent agency-wide audits have not identified deficiencies in the financial management of this program.		12%	0.12

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	NA	Material internal management deficiencies have not been identified for this program.		0%	
8 (B 1.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	yes	ED collects and reviews extensive summaries of local activities.		13%	0.13
9 (B 2.)	*Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	yes	The program collects and reports annual data through an extensive data collection system, and has published summaries of local evaluations.		13%	0.13
Total Section Score					**100%**	**0.63**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	Since targets have not been set, it is not currently possible to assess progress toward meeting them.		33%	0

Long-Term Goal I:	Percentage of Even Start adults who achieve significant gains on measures of literacy and math skills.
Target:	A clear target has not been set for this goal.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	
Long-Term Goal II:	Percentage of Even Start adults who earn a secondary school diploma or a GED.
Target:	A clear target has not been set for this goal.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Long-Term Goal III:	Percentage of Even Start children reading at grade level.				
	Target:	A clear target has not been set for this goal.				
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:					
	Long-Term Goal IV:	Percentage of Even Start children who enter school ready to read.				
	Target:	A clear target has not been set for this goal.				
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:					
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	No	Since targets have not been set, it is not currently possible to assess progress toward meeting them.		33%	0
	Key Goal I:	Percentage of Even Start adults who earn a secondary school diploma or a GED.				
	Performance Target:	A clear target has not been set for this goal.				
	Actual Performance:	1999: 18.4%; 2000: 17%; 2001: 17% (compared to a goal of 25%).				
	Key Goal II:	Percentage of Even Start children who achieve significant gains on measures of language development and reading readiness				
	Performance Target:	A clear target has not been set for this goal.				
	Actual Performance:					
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	NA	This program does not lend itself to the development of efficiency measures that link the Federal investment to program outcomes because it's funds are combined with a significant amount of other program dollars from the Federal, State, and local levels to provide achieve its goals.		0%	

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	NA	No comparable data are available for other programs.		0%	
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	No	Education has conducted three major evaluations of this program, two including a small experimental design study. None of the studies could show that the parents or children who received these services made greater gains than those who did not. Results from 3 States that have conducted their own evaluations are more positive than the national results, however these evaluations were not as rigorous as the national evaluations.	National Evaluations of the Even Start Family Literacy Program.	33%	0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**0**

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Family Education Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	33%	53%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program provides default insurance and interest subsidies to encourage private lenders to make postsecondary education loans to undergraduate and graduate students. The program also provides interest subsidies for eligible low-income students to cover interest accrued while in school.

Evidence: The Federal Family Education Loans (FFEL) program's purpose is established in Section 421 of the Higher Education Act.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program, in combination with other Federal student aid, helps individuals pay for postsecondary education. The program provides subsidized loans to low-income students and parents as well as unsubsidized loans to all students/parents regardless of income. In many cases loan recipients would not have access to credit at comparable interest rates, if at all, without this program. However, the statutorily fixed amount that students are allowed to borrow has not kept up with increases in tuition.

Evidence: Program eligibility and award criteria are discussed in Section 427 of the Higher Education Act.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: While different in structure, the Federal Direct Student Loan (DL) program and FFEL programs provide identical loans to the same population of students and parents.

Evidence: Sec. 421 (FFEL) and Sec. 451 (DL) of the Higher Education Act are structured to ensure that student borrowers receive identical benefits under either program.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: While the program is effective is distributing billions of dollars in student aid to millions of students and parents, there is evidence of significant cost inefficiencies in the program. For instance, unnecessary subsidies are provided to some lenders, who through a loophole have secured a 9.5% guaranteed rate of return on loans financed through outdated tax exempt securities. Moreover, the program is likely to become less cost efficient in 2006, when borrower interest rates revert from a market-sensitive variable rate to a fixed 6.8% rate.

Evidence: 1) Structural changes to the role of the FFEL program participants, such as increased risk-sharing and a greater reliance on performance-based compensation, could promote greater competition among program participants, and thus improve service delivery and decrease costs to the taxpayer. 2) Significantly lower Direct Loan subsidy rates call into question the cost effectiveness of the FFEL program structure, including the appropriate level of lender subsidies.

Program:	Federal Family Education Loans		
Agency:	Department of Education		
Bureau:	Federal Student Aid		
Type(s):	Credit		

Section Scores				**Overall Rating**
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	33%	53%	

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program's statutorily-based needs analysis formula effectively targets subsidized loans based on financial need. As noted in the response to 1.2 above, in most cases loan recipients would not have access to credit at comparable interest rates, if at all, without this program. However, a disproportionate amount of the program's benefits are provided to borrowers who have been out of school for several years. For instance, by consolidating their loans, borrowers can currently lock in interest rates below 4%, increasing federal subsidies as a result.

Evidence: Data from various Department financial management and operations reports, and longitudinal student aid analyses, demonstrate the extent to which these loans are targeted to low and moderate income students and families.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department's Strategic Plan includes measures on college enrollment rates (including closing the gaps between high- and low-income students, and minority and non-minority students) and the debt burden of students upon graduation. Given the scope of the loan programs (where nearly 1/2 of all undegraduates receive a direct or guaranteed federal loan), it is appropriate to use these overall postsecondary education measures to evaluate program performance. In addition, the Department has developed more specific goals related to student persistence and graduation rates for student aid recipients, as compared to the overall student population. The Department is establishing targets for these measures out to 2007. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Department of Education Strategic Plan; Goal 5, Objectives 5.1, 5.3. See "Measures" tab for specific program measures.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Specific targets and timeframes are shown in the "Measures" tab for annual goals only. The Department is working to develop specific long term targets and timeframes for all relevant performance measures.

Evidence:

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department has annual and long term goals (through fiscal year 2007) for performance measures related to the student aid programs, and is in the process of adding two new measures on persistence and completion. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Department of Education Strategic Plan; Goal 5, Objectives 5.1, 5.3. See "Measures" tab for specific program measures.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Specific targets and timeframes are shown in the "Measures" tab. Targets and timeframes for the new measures are under development.

Evidence: See answer to 2.3.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Program partners (i.e., schools, lenders, guaranty agencies) support the goals of the FFEL program, but they are not required to report explicitly on the goals included in the Department's Strategic Plan. However, participating institutions are required to report a wealth of program data through surveys such as the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS), the National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS), and the Department's financial systems. The Department uses these data to measure program performance.

Evidence: IPEDS, NSLDS, Department of Education financial and program management reports

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The General Accounting Office and the Department's Inspector General have conducted extensive audits of the program with recommendations for improved financial/program management. However, the Department has not commissioned any independent evaluations. Rather, the Department regularly collects data from FFEL program participants (i.e., postsecondary institutions, lenders, Guaranty Agencies) through a number of data systems and annual and longitudinal studies. These data collection efforts provide performance information used to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness.

Evidence: National Student Loan Data System; Integrated Postsecondary Data System; other Department of Education financial and program management reports; National Postsecondary Student Aid Study; Baccalaureate & Beyond; Beginning Postsecondary Student Longitudinal Study; High School and Beyond; National Education Longitudinal Study, 1988; National Household Education Survey; National Longitudinal Study, 1972; Recent College Graduates Study. GAO and OIG reports.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?

Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department collects extensive FFEL program data that is used in concert with forecasting models to project the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on program costs. However, the Department has not yet established a link between these costs and its long-term performance goals. Moreover, the Department's forecasting model needs to be improved to better capture relevant program costs.

Evidence: Department of Education FFEL budget forecast and program cost model.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department is developing additional goals related to student persistence and graduation rates, as compared to the overall population and has committed to making improvements to its credit forecasting model.

Evidence:

Program: Federal Family Education Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	33%	53%	

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: While the Department regularly collects data from FFEL program participants through a number of data systems and annual and longitudinal studies, these data submissions are not done in a timely manner. The lack of timely data contributed to the Department receiving a material weakness on its 2002 financial audit. While this data problem was upgraded to a reportable condition in the 2003 audit, the Department's financial records are often as much as two quarters behind actual program activity. In addition, many of these data submissions are done at an aggregate level; the Department needs to move to loan-level reporting to ensure program integrity and full compliance with credit reform requirements. The Department also needs to complete and implement the Office of Federal Student Aid's (OFSA) comprehensive data strategy.

Evidence: National Student Loan Data System; Integrated Postsecondary Data System; other Department of Education financial and program management reports; National Postsecondary Student Aid Study; Baccalaureate & Beyond; Beginning Postsecondary Student Longitudinal Study; High School and Beyond; National Education Longitudinal Study, 1988; National Household Education Survey; National Longitudinal Study, 1972; Recent College Graduates Study.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to EDPAS, which links employee performance to relevant Strategic Plan goals and action steps, and is designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. OFSA federal managers are also subject to performance agreements developed under its Performance-Based Organization authority. Postsecondary institutions are held accountable through statutory cohort default rate penalties, annual compliance audits, and periodic program reviews, including site visits by ED. In addition, a number of Guaranty agencies (GAs) operate under voluntary flexible agreements which establish agency-specific performance goals and incentives. However, in general, both poor and high performing GAs continue to receive comparable fees and reimbursements. GA's, moreover, are currently allowed to singlehandedly waive loan reinsurance fees, and thus reduce federal receipts. To receive a "Yes," ED needs to: (1) identify for OMB the federal managers for this program; (2) demonstrate the relationship between these managers' performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures; and (3) demonstrate the relationship between program partners' (postsecondary institutions and GA's) performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures.

Evidence:

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: ED obligates FFEL funds consistently with the overall program plan. The Department also has procedures for reporting actual expenditures, comparing them against the intended use, and taking timely and appropriate action when funds are not spent as intended. However, ED must take steps to ensure that only limited amounts of unobligated funds remain in the financing account at the end of the fiscal year. These funds should be returned to Treasury before the end of the year.

Evidence: Department of Education financial management reports

Program: Federal Family Education Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	33%	53%	

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department has not yet completed a comprehensive unit-cost measurement system for the student aid programs. That said, the Department has instituted a number of procedures to measure and achieve efficiencies in program operations, including the One-ED initiative (yet to be fully applied to FSA) and a strengthened Investment Review Board to review and approve information technology purchases. In addition, many FFEL-related activities, including especially default collection, are carried out through competitive contracts with substantial performance incentives.

Evidence: Department One-ED and Investment Review Board materials; debt collection and other FFEL-related contract materials.

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The FFEL program is part of a group of interrelated Federal, State, and institutional financial aid programs which work together to accomplish the shared goal of increasing access to higher education. The Federal student aid programs share a common application and need analysis process that is also used by many States and institutions as the basis for their own need-based aid. In additon, institutional financial aid administrators package the various forms of aid to best meet the needs of each eligible student.

Evidence: Program structure, including aid packaging process and widespread use of the Free Applicationa for Federal Student Aid (FAFS.

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department has taken major steps to improve its financial management over the past several years. The Department received an unqualified audit opinion for FY 2002, and is in compliance with major Federal financial management statutes such as the Credit Reform Act and the Debt Collection Improvement Act. That said, ED still needs to address the reportable conditions cited in the audit report.

Evidence: GAO and Education Inspector General reports, and Independent Audit reports.

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department has taken a number of major steps to improve internal management, one result of which is an unqualified opinion on its FY 2002 and 2003 financial statement. These efforts include the successful implementation of a new general ledger system, improved program reconciliations; an Investment Review Board to oversee information technology acquisitions, many of which directly involve FFEL program operations and oversight; and a new employee performance appraisal system tied directly to the Department's performance goals. However, the Department still needs to develop a unit cost framework and complete the One-ED strategic investment review process for the Office of Federal Student Aid.

Evidence: Department of Education FY 2002 and 2003 Accountability Reports; One-ED materials; Department strategic plan; Investment Review Board materials; implementation of EDPAS.

Program: Federal Family Education Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	33%	53%	

3.CR1 **Is the program managed on an ongoing basis to assure credit quality remains sound, collections and disbursements are timely, and reporting requirements are fulfilled?**
Answer: NO — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: FFEL data submissions are not done on a timely basis. Department financial records are often as much as two quarters behind actual program activity. In addition, many of these data submissions are done at an aggregate level; the Department needs to move to loan-level reporting to improve program management and integrity.

Evidence: GAO and Education Inspector General reports.

3.CR2 **Do the program's credit models adequately provide reliable, consistent, accurate and transparent estimates of costs and the risk to the Government?**
Answer: NO — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Financial reporting on credit programs remains a reportable condition in the Department's FY 2003 audit report, primarily related to the sufficiency of reliable data to develop and support estimation model assumptions. The audit report focused particular attention on assumptions related to consolidation loans, the volume of which has nearly tripled in the past five years. Additionally, OMB and the Department are continuing to improve the transparency of the modeling process and improve congruency with CBO estimates. Policy discussions involving possible model changes to incorporate probabilistic scoring and revisions in discounting methodology are ongoing.

Evidence: Department of Education FFEL budget forecasts and program cost model outputs.

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?**
Answer: SMALL EXTENT — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The FFEL program has met or exceeded some of its long-term performance goals. The addition of new measures related to persistance and graduation rates will strengthen the Department's ability to assess program performance. However, these performance goals are newly established and no long-term data is yet available.

Evidence: See "Measures" tab.

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?**
Answer: SMALL EXTENT — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The FFEL program has met or exceeded some of its annual performance goals. The addition of new measures related to persistance and graduation rates will strengthen the Department's ability to assess program performance. However, these performance goals are newly established and no long-term data is yet available.

Evidence: See "Measures" tab.

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?**
Answer: NO — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Department has yet to develop and implement efficiency measures to quantitatively assess performance improvements.

Evidence:

Program: Federal Family Education Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	33%	53%	

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Evidence suggests that competition between FFEL and DL has improved services to borrowers and participating institutions.

Evidence:

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Studies and program data indicate that Federal student loan programs are effective in increasing access to postsecondary education for low income individuals. Moreover, comprehensive studies by the American Council on Education, the National Center for Education Statistics, and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, among others, have consistently found that student aid has a major impact on the enrollment and persistence of low-income students in higher education. However, GAO and IG audits continue to find material deficiencies in program/financial management.

Evidence: "Descriptive Study of 1995-1996 BPS: Six Years Later," NCES, 2003; "Low-Income Students: Who They Are and How They Pay for Their Education" NCES, 2002; "How Low-Inomce Students Finance Their Education," NCES, 1993; "Challenges to Maintaining Access in the 21st Century, Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, 1999; The Student Aid Game: Meeting Need and Rewarding Talent in American Higher Education, Micheal McPherson and Morton Owen Shapiro, 1998; Crucial Choices: How Students' Financial Decisions Affect Their Academic Success, American Council on Education, 2002; FY 2000, 2001, 2002 Department of Education Accountability Reports.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Family Education Loans

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Federal debt burden: The median Federal debt burden (yearly scheduled payments as a percentage of annual income) of borrowers in their first full year of repayment shall be less than 10 percent.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the success of Federal student aid programs in limiting excessive borrowing in pursuit of postsecondary education.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	>10%	6.5%
2000	>10%	6.4%
2001	>10%	
2002	>10%	
2003	>10%	

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Black and White full-time students in less-than-4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	5.8%
2000	Decrease	7.5%
2001	Decrease	
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Family Education Loans

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Hispanic and White full-time students in less-than-4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	2.7%
2000	Decrease	3.9%
2001	Decrease	
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Federal debt burden: The median Federal debt burden (yearly scheduled payments as a percentage of annual income) of borrowers in their first full year of repayment shall be less than 10 percent.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the success of Federal student aid programs in limiting excessive borrowing in pursuit of postsecondary education.

Year	Target	Actual
2003	>10	
2004	>10	
2005	>10	
2006	>10	
2007	>10	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Enrollment rates: Postsecondary education enrollment rates will increase each year for all students.

Additional Information: The enrollment rate is defined as the percentage of high school graduates aged 16-24 enrolling immediately in college.

Year	Target	Actual
2003	Increase	

Measure Term: Long-term

Program: Federal Family Education Loans

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Enrollment rates: Postsecondary education enrollment rates will increase each year for all students.

Additional Information: The enrollment rate is defined as the percentage of high school graduates aged 16-24 enrolling immediately in college.

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2004	Increase	
2005	Increase	
2006	Increase	
2007	Increase	

Measure: Postsecondary Enrollment rates: The percent of high school graduates enrolling immediately in college will increase each year for all students.

Additional Information: The enrollment rate is defined as the percentage of high school graduates aged 16-24 enrolling immediately in college.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Increase	62.9%
2000	Increase	63.3%
2001	Increase	61.7%
2002	Increase	
2003	Increase	

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between low- and high-income high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	25.1%
2000	Decrease	28.1%
2001	Decrease	32.0%

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Family Education Loans

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between low- and high-income high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between Black and White high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	6.5%
2000	Decrease	7.1%
2001	Decrease	7.9%
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between Hispanic and White high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	14.4%
2000	Decrease	18.3%
2001	Decrease	15.6%
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Family Education Loans

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Completion rates: The percent of full-time degree seeking students completing college within 150 percent of the normal time required will increase each year for all students.

Additional Information: The completion rate is defined as the percentage of full-time degree-seeking students completing within 150 percent of the normal time required.

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Increase	53.0%
2000	Increase	52.4%
2001	Increase	
2002	Increase	
2003	Increase	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Completion rates: Postsecondary education completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in less-than-4-year programs will improve.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Increase	34.4%
2000	Increase	32.7%
2001	Increase	
2002	Increase	
2003	Increase	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Black and White full-time students in 4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	20.7%

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Family Education Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Black and White full-time students in 4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2000	Decrease	19.7%
2001	Decrease	
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Hispanic and White full-time students in 4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	15.2%
2000	Decrease	13.9%
2001	Decrease	
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Pell Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	67%	53%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program provides grant assistance to undergraduate students who have financial need. Pell Grants are considered to be the foundation of students' postsecondary financial assistance. In other words, additional Federal, State, and private aid is often built on top of a student's Pell Grant award.

Evidence: Section 400 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, states the Federal Pell Grant program's purpose is "to assist in making available the benefits of postsecondary education to eligible students in eligible institutions of higher education".

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program, in combination with other Federal student assistance programs, addresses the need of low-income individuals for assistance in meeting the cost of a postsecondary education.

Evidence: Section 401 of the Higher Education Act establishes program eligibility and award criteria for Pell Grants.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program is the single largest source of postsecondary grant aid, awarding funds to eligible students based on a statutory formula that takes into account family income and educational costs. The program makes a unique contribution by providing a stable foundation of need-based aid for all eligible students. Student aid administrators use other Federal, State, and private aid programs to complement Pell Grants when they create financial aid packages tailored to individual student needs.

Evidence: In 2001-2002, all State grant programs for higher education totaled an estimated $5 billion, whereas Pell Grants alone totaled nearly $10 billion (see The College Board's "Trends in Student Aid, 2002").

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Federal Pell Grants are designed to function as a voucher; as such, the program not only provides access to higher education but also greater flexibility and increased choice by allowing students to use their grants at a wide range of institutions of higher education nationwide.

Evidence: Students use Pell Grants to attend over 5,500 institutions across the country. These include four-year public and private institutions, two-year community colleges, and proprietary institutions.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Pell Grant program is the largest source of postsecondary grant aid, and is a means-tested program where students with the highest financial need receive the highest grant awards. However, any increase of the Pell Grant maximum award (done through Federal appropriations law) affects the program's targeting toward the neediest students. While increasing the maximum award benefits the neediest Pell students by increasing their total grant aid, it also expands Pell eligibility to more higher-income students, who then qualify for the minimum.

Evidence: In 2000-2001, approximately 84 percent of all Pell Grant recipients had family incomes less than or equal to $30,000.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program:	Federal Pell Grants
Agency:	Department of Education
Bureau:	
Type(s):	Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	67%	53%	

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department's Strategic Plan includes performance measures that tie directly to the purpose of the Pell Grant program, such as the degree to which Pell Grants are targeted to low-income students. The Strategic Plan also includes measures related to the postsecondary enrollment and graduation rates among low-income and minority students. Given the scope of the Pell Grant program (where nearly 1/3 of all undergraduates receive an award), it is appropriate to use these overall postsecondary education measures to evaluate Pell performance. In addition, the Department has developed more specific goals related to student persistence and graduation rates for student aid recipients, as compared to the overall student population. All these measures include (or, in the case of new measures, will include) annual goals through fiscal year 2007. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Department of Education Strategic Plan; Goal 5, Objectives 5.1, 5.3. See "Measures" tab for specific program measures.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Specific targets and timeframes are shown in the "Measures" tab. Targets and timeframes for the new measures are under development.

Evidence: See answer to 2.1

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department has annual and long term goals (through fiscal year 2007) for performance measures related to the student aid programs, and is in the process of adding two new measures on persistence and completion. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Department of Education Strategic Plan; Goal 5, Objectives 5.1, 5.3. See "Measures" tab for specific program measures.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Specific targets and timeframes are shown in the "Measures" tab. Targets and timeframes for the new measures are under development.

Evidence: See answer to 2.3.

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: While program partners (institutions of higher education) support the goals of the Pell Grant program, they are not required to report explicitly on the goals included in the Department's Strategic Plan. However, participating institutions are required to report a wealth of program data through both surveys (such as the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS) and the National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS)) and the Department's financial systems. The Department uses data from these reports to determine program performance.

Evidence: IPEDS, NSLDS, Department of Education financial and program management reports

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: While the Department has not commissioned any independent evaluations of the Pell Grant program, it regularly collects data from Pell Grant program participants through a number of data systems, annual studies, and longitudinal studies. These data collection efforts provide performance information which the Department uses to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness. Moreover, private researchers/higher education organizations regularly conduct their own comprehensive evaluations of the Pell Grant program.

Evidence: Pell Grant merged applicant files; National Student Loan Data System; Integrated Postsecondary Data System; other Department of Education financial and program management reports; National Postsecondary Student Aid Study; Baccalaureate & Beyond; Beginning Postsecondary Student Longitudinal Study; High School and Beyond; National Education Longitudinal Study, 1988; National Household Education Survey; National Longitudinal Study, 1972; Recent College Graduates Study, Persistence and Attainment of Beginning Students With Pell Grants Report, 2002. Also, various private studies (for examples of these, see the evidence for question 4.4).

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department collects extensive Pell program data, and uses it in concert with forecasting models to project the impact of economic conditions, college costs, student aid applicant rates, Pell maximum award levels, and policy changes on program costs. Still, ED has not fully satisfied the first part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program, at this time, does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess (whether directly or indirectly) the impact of the Federal investment. ED has, however, satisfied the second part of this question in that ED's budget submissions show the full cost of the program (including S&E). Also, ED's FY 2005 integrated budget and performance plan include the program's annual and long-term goals.

Evidence: Department of Education Budget justifications for Pell Grants, and the Department's Pell Grants program cost model.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department recently developed additional goals related to student persistence and graduation rates, as compared to the overall population. Moreover, as part of the Higher Education Act (HEA) reauthorization process, the Department is committed to strengthening the program's focus on encouraging persistence and degree attainment, and improve the program's targeting to low-income students.

Evidence: See "Measures" tab for specific program measures.

Program: Federal Pell Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	67%	53%	

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department regularly collects data from Pell Grant program participants through a number of data systems and annual and longitudinal studies. These data collection efforts provide sufficient performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness.

Evidence: Pell Grant merged applicant files; National Student Loan Data System; Integrated Postsecondary Data System; other Department of Education financial and program management reports; National Postsecondary Student Aid Study; Baccalaureate & Beyond; Beginning Postsecondary Student Longitudinal Study; High School and Beyond; National Education Longitudinal Study, 1988; National Household Education Survey; National Longitudinal Study, 1972; Recent College Graduates Study.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to EDPAS, which links employee performance to relevant Strategic Plan goals and action steps, and is designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. The Office of Federal Student Aid's (OFSA) federal managers are also subject to performance agreements developed under its Performance-Based Organization authority. Postsecondary institutions (the program partners) are held accountable through statutory cohort default rate penalties, annual compliance audits, and periodic program reviews, including site visits by ED. To receive a "Yes," ED needs to: (1) identify for OMB the federal managers for this program; and (2) demonstrate the relationship between these managers' performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures; and (3) demonstrate the relationship between program partners' performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures.

Evidence:

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: As required by the Higher Education Act, the Department provides participating institutions of higher education an initial allocation of funds sufficient to fund the first payment period (85% of the prior year's allocation). Thereafter, the Department uses electronic funds transfers to provide additional funds to institutions as needed.

Evidence: Department of Education financial management reports. Section 401(a) of the Higher Education Act includes the 85% allocation requirement.

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department has not yet completed a comprehensive unit-cost measurement system for the student aid programs. That said, the Department has instituted a number of procedures to measure and achieve efficiencies in program operations, including the One-ED initiative (yet to be fully applied to FSA) and a strengthened Investment Review Board to review and approve information technology purchases.

Evidence: Department One-ED and Investment Review Board materials.

Program: Federal Pell Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	67%	53%	

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Pell Grant program serves as the foundation for several interrelated Federal, State, and institutional financial aid programs which work together to accomplish the shared goal of increasing access to higher education. The Federal student aid programs share a common application and need analysis process that many States and postsecondary institutions use as the basis for their own need-based aid. In addition, postsecondary institution financial aid administrators package the various forms of aid to best meet the needs of each eligible student.

Evidence: Program structure, including aid packaging process and widespread use of FAFSA for Federal and State aid.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department has taken major steps to improve its financial management over the past several years, as reflected in the Department's unqualified audit opinion for FY 2002. That said, the Department's Inspector General has raised a number of issues regarding potential fraud in the Pell Grant program. Notably, net Pell Grant overawards are estimated at more than $300 million annually (these overawards are caused by students misreporting their income and assets on the FAFSA).

Evidence: Department of Education Inspector General Reports. Internal estimates of Pell Grant net overawards. These overawards are reflected in FY 2004 Budget materials as savings realized by enactment of the Administration's IRS income verfication proposal (see 3.7).

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department has taken a number of major steps to improve internal management, one result of which is an unqualified opinion on its FY 2002 and 2003 financial statements. These efforts include the successful implementation of a new general ledger system; an Investment Review Board to oversee information technology acquisitions; and a new employee performance appraisal system tied directly to the Department's performance goals. These efforts also include a legislative proposal to use IRS data to verify incomes on student aid applications. However, the Department still needs to develop a unit cost framework for its student aid administration, complete the One-ED strategic investment review process for the Office of Federal Student Aid (OFSA), and complete the OFSA data strategy.

Evidence: Department of Education FY 2002 Accountability Report; One-ED materials; Department strategic plan; Investment Review Board materials; implementation of EDPAS. The Administration's IRS income verification proposal is reflected in the FY 2004 Budget. For most information on OFSA, see the Student Aid Administration PART.

3.BF1 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Program participants are held accountable through annual compliance audits and regular program reviews, including peridoic site visits by Department of Education staff.

Evidence: Department of Education institutional eligibility reports

Program:	Federal Pell Grants	**Section Scores**				**Overall Rating**
Agency:	Department of Education	1	2	3	4	Adequate
Bureau:		100%	88%	67%	53%	
Type(s):	Block/Formula Grant					

3.BF2 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department's annual Pell Grant End-of-Year report contains a significant amount of aggregated program performance data. However, since Pell Grant recipients are individual students, data on specific grantees is subject to privacy restrictions and are thus not available.

Evidence: The Pell Grant annual end-of-year report is available on the Department of Education's web site

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?**

Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: To a minimal extent, the Pell Grant program has met its current long-term performance goals. The addition of new measures related to persistance and graduation rates will strengthen that Department's ability to assess program performance. However, these performance goals are newly established and no long-term data is yet available. To receive a "large extent" or Yes answer, the Department needs to show progress in achieving these additional performance goals, and improve its performance on enrollment rates.

Evidence: See "Measures" tab for specific program measures.

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?**

Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: To a minimal extent, the Pell Grant program has met its current annual performance goals. The addition of new measures related to persistance and graduation rates will strengthen that Department's ability to assess program performance. However, these performance goals are newly established and no long-term data are yet available. To receive a "large extent" or Yes answer, the Department needs to show it is achieving these additional performance goals, and improve the program's performance on inreasing enrollment rates.

Evidence: See "Measures" tab for specific program measures.

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence:

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Pell Grant program compares very favorably with other programs with similar purpose and goals; its voucher-like structure maximizes student choice and simplifies the delivery of funds, while studies have consistently found that Pell Grants are the single most effective tool in increasing low-income access to higher education.

Evidence: Persistence and Attainment of Beginning Students with Pell Grants (National Center of Education Statistics, 2002); The Economic Value of Higher Education (Leslie and Brinkman, American Council of Education, 1998); "Back to School: Federal Student Aid Policy and Adult College Enrollment" (Seftor and Turner, Journal of Human Resources, 2002)

Program: Federal Pell Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	67%	53%	

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Both comprehensive studies and program data indicate that the Pell Grant program is effective in increasing low-income individuals' access to postsecondary education.

Evidence: Persistence and Attainment of Beginning Students with Pell Grants (National Center of Education Statistics, 2002); The Economic Value of Higher Education (Leslie and Brinkman, American Council of Education, 1998); "Back to School: Federal Student Aid Policy and Adult College Enrollment" (Seftor and Turner, Journal of Human Resources, 2002); Department of Education program and financial reports

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Pell Grants

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau:

Measure: Postsecondary Enrollment rates: The percent of high school graduates enrolling immediately in college will increase each year for all students.

Additional Information: The enrollment rate is defined as the percentage of high school graduates aged 16-24 enrolling immediately in college.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Increase	62.9%
2000	Increase	63.3%
2001	Increase	61.7%
2002	Increase	

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Black and White full-time students in less-than-4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	5.8%
2000	Decrease	7.5%
2001	Decrease	
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Hispanic and White full-time students in less-than-4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	2.7%
2000	Decrease	3.9%

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Pell Grants

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau:

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Hispanic and White full-time students in less-than-4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	Measure Term: Annual
2001	Decrease		
2002	Decrease		
2003	Decrease		

Measure: Persistence: The gap between persistence rates for Pell Grant recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year.

Additional Information: The persistence rate is defined as the percentage of non-graduating students in a given year who return to continue their studies in the following year. A specific methodology to account for transfers and other data anomolies is under development.

Year	Target	Actual	Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Completion: The gap between completion rates for Pell Grant recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year.

Additional Information: The completion rate is defined as the percentage of full-time degree-seeking students completing within 150 percent of the normal time required.

Year	Target	Actual	Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Targeting: The percent of Pell Grant funds that are targeted to students below 150% of the poverty level.

Additional Information: At least 75 percent of Pell Grant funds will go to students below 150 percent of poverty level.

Year	Target	Actual	Measure Term: Annual
1999	75%	78%	
2000	75%	78%	
2001			
2002	75%		
2003	75%		

Program: Federal Pell Grants

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau:

Measure: Postsecondary Enrollment rates: The percent of high school graduates enrolling immediately in college will increase each year.

Additional Information: The enrollment rate is defined as the percentage of high school graduates aged 16-24 enrolling immediately in college.

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2003	Increase	
2004	Increase	
2005	Increase	
2006	Increase	
2007	Increase	

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between low- and high-income high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2003	Decrease	
2004	Decrease	
2005	Decrease	
2006	Decrease	
2007	Decrease	

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between Black and White high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2003	Decrease	
2004	Decrease	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Pell Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between Black and White high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2005	Decrease	
2006	Decrease	
2007	Decrease	

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between Hispanic and White high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2003	Decrease	
2004	Decrease	
2005	Decrease	
2006	Decrease	
2007	Decrease	

Measure: Federal debt burden: The median Federal debt burden (yearly scheduled student loan repayments as a percentage of annual income) of borrowers in their first full year of repayment be less than 10 percent.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the success of Federal grant and work-study programs in limiting excessive borrowing for higher education.

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2003	>10	
2004	>10	
2005	>10	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Pell Grants

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau:

Measure: Federal debt burden: The median Federal debt burden (yearly scheduled student loan repayments as a percentage of annual income) of borrowers in their first full year of repayment be less than 10 percent.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the success of Federal grant and work-study programs in limiting excessive borrowing for higher education.

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2006	>10	
2007	>10	

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between low- and high-income high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	25.1%
2000	Decrease	28.1%
2001	Decrease	32.0%
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Measure: Completion rates: Postsecondary education completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in 4-year programs will improve.

Additional Information: The completion rate is defined as the percentage of full-time degree-seeking students completing within 150 percent of the normal time required.

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2003	Increase	
2004	Increase	
2005	Increase	
2006	Increase	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Pell Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:

Measure: Completion rates: Postsecondary education completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in 4-year programs will improve.

Additional Information: The completion rate is defined as the percentage of full-time degree-seeking students completing within 150 percent of the normal time required.

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2007	Increase	

Measure: Completion rates: Postsecondary education completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in less-than-4-year programs will improve.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2003	Increase	
2004	Increase	
2005	Increase	
2006	Increase	
2007	Increase	

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Black and White full-time students in 4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2003	Decrease	
2004	Decrease	
2005	Decrease	
2006	Decrease	
2007	Decrease	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Pell Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Hispanic and White full-time students in 4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2003	Decrease	
2004	Decrease	
2005	Decrease	
2006	Decrease	
2007	Decrease	

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Black and White full-time students in less-than-4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2003	Decrease	
2004	Decrease	
2005	Decrease	
2006	Decrease	
2007	Decrease	

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Hispanic and White full-time students in less-than-4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2003	Decrease	

Program: Federal Pell Grants

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau:

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Hispanic and White full-time students in less-than-4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	Measure Term: Long-term
2004	Decrease		
2005	Decrease		
2006	Decrease		
2007	Decrease		

Measure: Persistence: The gap between persistence rates for Pell Grant recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year.

Additional Information: The persistence rate is defined as the percentage of non-graduating students in a given year who return to continue their studies in the following year. A specific methodology to account for transfers and other data anomolies is under development.

Year	Target	Actual	Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Completion: The gap between completion rates for Pell Grant recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year.

Additional Information: The completion rate is defined as the percentage of full-time degree-seeking students completing within 150 percent of the normal time required.

Year	Target	Actual	Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between Black and White high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	Measure Term: Annual
1999	Decrease	6.5%	
2000	Decrease	7.1%	
2001	Decrease	7.9%	
2002	Decrease		

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Pell Grants

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau:

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between Black and White high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2003	Decrease	

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between Hispanic and White high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	14.4%
2000	Decrease	18.3%
2001	Decrease	15.6%
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Measure: Federal debt burden: The median Federal debt burden (yearly scheduled student loan repayments as a percentage of annual income) of borrowers in their first full year of repayment be less than 10 percent.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the success of Federal grant and work-study programs in limiting excessive borrowing for higher education.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	>10	6.5%
2000	>10	6.4%
2001	>10	
2002	>10	
2003	>10	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Pell Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:

Measure: Completion rates: The percent of full-time degree seeking students completing college within 150 percent of the normal time required will increase each year for all students.

Additional Information: The completion rate is defined as the percentage of full-time degree-seeking students completing within 150 percent of the normal time required.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Increase	53%
2000	Increase	52.4%
2001	Increase	
2002	Increase	
2003	Increase	

Measure: Completion rates: Postsecondary education completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in less-than-4-year programs will improve.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Increase	34.4%
2000	Increase	32.7%
2001	Increase	
2002	Increase	
2003	Increase	

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Black and White full-time students in 4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	20.7%

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Pell Grants

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau:

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Black and White full-time students in 4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2000	Decrease	19.7%
2001	Decrease	
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Hispanic and White full-time students in 4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	15.2%
2000	Decrease	13.9%
2001	Decrease	
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Perkins Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Ineffective
20%	50%	33%	0%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: According to the authorizing statute, the program's purpose is to stimulate and assist "in the establishment and maintenance of funds at institutions of higher education for the making of low-interest loans to students thereof to pursue their courses of study'"

Evidence: The program's purpose is clearly expressed in section 461 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Institutions currently maintain revolving funds in excess of $7 billion; these funds will support new Perkins loan awards in excess of $1 billion annually without additional Federal Capital Contributions. In addition, low-income students are eligible to receive other federal student loans, Federal Family Education Loans (FFEL) or Federal Direct Loans (DL), that under current economic conditions offer lower interest rates than are available in the Perkins program.

Evidence: Almost 2,000 institutions participate in the Perkins Loan program, making $1.2 bilion in loans to over 700,000 students in FY 2003. The size of the Perkins Loan revolving fund is documented in Department financial reports. Variable DL and FFEL Stafford Loan interest rates for award year 2002-03 were below the 5 percent fixed rate in Perkins; rates for 2003-04 are expected to be even lower.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Loans available under Perkins Loans are both redundant and duplicative, given the broad availability of need-based, subsidized, and relatively low-interest Stafford loans through FFEL and DL.

Evidence: The FFEL and DL programs will make nearly $21 billion in Stafford loans to almost 5 million borrowers in FY 2003. In the event policymakers conclude that there are insufficient loans available, then loan limits in FFEL and DL could be adjusted rather than relying on a separate and redundant Perkins program.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The design of the program, based on institutional revolving funds, is significantly less efficient for the Federal taxpayer than the guaranteed or direct loan models available through FFEL and DL.

Evidence: The absence of credit reform and unit cost data makes it difficult to quantify the extent of program design inefficiencies. Given current subsidy and interest rates, and based on historical comparisons between Perkins, FFEL, and DL, the Department could make the same number of loans available through DL and FFEL at lower interest rates and less costs. Moreover, FFEL and DL have better track records on collections of defaulted debt than Perkins.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Perkins Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Ineffective
20%	50%	33%	0%	

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program's institutional allocation formula (i.e., how much program funding is given to each school to offer Perkins aid) is designed to heavily benefit postsecondary institutions that have participated in Campus-Based programs for a long time, at the expense of more recent entrants or new applicants. Since these longstanding institutions do not have a higher proportion of needy students, this allocation formula tends to limit the program's ability to target resources the neediest beneficiaries.

Evidence: The program's allocation formula is detailed in section 442 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department has developed common measures for the Campus-Based programs (Work Study, Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, and Perkins Loans). These measures relate to the targeting of Campus-Based aid to low-income students and the impact of such aid on student persistence and graduation rates, benchmarked to the overall population. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Department of Education Strategic Plan

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Specific targets and timeframes are shown in the "Measures" tab. Once completed, they will also be included in the Department's annual performance plans. Targets and timeframes for the new measures are under development. No annual data is currently available to support these goals.

Evidence: See answer to 2.1

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: See answer to 2.1.

Evidence: Department of Education Strategic Plan; Goal 5, Objectives 5.1, 5.3

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: See answer to 2.2

Evidence: See answer to 2.2

Program: Federal Perkins Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Ineffective
20%	50%	33%	0%	

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Program partners (i.e., schools) support the goals of the Perkins program, reporting data through the annual Fiscal Operations Report and Application to Participate (FISAP) form and meeting program statutory and regulatory requirements, as set out in program participation agreements. Schools also report program data through a variety of Department financial systems, as well as through ongoing surveys such as the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS). Data from these reports are used in determining program performance.

Evidence: IPEDS, Department of Education financial and program management reports

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: No evaluations of the Perkins loans programs have been conducted for at least the last 15 years.

Evidence:

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The measures discussed in 2.1 are new, and will be reflected in future budget requests. However, the Department did not request funding for new Perkins loan federal capital contributions in FY 2004. While this decision was not tied directly to the program's performance relative to specific goals, it was based on other objective data, such as the size of the Perkins revolving fund and the broad availability of alternative low-cost Federal loans.

Evidence: FY 2004 and 2005 President's Budget

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department is working to develop effecitive, program-specific performance measures, as discussed under 2.1.

Evidence: See 2.1

Program: Federal Perkins Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Ineffective
20%	50%	33%	0%	

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: NO | Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: ED primarily collects Perkins Loan information through the FISAP, which is used by participating institutions to report program data to the Department and apply for continued program participation. However, data ED collects on the FISAP is not sufficient for program management or performance assessment.

Evidence: Perkins loan program and financial data. FISAP data is not timely, or internally consistent, in that the design of the form, which requests cumulative rather than annual data, makes it almost impossible to reconcile financial information. In addition, no credit reform data is collected. While the quality of loan-level data in NSLDS is improving, problems remain with a number of fields.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**

Answer: NO | Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to EDPAS, which links employee performance to relevant Strategic Plan goals and action steps, and is designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. OFSA federal managers are also subject to performance agreements developed under its Performance-Based Organization authority. Postsecondary institutions (the program partners) are held accountable through statutory cohort default rate penalties, annual compliance audits, and periodic program reviews, including site visits by ED. In addition, ED requires institutions participating in the Campus-Based programs to sign program participation agreements. To receive a "Yes," ED needs to: (1) identify for OMB the federal managers for this program; (2) demonstrate the relationship between these managers' performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures; and (3) demonstrate the relationship between program partners' performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures.

Evidence:

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**

Answer: YES | Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Financial audits and program reviews indicate that funds are obligated in a timely manner and for the intended purpose.

Evidence: Department financial statements and supporting materials and documentation.

Program: Federal Perkins Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Ineffective
20%	50%	33%	0%	

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?**

Answer: NO   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing "One-ED" -- an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements. A "yes" answer is likely once the One-ED process is applied to this program's relevant business functions. [Note: Although the Department is currently developing a unit cost accounting system to measure cost effectiveness in FSA programs, this system is not yet fully in place.]

Evidence:

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?**

Answer: YES   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Perkins Loan program operates effectively within the overall Federal student aid system, taking advantage of shared application and aid disbursement procedures and systems, common institutional and student eligibility regulations, and program reviews.

Evidence: Perkins loan application and Federal funds disbursement processes; aid award packaging.

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?**

Answer: NO   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The lack of reliable financial data, coupled with a lack of credit and unit cost analysis, undermine program financial management. That said, the Department did receive an unqualified audit opinion, and no material weaknesses or reportable conditions related to Perkins Loans have been identified.

Evidence: Department financial statements and supporting materials and documentation. As stated above, FISAP design issues make it impossible to reconcile financial information. In addition, no credit reform data is collected and problems remain with certain NSLDS data fields.

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?**

Answer: YES   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department is in the process of developing program-specific unit cost measures to better assess management efficiency, and is finishing a data strategy for the Office of Federal Student Aid (OFSA). The Department also plans to conduct a One-ED strategic investment review for OFSA.

Evidence: The Department of Education's One-ED Strategic Investment Review process. Also, the Student Aid Administration PART includes a performance measure related to management efficiency, and information on OFSA's data strategy.

3.CR1 **Is the program managed on an ongoing basis to assure credit quality remains sound, collections and disbursements are timely, and reporting requirements are fulfilled?**

Answer: NO   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Despite its $7 billion portfolio, the program is not managed as a credit program, but rather as a formula grant program. Most credit management responsibility rests with participating institutions, subject to Department regulations.

Evidence:

Program: Federal Perkins Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Ineffective
20%	50%	33%	0%	

3.CR2 **Do the program's credit models adequately provide reliable, consistent, accurate and transparent estimates of costs and the risk to the Government?**
Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program is not budgeted or accounted for as a credit program, but rather as a formula grant program. The Department does not maintain a credit model for the program, nor require participating insitutions to report at the level of detail required to support credit reform estimation and accounting.

Evidence: FY 2004 and 2005 President's Budget; Department of Education financial statements and supporting documentation and reports.

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?**
Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Program performance goals are newly established; no long-term data are available.

Evidence:

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?**
Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Program performance goals are newly established; no long-term data are available.

Evidence:

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?**
Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Department has yet to develop and implement efficiency measures to quantitively assess performance improvements. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence:

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?**
Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The lack of meaningful credit reform and program performance information prevents useful cross-program comparisons.

Evidence:

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?**
Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: No evaluations of the Perkins loans programs have been conducted for at least the last 15 years.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Perkins Loans

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau:

Measure: Persistence: The gap between persistence rates for campus-based aid recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year. [Targets under development.]

Additional Information: The persistence rate is defined as the percentage of non-graduating students in a given year who return to continue their studies in the following year. A specific methodology to account for transfers and other data anomolies is under development.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Completion: The gap between completion rates for campus-based aid recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year. [Targets under development.]

Additional Information: The completion rate is defined as the percentage of full-time degree-seeking students completing within 150 percent of the normal time required.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Persistence: The gap between persistence rates for campus-based aid recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year. [Targets under development.]

Additional Information: The persistence rate is defined as the percentage of non-graduating students in a given year who return to continue their studies in the following year. A specific methodology to account for transfers and other data anomolies is under development.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

Measure: Completion: The gap between completion rates for campus-based aid recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year. [Targets under development.]

Additional Information: The completion rate is defined as the percentage of full-time degree-seeking students completing within 150 percent of the normal time required.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Federal Work-Study
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	63%	56%	20%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: According to the authorizing statute, the program's purpose is "to stimulate and promote the part-time employment of students who are enrolled in undergraduate, graduate, or professional students and who are in need of earnings to pursue courses of study...", as well as to "encourage students receiving Federal student financial assistance to participate in community service activities...."

Evidence: The program's purpose is clearly expreseed in section 441 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Many needy students qualify for more grant aid than is available under the Pell Grant program. This program offers an additional source for grant aid for some of these students. It also provides a source of grant aid for graduate students, who are ineligible for Pell Grants. Absent this program, it is unlikely that college communities would have jobs available for each student seeking employment to help pay for their postsecondary education.

Evidence: Over half of the nearly 5 million Pell Grant recipients each year have an expected family contribution of zero. Since the average cost of college significantly exceeds the Pell Grant maximum award, many if not most of these students qualify for additional grant assistance.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program is unique among the Department of Education's student aid programs, as it requires students to work for financial aid, and it encourages postsecondary institutions to place students in community service jobs.

Evidence: See program purpose in 1.1.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Given the program's purpose, there is no evidence of a better way to deliver work-based student aid. However, it is not clear whether the program's current approach is the most effective way to achieve the program's secondary goal of placing students in community service positions. Notably, universities only place a small proportion of work study students in community service positions.

Evidence: In recent years, universities placed an average of about 15% of their Work Study students in community service jobs. A recent study notes that many elite universities place a much smaller percentage of students in community service positions ("Federal Work Study: How America's Colleges Use Federal Funds" by the Center for Higher Education Support Services).

Program: Federal Work-Study
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	63%	56%	20%	

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program's institutional allocation formula (i.e., how much program funding is given to each school to offer Work Study aid) is designed to heavily benefit postsecondary institutions that have participated in Campus-Based programs for a long time, at the expense of more recent entrants or new applicants. Since these longstanding institutions do not have a higher proportion of needy students, this allocation formula tends to limit the program's ability to target resources to intended beneficiaries.

Evidence: The program's allocation formula is detailed in section 442 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department has developed common measures for the Campus-Based programs (Work Study, Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, and Perkins Loans). These measures relate to the targeting of Campus-Based aid to low-income students and the impact of such aid on student persistence and graduation rates, benchmarked to the overall population. The Department may also develop a program-specific measure for the Work Study program, related to the percentage of participating students who are placed in community service jobs. Finally, ED is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: See the "Measures" tab for these measures. They will also be included in the Department's annual performance plans.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Targets and timeframes for the new measures are under development. Currently, the available data on the benefits of working while in school is for working students in general; it is limited to those students participating in Work-Study.

Evidence: Specific targets and timeframes are shown in the "Measures" tab. Once completed, they will also be included in the Department's annual performance plans. Targets and timeframes for the new measures are under development. No annual data is currently available to support these goals.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: See answer to 2.1.

Evidence: See answer to 2.1.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: See answer to 2.2

Evidence: See answer to 2.2

Program: Federal Work-Study
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	63%	56%	20%	

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Program partners (i.e., schools) support the goals of the Work-Study program by reporting data through the annual Fiscal Operations Report and Application to Participate (FISAP) form, and by meeting program statutory and regulatory requirements, as set out in program participation agreements. Schools also report program data through a variety of Department financial systems, as well as through ongoing surveys such as the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS). Data from these reports are used in determining program performance.

Evidence: IPEDS, Department of Education financial and program management reports

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Private researchers/higher education associations have conducted comprehensive evaluations of work-based student aid programs. These studies have found that work-based student aid has a major impact on persistence in higher education.

Evidence: "College Students Who Work: 1980-84, Analysis Findings from High School and Beyond;" CS 87-413, June 1988"Profile of Undergraduates in U.S. Postsecondary Education Institutions: 1995-96: With an essay on: Undergraduates Who Work" NCES Number: 98084 Release Date: May 14, 1998

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: ED has not satisfied the first part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program, at this time, does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess (whether directly or indirectly) the impact of the Federal investment. However, ED has satisfied the second part of this question in that ED's budget submissions show the full cost of the program (including S&E). ED's FY 2005 integrated budget and performance plan includes the program's annual and long-term goals. [Note: The measures discussed in 2.1 are new, and will be reflected in future budget requests.]

Evidence:

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department is working to develop effecitive, program-specific performance measures, as discussed under 2.1.

Evidence: See answer to 2.1.

Program: Federal Work-Study
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	63%	56%	20%	

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: NO   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department primarily collects Work-Study information through the FISAP, which participating institutions use to report program data to the Department, and apply for continued program participation. However, the data collected on the FISAP are not sufficient for program management or performance assessment.

Evidence: Work-Study program and financial data. FISAP data is neither timely nor internally consistent. The design of the FISAP, which requests cumulative rather than annual data, makes it almost impossible to reconcile financial information.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**

Answer: NO   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to EDPAS, which links employee performance to relevant Strategic Plan goals and action steps, and is designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. The Office of Federal Studnet Aid's (OFSA's) federal managers are also subject to performance agreements developed under its Performance-Based Organization authority. Postsecondary institutions (the program partners) are held accountable through statutory cohort default rate penalties, annual compliance audits, and periodic program reviews, including site visits by ED. In addition, ED requires institutions participating in the Campus-Based programs to sign program participation agreements. To receive a "Yes," ED needs to: (1) identify for OMB the federal managers for this program; and (2) demonstrate the relationship between these managers' performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures; and (3) demonstrate the relationship between program partners' performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures.

Evidence:

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**

Answer: YES   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Financial audits and program reviews indicate that funds are obligated in a timely manner and for the intended purpose.

Evidence: Department financial statements and supporting materials and documentation.

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?**

Answer: NO   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing "One-ED" -- an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements. A "yes" answer is likely once the One-ED process is applied to this program's relevant business functions. [Note: Although the Department is currently developing a unit cost accounting system to measure cost effectiveness in FSA programs, this system is not yet fully in place.]

Evidence:

Program: Federal Work-Study
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	63%	56%	20%	

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Work-Study program operates effectively within the overall Federal student aid system, taking advantage of shared application and aid disbursement procedures and systems, common institutional and student eligibility regulations, and program reviews.

Evidence: Work-Study application and Federal funds disbursement processes; aid award packaging.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: No financial management deficiencies have been identified for this program; no negative audit reports have been issued. That said, as noted in 3.1, there are problems with the financial data ED collects on the FISAP.

Evidence: Department financial statements and supporting materials and documentation.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department is in the process of developing program-specific unit cost measures to better assess management efficiency, and is finishing a data strategy for the Office of Federal Student Aid (OFSA). The Department also plans to conduct a One-ED strategic investment review for OFSA.

Evidence: The Department of Education's One-ED Strategic Investment Review process. Also, the Student Aid Administration PART includes a performance measure related to management efficiency, and information on OFSA's data strategy.

3.BF1 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Program participants are subject to regular oversight, including institutional audits and periodic program reviews. These oversight activities, together with program and financial reports, provide sufficient knoweldge of grantee activities.

Evidence: See FSA oversight procedures for the Campus-Based programs. However, the Department's Inspector General has concluded that ED should improve its monitoring of post-secondary institutions.

3.BF2 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Annual data submitted through the FISAP contain compliance information, but not performance data.

Evidence: The Department of Education's FISAP data collection.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Program performance goals are newly established; no long-term data are available.

Evidence:

Program: Federal Work-Study
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	63%	56%	20%	

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Program performance goals are newly established; no annual data are available.

Evidence:

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Department has yet to develop and implement efficiency measures to quantitatively assess performance improvements. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence:

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Program performance goals are newly established; no long-term data are available.

Evidence:

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Studies conducted by private researchers/higher education associations have found that work-based student aid has a major impact on persistence in higher education.

Evidence: "College Students Who Work: 1980-84, Analysis Findings from High School and Beyond;" CS 87-413, June 1988. "Profile of Undergraduates in U.S. Postsecondary Education Institutions: 1995-96: With an essay on: Undergraduates Who Work" NCES Number: 98084 -- Release Date: May 14, 1998.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Federal Work-Study

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau:

Measure: Persistence: The gap between persistence rates for Federal Work-Study recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year. [Targets under development.]

Additional Information: The persistence rate is defined as the percentage of non-graduating students in a given year who return to continue their studies in the following year. A specific methodology to account for transfers and other data anomolies is under development.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Completion: The gap between completion rates for Federal Work-Study recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year. [Targets under development.]

Additional Information: The completion rate is defined as the percentage of full-time degree-seeking students completing within 150 percent of the normal time required.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Persistence: The gap between persistence rates for Federal Work-Study recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year. [Targets under development.]

Additional Information: The persistence rate is defined as the percentage of non-graduating students in a given year who return to continue their studies in the following year. A specific methodology to account for transfers and other data anomolies is under development.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

Measure: Completion: The gap between completion rates for Federal Work-Study recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year. [Targets under development.]

Additional Information: The completion rate is defined as the percentage of full-time degree-seeking students completing within 150 percent of the normal time required.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: GEAR UP
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	89%	13%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program is designed to provide support services and financial aid to low-income middle and high school students so they can attend college.

Evidence: The statutory purpose as stated in Section 404A of the Higher Education Act is to: "provide or maintain a guarantee" of financial aid and a wide range of additional services as preparation "to attend an institution of higher education."

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Data indicate that low-income students do not attend college at the same rates as students who are less disadvantaged, and they lack adequate middle and high school preparation.

Evidence: Data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 indicate that the overall college enrollment rate for low-income students is 64% compared to 79% and 93% for middle- and high-income students. The 4-year college enrollment rate for low-income students is 33% compared to 47% and 77% for middle- and high-income students. A wide-range of other data are available in NCES publications.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: GEAR UP targets entire grades of students beginning in middle school, leverages significant community resources and commitment through partnerships with State and local entities, and provides a comprehensive set of services, aid, and reform mechanisms.

Evidence: Other Federal programs, including Upward Bound and Talent Search, do not share these characteristics. Local and private efforts that are similar to GEAR UP, including those on which GEAR UP was modeled, are geographically limited in scope. Also, the GEAR UP statute requires that funds supplement and not supplant existing programs.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Similar approaches upon which this program is modeled are effective. There is no evidence that other approaches are more effective. The ongoing program evaluation should further inform as to the effectiveness of GEAR UP's design.

Evidence: I Have a Dream and Project GRAD are both proven models. According to one study, Project GRAD in Houston increased high school graduation rates by 64% as compared to a district-level decrease of 7% in graduation rates. Another study showed that the I Have a Dream program raised high school graduation rates to 90% among participants in a New York City school as compared to 25% for other students in that school.

Program: GEAR UP
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	89%	13%	

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: GEAR UP funds are used to support entire grades of students at high-poverty schools. Additionally, the evaluation of GEAR UP indicates that services tend to be weighted toward the neediest students in those grades.

Evidence: The statute requires that more than 50% of the students in participating schools be eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. Within this population, the national evaluation of GEAR UP (Westat, 2003) indicates that tutoring and other services are weighted toward the students that are failing and otherwise have the highest levels of need.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: GEAR UP has long-term goals of increasing high school graduation and college participation rates. These goals are derived directly from the purpose of the program. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: The primary GPRA objective is to increase high school graduation and postsecondary participation rates. Until participating students reach the 12th grade and beyond, data on other measures are being collected.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Although baseline data for the long-term goals will not be available for several years, targets have been developed on the basis of comparable NCES data.

Evidence: Targets for high school completion (73%) and college enrollment (65%) have been set to reduce the gap between low-income and middle-income students.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program has a number of short-term goals that measure progress toward high school graduation and college participation. Once participating students reach the 12th grade, annual measures also will be developed for these long-term goals. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: The GPRA indicators measure Prealgebra and Algebra I course completion (a key indicator of future college enrollment), attendance and promotion rates, and knowledge of necessary preparation and available financial aid.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Annual targets have been developed through 2007 as a benchmark for short- and long-term success.

Evidence: Selected targets for long-term performance are: 70% Algebra I completion, 98 percent grade promotion, and 75 percent knowledge of necessary preparation for college.

Program: GEAR UP
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	89%	13%	

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program design (projects must serve cohorts into and through high school) is structured to achieve the long-term program goals. Although targets for performance have been established only recently, all grantees are required to work toward the program goals. Funding for new and continuing awards is based on a project's plan for and success in meeting these goals.

Evidence: The statute requires all partnerships and States serving cohorts to "ensure that the services are provided through the 12th grade." New grant proposals receive up to 15 points for how well projects propose to use performance measures to assess progress toward achieving their intended outcomes. The statute also requires grantees to "biennially evaluate the activities...in accordance with the standards" prescribed by ED.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: A longitudinal study is currently underway to measure program impacts through the 8th grade. Follow-up studies are expected to measure impacts through the 12th grade and into college.

Evidence: The first impact report is due to be released toward the end of 2003.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: ED has not satisfied the first part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program, at this time, does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess (whether directly or indirectly) the impact of the Federal investment. However, ED has satisfied the second part of this question in that ED's budget submissions show the full cost of the program (including S&E). ED's 05 integrated budget and performance plan includes the program's annual and long-term goals.

Evidence:

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: GEAR UP is using performance report data to develop targets for annual goals.

Evidence: Targets have been developed for annual goals through 2007. Specific action steps for improved performance and revised performance targets will likely emerge when evaluation data become available.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: GEAR UP
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	89%	13%	

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: YES   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: GEAR UP utilizes annual performance reports to oversee grantee performance, and staff conduct quarterly conference calls with projects to collect information. While this performance data is limited due to the program's recent inception, ED uses it to shape its technical assistance workshops and to identify grantees that require additional program management assistance.

Evidence: GEAR UP is currently redesigning the performance reports to reduce the reporting burden and increase the quality of data collected. This will increase ED's ability to make informed decisions regarding program management and performance. GEAR UP relies on performance data to increase the focus of national conferences on parental involvement and other issues that have been shown to be most difficult to implement.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**

Answer: NO   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to EDPAS which links employee performance to relevant Strategic Plan goals and action steps, and is designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. To receive a "Yes", ED needs to: (1) identify for OMB the federal managers for this program; and (2) demonstrate the relationship between these managers' performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures; and (3) demonstrate the relationship between program partner's performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures.

Evidence:

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**

Answer: YES   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Funds are obligated in a timely matter but an IG report has indicated that monitoring of expenditures needs improvement. New office-wide monitoring plans have been implemented.

Evidence: GEAR UP developed a monitoring plan and actively monitors the draw down of Federal funds. In one case, a grantee was required to return funds. On another occasion, GEAR UP prohibited a grantee from using the interest accrued on scholarship funds for inappropriate purposes.

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?**

Answer: NO   Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing "One-ED" -- an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements. A "yes" answer is likely once the One-ED process is applied to this program's relevant business functions.

Evidence:

Program: GEAR UP
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	89%	13%	

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: GEAR UP projects are often linked with Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Student Support Services projects, creating a pipeline of services through college. Projects must coordinate with student aid offices and FSA.

Evidence: The statute requires each grantee to ensure that activities are coordinated with other GEAR UP projects in that school district or State, and with "related services under other Federal or non-Federal programs." Projects providing scholarships must coordinate with student aid offices and FSA on award packaging. Additionally, there are several GEAR UP grantees that also have UB, Talent Search, EOC, SSS, and McNair grants.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: GEAR UP has not been revealed to have internal control weaknesses and follows Departmental guidelines for financial management.

Evidence:

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: GEAR UP has developed a plan for responding to IG concerns such as inadequate grantee budget review and grant monitoring. The program office has trained staff to perform site visits and other monitoring activities.

Evidence: Each audit recommendation relating to GEAR UP's 2000 competition was addressed and implemented prior to the 2001 competition including: eligibility checklists, procedures to review budget materials prior to award of funds, and procedures to minimize the risk of error in the application review process. Procedures also have been developed to ensure that ED's grant oversight office will be notified of any future changes to the status of warrant holders.

3.CO1 Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Independent peer review panels are used to score and rank all applications. The number and distribution of new GEAR UP grantees indicate that new/first-time grantees are able to compete fairly.

Evidence: 100% of grants are subject to review. Funded partnerships include many non-traditional grantees such as faith-based and other community organizations, and many serve a high percentage of Hispanic students.

3.CO2 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: New procedures have been developed for improving the monitoring of expenditures based on IG concerns. GEAR UP engages in a number of systematic monitoring activities that look at both compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements and performance of grantees.

Evidence: GEAR UP's monitoring efforts focus on the review of annual performance reports, telephone contacts with each grantee at least quarterly, and selected site visits. Examples of corrective action include: 1) reducing funding for a grantee that was not meeting its matching requirements, 2) requiring a grantee that had not hired sufficient staff to make appropriate staffing changes, and 3) requiring two grantees to discontinue the provision of services at ineligible institutions.

Program:	GEAR UP	**Section Scores**				**Overall Rating**
Agency:	Department of Education	1	2	3	4	Adequate
Bureau:	Office of Postsecondary Education	100%	88%	89%	13%	
Type(s):	Competitive Grant					

3.CO3 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: GEAR UP collects and compiles data from performance reports and makes it available to the public, upon request, via their website. Additionally, aggregated performance data and program indicators are available online. Efforts are underway to increase the transparency of the data for all users, including online availability of program performance indicators. APR data should be aggregated in future years to maintain a YES answer for this question.

Evidence: GEAR UP's website (http://www.ed.gov/gearup) indicates that performance report data at the grantee level are available in an SPSS format. Data will be updated annually. Steps also are being taken to provide the data in an aggregated and easily understood format directly on the website. The first report from GEAR UP's national evaluation is available at http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/PPSS/gearup.html.

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Since GEAR UP is relatively new, there are not sufficient data available to make this determination.

Evidence: The first cohort of students have yet to reach the 12th grade. Once baseline data are available, future performance reports and evaluations will measure progress toward achieving long-term goals.

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Since GEAR UP is relatively new and targets have recently been established, it is too early to assess progress toward achieving short-term goals. However, initial results for some of the less critical program goals have been encouraging, with the program exceeding its initial targets for student knowledge of academic preparation, and for grade promotion.

Evidence: Annual performance data will begin to inform about achieving annual goals next year.

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence:

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: There are insufficient data regarding GEAR UP and related programs to make this determination.

Evidence: The first impact report for GEAR UP is due to be released toward the end of 2003. Next year, comparisons may be possible with Talent Search and Upward Bound, which also provide services to increase the postsecondary participation rates of low-income students.

Program: GEAR UP
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	88%	89%	13%	

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: SMALL EXTENT   Question Weight: 40%

Explanation: GEAR UP is relatively new and the national evaluation has produced only a descriptive report thus far. However, other recent studies, including 3 released since February 2003, indicate that programs receiving GEAR UP funding and programs with the same core elements as GEAR UP are effective in improving college enrollment for at-risk students.

Evidence: The Institute for Higher Education Policy's (IHEP) study Investing Early: Intervention Programs in Selected U.S. States examines the 17 leading State early intervention programs, 8 of which have GEAR UP grants. The study concludes that effective programs tend to be comprehensive; include financial assistance; provide access to challenging coursework, supportive enrichment activities, and peer groups; and maintain such services over a long time period. The Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis (CHEPA) study Preparing for College: Building Expectations, Changing Realities finds that keys to college enrollment include: strong academic preparation beginning no later than middle school, parental involvement, opportunities to enroll in rigorous coursework, tutoring, and coordination between K-12 and college educators. GEAR UP projects address these obstacles with many of the strategies articulated in the CHEPA and IHEP reports.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: GEAR UP
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education

Measure: Percentage of program participants completing Algebra I by the 9th grade

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2003		30
2004	40	
2005	50	
2006	60	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Percentage of program participants that enroll in college (the first complete GEAR UP student cohort does not finish 12th grade until 2005 at the earliest)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2007	65	
2008	65.5	
2009	66	
2010	66.5	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Percentage of program participants that complete high school (the first complete GEAR UP student cohort does not finish 12th grade until 2005 at the earliest)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2007	73	
2008	73.5	

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: GEAR UP

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education

Measure: Percentage of program participants that complete high school (the first complete GEAR UP student cohort does not finish 12th grade until 2005 at the earliest)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2009	74	
2010	74.5	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Increase 7th grader promotion rate for program participants

Additional Information: Combination of grade completion and drop-out status

Year	Target	Actual
2002		97
2003	97	98
2004	97	
2007	98	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Increase student knowledge of necessary preparation for college for program participants

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2002		0.53
2003	0.54	
2004	0.56	
2007	0.75	

Measure Term: Annual

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Block/Formula Grants

Name of Program: IDEA Grants for Infants and Families

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The purpose of this program is to develop and implement statewide, comprehensive, coordinated, multidisciplinary, interagency systems that provide early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.	The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), section 631(b), and associated GPRA data for this program.	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Studies indicate that children with disabilities who receive early intervention services (like those provided under Part C) have better educational outcomes than comparable children who do not receive these services.	Studies of the effectiveness of preschool interventions for children with disabilities. For instance, the 2000 National Academy of Sciences study "From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development."	20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	The program improves the access infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families have to early intervention services. It does so by providing States with financial resources in exchange for assurances that services are made available to all eligible children. Largely because of this program, each State has established a statewide system to serve infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.	IDEA, Part C, statute and regulations.	20%	0.2
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	There is no other program that focuses exclusively on the developmental needs of infants and toddlers with disabilities. A major purpose of this program is to coordinate resources from other sources, public and private. To the degree this program pays for services, the statute requires that this program's funding can only pay for services not already paid for by other sources. The IDEA Part C program establishes basic requirements for the early intervention services States make available, and for how States coordinate paying for these services among Federal, State, local, and private sources.	IDEA Part C, Sections 633(purpose), 635(a)(10) (responsibility for services and payments), 637(b)(5)(B) (supplement, not supplant), 638(1)&(2) (use of funds), and 640 (payer of last resort).	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	There is great variation between States in both the percentage of children served (compared to the population as a whole) and the age at which children are identified. There is also a lack of clarity related to some of this program's statutory requirements (e.g., natural environments) which leads to inconsistent application from State to State. However, there is no conclusive evidence that an alternative approach would be more effective.	Child count data shows the variations between States. The comments the Department of Education received on proposed changes to the IDEA Part C regulations highlighted the lack of clarity regarding the statute's "natural environments" provisions.	20%	0.2

Total Section Score					**100%**	**100%**

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	No	This program does not have quantifiable long-term performance goals related to child outcomes.	The Department of Education's Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance plans and reports.	14%	0.0
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	No	This program does not have quantifiable annual performance goals related to child outcomes.	The Department of Education's Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance plans and reports.	14%	0.0
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	No	States are required to establish performance goals and indicators for children with disabilities that promote the purposes of IDEA. However, these goals and indicators are not focused on the outcomes of infants and toddlers and their families.	The Department of Education's findings from State monitoring, and consumer feedback on Part C.	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	The IDEA established the Federal Interagency Coordinating Council (FICC) to coordinate early intervention policy issues among federal agencies, and the FICC has been relatively successful in doing so. For example, the FICC successfully negotiated jurisdictional issues between IDEA and Department of Defense's Champus programs.	The annual report of the FICC.	14%	0.1
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	Yes	The Department of Education is conducting a longitudinal study of this program which should provide short and long-term outcomes of childre nwith disabilities served through this program. However, this study will not provide ongoing data on performance.	National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study (NEILS).	14%	0.1
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	To the extent that States use Part C funds to augment services that are otherwise available, increases in Federal funding should increase the availability of early intervention services. However, the program cannot show a direct linkage between Federal appropriations and program performance.		14%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	No	There is no system for evaluating the effectiveness of the program's strategic planning, or for correcting deficiencies when goals are not achieved.		14%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**29%**

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	Yes	The Department of Education collects program data on: the number of children served; the age of children served; and the settings in which services are provided. These data are used to target the Department's State monitoring, and focus technical assistance and other activities that address problems. Additional baseline data on outcomes is forthcoming from a longitudinal study. However, outcome data are not currently available.	Program evaluation plans and GPRA reports.	11%	0.1
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	This program has not instituted an appraisal system that holds Federal managers accountable for grantee performance. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is planning to implement an agency-wide system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. Grantee performance is monitored on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. Grantees that do not meet Federal requirements are required to submit improvement plans and can have grants reduced or discontinued for serious or persistent failures to comply. However, IDEA requirements primarily focus on procedures, not results for children with disabilities (though many of these procedures are intended to promote improved results).	Program biennial reports, annual data reported by States, and program GPRA reports.	11%	0.0
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	No	In recent years, States have vastly improved their timely obligation and expenditure of Part C funds. However, there continue to be delays in a small number of States. Monitoring and program reports indicate that funds are being spent for the intended purpose.	Department of Education finance office records indicate that nine States/territories had either not submitted applications, or had not met the application requirements necessary, to receive FY 2001 awards until FY 2002.	11%	0.0
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	No	This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.		11%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	The Department of Education's FY 2004 Budget materials satisfy the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute 1.2 percent of the program's full costs. However, the Department has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. Also, the program does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess the impact of the Federal investment.		11%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	The Department conducts periodic monitoring of State activities under this program, and States are required to conduct annual audits of their education programs. No internal control weaknesses have been reported by auditors.		11%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	No	The Department of Education has not shown how it has addressed management deficiencies in this program.		11%	0.0
8 (B 1.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	State Part C programs submit annual performance reports to the Department, and conduct self-assessments as part of the Department's monitoring activities. In addition, the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center collects annual data on program outputs and characteristics of children served. However, since the program coordinates resources and services available from a wide range of agencies and funding sources, it is difficult to fully assess program activities and expenditures for children served under the program.	Program data the Department of Education receives from States.	11%	0.1
9 (B 2.)	*Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	Yes	The Department of Education collects program data on: the number of children served; the age of children served; and the settings in which services are provided. These data are available to the public through many channels, including an annual report to Congress and the Department's website. However, none of the Department's data on this program show anything about the outcomes of infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.	Program evaluation plans, GPRA reports, and the Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of IDEA.	11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Section Score					**100%**	**44%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	Long-term goals have not been established for this program. In addition, there are no data available related to outcome measures for children with disabilities for this program.	The Department of Education's Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance plans and reports.	33%	0.0
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	No	The program has been successful in meeting process goals such as the number of children served in natural environments, and goals relating to family capacity and the number served. However, the program has no data on the key measure of program performance -- the educational and developmental outcomes of infants and toddlers served through this program.	The Department of Education's Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance plans and reports.	33%	0.0

Key Goal I:	Functional abilities: The percentage of children participating in the Part C program who demonstrate improved and sustained functional abilities, including progress in areas such as social, emotional, cognitive, communication and physical development. (Proposed measure.)
Performance Target:	None.
Actual Performance:	TBD.
Key Goal II:	Family capacity: The percentage of families that report that early intervention services have increased their family's capacity to enhance their child's development.
Performance Target:	FY 2001: 80%
Actual Performance:	FY 1997: 72%; FY 2001: 73%
Key Goal III:	Infants and Toddlers Served: The percentage of children ages birth through 2 who are served under Part C as a proportion of the general population. The numbers of States that serve more than two percent of their population aged birth through 2 and more than one percent of their population under age one (targets first established for this performance measure in FY 2003).
Performance Target:	FY 1999: 1.6%; FY 2000: 1.8%; FY 2001: 1.8%; FY 2003: 20 States; FY 2004: 21 States.
Actual Performance:	FY 1999: 1.8%; FY 2000: 2.0%; FY 2001: 14 States; FY 2002: 18 States.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	N/A	The program does not lend itself to the development of efficiency measures that link the Federal investment to program outcomes.		0%	
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	N/A	There are no comparable programs serving this population.		0%	
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	No	A longitudinal study related to this program is underway. This study should provide some information on short and long-term outcomes for children with disabilities served through this program. However, no data are currently available.		33%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**0%**

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Block/Formula Grants

Name of Program: IDEA Grants to States

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes, No, N/A)						
	Questions	**Ans.**	**Explanation**	**Evidence/Data**	**Weighting**	**Weighted Score**
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The program's purpose is to assist States and local educational agencies in providing children with disabilities access to high quality education to help them meet challenging standards and prepare them for employment and independent living. However, many educational and State organizations, members of Congress, etc. believe the program's main purpose should be to provide financial relief to school districts to help pay for special education.	The Department of Education's Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance plans and reports.	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	The program addresses the specific needs of children with disabilities by: (1) ensuring access to education for children with disabilities by establishing basic service requirements that, in the absence of the program, would generally not be met; (2) improving educational outcomes for students with disabilities, who consistently do not perform as well as their nondisabled peers; and (3) providing financial assistance to States and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) to help pay for special education and related services.	Access to education for all children is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States (implicitly through the Equal Protection Clause), many State constitutions and laws, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. However, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) statute is used to define what this access means for children with disabilities.	20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	This program has a significant impact on how States and LEAs provide special education to students with disabilities. To receive funds under this program, States and LEAs must follow the IDEA statute's specific requirements regarding the services provided, due process protections, etc. Also, since other laws require schools to educate students with disabilities (see I.2 Evidence), the IDEA's requirements act as a "safe harbor" for what this access should entail. Still, while this program leverages how States/LEAs provide special education, it has less of an ability to ensure this education is of high quality.	IDEA Sections 612-613 spell out the program's major requirements. Since every State accepts IDEA funding, they have all agreed to follow the law's specific requirements. The Department of Education's monitoring show the degree to which States comply with these requirements.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	This program does not duplicate other Federal programs. Federally-run schools that provide special education (e.g., Department of Defense and Bureau of Indian Affairs schools) adhere to the IDEA's programmatic requirements. While States and LEAs pay for most of the cost of special education, the Federal program helps ensure that a minimum level of services and protections are provided to children with disabilities in each State.		20%	0.2
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	There is no conclusive proof that another approach would be more efficient or effective in meeting the purpose of this program. However, the absence of conclusive evidence does not mean that program improvements are not needed.		20%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**100%**

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes, No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	No	This program does not have quantifiable long-term performance goals related to child outcomes.	The Department of Education's Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance plans and reports.	14%	0.0
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	Yes	The Department of Education currently has some annual performance goals for this program. However, the Department intends to review these goals, and may make changes in the coming year.	The Department of Education's Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance plans and reports.	14%	0.1
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	Yes	The IDEA requires States to establish performance goals and indicators for children with disabilities that promote the purposes of the Act. While these goals and indicators are related to the Department's performance goals, they are not uniform across States.	IDEA section 612(a)(16)	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	No	While the IDEA includes provisions which provide for collaboration with other entities (federal and State), these requirements have not been implemented as well as they could be. At the federal and State level, there is a long history of poor collaboration between special education and vocational rehabilitation, adversely affecting the transition from school to work. There has also been inconsistent coordination between the ED and the Department of Health and Human Services on issues related to Medicaid reimbursement for IDEA-related health services.	IDEA sections 612(a)(12) and 614(d); Rehabilitation Act of 1973 sections 101(a)(11) and (24); Social Security Act, Section 1903(c).	14%	0.0
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	Yes	By law, the Department can use a portion of the program's appropriation to support longitudinal evaluations of program results. The Department of Education has used data gathered through these studies as a basis for targeting monitoring, providing technical assistance, and developing proposals for legislative changes. For example the National Longitudinal Transition Study (in progress) is addressing many of the same issues addressed in a similar study conducted in the late 1980s and early 1990s.	IDEA section 674.	14%	0.1
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	While IDEA funding has more than tripled in recent years, there is no evidence that this funding has improved educational outcomes for students with disabilities. State and local responsibilities for educating children with disabilities are not affected by changes in Federal funding.	The IDEA statute's requirements, and the number of children served under IDEA, are not contingent upon the federal appropriation.	14%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	No	There is no system for evaluating the effectiveness of the program's strategic planning, or for correcting deficiencies when goals are not achieved.		14%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**43%**

Section III: Program Management (Yes, No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	Yes	The Department of Education uses biennial reports from States and annual State data (including outcome data) to help target monitoring and technical assistance activities.	Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; OSEP Biennial Performance Report (OMB Number: 1820-0627)	11%	0.1
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	This program has not instituted an appraisal system that holds Federal managers accountable for grantee performance. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is planning to implement an agency-wide system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. Grantee performance is monitored on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. Grantees that do not meet Federal requirements are required to submit improvement plans and can have grants reduced or discontinued for serious or persistent failures to comply. However, IDEA requirements primarily focus on procedures, not results for children with disabilities (though many of these procedures are intended to promote improved results).		11%	0.0
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	Federal funds pay for only a small percentage of the total cost of special education. The IDEA statute provides broad authority for how federal funds can be used. When Federal funds are found to be improperly spent, it is usually due to an accounting error. Federal obligations are consistently made in a timely manner.		11%	0.1
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	No	This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.		11%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	ED's 04 budget submission satisfies the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute 0.1 percent of the program's full costs. However, ED has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess the impact of the Federal investment.		11%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	The Department conducts periodic monitoring of State activities under this program, and States are required to conduct annual audits of their education programs. No internal control weaknesses have been reported by auditors.	Grantee applications and reports.	11%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	No	The Department of Education has not shown how it has addressed management deficiencies in this program.		11%	0.0
8 (B 1.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	The Department has fairly extensive knowledge of State/Local Educational Agency activities under this program through its Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process, which is used to monitor State compliance with the IDEA.	Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process Reports.	11%	0.1
9 (B 2.)	*Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	Yes	The Department of Education makes program data available to the public through many channels, including an annual report to Congress and the Department's website. Also, State biennial reports and monitoring findings are posted on ED's website. However, none of these data show anything about the educational outcomes of preschool children.	IDEA section 618. Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; OSEP Biennial Performance Report (OMB Number: 1820-0627). OSEP Monitoring Process Reports.	11%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**56%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	Long term goals have not been established for this program.		33%	
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	Small Extent	The program is, in general, meeting its short term goals. Even though goals for increased graduations and reduced drop-outs were not met for the 1999-00 school year, the trend is toward improved results. However, there are still problems with the NAEP data (see below).		33%	0.1

Key Goal I:	Percentage of students with disabilities who meet or exceed basic levels in reading, math, and science in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). (Fourth grade reading data provided below.)
Performance Target:	Under development. Before the Department establishes targets, it needs to ensure that these data are timely and meet the same standards as other NAEP data.
Actual Performance:	FY 1998: 24.0%; FY 2000: 21.5%
Key Goal II:	Graduation: Percentage of children with disabilities who earn a high school diploma.
Performance Target:	FY 1999: 56%; FY 2000: 57%; FY 2001: 59%
Actual Performance:	FY 1996: 52.6%; FY 1999: 57.4%; FY 2000: 56.2%; FY 2001: 57.0%.

Footnote: Performance targets should reference the performance baseline and years, e.g. achieve a 5% increase over base of *X* in 2000.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	N/A	The program does not lend itself to the development of efficiency measures that link the Federal investment to program outcomes.			
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	N/A	Not Applicable. There are no comparable programs serving this population			
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	No	Longitudinal studies that are in progress may provide information in this area.		33%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**11%**

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: IDEA Part D - Personnel Preparation
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	0%	60%	0%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program's purpose is to improve the supply and training of special education personnel, targeting the following four areas: (1) personnel to serve children with low-incidence disabilities; (2) personnel to serve children with high-incidence disabilities; (3) leadership personnel; and (4) projects of national significance. There is disagreement, however, (particularly in high-incidence) as to whether the primary purpose of this program is to provide scholarships to increase the quantity of aspiring special education personnel, or to improve the quality of academic programs for these personnel. The Personnel Preparation program has only existed in its current form since the 1997 IDEA re-authorization. The upcoming 2003 re-authorization of IDEA is also likely to lead to significant programmatic changes. For example, the House Bill (H.R. 1350) eliminates the high-incidence authority and takes steps to focus program expenditures related to high-incidence personnel on qualitative rather than quantitative interventions.

Evidence: As defined in regulations, the program's purpose is to: "address State-identified needs for qualified personnel in special education, related services, early intervention, and regular education, to work with children with disabilities," and to "ensure that those personnel have the skills and knowledge, derived from practices that have been determined, through research and experience, to be successful, that are needed to serve those children." Also see IDEA, Part D, Section 673.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Persistent shortages of qualified personnel have been identified since the enactment of the Education of All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) in 1975. Although it is not possible to provide reliable estimates of the numbers of special education teachers and related personnel trained over time, the various Federal "personnel" program authorities have made significant investments towards the goal of increasing the supply of special education personnel. The funding level for personnel authorities increased from approximately $2.5 million in FY 1963 to nearly $13 million in FY 1964, and continued to increase to nearly $55 million in the early 1980's. Despite such investments, very serious shortages still exist. The quality of special education training programs is also consistently raised as an issue requiring attention. While it is difficult to identify the specific attributes of a "high quality" training program, all projects funded under this authority are required to take steps designed to lead to improvements in quality (e.g. - by using curricula and pedagogy that are shown the be effective, and demonstrating how research-based curricula and pedagogy are incorporated into training requirements).

Evidence: Quantity - State reported data indicate that approximately 47,532 special education teachers, roughly 11.4 percent of special education positions nationally, were not fully certified for their main teaching assignment for the 2000-2001 school year (up 1.4 percent from the 1999-2000 school year). According to SPeNSE (a national study of special education personnel issues), during the 1999-2000 school year more than 12,000 openings for special education teachers were left vacant or filled by substitutes. While there is some debate about severity of shortages, there is agreement that shortages do exist in most States. According to recent estimates by ED, the President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education, and the Council for Exceptional Children, the U.S. will need over 200,000 teachers to fill open positions during the next 5 years. Quality (of teacher training programs) - the most serious problems are: (1) the absence of a reliable research base; and (2) insufficient understanding of which program attributes lead to improved student outcomes. Recent testimony by leading researchers before the President's Commission revealed a complete lack of research that indicates whether or not "certification and years of experience are reliable predictors of student achievement."

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program makes a unique contribution by investing in key areas of special education personnel training (mostly at the higher education level) where the incentive for meaningful State and/or local educational agencies investment is low. Although the current IDEA Part D State Improvement Grants (SIG) program also makes significant contributions to State identified special education personnel issues, SIG funds are devoted almost exclusively to in-service (professional development) activities. While funds under both HEA Title II and ESEA Title II may also be used to train special education teachers (along with general education teachers in relevant areas of special education), there is no evidence that funds are being used for this purpose.

Evidence: Grantees supported through low-incidence, leadership, and national significance grants conduct work primarily in areas where SEAs and LEAs have little incentive to invest, or insufficient capacity to produce meaningful results. Particularly in these critical programmatic areas there is no excessive overlap with other Federal or non-Federal efforts. In each of these areas, ED is the primary source of funds.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program does not have any major design flaws that prevent it from meeting its defined objectives. It effectively supports training for personnel by concentrating the largest portion of its funds in areas where States have limited capacity and/or incentive to invest (e.g. - low-incidence and leadership). However, the program could be even more effectively targeted. A significant portion of the program's funds are currently used to support training for high-incidence personnel (from fiscal year 2002 through 2004, approximately $48 million or 17.5 percent of all program funds support new and continuation grants under high-incidence). It is unlikely that these investments will lead to measurable benefits, because annual program funds ($90 million) are insignificant compared to the total funds devoted to training high-incidence personnel from other sources (While it is not possible to develop an accurate estimate, many $ billions are devoted to such training annually. Examples of other sources of support for training include: Federal student loan programs, private foundations, personal savings, State and local tax dollars, etc . . .).

Evidence: The largest portion of funds under this program are devoted to low-incidence ($35 million or 32 percent) but a significant portion ($14 million or 13 percent) support continuation grants under high-incidence. Studies outlining the history of the Federal role in special education teacher training suggest that this role (at least in the area of high-incidence) has shifted dramatically over time. During the early years of ED's support for personnel activities (1963 to 1980), Federal contributions helped establish and solidify the field of special education as a separate profession, actually starting training programs in many institutions of higher education (IHEs) where none existed before. More recently, however, this balance has shifted significantly. Although it is not possible develop reliable estimates of total overall investments (from all non-Part D sources) to training special education and related personnel, it appears that (in relation to total sum) the share of funds available through the Personnel Preparation program is substantially less than it used to be. According to NCES Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), as of fall 2001 approximately 357 degree-granting institutions offered masters-level training in the area of General Special Education (this category excludes low-incidence fields of study such as deaf and hearing impaired, emotionally handicapped, and multiple handicapped). By comparison, in 2002 a total of 55 public and private institutions received awards to support training for high-incidence personnel at all levels (average annual award amount is $200,000) through the Personnel Preparation program.

Program: IDEA Part D - Personnel Preparation
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	0%	60%	0%	

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: As discussed above, the program's authority is intentionally broad and highly flexible (in order to increase the likelihood that investments in critical areas will impact the field). Within this broad authority, program funds are targeted effectively to activities where investments are most likely to yield the greatest impact (e.g. - low-incidence and leadership). But, limiting the program's current scope of authority and/or concentrating limited program funds more strategically could produce more significant effects. For example, targeting high-incidence program funds on qualitative interventions would most likely yield a greater impact.

Evidence: Program funds currently support interventions designed to address issues related to both quality and quantity. The current statutory authority clearly envisions both of these as areas where the Federal role should be strong. For example, "activities incorporating innovative strategies to recruit and prepare teachers and other personnel to meet the needs of areas in which there are acute and persistent shortages of personnel" are explicitly authorized in IDEA section 673. Given the relative size of the program and the wide variety of activities currently authorized, however, enhancing the supply of high-incidence personnel is an unrealistic goal (for this program at its current funding level). Program funds could be more effectively utilized if the high-incidence authority were either eliminated or designed specifically to support qualitative interventions for personnel training programs.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?

Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program does not have quantifiable long-term performance goals that focus on either quantitative or qualitative aspects of the program's purpose. Program staff recently participated in a Department-wide planning activity and are curretnly developing program specific performance measures. These draft indicators however are not yet being used. The Department is also working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Program GPRA reports and assorted analyses of program related activities.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?

Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program does not have meaningful long-term measures.

Evidence: N/A

Program:	IDEA Part D - Personnel Preparation
Agency:	Department of Education
Bureau:	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s):	Competitive Grant

Section Scores				**Overall Rating**
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	0%	60%	0%	

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?

Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Four broad GPRA performance measures are now used for all IDEA Part D programs, including Personnel Preparation. These goals are intended to determine whether the Part D programs: (1) respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families; (2) use high quality methods and materials; (3) communicate effectively with target audiences; (4) produce products and practices that are actually used. Unfortunately, these indicators (along with the methodologies used to measure them) do not meaningfully address the Personnel Preparation program's responsiveness to its stated goals. Program staff also maintain a separate set of "unofficial" measures that are more closely tailored to Personnel Preparation activities, and that are linked to a separate (2 year old) data collection called the Personnel Prep Data collection (PPD). Because participation in the PPD collection is voluntary, OSEP has agreed that this data would not be used for accountability purposes. Starting next year, however, OSEP intends to require all grantees to participate in data collections as a condition for receipt of funds. Once this requirement is in place, PPD data will be used for accountability purposes. ED, program staff, and OMB are currently working to define a limited number of more appropriate and ambitious annual performance goals for this program.

Evidence: Personnel Preparation GPRA goals and indicators are: (1) The percentage of IDEA program activities that are determined by expert panels to respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families will increase; (2) Expert panels determine that IDEA-funded projects use current research-validated practices and materials; (3) The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that communicate appropriately with target audiences will increase; (4) Expert panels determine that practitioners, including policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or others as appropriate, use products and practices developed through IDEA programs to improve results for children with disabilities. "Unofficial" goals for this program are: "PPD1: Increase in the number of IDEA-supported pre-service students who successfully complete training requirements; PPD2: Increase in the percentage of IDEA-supported pre-service student completers who are members of underrepresented populations; PPD3: Increase in the number of IDEA-supported students who are trained in areas of greatest need."

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?

Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: See above.

Evidence: See above.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?

Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: OSEP takes specific steps to ensure that all partners commit to and work toward the existing annual goals. Program solicitations (priority packages) explicitly include all program goals, and grant applications and progress reports assess performance and continuing relevance against these goals. Although existing program measures do not meaningfully measure the program's responsiveness to its stated goals, all partners do commit to and work towards these goals. Program staff are also currently working to develop both annual and long-term goals that are more appropriate for this program. Once the revised annual and long-term goals are implemented, OSEP can continue to use its current process to ensure that all program partners actually commit to and work toward the new measures.

Evidence: Program priority packages.

Program: IDEA Part D - Personnel Preparation
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	0%	60%	0%	

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: No independent evaluations of this program exist.

Evidence: No independent evaluations of this program exist.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: In the absence of long- and short-term goals that yield reliable and appropriate program outcomes data, it is not possible to link the budget request to accomplishment of such goals. Budgeting is not currently linked to long-term goals and/or a strategic plan.

Evidence: N/A

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Although OSEP has been working to address its strategic planning deficiencies, meaningful actions to eliminate such deficiencies have not yet been implemented. As OSEP works to address planning deficiencies, it is placing particular emphasis on "adopting a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals and a limited number of annual performance goals." (OMB Memorandum No. 861)

Evidence: The program is actively participating in a Department-wide Teacher Quality common measures meeting (which includes all ED teacher quality staff and relevant OMB staff). Among other things, participation in this group is intended to yield a long-term program indicator. OSEP developed Program staff are also working with relevant Budget and OMB staff to develop more appropriate short-term goals and indicators.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: All Personnel Preparation grantees are required to submit Annual Performance Reports and Final Reports. Data gathered in such reports occasionally translate into improved performance/accountability for grantees, but are not linked to more formal ED data/management initiatives. For example, existing GPRA indicators and data generated through this reporting process do not measure the actual performance of existing grantees. Instead, GPRA indicators gauge what grant recipients propose to accomplish. Available GPRA data is not used in program management. Limitations in the relevance of data gathered through GPRA and annual reports hamper meaningful use of such information for management and improved performance. However, the program is taking meaningful steps towards utilizing newly available data gathered through the PPD for accountability purposes. Next year, OSEP has agreed to require all grantees to participate in relevant data collections as a condition of receiving funds.

Evidence: Priority notices and EDGAR require grantees to submit Annual Performance Reports and Final Reports. Grantee participation in the separate OSEP PPD data collection is now voluntary and not used for accountability purposes to encourage increased participation. Starting next year, however, OSEP will require all grantees to participate in relevant data collections as a condition of receiving an award. This will help to address the link between data collection and program management by allowing program staff to use the best available data for accountability purposes.

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to EDPAS which links employee performance to relevant Strategic Plan goals and action steps, and is designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. However, ED cannot demonstrate specific ways by which OSEP's managers are held accountable for linking their performance standards to the program's long term and annual measures. Program partners are subject to project reviews and grant monitoring but these oversight activities are not designed to link partners to specific performance goals.

Evidence:

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The program successfully obligates funds by the end of each fiscal year. OSEP should institute changes to ensure that grant competitions are announced on a regular schedule and provide sufficient time for preparation and review of applications. Funds are spent for the intended purposes; this is assessed through grant and contract monitoring and intensive grant reviews for major grant programs. No improper uses of funds have been identified.

Evidence: Contract files; summaries of formative and summative grant reviews.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing "One-ED" -- an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.

Evidence: N/A

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: There are many instances of the program collaborating and coordinating with related programs. Program staff recently participated in Department-wide teacher quality meetings designed to yield new long-term program measures for all teacher quality programs. The indicator generated through these meetings that relates to special educators will be implemented in 2003. Additional examples of program collaboration include 2 summits (hosted through the Center on Personnel Studies in Special Education (COPSSE)) that brought together policy-makers from state and local education agencies, related Federal programs, and non-profits to target COPSSE's research agenda on issues important to practitioners. The program also supported the development of model standards for special educators through the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). These model standards articulated what all general and special education teachers should know and be able to do to effectively teach students with disabilities. The standards specifically address the nature of the collaborative relationship between general and special education teachers.

Evidence: Teacher Quality "Common Measures" materials; Departmental "teacher quality" team participation materials; For a discussion of how the COPSSE policy advisor meetings translate into the program research agenda (and how COPSSE has implemented specific recommendations) see the "3+2 Evaluation" of the COPSSE program at: http://www.coe.ufl.edu/copsse/Briefing%20Book.pdf; See "Model Standards for Licensing General and Special Education Teachers of Students with Disabilities: A Resource for State Dialogue (2001)": http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/SpedStds.pdf

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: No internal control weaknesses have been reported by auditors. The Department has a system for identifying excessive draw downs, and can put individual grantees on probation where draw downs need to be approved.

Evidence: N/A

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: OSEP has taken steps to address specific management deficiencies for the Personnel Prep program. Most significantly, program staff recently developed and implemented data collection designed to help staff manage the program more effectively. While OSEP's inability to meaningfully address strategic planning deficiencies is a critical fault, it is also an agency-level deficiency that does not affect this program as much because it has relatively few priorities and annual competitions. The priorities for this program are generally well written and competitions are also managed in an efficient and timely manner.

Evidence: Deficiencies at the program planning level (e.g. - the funding split between low incidence, high incidence, and leadership) are identified through forums, peer reviews, PPD data collection, and other processes implemented at the program level.

Program: IDEA Part D - Personnel Preparation
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	0%	60%	0%	

3.CO1 **Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Grants are awarded through a competitive peer review process that includes a qualified assessment of merit and many grantees have demonstrated track records for preparing special education teachers. The President's Commission for Excellence in Special Education recommended that OSEP's peer review process be improved in several ways, including: ensuring appropriate separation between program management and peer review responsibilities; developing a more effective process for recruiting and utilizing peer reviewers; ensuring that the peer review process is organized in a way that actively encourages progressive improvement of proposals through revision and resubmission. OSEP has already taken specific steps to address such concerns. For example, OSEP recently engaged the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study to improve the quality of peer review in IDEA Part D. An internal agency group is also developing procedures to standardize the training of reviewers.

Evidence: Program funds are used to support peer review costs. 100% of applicants are subject to peer review. "A New Era: Revitalizing Special Education for Children and Their Families" - the President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education

3.CO2 **Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The program has several mechanisms designed to generate meaningful information on grantees use of funds, including periodic regional site visits, periodic institutional site visits, analysis of data (submitted in Annual Reports and through the PPD) that relates to intended program outcomes, various meetings intended to develop and enhance the relationship and the level of understanding between grantees and ED/OSEP program staff.

Evidence: PPD reporting structure is a dedicated on-line system. Site visits are typically conducted where high concentrations of funds occur, although occasionally institutions are visited because a specific deficiency/problem has been identified and requires attention.

3.CO3 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: GPRA data are now reported in several formats (including on the web), and GPRA data is made available to the public through annual reports on the implementation of IDEA. Grantee final reports are available to the public, just as Research final reports are; however, information contained in these reports is not aggregated and disaggregated in a way that "relates to the impact of the program" as required by the OMB guidance document. Similarly, the program does not have in place a system to "collect and present publicly information that captures the most important impacts of program performace."

Evidence: http://ericec.org

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: Program does not yet have long-term goals.

Evidence: N/A

Program: IDEA Part D - Personnel Preparation
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	0%	60%	0%	

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: Program is currently working to develop and implement more appropriate annual performance goals.

Evidence: N/A

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year? Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: N/A

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals? Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Although programs with similar goals and purposes do exist in other areas of education (e.g. - non-special education personnel training/supply programs such as HEA Title II, ESEA Title II, various private foundation programs focusing on teacher quality, etc . . .) there is no reliable basis for comparing Personnel Preparation to such programs. No current studies, analyses, or evaluations have attempted to make such comparisons, and in the absence of reliable comparisons between these programs further analysis would be arbitrary.

Evidence: N/A

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results? Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: No independent evaluations of this program exist.

Evidence: N/A

PART Performance Measurements

Program: IDEA Part D - Personnel Preparation

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

---

Measure: Increase the number of highly qualified special educators graduating from IDEA funded programs. (Proposed new goal, targets under development).

Additional Information: Goal is not yet being used, and targets have not yet been develop. When implemented, this measure will track the percentage of program completers from IHEs participating in PP grants who meet NCLB's highly qualified teacher definition.

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2002		

Program ID: 10001039

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: IDEA Part D - Research and Innovation
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	40%	60%	8%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The overall purpose of the program of improving services and results for children with disabilities is clear from the authorizing legislation. While the main purpose of the program is to achieve these improvements through research, the program supports a wide range of other activities such as technical assistance and dissemination that overlap other Part D program activities.

Evidence: IDEA section 672(a) "The Secretary shall make competitive grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, eligible entities to produce, and advance the use of, knowledge" to improve services and results for children with disabilities.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: IDEA Research and Innovation is the principal Federal program supporting research to improve early intervention and education for children with disabilities. Children with disabilities have special needs that, because of their low numbers, are unlikely to be addressed through most research activities, which are directed toward the majority of children who do not have disabilities.

Evidence: The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation mandates improved results for all children, including children with disabilities. In order to achieve these results, schools need to have knowledge through research to address the specialized needs of children with disabilities.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The IDEA Research and Innovation program is the primary program focused on improving specialized services and results for children with disabilities through applied research. The special needs of these children require specialized research approaches to improve their outcomes. However, since most children with disabilities spend all or large parts of their school days in regular education classrooms, it is important to coordinate special and regular education research efforts. Legislation moving special education research from the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services to the Institute of Educational Sciences has been proposed by both the House and the Senate and is supported by the Administration. This transfer will improve coordination of special and regular education research activities.

Evidence: OSERS has long been a leader in supporting research and other activities to improve reading for children with disabilities. As part of its efforts, it has also played a leadership role in improving reading for all children (e.g. through its support of the National Center to Improve the Tools of Educators.) However, conducting meaningful research to that will benefit children with disabilities often entails looking at educational interventions for all children. Children who need special education should be those who do not respond to appropriate regular education interventions. For example, one reading center currently funded under the Research and Innovation program is providing primary and secondary interventions to almost 4,000 students and tertiary interventions to over 300 students.

Program: IDEA Part D - Research and Innovation
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	40%	60%	8%	

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: We are not aware of any studies that show that the current program structure is not cost effective compared to reasonable alternatives. However, the broad range of activities authorized under and funded through the program has detracted from its main focus of supporting research and providing new knowledge. For example, Research and Innovation is funding the Youth Leadership Development project which supports a group of youth leaders with disabilities who can provide input on policies and practices related to children with disabilities. This activity may be important but is not directly related to special education research.

Evidence: Diverse activities within the already broad purpose of the program described in section 672(a) include not only the production of new knowledge (section 672(b), but also the integration of research and practice (section 672(c) and improving the use of professional knowledge (section 672(d)).

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Research and Innovation funding priorities are targeted through an elaborate planning process that involves extensive consultation with various interest groups. However, the absence of clear and definitive long-term performance goals linked to priorities is a problem in determining the extent to which the program is effectively targeted over time.

Evidence: See IDEA section 661(a), application packages for competitions, notices of competitions, 23rd Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the IDEA, OSEP web site at http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/OSEP/Programs/CPP/index.html.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Three of OSEP's four GPRA indicators for all of IDEA Part D National Activities programs relate to performance of Research and Innovation activities. They deal with the importance of program priorities, the quality of activities, and whether these activities produce results that are used. However, these goals do not focus on specific long term improvement in educational outcomes for children with disabilities. The Department is currently working on developing long term performance goals for the special education research program. The Department is also working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Department of Education Annual Program Performance Reports (see http://www.ed.gov/pubs/annualplan2004/program/html); Department of Education Planning and Performance Management Database; priorities for grant competitions.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The program does not have meaningful long-term outcome measures and targets.

Evidence: Department of Education Annual Program Performance Reports (see http://www.ed.gov/pubs/annualplan2004/program/html); Department of Education Planning and Performance Management Database; priorities for grant competitions.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The program does not have specific long-term outcome measures but its annual GPRA indicators focus on the importance of program priorities, the quality of research, and on whether research activities produce results that could be used to improve educational services for children with disabilities. OSEP should continue to examine how the current methodology used to measure progress on GPRA indicators is an accurate representation of progress toward improving results. For example, grantees under the program are included as assessors of the extent to which the program addresses critical needs.

Evidence: Department of Education Annual Program Performance Reports (see http://www.ed.gov/pubs/annualplan2004/program/html); Department of Education Planning and Performance Management Database; priorities for grant competitions.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Research and Innovation has annual targets for its performance indicators. However, targets are often not ambitious.

Evidence: Department of Education Annual Program Performance Reports (see http://www.ed.gov/pubs/annualplan2004/program/html); Department of Education Planning and Performance Management Database; application packages including information on GPRA indicators.

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The Research and Innovation program priorities include annual GPRA goals and commit selected grantees to work toward those goals. OSEP also contracts with the American Institute of Research to conduct an annual reviews of grantees on the achievement of these goals. However, the methodology for conducting these reviews could be improved. For example, grantees are often used to review the importance of priorities under which they have been funded.

Evidence: Research and Innovation annual competition notices.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: An evaluation of IDEA Part D activities is under consideration for funding under the Grants to States set aside. However there have been no independent evaluations of Research and Innovation activities since 1991 when a partial evaluation of program activities was conducted. Program activities are also assessed through the GPRA process. However, process may not be very objective because some of the individuals involved are also engaged in program planning and/or are grant recipients.

Evidence: Evaluation plan provided to OMB. COSMOS Evaluation 1991.

Program: IDEA Part D - Research and Innovation
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	40%	60%	8%	

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Budget requests identify priority areas. However, these priority areas are not described in terms of overall long-term goals related to improving results for children with disabilities.

Evidence: Congressional Budget Justifications.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Although OSEP has been working to address its strategic planning deficiencies, meaningful actions to eliminate such deficiencies have not yet been implemented. As OSEP works to address planning deficiencies, it is placing particular emphasis on "adopting a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals and a limited number of annual performance goals."

Evidence: Twenty-third Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2001) (see http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/OSEP/Products/OSEP2001AnlRpt/index.html); IDEA section 661(a).

2.RD1 **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The program supports three types of activities - research, demonstration and outreach. These three activities support the acquisition of knowledge and the development of practical ways to apply that knowledge to improving results for children with disabilities. Funding for each of these types of activities is considered in the planning process through which priorities and funding levels are determined.

Evidence: IDEA section 661(a).

2.RD2 **Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: There is a documented planning process that leads to the development of specific annual priorities. However, the absence of meaningful long-term outcome goals linking the planning process to priorities over time is a serious problem.

Evidence: Twenty-third Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; priorities for grant competitions.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: A team of reviewers typically assess the performance of large grants in their second year. Program staff also work closely with these grantees in the implementation of their projects and review their final reports. However, the program could improve the collection of data related to GPRA performance goals.

Evidence: Program review files; reports

Program: IDEA Part D - Research and Innovation
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	40%	60%	8%	

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to EDPAS which links employee performance to relevant Strategic Plan goals and action steps, and is designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. However, ED cannot demonstrate specific ways by which OSEP's managers are held accountable for linking their performance standards to the program's long term and annual measures. Program partners are subject to project reviews and grant monitoring but these oversight activities are not designed to link partners to specific performance goals.

Evidence: Internal records

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: OSEP successfully obligates funds by the end of each fiscal year, but most funds are obligated late in each fiscal year. OSEP should institute changes to ensure that its grant competitions are announced on a regular schedule and provide sufficient time for preparation and review of applications. Funds are spent for the intended purposes; this is assessed through grant and contract monitoring and grant reviews for major grant programs. No improper uses of funds have been identified.

Evidence: Financial reports, notices of competitions, lists of funded applications.

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing "One-ED" -- an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.

Evidence:

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The Research and Innovation program collaborates effectively with some other agencies and programs, particularly the Department of Health and Human Services, and between Research and Innovation and other OSEP Part D programs, such as Technical Assistance and Dissemination. For example, research projects are required to report their findings to OSEP Technical Assistance and Dissemination projects to facilitate the distribution of information to appropriate audiences. However, collaboration between the special education research program and regular education research funded under the Institute of Educational Sciences is limited. The need to improve coordination between special and regular education is one reason the Department supports House and Senate legislative proposals to move special education research to the Institute for Educational Sciences.

Evidence: Reimbursable agreements with other agencies: program priorities

Program: IDEA Part D - Research and Innovation
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	40%	60%	8%	

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: No internal control weaknesses have been reported by auditors. The Department has a system for identifying excessive draw downs, and can put individual grantees on probation where draw downs need to be approved.

Evidence:

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The program has addressed some of its deficiencies. For instance, the President's Commission of Special Education identified the "peer review" process as an area of weakness in current program management practice. Internet training on the peer review process has been provided in an effort to improve the process. But, serious and persistent problems related to late award of grant have not been addressed. OSEP's inability to produce a Comprehensive Plan as required by the IDEA Amendments of 1997 is also a problem.

Evidence: President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education: Final Report

3.CO1 **Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Grants are awarded based on a competitive peer review process and are based on merit. However, the President's Commission identified the existing peer review process as an area needing improvement in current program management. Areas of concern include: ensuring appropriate separation between program management and peer review responsibilities; developing a more effective process for recruiting and utilizing peer reviewers; initiating a two-level review process that focuses on both technical quality/rigor and relevance to OSEP priorities; ensuring that the peer review process is itself organized in a manner that actively encourages progressive improvement of proposals through revision and resubmission.

Evidence: Program funds are used to support peer review costs. All applicants are subject to peer review. "A New Era: Revitalizing Special Education for Children and Their Families" - the President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education.

3.CO2 **Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: OSEP reviews grantee performance through annual performance reports and final reports, and holds annual meetings with projects in Washington. When necessary, OSEP staff also conduct site visits to review grantee activities.

Evidence: Annual performance reports

3.CO3 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: GPRA data are now reported in several formats (including on the web), and GPRA data is made available to the public through annual reports on the implementation of IDEA. Research final reports are available to the public through the Department's ERIC clearinghouse and the grantees own websites. However, it would be difficult for the public to access research information contained in these reports in a meaningful way to understand how the different research products support the program's goals and provide information about program performance.

Evidence: http://ericec.org/;Office of Special Education Programs Technical Assistance and Dissemination Network (see http://www.dssc.org/frc/oseptad.htm)

Program:	IDEA Part D - Research and Innovation	**Section Scores**				**Overall Rating**
Agency:	Department of Education	1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
Bureau:	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services	100%	40%	60%	8%	
Type(s):	Research and Development					

3.RD1 **For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: There has been some progress in meeting the output measures included in GPRA measures, but there are no long term outcome measures against which to judge progress.

Evidence:

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The program has had some success at meeting its short term output oriented GPRA goals. However, some of the long term GPRA goals appear to be relatively arbitrary and not particularly ambitious. Another problem is that the methodology used to collect data is not objective. For example, the expert panel used to address some indicators is recruited from among individuals who have been consulted during the planning process for developing the program priorities.

Evidence: Department of Education Annual Program Performance Reports (see http://www.ed.gov/pubs/annualplan2004/program/html); program reviews.

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence:

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: The Research and Innovation program is the only Federal program supporting applied research for special education, but it can be compared to other research programs in government. However, no systematic evidence has been collected to compare Research and Innovation to other research programs.

Evidence:

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: There have been no independent evaluations of this program within the last 20 years.

Evidence:

Program: IDEA Part D - Research and Innovation

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Measure: As determined by expert panels, the percentage of program funding priorities that respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2001		82
2002	85	72
2003	75	66
2004	75	
2005	75	
2006	75	
2007	75	

Measure: As determined by expert panels, the percentage of Research and Innovation projects that use exceptionally rigorous quantitative or qualitative research and evaluation methods or current research-validated practices and materials, as appropriate.

Additional Information: The program has separate measures for Research, Demonstration, and Outreach projects. Only the target and actual percentages for Research are shown here.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1998		60
1999	65	50
2000		77
2001		69
2002	75	73
2003	80	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: IDEA Part D - Research and Innovation

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

---

Measure: As determined by expert panels, the percentage of Research and Innovation projects that use exceptionally rigorous quantitative or qualitative research and evaluation methods or current research-validated practices and materials, as appropriate.

Additional Information: The program has separate measures for Research, Demonstration, and Outreach projects. Only the target and actual percentages for Research are shown here.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2004	82	
2005	84	

Measure: As determined by expert panels, the percentage of practitioners, including policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or others, as appropriate, that use products and practices developed through the Research and Innovation program to improve results for children with disabilities.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2000		53
2001		58
2002	65	
2003	75	
2004	75	
2005	75	
2006	85	
2007	75	

Measure: The percentage of research projects addressing casual questions that employ randomized experimental designs.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2002		50

PART Performance Measurements

Program: IDEA Part D - Research and Innovation

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

---

Measure: The percentage of research projects addressing casual questions that employ randomized experimental designs.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2003	65	
2004	69	
2005	73	
2006		
2007		

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Block/Formula Grants

Name of Program: IDEA Preschool Grants

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The program's purpose is to assist States and local educational agencies in providing children with disabilities aged 3 to 5 access to high quality education to help them meet challenging standards and prepare them for employment and independent living. This purpose is almost identical to the one for IDEA Grants to States.	The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), section 619. The Department of Education's Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance plans and reports.	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Research shows that, without appropriate interventions, children with disabilities are likely to enter school with significant developmental delays. The services supported through this program help ensure that all preschool children with disabilities enter school ready to learn.	Studies of the effectiveness of preschool interventions for children with disabilities. For instance, the 2000 National Academy of Sciences study "From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development."	20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	No	IDEA Preschool Grants funding supplement funds provided to States under the IDEA Part B Grants to States program, for children with disabilities aged 3 through 21. There is no way for the Department to determine the distinct impact of the Preschool Grants program. While this program was originally constituted as an incentive grants program, the IDEA now requires all States to serve children ages 3-5 if they want to receive funding under this program, the proportion of IDEA Grants to States funding that is targeted to the children ages 3-5, and funding under any of the IDEA's National Programs pertaining solely to children aged 3-5.	Sections 611 (Grants to States) and 619 (Preschool Grants) of the IDEA note that States can use funding under both programs to serve children ages 3-5.	20%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	No	The Preschool Grants program has the same programmatic requirements as the Grants to States program, and uses a funding allocation formula that is almost exactly the same.	Sections 611 (Grants to States) and 619 (Preschool Grants) of the IDEA note that both funding allocations are to be used "to provide special education and related services in accordance with [Part B of the IDEA]." Funding allocation formulas in Section 611 and Section 619 are nearly identical.	20%	0.0
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	No	This program is only a supplemental funding source. It does not have any separate programmatic requirements or incentives distinct from the Grants to States program. While the program's initial purpose was to provide a financial incentive for States to serve preschool children, this incentive is no longer necessary (especially since the Grants to States makes more funding available to serve preschool children than this program does).	IDEA, section 619, and program regulations.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**40%**

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	No	This program does not have quantifiable long-term performance goals related to child outcomes.	The Department of Education's Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance plans and reports.	14%	0.0
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	No	This program does not have quantifiable annual performance goals related to child outcomes.	The Department of Education's Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance plans and reports.	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	No	States are required to establish performance goals and indicators for children with disabilities that promote the purposes of IDEA. However, these goals and indicators typically focus on the outcomes of children with disabilities in elementary and secondary school, not preschool children.	The Department of Education's Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance plans and reports.	14%	0.0
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	No	While the IDEA includes provisions which provide for collaboration with other entities (federal and State), the Department does not collaborate as well as it could with some other federal programs. For instance, there has been inconsistent coordination between ED and the Department of Health and Human Services on issues related to Medicaid reimbursement for IDEA-related health services. Also, the program has not provided concrete examples of how this program collaborates with other federal preschool programs, such as Head Start.	Program monitoring reports.	14%	0.0
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	No	No performance information is available on the outcomes of this program. The Department of Education has initiated a longitudinal study, which will provide some information on outcomes. However, it will be several years before such outcome data are available. Even when completed, the longitudinal study will not provide ongoing data on performance.	The Department of Education initiated the Pre-Elementary Longitudinal Study (PEELS) in December 2002.	14%	0.0
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	Since this program's funding supplements IDEA Grants to States funding, it is necessary to look at how both programs affect preschool children. While IDEA funding available for preschool children has more than tripled in recent years, there is no evidence which shows that this funding has improved educational outcomes for preschool children with disabilities. State and local responsibilities for educating children with disabilities are not affected by changes in Federal funding.		14%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	No	There is no system for evaluating the effectiveness of strategic planning and correcting deficiencies when goals are not achieved.		14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Section Score					**100%**	**0%**

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	Yes	The Department of Education uses biennial reports from States and annual State data to help target monitoring and technical assistance activities. For preschool children, ED collects data on: the number of children served; the age of the children served; and the settings in which services are provided. Outcome data are not currently available. The Department expects to receive baseline outcome data in an longitudinal study initiated in FY 2003.	Program evaluation plans and GPRA reports.	11%	0.1
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	This program has not instituted an appraisal system that holds Federal managers accountable for grantee performance. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is planning to implement an agency-wide system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. Grantee performance is monitored on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. Grantees that do not meet Federal requirements are required to submit improvement plans and can have grants reduced or discontinued for serious or persistent failures to comply. However, IDEA requirements primarily focus on procedures, not results for children with disabilities (though many of these procedures are intended to promote improved results).	Program biennial reports, annual data reported by States, and program GPRA reports.	11%	0.0
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	Federal funds provide only a small percentage of the total cost of special education. There is broad authority for how federal funds can be used; when Federal funds are found to be improperly spent, it is usually due to an accounting error. Federal obligations are consistently made in a timely manner.		11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	No	This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.		11%	0.0
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	The Department of Education's FY 2004 Budget materials satisfy the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute 0.7 percent of the program's full costs. However, ED has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess the impact of the Federal investment.		11%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	The Department conducts periodic monitoring of State activities under this program, and States are required to conduct annual audits of their education programs. No internal control weaknesses have been reported by auditors.	Grantee applications and reports.	11%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	No	The Department of Education has not shown how it has addressed management deficiencies in this program.		11%	0.0
8 (B 1.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	The Department has fairly extensive knowledge of State/Local Educational Agency activities under this program through its Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process, which is used to monitor State compliance with the IDEA.	Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process Reports.	11%	0.1
9 (B 2.)	*Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	Yes	The Department of Education makes program data available to the public through many channels, including an annual report to Congress and the Department's website. Also, State biennial reports and monitoring findings are posted on ED's website. However, none of these data show anything about the educational outcomes of preschool children.	IDEA section 618. Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; OSEP Biennial Performance Report (OMB Number: 1820-0627). OSEP Monitoring Process Reports.	11%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**56%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	Long-term goals have not been established for this program. In addition, there are no data related to outcome measures available for this program.	The Department of Education's Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance plans and reports.	33%	0.0
	Long-Term Goal I:		The percentage of preschool children receiving special education and related services who have readiness skills when they reach kindergarten (proposed measure).			
	Target:		None.			
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:		TBD			
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	No	Data are not available or indicate that the goals have not been met.	The Department of Education's Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance plans and reports.	33%	0.0
	Key Goal I:		The percentage of preschool children receiving special education and related services who have readiness skills when they reach kindergarten (proposed measure).			
	Performance Target:		None.			
	Actual Performance:		TBD			
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	N/A	The program does not lend itself to the development of efficiency measures that link the Federal investment to program outcomes.		0%	
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	N/A	There are no comparable programs serving this population.		0%	
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	No	A longitudinal study has been initiated, which should provide information on outcomes for children served under this program. However, the results of this study are several years away, and it will not provide data on program effectiveness or ongoing data on results.	Program Evaluation Plans.	33%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**0%**

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	75%	78%	0%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Purpose is "to provide grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), State institutions of higher education (SAHEs), and eligible partnerships to increase student academic achievement [by] improving teacher and principal quality and increasing the number of 'highly qualified' teachers in the classroom and highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools; and hold LEAs and schools accountable for improvements in student academic achievement." In addition, the program requires LEAs to demonstrate: 1) annual progress in ensuring that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects within the State are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year; and 2) annual increases in the percentage of teachers who receive high-quality professional development. The program also targets high-poverty LEAs; research shows that high-poverty LEAs have fewer highly qualified teachers than do low-poverty LEAs.

Evidence: Section 2101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). Section 9101 of NCLB defines "highly qualified teacher" as a teacher who is fully certified by the State where he/she teaches, has at least a bachelor's degree, and, for new secondary school teachers, demonstrates competency in the subject matter he/she teaches in by passing a State proficiency test and completing an academic major in said field.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: A number of well-designed studies indicate that teacher quality has a powerful effect on student academic achievement. Students who are in the classrooms of effective teachers can achieve at a full grade level ahead of students assigned to weak teachers.

Evidence: For example, Sanders, W.L. & Rivers, J.C. (1996). Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Student Academic Achievement (Knoxville: University of Tennessee).

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: This program is the only teacher quality program that requires all teachers of the core academic subjects to be highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. It is compatible with several smaller Department programs that provide funds to States and communities solely for teacher quality purposes or that provide some funds for teacher quality purposes. States and local communities also support teacher quality efforts. The program differs from other Federal teacher quality programs and State and local programs in several ways: (1) It provides leverage for reform through the "highly qualified" requirement, which in the past has not been a component of State and local professional development programs; (2) Unlike ED's smaller, competitive teacher quality programs, it provides funds to all LEAs; and, (3) By law, program activities must be based on research-based strategies. Finally, this program differs from the professional development component of the Title I program because it serves teachers in all schools, not just those that have persistent problems and are in need of corrective action.

Evidence: The Department administers several small, competitive programs that focus on teacher quality. Formula grant programs with a significant focus on teacher quality include Title I, Educational Technology State Grants, and Language Acquisition Grants for Professional Development.

Program: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	75%	78%	0%	

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: There is no evidence indicating that the structure of the program is a flawed design for the program. The program has a supplement/not supplant provision, which prevents States and localities from using program funds in lieu of their own funds for teacher quality activities.

Evidence: The supplement/not supplant provision is Section 2113(f) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: There is no evidence indicating that the program is not effectively targeted. Funds are awarded to States and school districts by formulas that are partly based on each State and LEA's relative poverty share. LEAs are also required to conduct a needs assessment to ensure proper targeting of program funds.

Evidence: The LEAs' needs assessments require LEAs to consider where funds are most needed to ensure that teachers are highly qualified and students can meet challenging academic standards.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department has developed two long-term performance measures: 1) the percentage of highly qualified teachers in Title I schools and 2) overall, the percentage of highly qualified teachers in all schools, with the goal that all teachers will be highly qualified by the end of 2006. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Baseline data will become available in the upcoming year for these indicators.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Both performance measures have a target that all teachers will be highly qualified by the end of 2006. It will be quite challenging for States and LEAs to get all teachers highly qualified, given what we know about the number of teachers who are not currently highly qualified.

Evidence: See Measures tab for specific targets.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department has developed two annual performance measures: 1) the percentage of highly qualified teachers in Title I schools and 2) overall, the percentage of highly qualified teachers in all schools. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Baseline data will become available in the upcoming year for these indicators.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department will establish the baselines for these measures in the next few months.

Evidence:

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Through consolidated plans and needs assessments, ED confirms the State and local commitment to working towards the program's goals.

Evidence: The Department will determine how well partners are meeting the program's goals through implementation studies, meetings with State coordinators, and compliance audit reports that look at local needs assessments.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department is conducting a Teacher Quality Implementation Study, which will provide information about how States, school districts, schools, teachers, and paraprofessionals are responding to the program and its requirements. This study will be part of the National Study of Title I schools.

Evidence: Reports are due in the spring of 2005, 2006, and 2007.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: ED has not satisfied the first part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program, at this time, does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess (whether directly or indirectly) the impact of the Federal investment. However, ED has satisfied the second part of this question in that ED's budget submissions show the full cost of the program (including S&E). ED's 05 integrated budget and performance plan includes the program's annual and long-term goals.

Evidence:

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program has ambitious long-term and annual performance measures, and the results will help the Department with strategic planning for the program. In addition, this program has an internal strategic plan that will provide a framework for monitoring grantee performance and program management.

Evidence: The internal strategic plan includes a workplan, a plan to identify high-risk local grantees, strategies for monitoring and data collection/oversight, and milestones.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	75%	78%	0%	

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department is currently overseeing a survey conducted by an outside, independent evaluator of a sample of school districts that will provide performance data. In addition, the States' annual consolidated reports and Title I State Report Cards will also provide data that the Department will use to improve the management of the program; these may be validated through an outside, independent evaluator.

Evidence: The program began in FY 2002 and will not have any annual data to collect before the end of this calendar year.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to EDPAS which links employee performance to relevant Strategic Plan goals and action steps, and is designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. To receive a "Yes," the ED needs to: (1) identify for OMB the federal managers for this program; and (2) demonstrate the relationship between these managers' performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures; and (3) demonstrate the relationship between program partner's performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures.

Evidence:

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Funds are obligated within the timeframes set out by Department schedules and used for the purposes intended. The Department reserves some funds for program evaluation, which are obligated based on an evaluation plan.

Evidence: Early evidence suggests that States are drawing funds down at an acceptable rate.

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing "One-ED" -- an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements. A "yes" answer is likely once the One-ED process is applied to this program's relevant business functions.

Evidence:

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The program collaborates and coordinates with the Title I program and with other teacher quality programs in the Department.

Evidence: For example, the Teacher Quality Policy Group meets regularly to discuss teacher quality issues in programs authorized by the No Child Left Behind Act, and the Department's guidance for the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program provides information about the other programs. In addition, the Department is in the process of developing common performance measures for teacher quality programs.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Recent agency-wide audits have not identified deficiencies in the financial management of this program.

Evidence:

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: While material internal management deficiencies have not been identified for this program, the program has put in place a system to identify potential problems.

Evidence: Program staff monitor excessive drawdowns of funds to prevent high-risk situations.

3.BF1 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department maintains information on grantee activities through consolidated annual reports, site visits and compliance monitoring, and technical assistance activities. In particular, ED has deployed a Teacher Assistance Corps to assist implemenation of this program at the State and local levels.

Evidence: Under the Teacher Assistance Corps Initiative, teams comprised of ED staff and national experts meet with State educational, and in some cases, local educational agencies to: (1) develop partnerships between the States and ED (2) ensure that States have a clear understanding of the NCLB teacher quality requirements; (3) enable ED to understand what States are doing to meet the teacher quality requirements; and (4) gather examples of innovative practices States are using to meet the teacher quality requirements.

3.BF2 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The performance reports are annual and will be widely disseminated to the public. As ED receives the first year data from States it has begun to aggressively disseminate the information to stakeholders.

Evidence: The Department recently awarded a three-year contract to Westat to both support the Teacher Assistance Corps and to establish a database and evaluation system to track the use of Title II, Part A funds to support the highly qualified teacher challenge. Westat will be working with all State Title II coordinators to establish a framework for data collection that will provide timely data, through a combination of periodic surveys of nationally representative samples of districts and local and State reporting, covering local district uses of Title II, State activities, and State Agency for Higher Education partnership grants.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	75%	78%	0%	

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Because this program began in FY 2002, the Department has not yet been able to establish baseline data for performance goals. Therefore, it is not currently possible to assess progress toward meeting the long-term performance goals.

Evidence:

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Because this program began in FY 2002, the Department has not yet been able to establish baseline data for performance goals. Therefore, it is not currently possible to assess progress toward meeting the annual performance goals.

Evidence:

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence:

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: No data are available for comparable programs. Common measures are being explored.

Evidence:

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 40%

Explanation: The program evaluation is just beginning, so no data are yet available to determine if the program is effective and achieving results.

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Measure: Percentage of highly qualified teachers in Title I schools (baseline data needed to set initial targets)

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2004		
2006	100	
2007	100	

Measure: Percentage of highly qualified teachers in all schools (baseline data needed to set initial targets)

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2004		
2006	100	
2007	100	

Measure: Percentage of highly qualified teachers in all schools (baseline data needed to set initial target)

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2006	100	
2010	100	
2012	100	

Program ID: 10001029

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Measure: Percentage of highly qualified teachers in Title I schools (baseline data needed to set initial target)

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2006	100	
2010	100	
2012	100	

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program:	Independent Living (IL) Programs
Agency:	Department of Education
Bureau:	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s):	Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	13%	40%	8%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Independent Living (IL) programs promote: (1) leadership, empowerment, independence, and productivity of individuals with disabilities; and, (2) the integration and full inclusion of individuals with disabilities into mainstream American society.

Evidence: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, Title VII, Chapter 1, Parts B and C

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Unlike vocational rehabilitation and other disability programs within ED, IL programs provide services (information and referral, independent living skills training, peer counseling, and systems and individual advocacy) to persons whose disabilities might make competitive employment difficult to obtain, but for whom independent living goals are feasible. The IL programs are uniquely designed among Federal disability programs to help states and localities assist individuals find the support they need to live independently in a community-integrated setting, as mandated by the Supreme Court decision Olmstead v. LC In addition, demographic trends in aging and disability mean the need for these services is likely to increase.

Evidence: By 2020, the number of people with disabilities is projected to increase to 53.7 million or 1 in every 6 Americans (SOURCE: Census Bureau Projection). The likelihood of having a disability increases with age. Moreover, within the disabled population, the number of Americans 65 and over aging with disabilities was estimated to be 34.9 million on November 1, 2000, which is 12 percent higher than it was in the 1990 Census. According to the most recent disability supplement to the National Health Interview Survey conducted by the Census Bureau, 4.9 million people receive help in at least one basic activity of daily living (ADL) and an additional 8.3 million people receive help with an instrumental activity of daily living (IADL) but not an ADL. (SOURCE: NHIS-D, 1994-95). The NHIS-D data also show that 45 percent of people with disabilities live alone, and 26 percent of those who live with others, need more help than they are getting.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: In most States, centers for independent living (CILs) are supported through a combination of Federal, state, and local funding. Redundancy and duplication are limited through a two-tiered funding structure. Program funds are first allocated among States according to their relative share of population and then distributed through intra-state competitive grants. But States must justify the need for new CILs or increased funding to existing CILs through a Statewide Plan for Independent Living (SPIL) which describes efforts to coordinate Federal and State funding for CILs and services. However, the CIL program overlaps with RSA's Independent Living State Grants program. Since funding for CILs and the IL State Grants program requires that States demonstrate their ability to serve the entire state through the SPIL, the programs could be consolidated into a formula grant to the States, with set-asides for State administrative expenses and Statewide Independent Living Council administrative expenses.

Evidence: SPIL requirements are stated in Title VII, Chapter 1, Section 704(k) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Independent Living (IL) Programs
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	13%	40%	8%	

1.4 **Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: There are no major flaws in the design of this program but RSA could improve program efficiency while maintaining its goal of fostering independence for persons with disabilities. One alternative would be to administer the CIL program as a formula grant and allow RSA staff to devote more time to Federal activitiesmonitoring, promoting best practices, addressing policy and legal issues, and fostering improved financial management practices among grantees.

Evidence:

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: There is no evidence that services are being provided to beneficiaries who do not need or merit them. States must demonstrate in their SPILs that new funding is being used to address unserved or underserved communities. Statutory changes would be required to authorize targeting of services within a CIL based on financial need, membership in an underserved disability group, or other characteristics, such as age or gender.

Evidence: State Plans for Independent Living, Section 704 reports submitted by CILs.

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The program has not established measures that focus on outcomes in the long-term. States currently collect data for GPRA on outputs - such as the number of individuals who leave nursing homes and other institutions for community-based housing and the number of individuals at risk of entering nursing homes who are receiving IL services and can remain at home. However, variation in data reported by CILs casts doubt on their validity. As part of its revision of the Section 704 reporting requirements, RSA is currently re-examining the four core areas of service and translating them into long-term, performance-oriented goals and measures. The Department is also working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Forthcoming: Corrective action plan or other document explaining the proposed changes to the Section 704 reporting requirements and providing justification for these changes.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Pending development of new long-term outcome measures.

Evidence:

Program: Independent Living (IL) Programs
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	13%	40%	8%	

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: RSA currently collects annual data for GPRA on numbers of individuals served under the CIL program and the IL State Grants program and the percentage of consumers served under these programs who achieve their goals. RSA is revising its Section 704 reporting requirements and developing annual measures that will show progress toward long-term outcomes. The Department is also working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Forthcoming: Corrective action plan or other document explaining the proposed changes to the Section 704 reporting requirements and providing justification for these changes.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Pending development of new annual performance measures.

Evidence:

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: OSERS takes specific steps to ensure that all partners commit to and work toward the existing annual goals. Program solicitations (priority packages) explicitly include all program goals, and grant applications and progress reports assess performance and continuing relevance against these goals. Although existing program measures do not meaningfully measure the program's responsiveness to its stated goals, all partners do commit to and work toward these goals. Program staff are also currently working to develop both annual and long-term goals that are more appropriate for this program. Once the revised annual and long-term goals are implemented, OSERS can continue to use its current process to ensure that all program partners actually commit to and work toward the new measures.

Evidence: Forthcoming: Corrective action plan or other document explaining the proposed changes to the Section 704 reporting requirements and providing justification for these changes.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: RSA has conducted regular evaluations of the Independent Living programs and used the findings and recommendations to improve program management. The final report for the most recent evaluation is currently under ED review. Unlike other principal offices within the Department however, OSERS administers its own program evaluations, potentially limiting the independence and objectivity of the findings.

Evidence: Previous evaluations: Berkeley Planning Associates, 1986; Research Triangle Institute, 1996; Research Triangle Institute, 1998; CESSI, Inc., 2002.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The budget request has typically focused on program outputs, such as the number of new centers that could be supported, rather than program outcomes, such as reducing unmet need or increasing the number of individuals meeting independent living goals or the number of individuals leaving nursing homes.

Evidence: Congressional budget justifications.

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The IL program is in the process of revising the Section 704 reporting requirements. RSA is re-examining the four core areas of service and will translate the priorities associated with them into long-term, performance-oriented goals and measures. The criteria being developed will enable the IL program to collect on a yearly basis specific information tied to outcome measures.

Evidence: Forthcoming: Corrective action plan or other document explaining the proposed changes to the Section 704 reporting requirements and providing justification for these changes.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Each CIL grantee is required to have an annual independent audit. RSA uses these audit findings, site visit reports, and annual performance data submitted by grantees for section 704 reporting requirements to identify and correct program weaknesses. Grantees currently collect data based upon the minimal requirements set forth in section 725 of the authorizing legislation. RSA's ability to draw meaningful conclusions about center outcomes based on these data has been limited. RSA is currently revising the section 704 reporting requirements and will propose indicators to collect higher quality annual outcome data to inform management decisions.

Evidence: Forthcoming: Corrective action plan or other document explaining the proposed changes to the Section 704 reporting requirements and providing justification for these changes.

3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: EDPAS which links employee performance to relevant Strategic Plan goals and action steps, and is designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. However, ED cannot demonstrate specific ways by which RSA managers are held accountable for linking their performance standards to the program's long term and annual measures. Program partners are subject to project reviews and grant monitoring but these oversight activities are not designed to link partners to specific performance goals.

Evidence: •

3.3 Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: IL programs successfully obligate appropriated funds by the end of each fiscal year. Funds are spent in accordance with the program authority and Department regulations. For the past two years, however, applicants have had fewer than 45 days to submit applications for grants under this program. RSA should take steps to ensure that grant competitions are announced on a regular schedule that provides sufficient time for the preparation and review of applications.

Evidence: Audit reports, ED grant award database, and solicitations for grant competitions in the Federal Register.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution? Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing "One-ED" -- an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.

Evidence:

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: At the federal level, the independent living programs collaborate with: each other, other RSA and Federal programs, such as Social Security. To receive funding under the State grants program, each Designated State Unit must have a State Plan for Independent Living (SPIL) that demonstrates that it has appropriate planning, financial support and coordination, and other assistance to appropriately address, on a statewide and comprehensive basis, needs in the State for the provision of independent living services. The plan must document the working relationship between programs providing independent living services and independent living centers, the vocational rehabilitation program, and other programs providing services for individuals with disabilities. At the local level, CILs must demonstrate in their section 704 reports that they collaborate with other disability, health, and employment service providers to coordinate services that will enable individuals with significant disabilities to live independently in their own communities.

Evidence: State Plans for Independent Living, Section 704 reports submitted by CILs.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: No internal control weaknesses have been identified for the Independent Living programs.

Evidence: Inspector General Department audits

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: RSA has not demonstrated that it has a system in place to identify and address management deficiencies within these programs.

Evidence:

Program: Independent Living (IL) Programs
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	13%	40%	8%	

3.CO1 **Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: RSA administers all available program funds through a clear competitive process that uses external panels of peer reviewers. However, grantees that have successfully competed for an award are not required to compete again as long as they meet the performance standards for the program. As a result, the majority of appropriated funds are distributed each year non-competitively.

Evidence: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, Title VII, Chapter 1, Part C, Section 722.

3.CO2 **Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Independent annual audits are required for each CIL to ensure that grantees are meeting the terms of their awards and spending funds appropriately. RSA is also required by statute to perform site visits of 15 percent of grantees and 1/3 of the designated state units each year. However, the regional and headquarters staff have had difficulty meeting the site visit requirement.

Evidence: Audit and site visit reports.

3.CO3 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: RSA collects annual performance data through the Section 704 reporting requirements. For reasons discussed above, the current reporting requirements do not generate data with which RSA can draw meaningful conclusions about grantee performance. In addition, the data collected through the Section 704 reporting requirements have not been made available to the public. Through a cooperative agreement with RSA, the Independent Living Resource Utilization (ILRU) Center has agreed to compile program performance data through grantee responses to the section 704 reporting requirements and publish this performance data on its website. The most recent data available online are from 1998 and the most recent data for SILCs are from 1997.

Evidence: ILRU website: http://www.ilru.org/704/index.html

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: These programs have not established measures that focus on outcomes in the long-term.

Evidence: N/A

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: These programs are currently working to develop and implement more appropriate annual performance goals.

Evidence: N/A

Program: Independent Living (IL) Programs
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	13%	40%	8%	

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: N/A

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: Although programs with similar goals and purposes may exist, no current studies, analyses, or evaluations have attempted to compare the Independent Living program to these programs.

Evidence: N/A

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: Previous evaluations of these programs did not attempt to measure its effect on outcomes. However, the evaluations do indicate that the programs were meeting the legislative requirements.

Evidence: Previous evaluations: Berkeley Planning Associates, 1986; Research Triangle Institute, 1996; Research Triangle Institute, 1998; CESSI, Inc., 2002.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Independent Living (IL) Programs

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

---

Measure: Number of individuals served

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1998	Not listed	155,230
1999	Not listed	116,456
2000	Not listed	123,395
2001		174,043
2002		181,980

Measure: Percentage of goals achieved by consumers (goals may include such things as living skills, transition from school to work, or remaining in home rather than entering institutional environments)

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	67	62.5
2000	63	63
2001	63	64
2002	75	63
2003	80	

Measure: Number of individuals who leave long-term care facilities and other institutions for community-based housing due to services provided by a CIL,

Additional Information: Increase the number of clients who are able to leave nursing homes

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2001	900	1,777

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Independent Living (IL) Programs

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

---

Measure: Number of individuals who leave long-term care facilities and other institutions for community-based housing due to services provided by a CIL,

Additional Information: Increase the number of clients who are able to leave nursing homes

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2002	900	2,012
2003	2,213	
2004	2,434	
2005	2,677	

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: National Assessment
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	70%	100%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: Yes Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The statute clearly states the purpose of National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): "to provide, in a timely manner, a fair and accurate measurement of student achievement and reporting trends in such achievement in reading, mathematics, and other subject matter ."

Evidence: Sec. 303, National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act

1.2 Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need? Answer: Yes Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: NAEP provides the only nationally representative and continuing assessment of what American students know and can do.

Evidence: Sec. 303, National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act

1.3 Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need? Answer: Yes Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: See above.

Evidence: See above.

1.4 Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)? Answer: Yes Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is organized according to policy area and core activity. The current administrative structure is successful in supporting NCES products and activities, however the successful administration of the assessment program does not mean that continuous program improvements are not needed. The National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) serves as the NAEP governing body and formulates policy guidelines for NAEP.

Evidence: Key NAEP reports provide useful information and are produced on schedule.

1.RD1 Does the program effectively articulate potential public benefits? Answer: Yes Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Office measures public benefit through satisfaction surveys. However, NCES should consider conducting surveys to determine how data are used, as well as evaluations to determine the effectiveness of NAEP data in informing educational decisions.

Evidence: Results of biennial customer surveys.

1.RD2 If an industry-related problem, can the program explain how the market fails to motivate private investment? Answer: Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: N/A

Evidence:

Program: National Assessment
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	70%	100%	

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?

Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department of Education's GPRA Plan contains an NCES long-term goal to "Provide timely, useful, and comprehensive data that are relevant to policy and educational improvement." Performance targets are established through 2007.

Evidence: NCES GPRA goals.

2.2 Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?

Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NCES uses a survey to measure customer satisfaction goals related to product comprehensiveness, timeliness, and utility. Although this survey is only administered every two years, the Department of Education has demonstrated that biennial administration provides high quality data for decision-making while reducing respondent burden and survey costs. A shortcoming of the performance measure, however, is that customer satisfaction data are reported for the Statistics and Assessment programs combined. However, the Assessment program also will monitor the timeliness of NAEP reports with a separate measure of the time from the end of data collection to the initial public release of results of the reading and mathematics assessments.

Evidence: NCES Customer Satisfaction Survey. NAEP reports.

2.3 Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?

Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NCES conducts meetings with key constituents. Contractors, grantees, and the NCES Advisory Council were involved in the development and/or review of the NCES Information Quality Guidelines and Statistical Standards. In addition, each contractor and subcontractor is contractually committed to adhering to the NCES Information Quality Guidelines and Statistical Standards.

Evidence: Elementary and Secondary and Postsecondary data forums, technical review panels, contractor meetings, and the NCES Advisory Council for Education Statistics. NCES held separate review meetings with a cross-section of NCES contractors and Grantees to receive input to the development of the Information Quality Guidelines and Statistical Standards.

2.4 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?

Answer: N/A Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

Program: National Assessment
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	70%	100%	

2.5 **Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: External evaluations of Assessment activities include the work of the Board on Testing and Assessment (BOTA), an arm of the National Academies National Research Council (NRC). In addition, in 2003 the Department will make an award for an independent review of NAEP.

Evidence: See above (BOTA) and http://www7.nationalacademies.org/bota/Evaluation_of_NAEP.html & http://www7.nationalacademies.org/bota/NAEP_Reporting_Practices.html. Reports include: Grading the Nation's Report Card: Evaluating NAEP and Transforming the Assessment of Educational Progress, 1999 and NAEP Reporting Practices: Investigating District-Level and Market-Basket Reporting, 2001.

2.6 **Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Budget decisions are directly tied to the scope and methodological rigor of assessment activities.

Evidence: Budget calculations associated with NAEP authorization.

2.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: NAGB's long-range schedule of assessments provides appropriate opportunities to review and address strategic planning issues.

Evidence: NAGB documents and reports on the NAGB web site.

2.RD1 **Is evaluation of the program's continuing relevance to mission, fields of science, and other "customer" needs conducted on a regular basis?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: See questions 2 and 5. In addition, NAEP is subject to an ongoing validity study by a panel of academic researchers.

Evidence: Customer survey; NAGB

2.RD2 **Has the program identified clear priorities?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: In large part based on statutory guidance, NAGB has identified clear goals for the program.

Evidence: Statute and NAGB data collection and reporting schedules.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NCES uses customer satisfaction information to inform bureau products and services. NCES claims that biennial surveys are sufficient to measure satisfaction of customers and structure the creation and delivery of products.

Evidence: Customer satisfaction surveys.

Program: National Assessment
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	70%	100%	

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to the new EDPAS system which links employee performance to success in meeting the goals of the Department's Strategic Plan. In general, managers are provided individual performance agreements where there are given responsibility for achieving relevant action steps outlined in the Strategic Plan. These action steps and other items included in managers performance agreements are designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. Contractor and grantee performance is monitored on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. Contractors and grantees that do not meet Federal requirements are required to submit improvement plans and can have awards reduced or discontinued for serious or persistent failures to comply.

Evidence:

3.3 **Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The Assessment program successfully obligates funds by the end of each fiscal year, but should work to reduce penalty interest charges.

Evidence:

3.4 **Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: No Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Although NCES has been working on technological improvements that will improve data accuracy and timeliness, the Office does not have formal incentives and procedures for realizing efficiencies and cost effectiveness. Moreover, NCES should work to synthesize project web architecture in order to promote interoperability and lower costs.

Evidence:

3.5 **Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?** Answer: No Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Education's 2004 Budget satisfies the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute 8.6 percent of the program's full costs. However, Education has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels.

Evidence:

Program: National Assessment
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	70%	100%	

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NCES follows Federal Procurement Regulations that prescribe procedures for monitoring poor performance, such as the issuance of cure notices and stop work notices, and for executing termination as required. In addition the conversion to performance-based contracts will further facilitate this monitoring activity.

Evidence:

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The program is subject to the advice and consent of NAGB. NAGB oversight has led to several changes in the administration of the Assessment program.

Evidence:

3.RD1 **Does the program allocate funds through a competitive, merit-based process, or, if not, does it justify funding methods and document how quality is maintained?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NAEP is conducted through competitive awards to external firms.

Evidence:

3.RD2 **Does competition encourage the participation of new/first-time performers through a fair and open application process?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NAGB holds four public meetings a year. The meetings include discussion of procurement policy and future plans for the Assessment program. NCES holds bidders conferences, places SOWs on the web, and conducts outreach at meetings and conferences.

Evidence:

3.RD3 **Does the program adequately define appropriate termination points and other decision points?** Answer: No Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NCES is beginning to use performance-based contracts that have adequate opportunity for termination and amendment. NAGB provides oversight of NAEP activities and selects subject areas to be assessed (consistent with the statute). However, the Assessment program did not demonstrate that there is in place an effective plan for systematically determining when resources should be allocated to higher priority activities or when specific data elements or reports should be terminated or overhauled. In addition, NCES needs to design a process wherein decisionmakers, including the OMB and senior Departmental management, are apprised of significant contractual activity.

Evidence:

Program: National Assessment
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	100%	70%	100%	

3.RD4 If the program includes technology development or construction or operation of a facility, does the program clearly define deliverables and required capability/performance characteristics and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals?

Answer: N/A   Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: N/A

Evidence: N/A

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?

Answer: Yes   Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The Department of Education's GPRA Plan contains an NCES long-term goal to "Provide timely, useful, and comprehensive data that are relevant to policy and educational improvement." Measurement of this indicator shows that NCES is showing progress in achieving long-term goals. Data for this indicator are available for both the Statistics program and NAEP combined, and therefore do not provide specific information for the NAEP program. However, NCES has added a second performance goal for NAEP: reducing the time between the end of data collection to the initial public reselase of the reading and mathematics assessment results. Data are not yet available for this indicator.

Evidence: GPRA Performance Plan.

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?

Answer: Yes   Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: NCES continues to measure high levels of customer satisfaction.

Evidence:

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: Yes   Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: NCES staff work to improve data collection and reporting strategies, such as through the enhanced use of technology, in order to conduct work in a more cost-effective manner.

Evidence: NCES continues to modify product delivery so that publications and data are available electronically and on the web. Technological improvements have increased the timeliness of NCES products and services.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: N/A   Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

4.5 **Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?**

Answer: Yes

Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: NCES conducts reviews of individual projects to ensure high quality, and customer survey data show that customers are, overall, satisfied with the comprehensiveness, timeliness, and utlity of publications, data files, and services. In addition, external evaluations of the Assessment program by BOTA indicate that Assessment activities produce quality products.

Evidence: Customer satisfaction surveys. NAEP validity studies by BOTA.

4.RD1 **If the program includes construction of a facility, were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?**

Answer: N/A

Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Assessment

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau:

Measure: Customer Satisfaction: Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with timeliness of NCES publications.

Additional Information: Percentage of customer respondents derived from customer satisfaction survey.

Year	Target	Actual
2001	90	74
2003	90	
2005	90	
2007	90	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Customer Satisfaction: Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with the timeliness of NCES data files.

Additional Information: Percentage of customer respondents derived from customer satisfaction survey.

Year	Target	Actual
2001	90	66
2003	90	
2005	90	
2007	90	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Customer Satisfaction: The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data are comprehensive.

Additional Information: Target:(2001) Comprehensiveness, 90%; Actual Progress achieved toward goal: (2001) Comprehensiveness, 83%;

Year	Target	Actual
2001	90	

Measure Term: Long-term

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program:	National Center for Education Statistics	**Section Scores**				**Overall Rating**
Agency:	Department of Education	1	2	3	4	Effective
Bureau:		100%	89%	60%	100%	
Type(s):	Research and Development					

1.1 **Is the program purpose clear?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: NCES follows a Congressional mandate to collect, analyze, and report education information and statistics.

Evidence: Sec. 151, P.L. 107-279

1.2 **Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: NCES is the lead Federal agency for collecting, reporting, analyzing, and disseminating statistical data related to education in the United States and in other nations.

Evidence: Publications and products.

1.3 **Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: See above.

Evidence: See above.

1.4 **Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: NCES is organized according to policy area and core activity. The current administrative structure is successful in supporting NCES products and activities, however the successful administration of the Center does not mean that program improvements are not needed

Evidence: Successful release of core NCES products.

1.RD1 **Does the program effectively articulate potential public benefits?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Office attempts to measure benefit through customer satisfaction surveys. In addition, NCES is developing a monitoring system to measure external uses of NCES products. However, NCES should also consider conducting evaluations to determine the effectiveness of NCES data in informing educational decisions.

Evidence: Results of bi-ennial customer satisfaction surveys.

1.RD2 **If an industry-related problem, can the program explain how the market fails to motivate private investment?** Answer: N/A Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: N/A

Evidence: N/A

Program: National Center for Education Statistics
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	89%	60%	100%	

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?

Answer: Yes Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department of Education's GPRA Plan contains an NCES long-term goal to "Provide timely, useful, and comprehensive data that are relevant to policy and educational improvement." Performance targets are established through 2007.

Evidence: NCES GPRA goals.

2.2 Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?

Answer: Yes Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Measurement of customer satisfaction is consistent with continuous improvement of NCES products and services. Although this survey is only administered every two years, the Department of Education has demonstrated that biennial administration provides high quality data for decision-making while reducing respondent burden and survey costs. However, ED should consider supplementing this survey with an external evaluation of the entire Statistics portfolio to determine whether resources are optimally allocated across project areas and with an annual review of a subset of products from the Statistics program to ensure technical rigor. NCES also should consider developing additional performance measures to supplement the customer service data, and should examine whether it is possible to disaggregate data in the customer survey to provide information on aspects of the Statistics program alone. (The current survey provides information for Statistics and NAEP combined.)

Evidence: Customer satisfaction surveys.

2.3 Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?

Answer: Yes Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NCES conducts meetings with key constituents. Contractors, grantees, and the NCES Advisory Council were involved in the development and/or review of the NCES Information Quality Guidelines and Statistical Standards. In addition, each contractor and subcontractor is contractually committed to adhering to the NCES Information Quality Guidelines and Statistical Standards.

Evidence: Elementary and Secondary and Postsecondary data forums, technical review panels, contractor meetings, and the NCES Advisory Council for Education Statistics. NCES held separate review meetings with a cross-section of NCES contractors and Grantees to receive input to the development of the Information Quality Guidelines and Statistical Standards.

2.4 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?

Answer: Yes Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NCES collaborates with other agencies (e.g., HHS, USDA) on data collection activities and participates in the Federal Committee for Statistical Methodology and the Interagency Council for Statistical Policy. However, a more systematic approach to working with other ED offices and ensuring their information needs are met might be warranted.

Evidence: Joint funding of activities with other agencies (e.g., the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, TIMSS, CPS, Household Crime Victimization Study)

Program: National Center for Education Statistics
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	89%	60%	100%	

2.5 **Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?** Answer: No Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The last National Academy of Science review was completed in 1986, and there are no plans at present for another independent study of NCES. However, the revised statistical standards were reviewed by an external expert panel convened (at NCES request) by the National Institute of Statistical Sciences.

Evidence:

2.6 **Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: To the extent that the NCES budget is aligned with discreet statistical projects, the impact of funding decisions can be understood.

Evidence: Budget requests and project contracts.

2.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NCES has revised its statistical standards and has products peer reviewed prior to release. Customers have, in general, been satisfied with the quality of NCES products. However, NCES has not demonstrated that it has a plan for a systematic review of its entire portfolio to determine appropriate allocation of resources across program areas, overall program effectiveness, and strategies for improving the efficiency of the organization.

Evidence: Publication of the draft revised Statistical Standards in 2002 (http://nces.ed.gov/statprog/stat_standards.asp); adjudication procedures; customer surveys.

2.RD1 **Is evaluation of the program's continuing relevance to mission, fields of science, and other "customer" needs conducted on a regular basis?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NCES solicits opinions from customers via a biennial survey. In addition, NCES is developing a monitoring system to measure uses of NCES products by various user groups. However, NCES is in need of a systematic evaluation by an independent organization.

Evidence: Participation of advisory board. Customer satisfaction surveys.

2.RD2 **Has the program identified clear priorities?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: NCES conducts large, on-going surveys and has ad-hoc meetings with individual program office staff to discuss data needs, and, in addition, receives recommendations from advisory groups for its major data collections.

Evidence: Current portfolio of work.

Program: National Center for Education Statistics
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	89%	60%	100%	

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: Yes — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NCES uses customer satisfaction information to inform bureau products and services. NCES claims that biennial surveys are sufficient to measure satisfaction of customers and structure the creation and delivery of products. NCES should consider providing Statistics-specific customer service data and also should consider developing additional performance measures to supplement the customer service data. (See II.2.)

Evidence: Customer satisfaction surveys.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**

Answer: Yes — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to the new EDPAS system which links employee performance to success in meeting the goals of the Department's Strategic Plan. In general, managers are provided individual performance agreements where there are given responsibility for achieving relevant action steps outlined in the Strategic Plan. These action steps and other items included in managers performance agreements are designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. Contractor and grantee performance is monitored on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. Contractors and grantees that do not meet Federal requirements are required to submit improvement plans and can have awards reduced or discontinued for serious or persistent failures to comply.

Evidence:

3.3 **Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**

Answer: Yes — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NCES successfully obligates funds by the end of each fiscal year, but should work on the timeliness of interagency agreements and needs to reduce the number of penalty interest charges. Funds are spent for the intended purposes; this is assessed through contract monitoring.

Evidence: Contract files, Inspector General audit reports.

3.4 **Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?**

Answer: No — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Although NCES has been working on technological improvements that will improve data accuracy and timeliness, the Office does not have formal incentives and procedures for realizing efficiencies and cost effectiveness. Moreover, NCES should work to synthesize project web architecture in order to promote interoperability and lower costs.

Evidence:

Program: National Center for Education Statistics
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	89%	60%	100%	

3.5 **Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?** Answer: No Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Education's 2004 Budget satisfies the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute 29.6 percent of the program's full costs. However, Education has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels.

Evidence:

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: No Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: An Inspector General audit report released September 20, 2002 found that the Office of Education Research and Improvement (now the Institute of Education Sciences) "did not always ensure compliance with contract terms or follow established regulations, policies, and procedures." In response to the IG audit, ED Contracts Office staff arranged training, which all NCES contracting officer's representatives and program managers attended.

Evidence: Audit #ED-OIG/A19-B0009

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NCES identified deficiencies in the contract oversight process and is working to ensure that all contract management staff receive appropriate training. NCES requires all staff responsible for monitoring contracts to maintain up-to-date certification.

Evidence:

3.RD1 **Does the program allocate funds through a competitive, merit-based process, or, if not, does it justify funding methods and document how quality is maintained?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Most NCES activities are conducted through competitively awarded contracts.

Evidence: Contract files.

3.RD2 **Does competition encourage the participation of new/first-time performers through a fair and open application process?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NCES holds bidders conferences, places Statements of Work (SOWs) on the web, and conducts outreach at meetings and conferences.

Evidence: Contract files and outreach conferences.

3.RD3 **Does the program adequately define appropriate termination points and other decision points?** Answer: No Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NCES is beginning to use performance-based contracts that have adequate opportunity for termination and amendment. However, NCES did not demonstrate that it has in place a plan for systematically reviewing its portfolio to determine when resources should be allocated to higher priority activities or when specific data collections, data elements, or reports should be terminated or overhauled. In addition, NCES has not designed a process wherein decisionmakers, including the OMB and senior Departmental management, are aware of significant contractual activity. In response to these concerns, NCES has initiated an ongoing internal program review that will result in the evaluation of all major NCES data collections (see Section II, Question 1). This will provide the information base for NCES to set priorities and to make programmatic adjustment as necessary. This will also provide an information base to share with OMB and Senior Departmental Management.

Evidence:

3.RD4 **If the program includes technology development or construction or operation of a facility, does the program clearly define deliverables and required capability/performance characteristics and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals?** Answer: N/A Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: N/A

Evidence: N/A

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The Department of Education's GPRA Plan contains an NCES long-term goal to "Provide timely, useful, and comprehensive data that are relevant to policy and educational improvement." Measurement of this indicator shows that NCES is showing progress in achieving long-term goals, but needs to work on improving the timeliness of products. Performance targets are established through 2007.

Evidence: GPRA Performance Plan.

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: NCES continues to measure high levels of customer satisfaction but need to improve timeliness.

Evidence:

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: NCES staff work to improve data collection and reporting strategies, such as through the enhanced use of technology, in order to conduct work in a more cost-effective manner.

Evidence: NCES continues to modify product delivery so that publications and data are available electronically and on the web. Technological improvements have increased the timeliness of NCES products and services.

Program: National Center for Education Statistics
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Effective
100%	89%	60%	100%	

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: N/A Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

4.5 **Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: Yes Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: NCES conducts reviews of individual projects to ensure high quality, and customer survey data show that customers are, overall, satisfied with the comprehensiveness, timeliness, and utlity of publications, data files, and services. NCES has not, however, demonstrated that the Statistics program as a whole is effective, and ED should consider conducting an external review, by an independent organization, of the Statistics program to assess overall quality, allocation of resources, and the extent to which NCES data meet the nation's need for educational information.

Evidence: Customer satisfaction surveys.

4.RD1 **If the program includes construction of a facility, were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?** Answer: N/A Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: N/A

Evidence: N/A

PART Performance Measurements

Program: National Center for Education Statistics

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau:

Measure: Customer Satisfaction: Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with timeliness of NCES publications.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2001	90	74
2003	90	
2005	90	
2007	90	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Customer Satisfaction: Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with the timeliness of NCES data files.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2001	90	66
2003	90	
2005	90	
2007	90	

Measure Term: Long-term

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Nat'l Institute on Disability and Rehab. Research (NIDRR)
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	60%	90%	34%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: NIDRR's mission is clear and delineated in its authorizing statute: conduct research, demonstration projects and training, and related activities that improve the quality of life for individuals with disabilities. The ED strategic plan, the NIDRR long-range plan, and (to some extent) the New Freedom Initiative (NFI) guide NIDRR activities.There are areas where strategies can be improved. The Long-Range Plan, for example, is very broad and does not set priorities for the many areas covered. In addition, the legislation allows funds for a variety of activities, which could result in tension between funding for research and for other activities. (In fiscal year 2002, approximately 63% of the NIDRR funds supported R&D activities.)

Evidence: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II, NIDRR Long-Range Plan, the New Freedom Initiative, and NIDRR priority notices for grant competitions.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Three major developments--scientific progress that has led to longer lives for individuals with disabilities, a larger proportion of older individuals in the population, and the empowerment of persons with disabilities--have led to increased need for research and development in the disability area. By 2020, the Census Bureau predicts that 1 in every 6 Americans--nearly 54 million people--will have a disability. The proportion of older Americans with a disability is higher; in 1997, nearly 3 out of 4 Americans over age 80 had a disability.

Evidence: Demographic data on disability; research supported; results of interim and summative reviews of key research program grants.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: NIDRR is the principal Federal agency supporting applied research and development to improve the lives of individuals with disabilities. Unlike the National Institutes for Health (NIH), which are focused primarily on basic research and on biomedical research issues, NIDRR's mission encompasses technology and the many factors that affect community and societal participation and employment for individuals with disabilities. In addition, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 authorized the Interagency Committee on Disability Research (ICDR), a Federal interagency committee which is chaired by the NIDRR Director. The ICDR is mandated to promote coordination and cooperation among Federal departments and agencies conducting rehabilitation research programs.

Evidence: ICDR activities (see www.icdr.us); results of program reviews.

Program: Nat'l Institute on Disability and Rehab. Research (NIDRR)
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	60%	90%	34%	

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program does not have any major design flaws that prevent it from meeting its defined objectives and it effectively supports research in many disability areas. However, NIDRR could improve program effectiveness and efficiency in selected areas. For example, NIDRR's proposal and program review processes, while rigorous, require improved incorporation of performance measurement and outcomes-oriented criteria. In addition, NIDRR funding is split across many program and priority areas without a systematic analysis of whether this blanket approach is more effective than targeting funds on strategic priority areas. There has been no systematic study of whether alternative approaches, such as regulation or stricter enforcement of existing laws, could stimulate private sector investment in certain areas of research (e.g., public transportation accessibility; telecommunications). However, NIDRR's current administrative structure has been successful in ensuring completion of most NIDRR work, and the organization is strengthening review procedures to ensure that information is available on the quality of grantee activities and products.

Evidence: Institute of Medicine Report (1997) Enabling America: Assessing the Role of Rehabilitation Science and Engineering

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: NIDRR resources are targeted through:· Specific research priorities established in the Long-Range Plan; · Use of a broad range of program mechanisms with different objectives and target audiences to address specific research priorities; · A Departmental, Interagency, and OMB review process; · Publication of proposed priorities in the Federal Register and solicitation of public comment to establish the final priority and notice inviting applications; · Outreach to attract and inform applicants of program opportunities; · Peer review of all applications submitted for NIDRR competitions; · Outreach activities to build capacity to respond to NIDRR priorities among underrepresented areas of expertise and groups, including individuals with disabilities and members of culturally diverse and minority populations. · Post-Award monitoring and Program Reviews; · Knowledge dissemination and utilization efforts to promote findings.

Evidence: Long-Range Plan for 1999-2003; priority notices published in the Federal Register, Departmental files.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?

Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NIDRR has annual performance goals but it has not established specific long-term performance measures. The Department should articulate substantive long-term research objectives for the program that have measurable outcomes. NIDRR is updating its 1999 to 2003 Long-Range Plan.

Evidence: Department of Education Annual Program Performance Reports; Department of Education Planning & Performance Management Database.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Currently, NIDRR does not have efficiency goals or long-term outcome measures. However, NIDRR has established performance indicators for research quality and productivity and has quantifiable targets for the indicators. Information is collected from the major grantees (Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers, Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers, and Model Systems) and reviewed by panels of experts who assess research quality and utility. In addition, NIDRR has established performance indicators that focus more directly on improving the lives of people with disabilities. The indicators will measure whether R&D projects are addressing problems or issues of "high relevance" to consumers and other end-users, whether the end products of the research are reaching end users, and whether consumer-oriented products and information are deemed to be of high quality by the end-users. Baseline data for these indicators will be collected in 2003. Starting in 2003, new grantees are being required to identify specific performance targets and timelines for reaching those targets.

Evidence: Department of Education Annual Program Performance Reports; Department of Education Planning & Performance Management Database.

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NIDRR has not established long-term goals. However, NIDRR has established annual performance goals for research quality, productivity (i.e., number of peer-reviewed journal articles), and utility. NIDRR needs to develop schedules with annual milestones for competitions over the next several years, including timelines for determining allocation of funds to program areas, development of final priorities, and deciding termination points. The program proposals must define what would be a minimally effective and a successful program, and explain how program results will be used to make changes in program direction. The Department is also working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Department of Education Annual Program Performance Reports; Department of Education Planning & Performance Management Database.NIDRR developmental and internal performance indicators

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NIDRR has established annual targets for its performance indicators.

Evidence: Department of Education Annual Program Performance Reports (http://www.ed.gov/pubs/annualplan2004/program.html)

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NIDRR conducts program reviews for its major grantees and emphasizes GPRA indicators at grantee meetings and during monitoring discussions. Grantees report data needed to assess progress on the performance indicators, and expert panels review the material provided on grantee activities and products. NIDRR plans to incorporate performance measurement into the upcoming formative program reviews and into the web-based annual performance reporting system. NIDRR currently assesses only its largest grantees but is developing plans to review a larger percentage of its grantees.

Evidence: For Centers and Model Systems projects, guidelines for preparing briefing books and other documentation for the 2002 and 2003 program reviews. Evaluation data from the 2002 series of summative program reviews.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: In 1997, the National Academy of Science (NAS) Institute of Medicine (IOM) conducted a comprehensive independent evaluation of NIDRR in response to a Congressional mandate to evaluate all Federal rehabilitation research programs. NIDRR used the IOM findings to improve features of its strategic planning and program management systems. NIDRR should establish a regular evaluation cycle coordinated with reauthorizations and the Long-Range Plan cycle.NIDRR also conducts comprehensive formative and summative reviews of its major grantees using external expert panels and funds grantee sponsored State-of-the-Science conferences to assess contributions and needs corresponding to specific research priorities identified in the Long-Range Plan.

Evidence: Enabling America: Assessing the Role of Rehabilitation Science and Engineering, National Academy of Sciences/Institute of Medicine, 1997Reports from program reviews.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Budget requests provide information on activities supported with program funds and include a discussion of the performance indicators. However, NIDRR does not have an overall comprehensive plan that details what specific projects would be funded or not funded with budget changes and NIDRR has not systematically evaluated how its budget structure reflects program goals.

Evidence: Program review files; Congressional Budget Justifications.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NIDRR is currently working to correct strategic planning deficiencies that may affect its ability to target priorities more effectively and to measure and evaluate long-term performance goals. NIDRR also has undertaken work on a new Long-Range Plan.

Evidence:

2.RD1 **If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program to other efforts that have similar goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Individual grants within NIDRR's major programs (i.e., Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers, Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers, and Model Systems) are systematically peer reviewed to assess the quality, relevance, and utility of the work. Independent observer reports provide information on the status of activities and accomplishments of topical clusters of grantees and provide recommendations for future activities. Other grant programs in NIDRR's portfolio (e.g., field-initiated studies) receive less rigorous review, but NIDRR is developing strategies to have their products reviewed by expert panels in 2004.

Evidence: Program review files.

Program: Nat'l Institute on Disability and Rehab. Research (NIDRR)
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	60%	90%	34%	

2.RD2 **Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NIDRR establishes priorities for its major grant competitions that are within the NIDRR Long-Range Plan. The current Long-Range Plan, however, is very broad. NIDRR does not identify what areas would be funded with increases in funds, or which would be eliminated if funding were reduced.Given limited funding, NIDRR needs to examine its entire portfolio and determine whether it can more optimally target funds on a smaller number of research priorities.

Evidence: Current portfolio of work; priorities for grant competitions.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NIDRR conducts regular formative and summative reviews of major grants, collects grantee information via a web-based system, and holds State-of-the-Science conferences in key areas. However, it is unclear whether NIDRR examines its internal management practices to ensure smooth program operation and adequately-trained staff.

Evidence: Program review files; reports

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to the new EDPAS system which links employee performance to success in meeting the goals of the Department's Strategic Plan. In general, managers are provided individual performance agreements where there are given responsibility for achieving relevant action steps outlined in the Strategic Plan. These action steps and other items included in managers performance agreements are designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. Moreover, NIDRR monitors grantee performance on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. Grantees that do not meet Federal requirements are required to submit improvement plans and can have grants reduced or discontinued for serious or persistent failures to comply or meet performance targets.

Evidence: Internal records

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NIDRR successfully obligates funds by the end of each fiscal year, but most funds are obligated late in each fiscal year. NIDRR should institute changes to ensure that grant competitions are announced on a regular schedule and provide sufficient time for preparation and review of applications. Funds are spent for the intended purposes; this is assessed through grant and contract monitoring and intensive grant reviews for major grant programs. No improper uses of funds have been identified.

Evidence: Contract files; summaries of formative and summative grant reviews.

Program: Nat'l Institute on Disability and Rehab. Research (NIDRR)
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	60%	90%	34%	

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing "One-ED" -- an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.

Evidence:

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NIDRR collaborates with other agencies (e.g., HHS, VA) to plan research and data collection activities and is the lead agency for the Interagency Committee for Disability Research (ICDR). The program has not yet demonstrated, however, that the ICDR activities have produced meaningful changes in activities or resource allocation.

Evidence: http://www.icdr.us

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NIDRR has developed internal practices to ensure appropriate payments; e.g., staff are designated to track expenditures and NIDRR is working to improve oversight of grant activities. No internal control problems have been identified in audit reports.

Evidence:

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NIDRR has taken steps to ensure that it has in place a management system that effectively prevents problems. For example, NIDRR has separated peer review and grant oversight and is examining the composition of peer review panels. In addition, NIDRR managers conducted staff training on appropriate grant notification procedures. However, NIDRR needs to monitor activities to ensure that training was effective.

Evidence:

3.CO1 **Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Most NIDRR activities are conducted by grantees, although some work is conducted by contractors. Both types of awards are made through a competitive, merit-based process. Reviewers for grant competitions are not ED employees.

Evidence: Contract and grant files; Federal Register grant announcements.

Program: Nat'l Institute on Disability and Rehab. Research (NIDRR)
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	60%	90%	34%	

3.CO2 **Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NIDRR conducts thorough reviews of the Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers, Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers, and Model Systems grants using expert review panels and annual performance reviews. NIDRR also holds regular (at least annual) grantee meetings for most of its grantees during which NIDRR staff review program goals and requirements.

Evidence: Contract and grant files.

3.CO3 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: NIDRR has developed an online performance reporting system to obtain information on most of its grantees, and expert panels judge the quality and utility of data from the largest grantees. NIDRR is also developing procedures to review a larger portion of its portfolio and plans to audit the data in the web-based system to ensure its accuracy. NIDRR should consider making the results of the program reviews, as well as grantee final reports, easily available to the public.

Evidence: On-line reporting system; materials from the formative and summative reviews; annual report of activities and accomplishments.

3.RD1 **For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation:

Evidence:

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: NIDRR has not established long-term performance goals. However, results of summative grant reviews indicate that funds are being used for high quality research activities that will help improve the lives of individuals with disabilities. In addition, NIDRR is conducting analyses to determine the extent to which funded research is in accord with the current long-range plan and to systematically identify the accomplishments of funded research. Currently, most work has been the identification of "outputs" (e.g., peer-reviewed publications) and not "outcomes" (i.e., the ultimate effect of the work). However, in 2003, NIDRR will be conducting a pilot study to identify outcomes of funded projects. Nine grantees will nominate outcomes from their work for in-depth study. These nominations will be vetted by an expert panel, and a contractor will select a subset for a "verification" process that will involve focus groups, key information interviews, and citation analysis. The goal is to not only learn more about the outcomes of this subset of research projects but also to learn ways in which reporting can be improved to ensure that NIDRR obtains information on grant outcomes.

Evidence: Summative reviews, program reports, internal analyses.

Program: Nat'l Institute on Disability and Rehab. Research (NIDRR)
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Type(s): Research and Development

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	60%	90%	34%	

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?**
Answer: LARGE EXTENT   Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: NIDRR has conducted intensive reviews of its largest grantees, and results to date indicate that it is meeting its annual goals for the program.

Evidence: GPRA data; results of program reviews.

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?**
Answer: NO   Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence:

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?**
Answer: NA   Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: NIDRR is the only Federal program supporting applied research on disability issues but it can be compared to other research programs in government. However, no systematic evidence has been collected to compare NIDRR to other research programs.

Evidence:

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?**
Answer: LARGE EXTENT   Question Weight: 25%

Explanation: The last comprehensive external review of NIDRR was in 1997. ED should establish a regular schedule for review of NIDRR by an independent organization to assess overall program quality, allocation of resources, and the extent to which supported research priorities meet the nation's need. NIDRR does conduct reviews of individual projects to ensure high quality, and the results of the formative and summative grant reviews show that the program is, overall, meeting its objectives.

Evidence: Results of formative and summative reviews. 1997 IOM Report.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Nat'l Institute on Disability and Rehab. Research (NIDRR)

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

---

Measure: Percentage of grantee research and development activity rated 4 or greater in appropriateness of study designs, the rigor with which accepted standards of scientific and/or engineering methods are applied, and the degree to which it builds on and contributes to the level of knowledge in the field, based on a 5-point Likert-type scale.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2002	65	54
2003	70	67
2004	70	
2005	75	
2006	75	

Measure: The average number of publications per award based on NIDRR-funded research and development activities in refereed journals.

Additional Information: NIDRR will set a baseline for this indicator in 2003. The 2004 target will be the baseline plus 5%.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2002		4.6
2003	4.6	
2004	5	
2005	5	

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Nat'l Institute on Disability and Rehab. Research (NIDRR)

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

---

Measure: Percentage of grantees rated "good to excellent" in implementing a systematic, outcomes-oriented dissemination plan, with measurable performance goals and targets, that clearly identifies the type of products and services to be produced, the target audiences to be reached, and describes how dissemination products and strategies will be used to meet the needs of end-users, including individuals with disabilities and those from diverse backgrounds, and to promote the awareness and/or use of information and R&D findings from NIDRR-funeded projects.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:**
2003	55	55.5	
2004	60		
2005	60		
2006	70		
2007	70		

Program ID: 10001041

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Competitive Grant Programs

Name of Program: Occupational and Employment Information

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)						
	Questions	**Ans.**	**Explanation**	**Evidence/Data**	**Weighting**	**Weighted Score**
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The program, in general, is intended to provide assistance to States to promote improved career and education decision-making by individuals. This broad purpose does not lend itself to identifying focused, achievable, and measurable outcomes that would indicate program success.	Sec. 118 of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act.	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	This program addresses the general interest of helping individuals make better decisions about their education and careers.		20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	No	This program provides broad latitude in the approaches states may use to try to help individuals make better decisions about their careers and education. The actual impact of this program is not known and there is no evidence that increasing or reducing Federal funding would have significant impact.	Current annual performance indicators measure program outputs, such as number of career guidance and information resources disseminated to parents, students, teachers, school administrators, and other customers during the program year. No data is collected on student outcomes.	20%	0.0
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	No	This small categorical program supplements various state and local efforts to improve career and education decision-making. Activities under this program are redundant with allowable activities under the Vocational Education State Grant program.	For example, nothing in the law prevents a Voc Ed grantee from using funds to support career and educational information dissemination.	20%	0.0
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	There is no conclusive evidence that a different design would improve program performance. However, the absence of conclusive evidence does not mean that program improvements are not needed.		20%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**60%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	No	Long-term goals have not been established for this program.		14%	0.0
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	No	No long-term and related annual performance goals have been set for this program. Current annual performance indicators measure program outputs, such as number of career guidance and information resources disseminated to parents, students, teachers, school administrators, and other customers during the program year.		14%	0.0
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	No	While the program receives regular and timely annual performance information from grantees, the information cannot be tied to a strategic planning framework where a limited number of annual performance goals demonstrate progress toward achieving long-term goals.	Instructions for this question indicate that a "no" is required if the program received a "no" for both questions 1 and 2 of this section.	14%	0.0
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	State programs are coordinated at the local level with WIA, Voc. Rehab., welfare to work, and corrections programs. The program also coordinates with national professional membership organizations.		14%	0.1
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	No	No evaluation is planned for this program.		14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	It is not possible to assess the impact of incremental increases or decreases in program funding. The Administration has never requested funds for this program.		14%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	No	The Department has not taken the necessary steps to develop a strategic planning framework where a limited number of annual performance goals demonstrate progress toward achieving long-term goals.		14%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**14%**
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	No	While grantees provide regular and timely information for a series of existing performance measures, the information is not outcome-based, and is not linked to a strategic goals framework where a limited number of annual performance goals demonstrate progress on achieving long-term goals.		10%	0.0
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	This program has not instituted an appraisal system that holds Federal managers accountable for grantee performance. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is planning to implement an agency-wide system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. Grantee performance is monitored on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. Grantees that do not meet Federal requirements are required to submit improvement plans and can have grants reduced or discontinued for serious or persistent failures to comply.		10%	0.0
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	Funds are obligated within the timeframes set out by Department schedules and used for the purposes intended.		10%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	No	This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.		10%	0.0
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	Education's 2004 Budget satisfies the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute 18.9 percent of the program's full costs. However, Education has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess the impact of the Federal investment.		10%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	The program has a positive audit history, with no evidence of internal control weaknesses.		10%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	The program is currently investigating ways to make financial review of grantee expenditures more timely and to more closely monitor grantee disbursement rates.		10%	0.1
8 (Co 1.)	*Are grant applications independently reviewed based on clear criteria (rather than earmarked) and are awards made based on results of the peer review process?*	Yes	Initial grant applications were reviewed by independent teams against published criteria. Once a grant is awarded, applications for annual extensions are reviewed by Department staff.		10%	0.1
9 (Co 2.)	*Does the grant competition encourage the participation of new/first-time grantees through a fair and open application process?*	N/A	All eligible applicants for this program have applied and are recipients.		0%	

Questions		Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
10 (Co 3.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	Grantee activities are reviewed in several ways: (i) grantees file annual reports; (ii) on-site reviews; (iii) conference calls with state liaisons.		10%	0.1
11 (Co 4.)	*Does the program collect performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	No	Data are collected and compiled from annual reports, and reported to Congress. However, these data are not readily available to the public, in print or on the Internet, and do not reflect program impacts.		10%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**50%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	Long-term goals have not been established for this program.		33%	0.0

Long-Term Goal I:	
Target:	
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	
Long-Term Goal II:	
Target:	
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	
Long-Term Goal III:	
Target:	
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	

2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	No	No long-term and related annual performance goals have been established for this program. Current annual performance indicators measure program outputs, not impacts.		34%	0.0

Key Goal I:	
Performance Target:	
Actual Performance:	

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Key Goal II:					
	Performance Target:					
	Actual Performance:					
	Key Goal III:					
	Performance Target:					
	Actual Performance:					
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	N/A	The program does not lend itself to the development of efficiency measures that link the Federal investment to program outcomes.		0%	
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	N/A	There is insufficient information on impacts for this program to conduct an adequate analysis of how it compares to programs that have similar purpose or goals.		0%	
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	No	No evaluations have been conducted or are planned for this program.		33%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**0%**

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Block/Formula Grants

Name of Program: Safe and Drug Free Schools State Grants

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	Purpose is to support school-based programs that prevent youth violence and drug-use.	Statutory purpose: "to support programs that prevent violence in and around schools; that prevent the illegal use of alcohol, tobacco, and drugs..." Sec. 4002, Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific problem, interest or need?*	Yes	Numerous Federal surveys indicate that youth violence and drug-use remain significant social problems.	Federal surveys include the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, Monitoring the Future, and the Annual Report on School Safety.	20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	No	While the program serves almost all school districts in the country, the thin distribution of formula funds required by statute prevents many local administrators from designing and implementing meaningful interventions.	"Options for Restructuring the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act." RAND Drug Policy Research Center, 2001.	20%	0.0
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	The program approaches youth drug-use and violence prevention using a school-based model.		20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	No	While the program has design advantages (e.g. flexibility), the thin distribution of funds prevents many local administrators from designing and implementing meaningful interventions. In addition, the law is written to address multiple purposes, including drug prevention, alcohol prevention, and violence prevention.	"Options for Restructuring the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act." RAND Drug Policy Research Center, 2001.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**60%**

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	No	The Department of Education's Strategic Plan includes a long-term program goal to "ensure that our nation's schools are safe and drug free." However, given the small per-pupil funding level and the high degree of State and local flexibility in the use of funds under this program, it is difficult to isolate the effects of this program.		14%	0.0
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	No	SDFSC authorization calls for States and schools districts to articulate their own goals.	Federal goals are based on nationally-representative surveys that have no relationship to program administration and cannot inform specific policy interventions.	14%	0.0
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	Yes	States, school districts, and the Department of Education report on program performance. The program's Principles of Effectiveness require grantees to link their activities to locally determined objectives, and to measure and report their progress toward achieving those objectives.	School district reports, State Reports, and the Department of Education's GPRA submissions.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	The Department of Education's Safe and Drug Free Schools program office collaborates on National Activities and has initiated collaboration with Federal administrators of other formula violence and drug-use prevention programs.	Collaboration with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), the Center for Substance Abuse and Prevention (CSAP), and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP).	14%	0.1
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	Yes	SDFSC is currently undergoing an evaluation.		14%	0.1
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	The Budget request for SDFSC State Grants is not tied directly to specific interventions or capacities at the State and local levels. However, the budget request for SDFSC National Programs is tied, in part, to such strategies.	The list of authorized State and local program activities is very long. The Department of Education does not (and perhaps cannot) inventory local interventions.	14%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	Under the program's Principles of Effectivess, grantees must base their prevention programs on a needs assessment and evaluate their programs over time against locally selected performance measures.		14%	0.1
Total Section Score					100%	57%

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	No	Although Education aggregates State reports, the resulting information is not meaningful enough to inform program management.	Consolidated State Performance Report.	13%	0.0
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	This program has not instituted an appraisal system that holds Federal managers accountable for grantee performance. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is planning to implement an agency-wide system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. Grantee performance is monitored on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. Grantees that do not meet Federal requirements are required to submit improvement plans and can have grants reduced or discontinued for serious or persistent failures to comply.		13%	0.0
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	All money is obligated at the Federal level by July 1 and October 1 or each year. SEAs and LEAs have up to 27 months to obligate the funds.		13%	0.1
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	N/A	Not possible considering the small amounts received by school districts.			

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	The Department of Education's 04 Budget satisfies the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute .59 percent of the program's full costs. However, Education has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess the impact of the Federal investment.		13%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	Recent agency-wide audits have not identified deficiencies in the financial management of this program.		13%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	Education has provided guidance in response to administrative problems at the State and local levels.		13%	0.1
8 (B 1.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	The Department maintains information on grantee activities through consolidated annual reports, site visits and compliance monitoring, and technical assistance activities.		13%	0.1
9 (B 2.)	*Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	No	Summaries of State reporting for statutory purposes are processed into reports, but not made available to the public.	Consolidated State Performance Report.	13%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**38%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	This program does have GPRA goals and indicators that show progress toward lowering youth crime and drug abuse. However, because of the difficulty in establishing a causal link between program activities and behavioral outcomes, the program has based program indicators on national surveys that don't reveal much about the nature of the program.	GPRA Indicators.	33%	0.0

Long-Term Goal I:	
Target:	
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	
Long-Term Goal II:	
Target:	
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	
Long-Term Goal III:	
Target:	
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	No	This program does have GPRA goals and indicators that show progress toward lowering youth crime and drug abuse. However, because of the difficulty in establishing a causal link between program activities and behavioral outcomes, the program has based program indicators on national surveys that don't reveal much about the nature of the program.	GPRA Indicators.	33%	0.0

Key Goal I:	
Performance Target:	
Actual Performance:	
Key Goal II:	
Performance Target:	
Actual Performance:	
Key Goal III:	
Performance Target:	
Actual Performance:	

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
		Footnote: Performance targets should reference the performance baseline and years, e.g. achieve a 5% increase over base of *X* in 2000.				
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	N/A			0%	
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	N/A				
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	No	A recent RAND study indicated that the program structure is fundamentally flawed. The study was funded by the Safe and Drug Free Schools program and released after Congress had finished deliberations on ESEA reauthorization.	"Options for Restructuring the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act." RAND Drug Policy Research Center, 2001.	34%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**0%**

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Student Aid Administration
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	78%	75%	28%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Higher Education Act provides six explicit purposes for the Office of Federal Student Aid (OFSA): 1) to improve service to student aid program participants; 2) to reduce the cost of student aid administration; 3) to increase accountability for program management officials; 4) to increase student aid management flexibility; 5) to integrate student aid information systems; and 6) to better ensure student aid program integrity.

Evidence: The program's purpose is established in Section 141 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1018).

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program addresses the need to effectively administer $50+ billion in Federal financial aid for higher education. Each year, the federal government makes available more than $50 billion in grants, loans, and work study to help students and parents pay for postsecondary education.

Evidence: The Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, authorizes several Federal student aid programs, which are administered by the Office of Federal Student Aid.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program is inherently unique in that its purpose is to administer the federal responsibilities associated with the Department's student aid programs. While other state, local, and private entities are involved in administering some aspect of these programs, they play no explicit role in federal activities.

Evidence:

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: There is no strong evidence that another approach or mechanism would be more efficient in administering the Department's student aid programs. That said, ED needs to develop a unit cost framework in order to measure and monitor the relative efficiency of the office's business functions. Moreover, the Department's student aid programs continue to be included on the General Accounting Office's high-risk list, and are the focus of several Inspector General reports. Finally, the Department's financial audits continue to identify reportable conditions associated with the student aid programs.

Evidence: At a minimum, ED still needs to complete its efforts to integrate OSFA's IT systems, and implement its new data strategy. This data strategy should improve the timeliness and quality of program/financial data, and integrate these data into short and long-term management decisions. As noted in the explanation, OFSA has begun to make critical management reforms. Most notably, these reforms contributed to the Department receiving an unqualified audit opinion in its FY 2002 financial statements. OFSA has also successfully initiated system integration efforts such as: (i) retiring the Central Data System (CDS); (ii) replacing proprietary Title IV Wide Area Network (TIVWAN) with an internet gateway; (iii) replacing Campus-Based Systems (CBS) with e-CB (electronic submission of data); (iv) implementing Forms 2000, an electronic payment and reporting system for guaranty agencies; (v) retiring the Financial Aid Recipients System (FARS); and (vi) integrating two major delivery systems (Direct Loan Origination System and Recipient Financial Management System) to create a student-centric process (COD) to originate and disburse Direct Loan and Pell funds.

Program: Student Aid Administration
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	78%	75%	28%	

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: This program consists entirely of Department of Education S&E funds to administer the Federal student aid programs.

Evidence: Department of Education budget and financial reports.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Modernizing the student aid programs is a major objective of the Department's strategic plan, which includes six long-term measures to measure the effectiveness of student aid management activities. However, these measures are currently under review and may be changed or expanded to include more rigorous criteria involving unit costs and other aspects of FSA activity.

Evidence: Department of Education Strategic Plan, Goal 6, Objective 6.4. The six long-term measures include: (1) Leaving GAO's high risk list; (2) Increasing the default recovery rate; (3) Reducing overpayments in the Pell Grant program; (4) Improving the reconciliation of data between FSA's financial system and the Department's general ledger; (5) Improving customer service; and (6) Integrating OFSA's IT systems.

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Specific targets and timeframes are shown in the "Measures" tab. For two of these measures, targets are under development.

Evidence:

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department has annual goals and milestones relating to the modernization of student aid delivery and management. The six long-term measures identified in 2.1 also measure annual progress in improving the effectiveness of student aid management activities. These measures are currently under review and may be changed or expanded to include more rigorous criteria involving unit costs and other aspects of FSA activity.

Evidence: Department of Education Strategic Plan, Goal 6, Objective 6.4. As noted in 2.1, the long-term measures also measure annual performance.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Specific targets and timeframes are shown in the "Measures" tab. For two of these measures, targets are under development.

Evidence: See "Measures" tab.

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?**

Answer: NO   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Most OFSA contractors have committed to program goals through performance-based contracts that include incentives for high performance. However, some contracts (including contracts renegotiated in recent years) still do not include adequate performance incentives. Moreover, OIG audits have found problems with FSA's oversight of its contractors. Other program partners (in particular, schools that participate in the Federal student aid programs) provide program and financial data to the Department. The Department uses these data, in part, to certify schools' eligibility to participate in the Federal student aid programs.

Evidence: The Public Inquiry and Direct Loan Servicing and Consolidation contracts are examples of major contracts with built-in incentive provisions. Under these contracts, contractor payments increase or decrease based on their performance in completing activities on a timely basis. Still, other FSA contracts do not have such incentives.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: YES   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The General Accounting Office and the Department's Inspector General have conducted a number of audits of FSA activities. Also, for the past year and a half, ED has conducted independent post-production validations designed to validate expected results for any major system changes to FSA's financial management systems.

Evidence: GAO and IG audits, IG investigations, independent post-production validations, and independent internal control reviews.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: YES   Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: OFSA conducts a rigorous annual planning process to determine the initiatives it will accomplish in the upcoming year. This process is driven by OFSA's Strategic Plan and are based on the goal to improve service, reduce cost, modernize systems and improve program integrity. This process is also influenced by the authorizing language that established OFSA as a Performance-Based Organization, the Department's Strategic Plan, and the Department's implementation of the President's Management Agenda. However, the Department has not completed a unit cost framework and thus the Department is unable to provide detail on how various initiatives and investments will affect the cost of daily and long-term activities. That said, FSA does a good job of evaluating the extent to which prior year initiatives are meeting strategic objectives and prioritizing initiatives for the upcoming year in terms of how it will further strategic goals.

Evidence: One of ED's key priorities in the first half of FY 2003 was to receive a clean opinion on the Department's Financial Statements. As a result, ED funded several initiatives that aimed to improve FSA's ability to receive a clean audit. These initiatives included enhancing the FMS "splitter" process, and implementing trial balance capabilities with operating partners to facilitate reconciliation. In addition, FSA is working with partners to re-engineer the case management and oversight process, has undertaken extensive market research to test the Common Servicers for Borrowers concept with actual players in the market, and continued to work with alternative bidders in the RFP process. ED prioritized both of these initiatives because of their potential to reduce costs, improve program integrity, modernize systems and improve service to FSA's customers.

Program: Student Aid Administration
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	78%	75%	28%	

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?
Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department is in the process of reviewing its student aid administration performance measures to ensure that FSA's goals are integrated with the Department's overall goals, and that the goals and measures are sufficiently rigorous and broad in scope.

Evidence: Department of Education Strategic Plan, Goal 6, Objective 6.4.

2.CA1 Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals and used the results to guide the resulting activity?
Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Alternative analyses are included in business cases developed for all major investments in consultation with the Department's Office of the Chief Information Officer; these analyses are reviewed by both the internal FSA management council and the Department-wide investment review board. However, the Department needs to develop a unit cost framework in order to make these analyses more meaningful. Moreover, the Department needs to more thoroughly assess schedule requirements when determining appropriate costs, in particular for establishing/negotiating performance-based contracts.

Evidence: Exhibit 300's and supporting business cases for FSA activities.

3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?
Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: FSA is in the process of developing its data strategy, which will map out the Department's existing data transactions, evaluate the timeliness and accuracy of these data, and assess FSA's ability to use these data to manage the program. That said, the Department does collect some performance information for review and use by the FSA Management Council, the Department's Investment Review Board, and other ED senior leadership. ED uses these data to help make resource allocation and system re-engineering decisions.

Evidence: Performance information is included in FSA activity business cases and other Department financial and management reports. These data include, in part, customer and employee satisfaction data and preliminary unit cost data. Under its data strategy, FSA is mapping out all of its data transactions, and will determine how it can make these processes more efficient.

Program: Student Aid Administration
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	78%	75%	28%	

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: All FSA senior managers have individual performance agreements that include performance targets and results, as well as schedules for system integration. In some cases, FSA managers and their major system contractors have developed business cases that include cost, schedule and performance results for new system integration initiatives (based on the Department's modernization plan). In addition, ED has renegotiated several major contracts to both reduce costs and include incentives/disincentives for meeting milestones and agreed upon levels of performance.

Evidence: All senior managers in FSA have performance agreements. Managers' bonuses are based on how well they performed on these performance agreements. The Public Inquiry, Direct Loan Servicing and Consolidation, and Common Origination and Disursement contracts are examples of major contracts with built-in incentive provisions. Under these contracts, contractor payments increase or decrease based on their performance in completing activities on a timely basis.

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department obligates student aid administration funds with the overall program plan; a limited amount of unobligated funds remain at the end of the year. The Department has procedures in place for reporting actual expenditures, comparing them against the intended use, and taking timely and appropriate action when funds are not spent as intended.

Evidence: Department of Education financial management reports

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Many student aid administrative contracts and personnel agreements include built-in performance incentives. However, OFSA has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve efficiency in program execution. As part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implenting its One-ED Plan -- an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function. Through One-ED, the Department will develop of cost and cycle time metrics for all the Department's major business functions, make competitive sourcing decisions for these functions, and make necessary IT improvements.

Evidence: The public inquiry and Direct Loan servicing, consolidation, and COD contracts are examples of major contracts with built-in incentive provisions. Under these contracts, contractor payments increase or decrease based on their performance in completing activities on a timely basis.

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Due to the nature of the Federal student aid programs, OFSA is required to coordinate with several other federal agencies, including the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Social Security Administration, the Department of Treasury (in particular, the Internal Revenue Service), and the Department of Health and Human Services. While there are no apparent flaws in OFSA's current coordination efforts, OFSA's data strategy will, in part, examine potential improvements to coordination efforts.

Evidence:

Program: Student Aid Administration
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Capital Assets and Service Acquisition

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	78%	75%	28%	

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The General Accounting Office has consistently put the student aid programs on its High-Risk List, and the Department's Inspector General has raised several issues regarding potential fraud in the student aid programs. The Department has taken a number of steps to improve financial management and program integrity (resulting in an unqualified audit opinion in 2002 and 2003), and has made removing the student aid programs from the GAO high-risk list a priority. However, weaknesses still remain, as reflected in the reportable conditions cited in the audit report.

Evidence: FY 2002 audit opinion and accountability report. GAO and OIG reports.

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department has taken a number of steps to improve program management and implement more effective financial management systems, resulting in an unqualified opinion in the Department's 2002 and 2003 financial statement audit.

Evidence: FY 2002 and 2003 audit opinion. In addition, the Department has undertaken a multi-year effort to integrate the disparate computer systems that support various postsecondary programs and implement new accounting systems. In particular, the Department plans to develop a single financial system for the Department, if feasible, as part of its implementation of Oracle Financials 11i.

3.CA1 **Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: OFSA conducts a rigorous annual planning process to determine the initiatives it will accomplish in the upcoming year. This includes evaluating the extent to which prior year initiatives are meeting strategic objectives and prioritizing initiatives for the upcoming year in terms of how it will further strategic goals. The Department uses factors such improved service, reduced costs, modernization of systems, and improved program integrity to guide management decisions. However, the Department has not completed a unit cost framework and is thus unable to provide detail on how various initiatives and investments will affect the cost of daily and long-term activities.

Evidence:

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: As shown in the "Measures" tab, the Department has made progress in meeting its long-term goals. However, student aid systems still remain on the GAO High-Risk list, and material weaknesses still remain.

Evidence: See performance data on "Measures" tab.

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: As shown in the "Measures" tab, the Department has made progress in meeting its annual goals. However, student aid systems still remain on the GAO High-Risk list, and material weaknesses still remain.

Evidence: See performance data on "Measures" tab.

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: SMALL EXTENT — Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: The Department has introduced significant new efficiencies in achieving student aid administration program goals, including the shift of substantial numbers of student applications from paper-based to electronic processing, and the creation of web-based solutions to replace the previous "wide-area" network. The Department is currently examining a number of other program redesign efforts that will further streamline student aid services. However, the Department has not yet implemented a unit cost framework for assessing program efficiency.

Evidence: Examples of improvements inlcude: (1) Electronic student aid applications (e.g., FAFSA online) have increased from 32 percent of overall applications in award year 1999-2000 to a projected 60 percent for award year 2002-2003; (2) FSA's renegotiation of contracts have resulted in FY 2002 savings of nearly $1 million in the Public Inquiry contract (PIC) and $26 million in the Virtual Data Center contract (VDC); (3) The retirement of the Financial Accounting and Reconciliation Sytem (FARS) will net between $8-$11 million in savings by FY 2005, and $4 million in annual savings thereafter; (4) OFSA's printing budget was reduced by almost $2 million in FY 2002; (5) Performance-based contracts with private collection agencies have increased collections of defaulted student loans ($925M) and reduced the costs of collections; and (6) Converting partner interfaces from a private network (TIV WAN) to the internet (SAIG) has yielded $3.6 million in annual savings. However, a unit cost framework will provide a more comprehensive assessment of FSA's progress on improving cost efficiency.

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: OFSA conducts several business processes that may be comparable to similar processes in other federal agencies and the private sector (e.g., lenders, guaranty agencies). However, until OFSA has had the chance to complete its unit cost framework, it cannot reasonably compare OFSA's efficiency to other entities.

Evidence:

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: As noted in 2.6, the General Accounting Office and the Department's Office of the Inspector General have conducted a number of audits of FSA activities. While the findings of these audits are mixed, many of them identify several remaining issues. Also, for the past year and a half, ED has conducted independent post-production validations designed to validate expected results for any major system changes to FSA's financial management systems. Aside from these evaluations, to date the Department has not comissioned independent evaluations of other OFSA activities and processes.

Evidence:

4.CA1 Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?

Answer: LARGE EXTENT — Question Weight: 16%

Explanation: In general, major student aid administration projects have been completed on time and within planned budgets.

Evidence: FY 2003 Apportionment back-up materials, which show planned versus actual spending by major contract.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Student Aid Administration

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Move student aid off the GAO high-risk list by 2005.

Additional Information: The Department has worked with GAO to develop and implement a comprehensive plan including all the steps needed to remove the student aid programs from the high-risk list.

Year	Target	Actual
2001		On List
2002		On List
2003	Off List	On List
2004		
2005	Off List	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Reduce Pell Grant overawards.

Additional Information: While total Pell Grant overawards rose from 2001 to 2002, they fell slightly as a percentage of total awards, from 3.4 percent to 3.3 percent.

Year	Target	Actual
2001		3.4%
2002	<2.5%	3.3%
2003	<2.5%	
2004	<2.5%	
2005	<2.5%	

Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)

Measure: Improve timeliness of FSA system reconciliations to the general ledger.

Additional Information: The goal of the measure is to have all systems fully reconciled to the general ledger for a given month within 30 days of the month-end close or less.

Year	Target	Actual
2002	45 days	45 days

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Student Aid Administration

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Improve timeliness of FSA system reconciliations to the general ledger.

Additional Information: The goal of the measure is to have all systems fully reconciled to the general ledger for a given month within 30 days of the month-end close or less.

Year	Target	Actual
2003	30 days	
2004	30 days	
2005	30 days	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Meet 100 percent of system integration targets developed for each fiscal year.

Additional Information: Annual targets are developed before the start of each fiscal year and are included in the annual plan.

Year	Target	Actual
2002	1	1
2003	1	
2004	1	
2005	1	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Improve customer service.

Additional Information: Targets are being developed in FY03

Year	Target	Actual
2001		

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Reduce the unit cost of student aid processes. [Baselines and targets under development.]

Additional Information: Targets are being developed in FY03

Year	Target	Actual
2001		

Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Student Aid Administration

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Recovery rate on Department-held defaulted loans.

Additional Information: Recovery rate = (sum of FSA collection on defaults) - (collections through consolidations) / outstanding default portfolio from the previous year.

Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)

Year	Target	Actual
2001		7.8%
2002	7.2 %	7.6%
2003	7.6%	
2004	8.0%	
2005	8.5%	

Measure: Reduce the percentage of Pell Grant overawards.

Additional Information: While total Pell Grant overawards rose from 2001 to 2002, they fell slightly as a percentage of total awards, from 3.4 percent to 3.3 percent.

Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)

Year	Target	Actual
2001		3.4%
2002	<2.5%	3.3%
2003	<2.5%	3.1%
2004	<2.5%	
2005	<2.5%	

Measure: Improve timeliness of FSA system reconciliations to the general ledger.

Additional Information: The goal of the measure is to have all systems fully reconciled to the general ledger for a given month within 30 days of the month-end close or less.

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2002	45 days	45 days

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Student Aid Administration

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Improve timeliness of FSA system reconciliations to the general ledger.

Additional Information: The goal of the measure is to have all systems fully reconciled to the general ledger for a given month within 30 days of the month-end close or less.

Year	Target	Actual
2003	30 days	
2004	30 days	
2005	30 days	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Meet 100 percent of system integration targets developed for each fiscal year.

Additional Information: Annual targets are developed before the start of each fiscal year and are included in the annual plan.

Year	Target	Actual
2001		
2002	1	1
2003	1	
2004	1	
2005	1	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Improve customer service.

Additional Information: Target are being developed in FY03

Year	Target	Actual
2001		

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Student Aid Administration
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Reduce the unit cost of student aid processes. [Baselines and targets under development.]

Additional Information: Target are being developed in FY03

Measure Term: Long-term (Efficiency Measure)

Year	Target	Actual
2001		

Measure: Move student aid off the GAO high-risk list by 2005.

Additional Information: The Department has worked with GAO to develop and implement a comprehensive plan including all the steps needed to remove the student aid programs from the high-risk list.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2001		On List
2002		On List
2003	Off List	On List
2004		
2005	Off List	

Measure: Increase the recovery rate on Department-held defaulted loans.

Additional Information: Recovery rate =(sum of FSA collection on defaults)-(collections through consolidations)/outstanding default portfolio from the previous year.

Measure Term: Annual (Efficiency Measure)

Year	Target	Actual
2001		7.8%
2002	7.2%	7.6%
2003	7.6%	
2004	8.0%	
2005	8.5%	

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
60%	63%	56%	20%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: According to the authorizing statute, the program's purpose is "to provide, through instituions of higher education, supplemental grants to assist in making available the benefits of postsecondary education to qualified students who demonstrate financial need..."

Evidence: The program's purpose is clearly expressed in section 413A of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Many needy students qualify for more grant aid than is available under the Pell Grant program. This program offers an additional source for grant aid for some of these students.

Evidence: Over half of the nearly 5 million Pell Grant recipients each year have an expected family contribution of zero. Since the average cost of college significantly exceeds the Pell Grant maximum award, many if not most of these students qualify for additional grant assistance.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program is clearly redundant of the Pell Grant program, as well as of other state, local, and institutional grant programs.

Evidence: Virtually all SEOG recipients also receive Pell Grants. Simply shifting funds appropriated for SEOG into the Pell Grant program would raise the maximum award by roughly $200. Since the average SEOG award is nearly $750, such an approach would more broadly distribute smaller grant awards to the rest of the Pell-eligible population, as compared to the current program structure.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: There is no evidence of a better existing mechanism to deliver supplemental aid.

Evidence:

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program's institutional allocation formula (i.e., how much program funding is given to each school to offer SEOG aid) is designed to heavily benefit postsecondary institutions that have participated in Campus-Based programs for a long time, at the expense of more recent entrants or new applicants. Since these longstanding institutions do not have a higher proportion of needy students, this allocation formula tends to limit the program's ability to target resources to the neediest beneficiaries.

Evidence: The program's allocation formula is detailed in section 442 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

Program: Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
60%	63%	56%	20%	

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department has developed common measures for the Campus-Based programs (Work Study, Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, and Perkins Loans). These measures relate to the targeting of Campus-Based aid to low-income students and the impact of such aid on student persistence and graduation rates, benchmarked to the overall population. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Department of Education Strategic Plan

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?

Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Specific targets and timeframes are shown in the "Measures" tab and are under development. Once completed, they will also be included in the Department's annual performance plans. No annual data is currently available to support these goals.

Evidence: See answer to 2.1

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: See answer to 2.1.

Evidence: Department of Education Strategic Plan; Goal 5, Objectives 5.1, 5.3

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?

Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: See answer to 2.2

Evidence: See answer to 2.2

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Program partners (i.e., schools) support the goals of the SEOG program, reporting data through the annual Fiscal Operations Report and Application to Participate (FISAP) form and meeting program statutory and regulatory requirements, as set out in program participation agreements. Schools also report program data through a variety of Department financial systems, as well as through ongoing surveys such as the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS). Data from these reports are used in determining program performance.

Evidence: IPEDS, Department of Education financial and program management reports.

Program: Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
60%	63%	56%	20%	

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Comprehensive studies by the American Council on Education, the National Center for Education Statistics, and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, among others, assess the impact grant aid has on the enrollment and persistence of low-income students in higher education.

Evidence: NCES studies include: "Student Financing of Undergraduate Education (1999-2000); How Families of Low- and Middle-Income Undergraduates Pay for College: Full-Time Dependent Students in (1999-2000)"; and "Low-Income Students: Who They Are and How They Pay for Their Education (2000)." Advisory Committee studies include: "Access Denied: Restoring the Nation's Commitment to Equal Educational Opportunity," Feb 2001; and "Empty Promises: The Myth of College Access in America," June 2002.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: ED has not satisfied the first part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program, at this time, does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess (whether directly or indirectly) the impact of the Federal investment. However, ED has satisfied the second part of this question in that ED's budget submissions show the full cost of the program (including S&E). ED's '05 integrated budget and performance plan includes the program's annual and long-term goals. [Note: The measures discussed in 2.1 are new, and will be reflected in future budget requests.]

Evidence:

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?**

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department is working to develop effective, program-specific performance measures, as discussed under 2.1.

Evidence: See 2.1

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: SEOG information is primarily collected through the FISAP, which is used by participating institutions to report program data to the Department and apply for continued program participation. Data on the FISAP is not sufficient for program management or performance assessment.

Evidence: SEOG program and financial data. FISAP data is not timely, or internally consistent, in that the design of the form, which requests cumulative rather than annual data, makes it almost impossible to reconcile financial information.

Program: Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
60%	63%	56%	20%	

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to EDPAS, which links employee performance to relevant Strategic Plan goals and action steps, and is designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. OFSA federal managers are also subject to performance agreements developed under its Performance-Based Organization authority. Postsecondary institutions (the program partners) are held accountable through statutory cohort default rate penalties, annual compliance audits, and periodic program reviews, including site visits by ED. In addition, ED requires institutions participating in the Campus-Based programs to sign program participation agreements. To receive a "Yes," ED needs to: (1) identify for OMB the federal managers for this program; and (2) demonstrate the relationship between these managers' performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures; and (3) demonstrate the relationship between program partner's performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures.

Evidence:

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Financial audits and program reviews indicate that funds are obligated in a timely manner and for the intended purpose.

Evidence: Department financial statements and supporting materials and documentation.

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing "One-ED" -- an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements. A "yes" answer is likely once the One-ED process is applied to this program's relevant business functions. [Note: Although the Department is currently developing a unit cost accounting system to measure cost effectiveness in FSA programs, this system is not yet fully in place.]

Evidence:

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The SEOG program operates effectively within the overall Federal student aid system, taking advantage of shared application and aid disbursement procedures and systems, common institutional and student eligibility regulations, and program reviews.

Evidence: SEOG application and Federal funds disbursement processes; aid award packaging.

Program:	Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants		
Agency:	Department of Education		
Bureau:			
Type(s):	Block/Formula Grant		

Section Scores 1	2	3	4	Overall Rating
60%	63%	56%	20%	Results Not Demonstrated

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: No financial management deficiencies have been identified for this program; no negative audit reports have been issued. That said, as noted in 3.1, there are problems with the financial data ED collects on the FISAP.

Evidence: Department financial statements and supporting materials and documentation.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department is in the process of developing program-specific unit cost measures to better assess management efficiency, and is finishing a data strategy for the Office of Federal Student Aid (OFSA). The Department also plans to conduct a One-ED strategic investment review for OFSA.

Evidence: The Department of Education's One-ED Strategic Investment Review process. Also, the Student Aid Administration PART includes a performance measure related to management efficiency, and information on OFSA's data strategy.

3.BF1 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities? Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Program participants are subject to regular oversight, including institutional audits and periodic program reviews. These oversight activities, together with program and financial reports, provide sufficient knoweldge of grantee activities.

Evidence: See FSA oversight procedures for the campus-based programs. However, Department Inspector General has concluded that ED should improve its monitoring of post-secondary institutions.

3.BF2 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner? Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Annual data submitted through the FISAP contain compliance information, but not performance data.

Evidence: FISAP data collection. Program operations and financial reports.

4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Program performance goals are newly established; no long-term data are available.

Evidence:

4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Program performance goals are newly established; no long-term data are available.

Evidence:

Program: Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau:
Type(s): Block/Formula Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
60%	63%	56%	20%	

4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Department has yet to develop and implement efficiency measures to quantitively assess performance improvements. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence:

4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Program performance goals are newly established; no long-term data are available.

Evidence:

4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Comprehensive studies by the American Council on Education, the National Center for Education Statistics, and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, among others, have consistently found that grant aid has a major impact on the enrollment and persistence of low-income students in higher education.

Evidence: NCES studies -- Student Financing of Undergraduate Education (1999-2000); How Families of Low- and Middle-Income Undergraduates Pay for College: Full-Time Dependent Students in (1999-2000); Low-Income Students: Who They Are and How They Pay for Their Education (2000). Advisory Committee studies -- "Access Denied: Restoring the Nation's Commitment to Equal Educational Opportunity," Feb 2001 and "Empty Promises: The Myth of College Access in America," June 2002.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau:

Measure: Persistence: The gap between persistence rates for campus-based aid recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year. [Targets under development.]

Additional Information: The persistence rate is defined as the percentage of non-graduating students in a given year who return to continue their studies in the following year. A specific methodology to account for transfers and other data anomolies is under development.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Completion: The gap between completion rates for campus-based aid recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year. [Targets under development.]

Additional Information: The completion rate is defined as the percentage of full-time degree-seeking students completing within 150 percent of the normal time required.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual

Measure: Persistence: The gap between persistence rates for campus-based aid recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year. [Targets under development.]

Additional Information: The persistence rate is defined as the percentage of non-graduating students in a given year who return to continue their studies in the following year. A specific methodology to account for transfers and other data anomolies is under development.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

Measure: Completion: The gap between completion rates for campus-based aid recipients and for the general student population will decrease each year. [Targets under development.]

Additional Information: The completion rate is defined as the percentage of full-time degree-seeking students completing within 150 percent of the normal time required.

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Teacher Quality Enhancement
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	29%	50%	13%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Teacher Quality Enhancement (TQE) program's purpose is to improve the quality of the Nation's teachers by improving teacher preparation and professional development programs for current and prospective teachers, with the ultimate goal of improving student achievement.

Evidence: The purpose is laid out in Title II, Part A of the Higher Education Act, which states that: "The purposes of this title are to (1) improve student achievement; (2) improve the quality of the current and future teaching force by improving teacher preparation of prospective teachers and enhancing professional development activities; (3) hold institutions of higher education accountable for preparing teachers who have the necessary teaching skills ....; and (4) recruit highly qualified individuals, including individuals from other occupations, into the teaching force."

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Researchers and policymakers agree that teacher quality is key to improving student achievement. However, much of the research in this area says that teacher preparation programs are not adequately training new teachers, and that these new teachers do not receive enough support in their early years of teaching. As a result, many students are taught by underprepared teachers. In addition, research has found that one third of new teachers leave the profession within five years. High levels of attrition are most severe in the highest need areas, where one half of new teachers leave within their first five years.

Evidence: Scheerens/Bosker report The Foundations of Educational Effectiveness (1997); Sanders/Rivers report, Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Student Academic Achievement (1996); National Center for Educational Statistics report The Condition of Education (2001); Office of Postsecondary Education report Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Second Annual Report on Teacher Quality (2003).

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: This program is one of a range of programs in the Department that address the teacher quality issue. The program focuses on the key role that Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) play in preparing and supporting new teachers, and in improving the quality of current teachers through improved professional development. While Title II of the NCLB Act would allow the Teacher Quality State Grants program to fund similar reforms, in practice, funds from that program are focused on local educational agencies (LEAs) and only involve IHEs in a secondary role, if at all. Although the Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to use Technology program is similar to TQE in that it focuses on the role of the IHEs in teacher preparation, its scope is limited to technology, and therefore would not be an appropriate vehicle for institution-wide reforms.

Evidence: No other program in the Federal government focuses exclusively on the role of IHEs in teacher preparation and on improving the level of collaboration between Schools of Education and Schools of Arts and Sciences as well as between teacher preparation programs and local school districts, especially high-need districts. Research suggests that strengthening these collaborations is associated with improvements in the quality of teacher preparations programs and the students that they graduate.

Program ID: 10001038

Program: Teacher Quality Enhancement
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	29%	50%	13%	

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Early implementation of the program has not revealed any major flaws in the actual program model that would greatly limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency. However, the authorizing statute mandates that funds appropriated for the program are divided between the State, Partnership and Recruitment parts of the program according to a 45:45:10 ratio. The statutorily mandated ratio does not reflect the level of demand for program funds, and has compelled ED to lapse TQE funds in the last two fiscal years. Other minor flaws include: inadequate funding for evaluating the State and Recruitment grants, TQE's lack of support for alternative certification programs, and the redundancy of the Recruitment program to the State and Partnership programs.

Evidence: While every competition for the Partnership program has been oversubscribed, the program encountered difficulty recruiting sufficient quality applicants for State or Recruitment funds. As a result, in FY 2002 the program lapsed $655,000 and $1,416,000 under the State and Recruitment programs respectively. In a recent report, the General Accounting Office (GAO) suggested that Congress re-visit the issue of the statutory funding ratio in order to avoid future fund lapses, especially within the State program. It should also be noted that the authorizing statute allows all of the activities of the Recruitment program to be carried out under the State and Partnership programs, and identical entities are eligible to receive funds under either of the State and Partnership programs and the Recruitment program.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program is focused on the roles of IHEs and States in ensuring that both prospective and veteran teachers have the content knowledge and teaching skills they need to help all students reach high academic standards. This IHE focus is integral to improving teacher preparation, strengthening teacher quality and, ultimately, raising student achievement.

Evidence: By mandating that IHEs partner with high-need schools or school districts, the Partnership program ensures that the program resources are more effectively targeted to achieve the maximum benefit. States oversee the teacher certification process and establish student achievement standards. As a result, it is appropriate that the State program suports better alignment of teacher certification with student achievement standards.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?

Answer: NO Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: ED has not yet developed multiple meaningful long-term measures for the TQE program. ED has developed a long-term performance measure that focuses on the quality of partnership grants participants. The Department is working with OMB on developing an additional long-term measure for the State grants and an appropriate efficiency measure for the entire TQE program.

Evidence: The program has developed one long-term performance measure, focusing on the percentage of program completers that are highly qualified teachers (according to the NCLB definition). The program is currently working to develop an additional long-term performance measure.

Program:	Teacher Quality Enhancement		
Agency:	Department of Education		
Bureau:	Office of Postsecondary Education		
Type(s):	Competitive Grant		

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	29%	50%	13%	

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: The program has developed ambitious targets and timeframes for its only long-term measure but does not yet have multiple measures.

Evidence: The target established for the program is that by 2008, 90 percent of program participants will be highly qualified teachers (according to the NCLB definition) upon program completion. The program is currently working to develop additional targets and timeframes for the long-term measures that are currently under development.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals? Answer: NO Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: ED has not yet developed multiple meaningful annual measures for the TQE program. ED has developed an annual performance measure that focuses on the quality of partnership grants participants. The Department is working with OMB on developing an additional annual measure for the State grants and an appropriate efficiency measure for the entire TQE program.

Evidence: The program has developed one annual performance measure, focusing on the percentage of program completers that are highly qualified teachers (according to the NCLB definition). The program is currently working to develop an additional long-term performance measure.

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures? Answer: NO Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: Baseline data is not yet available to set useful targets for the annual measure.

Evidence: In order to collect the necessary baseline data, the program's Annual Performance Report will have to be revised. ED plans to complete the revision and collect this data by the end of 2003.

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program? Answer: NO Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: With the recent development new annual and long-term performance goals, partners have not yet been able to commit to these new goals. The program plans outreach to its grantees to communicate the new goals and integrate these performance goals into each grantee's work plan.The TQE program will revise its Annual Performance Reports to gather the neceassry data for the new indicators.

Evidence: Applicants are currently required to demonstrate that their project has clear, measurable project goals and performance objectives and that these will lead directly to improvements in teaching quality and student achievement as measured against rigorous academic standards. Once the grantees have been informed about the newly formulated goal and objectives, the program will utilize the annual outcomes-based work plans to ensure that grantees are incorporating them into their work.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: YES | Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: A longitudinal study of the Partnership program is currently underway and it is expected that this evaluation will provide performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness. Because of limited evaluation funding, program evaluations are not being carried out on the State and Recruitment programs.

Evidence: The Partnership evaluation is looking at both implementation issues and program outcomes, in terms of student achievement. The evaluation is examining the association between collaborative activities associated with the Partnership grants among institutions of higher education and schools, and student achievement outcomes. Using student achievements at schools participating in Partnership grants, comparisons will be drawn with a control group of comparable, non-Partnership schools. The first impact data will be available in FY 2006.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: NO | Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: ED has not satisfied the first part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program, at this time, does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess (whether directly or indirectly) the impact of the Federal investment. However, ED has satisfied the second part of this question in that ED's budget submissions show the full cost of the program (including S&E). ED's 05 integrated budget and performance plan includes the program's annual and long-term goals.

Evidence:

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?**

Answer: YES | Question Weight: 14%

Explanation: The program has identified strategic planning deficiencies and taken meaningful steps to address these deficiencies. ED and OMB will continue to work to establish an additional meaningful annual, long-term, and efficiency measure.

Evidence: In addition, the program has also initiated a process to revise program materials, such as application packets and annual performance reports, to reflect its new long-term and annual performance measures.

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: NO | Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Grant recipients are required to submit Annual Performance Reports, and a Final Report. Furthermore, student achievement data are collected by the Department annually and are being utilized within the Partnership evaluation to assess the effectiveness of the program. However, this data has not been used to manage the program in order to improve performance.

Evidence: The program has initiated a process to revise its Annual Performance Reports in order to collect more pertinent, outcomes oriented data--particluarly for the Partnerships grant program. It is expected that this data will be used in the future to enhance program management.

Program:	Teacher Quality Enhancement
Agency:	Department of Education
Bureau:	Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s):	Competitive Grant

Section Scores				**Overall Rating**
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	29%	50%	13%	

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to EDPAS which links employee performance to relevant Strategic Plan goals and action steps, and is designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. To receive a "Yes," the ED needs to: (1) identify for OMB the federal managers for this program; and (2) demonstrate the relationship between these managers performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures; and (3) demonstrate the relationship between program partner's performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures.

Evidence:

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: At the Federal level, all funds are obligated according to an annual spending schedule that is established at the beginning of the fiscal year. At the partner level, grantees are obligating funds at a reasonable rate.

Evidence: At the start of each fiscal year, the program establishes an Annual Spending Plan that governs the timing of all obligations and ensures that funds are spent for the intended purposes. To date, ED has only lapsed TQE funds due to a lack of quality applications, rather than from poor fiscal management. TQE grantees have obligated funds at approximately the same rate as grantees in other ED higher education programs.

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing "One-ED" -- an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements. A "yes" answer is likely once the One-ED process is applied to this program's relevant business functions.

Evidence:

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The Department has implemented strategies to encourage collaboration and coordination between the Teacher Quality Enhancement program and other programs addressing teacher quality issues, both within the Office of Postsecondary Education and across the Department as a whole.

Evidence: ED has convened a high-level working group to develop common performance measures for its teacher quality programs. TQE's new performance indicator is a result of this effort. TQE is also part of a separate cross-cutting team at ED which is collaborating on other critical teacher quality issues. Within the Office of Postsecondary Education, the two programs that most directly address teacher quality (Teacher Quality Enhancement and Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to use Technology) have been placed under the leadership of a single Federal manager, in order to further encourage collaboration and coordination.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: No internal control weaknesses have been reported by auditors. Plus, the Department has a system for identifying excessive draw downs, and can put individual grantees on probation which requires ED approval of all grantee draw downs.

Evidence: N/A

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: A recent GAO report on the program identified important management deficiencies and the program has taken a number of meaningful steps to address these deficiencies.

Evidence: The GAO report (GAO-03-6) found that the program did not have an effective system for communicating program information to grantees. In response, ED has improved communications efforts in a number of areas, including hosting two national grantee meetings for program participants.

3.CO1 Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit? Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Independent peer review panels are used to score and rank all applications.

Evidence: Program funds are used to pay for the peer review process. 100 percent of grants are subject to peer review.

3.CO2 Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities? Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: In reviewing program management, the program has concluded that current oversight practices do not provide staff with sufficient knowledge of grantee activities. The program office has developed a plan to ensure that there is sufficient oversight of grantee activities. However, implementation of this plan has not yet been completed.

Evidence:

3.CO3 Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner? Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: GPRA data are now reported in several formats, including on the Department's website. Basic award information on awardees and grant amounts is also available on the Department's web-site. However, this publicly available information is not performance related. As a result, ED has begun to revise TQE's Annual Performance Reports, in order to provide more useful performance data.

Evidence: This data will include information on the program's annual and long-term measures.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Teacher Quality Enhancement
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
80%	29%	50%	13%	

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program has recently developed a long-term performance goal and is working on establishing a second long-term measure. However, data are not yet available for this new long-term PART measure.

Evidence: The revised TQE Annual Performance Reports should begin to provide baseline data on the long-term measure within the next year.

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program has recently developed an annual performance goal and is working on establishing a second annual measure. However, data are not yet available for the this new annual PART measure.

Evidence: The revised TQE Annual Performance Reports should begin to provide baseline data on the annual measure within the next year.

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence:

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: There is no comparable data available to compare TQE with other Federal teacher quality programs.

Evidence: ED may be able to make some comparisons between teacher quality programs in future years as performance measures for these programs are implemented.

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: SMALL EXTENT Question Weight: 40%

Explanation: The Partnership program evaluation is currently under way and will not be completed until FY 2006. At that time an assessment of effectiveness will be available. However, an initial report of the evaluation does note that grantees find that partnerships and alliances formed through the grants have had positive impacts in improving the quality of teacher preparation in those cases.

Evidence: A recent GAO report also noted that TQE grantees have formed meaningful partnerships that appear to have had positive impact in improving the quality of teacher preparation amongst its partner IHEs.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Teacher Quality Enhancement

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education

Measure: The percentage of program completers, from Institutions of Higher Education with Teacher Quality Enhancement Partnership grants, who are highly qualified teachers (according to the NCLB definition) upon program completion.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2004	>75%	
2005	>80%	
2006	>85%	
2007	>88%	

Measure: The percentage of program completers, from Institutions of Higher Education with Teacher Quality Enhancement Partnership grants, who are highly qualified teachers (according to the NCLB definition) upon program completion.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2006	>85%	
2007	>90%	
2008	>90%	

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Block/Formula Grants

Name of Program: Tech-Prep Education State Grants

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The program provides financial assistance to states in support of expanding 2 + 2 programs (i.e., 2 years of secondary education transitioning into 2 years of postsecondary education) with the goal of increasing the number of students who receive technical degrees.	Sec. 202(a)(3) of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (hereinafter, "the Act").	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Labor market data demonstrate that the supply of jobs necessitating technical degrees exceeds the number of individuals with technical degrees. The disparity is expected to grow in the coming years.	National Assessment of Vocational Education, Interim Report for 2002.	20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	No	Because the impacts of the program are not currently known, the effect of reducing or increasing the federal investment in this program is unclear.	The Act requires grantees to report on outcomes for Tech Prep students. However, to date, the Department has only baseline data on grantee performance. Moreover, grantee performance reporting suffers from silimar data integrity problems as found in the Voc. Ed State Grant program -- non-uniform definition of a Tech Prep student, inability to aggregate outcome data to a national level.	20%	0.0
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	No	All relevant activities under this program are allowable under the Vocational Education State Grant program.	For example, nothing in the law prevents a Voc Ed Grantee from using funds to develop a 2 + 2 program	20%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	There is no conclusive evidence that a different design would improve program performance. However, the absence of conclusive evidence does not mean that program improvements are not needed.		20%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**60%**
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	No	Consistent with measures established under the job training common measures framework, the Department is working to develop several long-term indicators that are tied to short term goals and are consistent with the program's scope and activities.		14%	
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	No	Through the common measures matrix, the program has established a limited set of performance indicators designed to measure program performance/progress, including for example, placement in employment, degree attainment, and skill attainment. However, the Department must establish numerical targets and ensure that performance data exists to report on those targets. In addition, any short-term measures (whether the common measures or additional measures) must be linked to long-term goals. To the extent performance targets are set by states, a process should be put in place to ensure that state-defined targets are appropriately rigorous and that a methodology can be developed for aggregating performance data at the national level.		14%	
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	No	While the program receives regular and timely annual performance information from grantees, the information cannot yet be tied to a strategic planning framework where a limited number of annual performance goals demonstrate progress toward achieving long-term goals.	Instructions for this question indicate that a "no" is required if the program received a "no" for both questions 1 and 2 of this section.	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	Considerable collaboration and coordination occurs at both the Federal level (e.g., with DOL) and at the grantee level (e.g., with WIA title I one-stops)		14%	0.1
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	Yes	The National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) is an independent analysis, conducted every 5 years, and tracks appropriate program outcomes and use of Federal dollars.		14%	0.1
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	The program does not have a strategic planning framework where a limited number of annual performance goals demonstrate progress toward achieving long-term goals. Thus, at this time, performance goals are not currently aligned with budget policy.	There is limited reliable data informing on critical performance measures. Specifically, educational and employment outcome data are not uniform across states and cannot be aggregated (e.g., states set their own thresholds, states have different definitions for who is a Tech-prep student).	14%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	The Department has undertaken a process to make strategic planning improvements. This process is being coordinated with the Department's ongoing development of a reauthorization proposal.		14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**43%**

	Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)					
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	No	While the program receives regular and timely annual performance information from grantees, the information cannot yet be tied to a strategic planning framework where a limited number of annual performance goals demonstrate progress toward achieving long-term goals. In addition, there are data quality problems with the performance information currently obtained.		11%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	This program has not instituted an appraisal system that holds Federal managers accountable for grantee performance. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is planning to implement an agency-wide system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. Grantee performance is monitored on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. The program's current accountability framework needs to be further strengthened to ensure that poor performing grantees submit improvement strategies and have grants reduced or eliminated for serious or persistent failures to comply.		11%	0.0
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	Funds are obligated within the timeframes set out by Department schedules and used for the purposes intended.		11%	0.1
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	No	This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.		11%	0.0
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	Education's 2004 Budget satisfies the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute 1.1 percent of the program's full costs. However, Education has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess the impact of the Federal investment.		11%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	The program has a positive audit history, with no evidence of internal control weaknesses.		11%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	The Department has identified implementation problems that persist at the grantee level and has taken steps to increase compliance monitoring efforts and strengthen grantee accountability.		11%	0.1
8 (B 1.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	The Department maintains information on grantee activities through consolidated annual reports, site visits and compliance monitoring, and technical assistance activities.		11%	0.1
9 (B 2.)	*Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	Yes	The performance reports are annual and widely disseminated. Work needs to be done to both rectify data quality problems and make data quality problems more transparent.		12%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**56%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	Consistent with measures established under the job training common measures framework, the Department is working to develop several long-term indicators that are tied to short term goals and are consistent with the program's scope and activities.		20%	0.0

Long-Term Goal I (post-sec):	Participants placed in employment.
Target:	X%
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal II (post-sec):	Participants retaining employment.
Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal III (post-sec):	Earnings increase
Target:	Earnings will increase by X%

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.				
	Long-Term Goal IV (post-sec/optional):	Attainment of a degree or certificate by participants.				
	Target:	X% of participants.				
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.				
	Long-Term Goal I (secondary):	Participants placed in employment or education.				
	Target:	X%				
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.				
	Long-Term Goal II (secondary):	Attainment of a degree or certificate by participants.				
	Target:	X% of participants.				
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.				
	Long-Term Goal III (secondary):	Attainment of literacy and numeracy skills by participants.				
	Target:	Literacy and numeracy skills of participants will increase by X%.				
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.				
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	No	Through the common measures matrix, the program has established a limited set of performance indicators designed to measure program impacts, including for example, placement in employment, degree attainment, and skill attainment. However, the Department must establish numerical targets and ensure that performance data exists to report on those targets. In addition, any short-term measures (whether the common measures or additional measures) must be linked to long-term goals.		20%	0.0
	Key Goal I (post-sec):	Participants placed in employment.				
	Performance Target:	X%				
	Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.				
	Key Goal II (post-sec):	Participants retaining employment.				
	Performance Target:	X% of participants.				
	Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.				
	Key Goal III (post-sec):	Earnings increase				
	Performance Target:	Earnings will increase by X%				
	Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.				
	Key Goal IV (post-sec/optional):	Attainment of a degree or certificate by participants.				
	Performance Target:	X% of participants.				
	Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.				
	Key Goal I (sec):	Participants placed in employment or education.				

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Performance Target:	X%				
	Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.				
	Key Goal II (sec):	Attainment of a degree or certificate by participants.				
	Performance Target:	X% of participants.				
	Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.				
	Key Goal III (sec):	Attainment of literacy and numeracy skills by participants.				
	Performance Target:	Literacy and numeracy skills of participants will increase by X%.				
	Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.				
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	No	The common measures framework includes an efficiency measure -- cost per participant. The Department estimates that the annual cost per participant is $70. However, the lack of valid outcome data makes it impossible to link these costs to the achievement of program goals.		20%	0.0
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	No	To date, the Department has been unable to provide data that informs on the common measures. NAVE results and individual State performance reports (non-aggregated) indicate that program as currently constituted is not effective in achieving academic and employment outcomes.		20%	0.0
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	No	The most recent NAVE findings, released in December, 2002, provides preliminary data on vocational education generally, but do not yet disaggregate results specific to Tech-prep. Historically, the NAVE has provided mixed results on th effectiveness of vocational education in general. The 1994 NAVE concluded that vocational education provides little or no measurable advantage for high school students in terms of high school completion, postsecondary enrollment, and academic achievement. Preliminary results from the 2002 NAVE confirm the 1994 findings and find further that substituting vocational courses for academic courses adversely affects student academic achievement and college enrollment. However, the 2002 NAVE did find that taking a high school vocational course (versus taking no vocational courses) may have a positive impact on earnings.	1994, 2002 NAVE.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**0%**

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Competitive Grant Programs

Name of Program: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)						
	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The program provides Federal funding for the basic support, operation, and improvement of tribally controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institutions, so that funded institutions may provide continued and expanded vocational education and training opportunities for Indian students.	Sec. 117 of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act.	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	The program addresses the postsecondary vocational and technical education and training needs of the Indian student population.		20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	The program provides Federal funding to tribally controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institutions that do not receive Federal support under two major Federal sources of funding for Indian colleges and universities and are administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs -- the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act and the Navajo Community College Act. Without Federal support under this program, it is unlikely that the grantee institutions would be able to continue providing the vocational and technical education and training services they currently provide to Indian students.		20%	0.2
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	Since this program supports institutions not receiving funds under the other two major authorities supporting Indian postsecondary institutions, funds awarded under this program represent a sizeable share of public funds received by these institutions for the education and training of Indian students.		20%	0.2

5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	There is no conclusive evidence that a different design would improve program performance. However, the absence of conclusive evidence does not mean that program improvements are not needed.		20%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**100%**

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	No	Consistent with measures established under the job training common measures framework, the Department is working to develop several long-term indicators that are tied to short term goals and are consistent with the program's scope and activities.		14%	
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	No	Through the common measures matrix, the program has established a limited set of performance indicators designed to measure program performance/progress, including for example, placement in employment, degree attainment, and skill attainment. However, the Department must establish numerical targets and ensure that performance data exists to report on those targets. In addition, any short-term measures (whether the common measures or additional measures) must be linked to long-term goals. To the extent performance targets are set by states, a process should be put in place to ensure that state-defined targets are appropriately rigorous and that a methodology can be developed for aggregating performance data at the national level.	There is currently one annual performance indicator which measures degree or certificate attainment. The measure, however, is flawed in that the denominator is not derived from the cohort from the time they enter school. Rather, the denominator is those students who have made it into their final semester.	14%	
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	No	While the program receives regular and timely annual performance information from grantees, the information cannot yet be tied to a strategic planning framework where a limited number of annual performance goals demonstrate progress to achieving long-term goals.	Instructions for this question indicate that a "no" is required if the program received a "no" for both questions 1 and 2 of this section.	14%	0.0

4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	No	This program serves a narrow and very specific population -- those schools not served by similar BIA programs. Department and BIA staff do not collaborate on efforts to improve program outcomes.		14%	0.0
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	No	No evaluation is planned for this program.		14%	0.0
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	The program does not have long- or short-term strategic planning performance goals that can be aligned with budget policy.		14%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	No	The Department has not taken the necessary steps to develop a strategic planning framework where a limited number of annual performance goals demonstrate progress to achieving long-term goals.	Any efforts to develop a strategic planning framework would have to be done in the context of the longstanding and unique Govt.-to-Govt. relationship between Indian tribal governments and the U.S. government.	14%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**0%**

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	No	While grantees provide regular and timely information, such information does not adequately address program performance. However, information on the grantees' compliance with program requirements and objectives is collected annually and continuation awards are dependent upon a determination of progress being made.		10%	0.0
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	This program has not instituted an appraisal system that holds Federal managers accountable for grantee performance. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is planning to implement an agency-wide system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. Grantee performance is monitored on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. Grantees that do not meet Federal requirements are required to submit improvement plans and can have grants reduced or discontinued for serious or persistent failures to comply.		10%	0.0
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	Funds are obligated within the timeframes set out by Department schedules and used for the purposes intended.		10%	0.1
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	No	This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.		10%	0.0

5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	Education's 2004 Budget satisfies the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute 23.8 percent of the program's full costs. However, Education has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess the impact of the Federal investment.		10%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	The program has a positive audit history, with no evidence of internal control weaknesses.		10%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	No	The Department has not taken the necessary steps to develop an efficiency measure or to obtain valid performance information from grantees.		10%	0.0
8 (Co 1.)	*Are grant applications independently reviewed based on clear criteria (rather than earmarked) and are awards made based on results of the peer review process?*	N/A	This program has a very small pool of eligible applicants, and although there is no earmark of funds, the review process has, since enactment of the program, resulted in the funding of the two largest tribally controlled postsecondary vocation and technical institutions.	Despite the recurrence of the same awardees, the grant application review process is a competitive process based on program requirements, priorities, and selection criteria. Awards are made based on the Department's review of applications from eligible applicants.	0%	
9 (Co 2.)	*Does the grant competition encourage the participation of new/first-time grantees through a fair and open application process?*	No	The legislation specifies very narrow eligibility criteria and a very limited number of institutions meet them. Since the program's inception, the same two grantees have been the recipients of the grants.		10%	0.0
10 (Co 3.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	The program has a strong relationship with its grantees as well as a high level of understanding of what grantees do with the resources allocated to them. Program oversight includes documentation of grantees' use of funds and site visits.		10%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
11 (Co 4.)	*Does the program collect performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	No	Data are collected and compiled from annual reports and used for mandated reports to Congress. However, these data and reports are not readily available to the public, in print or on the internet, and do not reflect program impacts.		10%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**30%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	Consistent with measures established under the job training common measures framework, the Department is working to develop several long-term indicators that are tied to short term goals and are consistent with the program's scope and activities.		20%	0.0

Long-Term Goal I:	Participants placed in employment.
Target:	X%
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal II:	Participants retaining employment.
Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal III:	Earnings increase
Target:	Earnings will increase by X%
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal IV (optional):	Attainment of a degree or certificate by participants.
Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.

2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	No	Through the common measures matrix, the program has established a limited set of performance indicators designed to measure program impacts, including for example, placement in employment, degree attainment, and skill attainment. However, the Department must establish numerical targets and ensure that performance data exists to report on those targets. In addition, any short-term measures (whether the common measures or additional measures) must be linked to long-term goals.	20%	0.0

Key Goal I:	Participants placed in employment.
Performance Target:	X%
Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Key Goal II:	Participants retaining employment.
Performance Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Key Goal III:	Earnings increase
Performance Target:	Earnings will increase by X%
Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Key Goal IV (optional):	Attainment of a degree or certificate by participants.
Performance Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.

Footnote: Performance targets should reference the performance baseline and years, e.g. achieve a 5% increase over base of *X* in 2000.

3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	No	The common measures framework includes an efficiency measure -- cost per participant. The Department estimates that the annual cost per participant is $6,951. However, the lack of valid outcome data makes it impossible to link these costs to the achievement of program goals.	20%	
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	No	To date, the Department has been unable to provide data that informs on the common measures. The answer to this question could change depending on the Department providing the necessary data.	20%	
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	No	No evaluations have been conducted or are planned for this program.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score				**100%**	**0%**

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Competitive Grant Programs

Name of Program: TRIO Student Support Services

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The program is designed to provide support services to college students to increase retention and completion rates.	Statutory purpose (Subpart 2 of the Higher Education Act of 1965) : "increase college retention and graduation rates" for low-income, first generation, and disabled college students.	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Data indicates that low-income, first-generation, and disabled college students do not attend and graduate from college at the same rates as students who are less disadvantaged.	A wide-range of data is available in National Center for Education Statistics publications.	20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	SSS is designed to provide much-needed services to students with demonstrated need for assistance. SSS is unique from other programs in the intensity of its program services and the targeting of these services to the highest-impact population of college-bound recipients.	SSS evaluation indicates significant impacts across a wide-range of outcomes.	20%	0.2
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	The intensity and targeting of tutoring and counseling services provided by SSS are unique.	SSS evaluation indicates that the program is well targeted to the students most in need, resulting in significant benefits.	20%	0.2
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	There is no evidence that other approaches, like leveraging community resources, are more effective in providing support services and improving graduation rates. This does not mean that program improvements are not needed.	The significant impacts of SSS imply that it is optimally designed.	20%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**100%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	Yes	The program's overall goal is to increase the college persistence and completion rates of low income, first-generation students. ED has recently finalized targets for measuring success.	The GPRA indicators track college persistence and completion rates and targets are set to improve upon the current baseline performance levels.	14%	0.1
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	Yes	The long-term goals are the same as the annual goals. With annual performance information available for both goals, ED will be able to track annual progress against its short-term targets while also tracking progress against its long-term goals.	The GPRA indicators track college persistence and completion rates and targets are set to improve upon the current baseline performance levels.	14%	0.1
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	Yes	Annual performance reports (APRs) are required of all grantees and their performance is measured (including the allocation of prior experience points) on the basis of how well they meet program goals.	Performance reports to collect data on student persistence and completion rates.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	SSS projects providing grant aid must coordinate with their student aid offices and Federal Student Aid. Some projects also coordinate with other Federal programs.	The University of Nevada/Las Vegas project coordinates with the Student Development Center and Early Studies Program that are funded by the State, NSF, DOE Super Computing Project and the HHS' Health Careers Opportunity Program; the California State University/Stanislaus project coordinates with the Faculty Mentor Program and the California Mini Corps program which allows Students to acquire experience in the field of teaching; the University of California/Berkeley/Disabled Projects collaborates with Student Life Advising Services and the Student Learning Center sponsored by the institution; and the St. Petersburg College (FL) project coordinates with their Office for Students with Disabilities (as do many projects).	14%	0.1
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	No	The recently completed impact evaluation of this program was the first in over two decades. While this evaluation is of sufficient scope, this program has not had regular evaluations to guide program management and discern program impacts. ED has begun formulating a long-term evaluation plan for TRIO programs that will include Institute of Education Sciences (IES) intervention studies.	The final evaluation report should be released in early 2003	14%	0.0
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	Yes	Funds for SSS have been requested and allocated to increase the intensity of services per evaluation findings and to provide grant aid to improve program performance. Though no specific goals have been set to link increased intensity of services and grant aid to increased impact, research suggests that these are effective approaches.	The SSS evaluation indicates a linear relationship between the amount of services received and the size of the impact.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	The program has recently developed annual goals, short- and long-term targets. In addition, SSS has begun to implement program improvement strategies based on evaluation findings.	Funds have been provided to increase the intensity of project services and to provide grant aid to increase the retention rate of SSS participants in the first years of college. Both efforts aim to increase college graduation rates in the long-term.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**86%**

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	No	Project performance information is not used to improve program performance even though it is used for grantee management, such as scoring prior experience points during each program competition (every 4 years), and assessing the degree to which grantees achieved their stated goals and objectives.	In addition to scoring 15 prior experience points in each competition, staff work with project directors in developing partnership agreements to ensure that goals are attainable yet ambitious based on information included in newly funded proposals and staff's assessment of reports from the grantees. If grantees do not demonstrate sustained progress, continuation awards can and have been withheld.	9%	0.0
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	This program has not instituted an appraisal system that holds Federal managers accountable for grantee performance. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is planning to implement an agency-wide system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. Grantee performance is monitored on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. Grantees that do not meet Federal requirements are required to submit improvement plans and can have grants reduced or discontinued for serious or persistent failures to comply.	Follow-up efforts to Inspector General (IG) reports have resulted in several SSS and UB grantees (Creighton University, Independence College, Miami-Dade, Winston Salem State College, etc.) being designated as high risks. They are required to submit monthly reports of activities and expenditures and staff conduct site visits.	9%	0.0
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	Funds are obligated in a timely matter but IG reports have indicated that monitoring of expenditures needs improvement. New office-wide monitoring plans are being implemented.	Staff now monitor grantees' draw-down of funds by reviewing grantees' financial reports (GAPS). A memo explaining the consequences of excessive draw-downs was sent to all TRIO grantees. In addition, grantees must submit a written request before any accounts are reopened after the close of a grant cycle.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	Yes	The TRIO program office relies on competitive sourcing to "farm-out" technical and other administrative tasks that it does not have the expertise and staff to fill. However, the program has no formal procedures for measuring and improving the cost efficiency of its operations.	TRIO administration funds support multiple contracts to provide database, technical assistance, and reporting support. Electronic APRs also create efficiencies in reporting.	9%	0.1
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	Education's 2004 Budget submission satisfies the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute less than 1% percent of the program's full costs. However, Education has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess the impact of the Federal investment.		9%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	The TRIO program office has not been revealed to have internal control weaknesses and follows Departmental guidelines for financial management.		9%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	TRIO has developed a plan for responding to IG concerns regarding insufficient grantee monitoring and unclear reporting requirements.	The TRIO program office has developed a detailed monitoring plan that emphasizes conducting on-site visits to newly funded projects, high-risk projects (evidence of mismanagement, constant turnover in leadership, etc.). In the past several months, newly funded grantees under the 2001 competition have been visited and more are scheduled.	9%	0.1
8 (Co 1.)	*Are grant applications independently reviewed based on clear criteria (rather than earmarked) and are awards made based on results of the peer review process?*	Yes	Independent peer review panels are used to score and rank all applications.	TRIO administration funds are used to pay for the peer review process. 100% of grants are subject to review.	9%	0.1

Questions		Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (Co 2.)	*Does the grant competition encourage the participation of new/first-time grantees through a fair and open application process?*	No	The TRIO program office provides outreach and technical assistance to new grantees, but significant competitive preference is given to existing grantees for their prior experience. The statute and regulations provide up to 15 bonus points for prior experience.	Over 95% of grantees are successful in reapplying for funds. Without additional funds for awards, few if any new projects would be first-time grantees.	9%	0.0
10 (Co 3.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	New procedures have been developed for improving the monitoring of expenditures based on IG concerns.	In addition to increasing efforts at on-site monitoring, the TRIO program office continues to review all reports (APRs, partnership agreements, interim performance reports, audits) that grantees are required to submit and make follow-up calls to clarify questions and concerns.	9%	0.1
11 (Co 4.)	*Does the program collect performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	No	The TRIO program office does collect and compile data from performance reports, and occasionally produces a program profile report. However, this data is not readily available to the public, is not available on the internet, and does not reflect program impacts.		9%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**55%**

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	ED has finalized its goals and targets for Student Support Services but does not yet have information to measure program progress. SSS has demonstrated performance in its latest evaluation data, proving very successful at improving student academic performance and other outcomes.	The evaluation indicates a 9%-point increase on bachelor's degree completion rates, and significant impacts on other many other academic outcomes. ED will use APR data for subsequent reporting upon its new targets.	25%	0.0

Long-Term Goal I:	Increase college completion rate of low-income, first-generation college students
Target:	31% by 2007, a 2% increase over the 2002 baseline of 29%.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Targets are new. Information will be available from APRs next year.
Long-Term Goal II:	Increase persistence rate of low-income, first-generation college students
Target:	70% by 2007, a 3% increase over the 2002 baseline of 67%.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Targets are new. Information will be available from APRs next year.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	No	ED's annual goals for this program are the same as the long-term goals. Annual targets are set as a proportion of the long term targets.	2003 APR data will begin to inform about annual progress for ED's goals.	25%	0.0

Key Goal I:	College completion rate.
Performance Target:	Increase .5 % every year from 67% in 2002 to 70% by 2007.
Actual Performance:	Targets are new. Information will be available from APRs next year.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	N/A	The program does not lend itself to the development of efficiency measures that link the Federal investment to program outcomes.		0%	
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	N/A	The successful performance of SSS is apparent even though there are no comparable programs with outcome data against which it can be judged.	SSS has significant impacts on students and is well targeted to those most in need of services.	0%	
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	Yes	The evaluation findings are those of an independent contractor hired by the Department to conduct a longitudinal study with a matched comparison group and case studies.	The evaluation indicates a 9%-point increase on bachelor's degree completion rates, and significant impacts on many other academic outcomes.	50%	0.5

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Section Score				**100%**	**50%**

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: TRIO Talent Search
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	75%	70%	0%	

1.1 **Is the program purpose clear?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program is designed to encourage low-income, first-generation middle and high school students to complete high school and pursue a postsecondary degree.

Evidence: Section 402B of the Higher Education Act (HEA) states that the purpose is to identify low-income, first-generation students with college potential and "encourage such youths to complete secondary school and to undertake a program of postsecondary education."

1.2 **Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Data indicate that low-income, first-generation students are not adequately prepared for college, and do not enroll in and complete college at the same rates as students who are less disadvantaged.

Evidence: Data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 indicate that the overall college enrollment rate for low-income students is 64% compared to 79% and 93% for middle- and high-income students. The 4-year college enrollment rate for low-income students is 33% compared to 47% and 77% for middle- and high-income students. A wide-range of other data are available in NCES publications.

1.3 **Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Talent Search provides assistance in applying for financial aid, multiple types of counseling, and other forms of assistance. Although similar services are provided by local school districts, the high level of need exceeds the capacity of school counselors. Talent Search complements existing efforts by targeting students not served.

Evidence: Numerous studies indicate that counselor-student ratios in public schools are very high (Blackwater Associates & Savage, 1989; Wells & Gaus, 1991; Yanis and Willner, 1988). Talent Search addresses this issue by targeting low-income students who require additional guidance. Talent Search also provides career and college planning counseling services not available to most low-income students.

1.4 **Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: There is no evidence of design problems that limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency. However, the program evaluation should illuminate whether or not the regulatory requirement that a minimum number of students be served works to ensure project efficiency or decrease project effectiveness.

Evidence: Program regulations require projects to serve at least 600 students, with a projected expenditure of approximately $300 per student. The program evaluation will help determine the effectiveness of this requirement and other program design elements.

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: TRIO Talent Search
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	75%	70%	0%	

1.5 **Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program appears well targeted to the neediest students who have potential for postsecondary education. ED may consider HEA reauthorization proposals that would increase targeting based on need.

Evidence: The statute requires projects to assure that at least two-thirds of participants are low-income, first-generation college students. Talent Search's profile report (Mathematica, 2002) indicates that 81% of participants are low-income and 88% of participants are first-generation. The report also indicates that students in Talent Search schools have higher rates of participation in the Federal free lunch program than students in other schools (40% v. 25%).

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The overall goal of Talent Search is to increase the postsecondary enrollment rate of participating students. An additional long-term goal is to increase the percentage of participants applying for financial aid. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: In addition, the TRIO programs have a GPRA goal to increase the postsecondary enrollment rate of participants.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: ED has set targets for its enrollment rate measure and is currently finalizing targets for the financial aid application measure.

Evidence: ED is in the process of finalizing the financial aid targets

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The annual goals are the same as the long-term goals. Annual performance information will track progress against short-term targets while also tracking progress against the long-term goals. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: In addition, the TRIO programs have a GPRA goal to increase the postsecondary enrollment rate of participants.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: ED has set targets for its enrollment rate measure and is currently finalizing targets for the financial aid application measure.

Evidence: ED is in the process of finalizing the financial aid targets

Program:	TRIO Talent Search	**Section Scores**				**Overall Rating**
Agency:	Department of Education	1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
Bureau:	Office of Postsecondary Education	100%	75%	70%	0%	
Type(s):	Competitive Grant					

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Talent Search projects all work toward the annual and long-term goals of the program. Although performance targets have yet to be established, the goals have been in place and widely accepted for some time. Annual performance reports (APRs) are required of all grantees and their performance is measured on the basis of how well they meet program goals.

Evidence: Program regulations clearly articulate the program goals (34 CFR 643.1) and indicate that grant awards, continuation funding, and prior experience points are awarded partly on the basis of how well projects achieve these goals.

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: An evaluation to assess the impact of Talent Search on college enrollment rates, the first of its kind, is underway. Although Talent Search has not previously had regular evaluations to guide program management and discern program impacts, efforts are underway to create a long-term strategy for assessing performance and making program improvements including: National Center for Education Evaluation (NCEE) intervention studies, the use of annual performance data to track progress on program outcomes highlighted by evaluation findings, and follow-up assessments as necessary.

Evidence: An evaluation report is due to be released in 2004, which may inform on progress in meeting the overall program goals. However, since the designed feasibility and impact study is a new type of study for the Department of Education, utilizing state data sources as a more cost effective means of conducting a program study, the degree to which the study will inform about program impact is unclear at this time.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: ED has not satisfied the first part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program, at this time, does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess (whether directly or indirectly) the impact of the Federal investment. However, ED has satisfied the second part of this question in that ED's budget submissions show the full cost of the program (including S&E). ED's 05 integrated budget and performance plan includes the program's annual and long-term goals.

Evidence:

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: A program evaluation is underway and steps are being taken to develop performance targets on the basis of annual performance data. Additionally, the performance report is being revised to collect data that is more useful for assessing performance and making budgetary decisions on an annual basis.

Evidence: Numerical short- and long-term targets will be developed once performance baselines are established. The annual performance report will collect data on college enrollment rates and other outcomes on a more comparable basis to similar programs.

Program: TRIO Talent Search
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	75%	70%	0%	

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Project performance information is not used to improve program performance even though it is used for grantee management, such as scoring prior experience points during each program competition (every 4 years), and assessing the degree to which grantees achieved their stated goals and objectives. Once performance targets have been set, data will be used to measure progress in achieving program goals.

Evidence: In addition to allocating up to 15 prior experience points to current grantees on the basis of performance data, staff work with project directors to ensure that goals are attainable yet ambitious based on information included in newly funded proposals and staff's assessment of reports from the grantees. If grantees do not demonstrate sustained progress, continuation awards can and have been withheld. Reports from grantees also were the basis for TRIO providing technology supplements to improve project performance.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to EDPAS which links employee performance to relevant Strategic Plan goals and action steps, and is designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. To receive a "Yes," the ED needs to: (1) identify for OMB the federal managers for this program; and (2) demonstrate the relationship between these managers performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures; and (3) demonstrate the relationship between program partner's performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures.

Evidence:

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Funds are obligated in a timely matter but IG reports have indicated that monitoring of expenditures needs improvement. New office-wide monitoring plans are being implemented.

Evidence: Staff now monitor grantees draw-down of funds by reviewing grantees financial reports (GAPS). A memo explaining the consequences of excessive draw-downs was sent to all TRIO grantees. In addition, grantees must submit a written request before any accounts are reopened after the close of a grant cycle.

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: As a discretionary grant program, TRIO has a unique set-aside for carrying-out necessary administrative tasks. To increase cost effectiveness, TRIO relies on competitive sourcing for technical and other support activities that it does not have the expertise and staff to fill. Prior experience points also serve as a performance incentive for grantees.

Evidence: TRIO administration funds support multiple contracts to provide database, technical assistance, and reporting support. Additionally, up to 15 prior experience points are awarded to all eligible applicants during a competitive cycle. Electronic annual performance reporting also creates efficiencies in data collection.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: TRIO urges coordination with other Federal and non-Federal projects to create a pipeline of services through college. Some projects share project directors to oversee all programs with coordinators providing day-to-day management.

Evidence: Talent Search projects are often linked with Upward Bound, GEAR UP, and Student Support Services projects, including a number of institutions that are the recipients of multiple such grants.

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The TRIO program office has not been revealed to have internal control weaknesses and follows Departmental guidelines for financial management.

Evidence: The IG audit of TRIO's financial controls found no evidence of erroneous payments or other such material weaknesses.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: TRIO has developed a plan for responding to IG concerns regarding insufficient grantee monitoring and unclear reporting requirements.

Evidence: The TRIO program office has developed a detailed monitoring plan that emphasizes conducting on-site visits to newly funded projects, high-risk projects (evidence of mismanagement, constant turnover in leadership, etc.).

3.CO1 Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The TRIO program office provides outreach and technical assistance to new grantees, but significant competitive preference is given to existing grantees for their prior experience. The statute and regulations provide up to 15 bonus points for prior experience. However, independent peer review panels are used to score and rank all applications.

Evidence: Over 95% of grantees are successful in reapplying for funds. Without additional funds for awards, few if any new projects would be first-time grantees. TRIO administration funds are used to pay for the peer review process. 100% of grants are subject to review.

Program: TRIO Talent Search
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	75%	70%	0%	

3.CO2 **Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: New procedures have been developed for improving the monitoring of expenditures based on IG concerns, including joint audits with IG.

Evidence: In addition to increasing efforts at on-site monitoring, the TRIO program office continues to review all reports (APRs, partnership agreements, interim performance reports, audits) that grantees are required to submit and make follow-up calls to clarify questions and concerns.

3.CO3 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The TRIO program office collects and compiles data from performance reports on an annual basis and produces a program profile report biennially. Efforts are underway to analyze the most recent performance data for future reports, to increase the timeliness of making the data available to the public, and to make comparisons with data on participation in the Federal student financial assistance programs.

Evidence: A program profile report (Mathematica, 2002) was sent to all grantees in September 2002 and is available on TRIO's website (http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/trio).

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Performance targets have been recently developed and impact data are not yet available.

Evidence: Because targets were recently developed, ED has not been able to show progress towards achieving these long-term goals.

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Performance targets have been recently developed and impact data are not yet available.

Evidence: Annual performance data will be used to measure progress in achieving short-term goals.

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence:

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: At this time, data are not available to make comparisons between Talent Search and similar programs.

Evidence: The ongoing feasibility and impact study will not make specific comparisons between Talent Search and similar programs, but should be able to contrast the typical experiences of Talent Search students with students who participate in other programs.

Program: TRIO Talent Search
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Results Not Demonstrated
100%	75%	70%	0%	

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?**

Answer: NO

Question Weight: 40%

Explanation: At this time, data are not available to make this determination.

Evidence: The ongoing study is being conducted in only 4 states where the use of state records was deemed feasible, so the results will not necessarily reflect the impact of Talent Search on participants nationally. However, the 4 states are diverse and any consistent findings across the states may be suggestive of the effectiveness of the program nationally.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: TRIO Talent Search
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education

Measure: Percentage of low-income, first-generation participants that enroll in college

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2000		73
2004	73.5	
2005	74	
2006	74.5	
2007	75	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Percentage of participants who apply for financial assistance to attend college (targets under development)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2004	TBD	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Percentage of low-income, first-generation participants that enroll in college

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2007	75	
2009	76	
2011	77	
2013	78	

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: TRIO Talent Search

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Office of Postsecondary Education

Measure: Percentage of participants who apply for financial assistance to attend college (targets under development)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2007	TBD	

Measure Term: Long-term

Program ID: 10001036

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Competitive Grant Programs

Name of Program: TRIO Upward Bound

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The program is designed to provide support services to high school students to increase their academic performance to prepare them for college.	Statutory purpose (Subpart 2, Higher Education Act of 1965): "generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond secondary school" for low-income, first generation students.	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Data indicates that low-income, first-generation students are not adequately prepared for college, and do not enroll and complete college at the same rates as students who are less disadvantaged.	A wide-range of data is available in NCES publications.	20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	UB is designed to provide highly intensive services to selected students with demonstrated need for assistance.	The average per student expenditure is over $4,500, supporting a range of interventions and a 6-week residential summer program. This level of expenditure and effort is 5 to 15 times more expensive than other individual interventions such as tutoring and other student supplemental services.	20%	0.2
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	Few if any programs deliver the same high-intensity academic instruction catered to individual students, residential programs, and work-study stipends.	GEAR UP and Talent Search have considerably lower expenditure levels per student and do not support residential programs and high school stipends.	20%	0.2
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	No	The program does have significant impacts on certain types of students, but the evaluation findings indicate that it does not typically serve these students. This may be a design problem to be addressed through regulatory changes.	The UB evaluation indicates that it increases 4-year college enrollment by 22% for students with lower expectations and 5% for all students, but the overall college enrollment rate is not improved. A multi-step plan has been put in place to improve performance by targeting higher risk students like those with lower expectations.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**80%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)						
	Questions	**Ans.**	**Explanation**	**Evidence/Data**	**Weighting**	**Weighted Score**
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	Yes	The program's overall goal is to increase the college enrollment rates of low income, first-generation students. ED has recently finalized targets for measuring success.	The GPRA indicators track college enrollment rates for all UB students and for its higher-risk students, and targets are set to improve upon the current baseline performance levels.	14%	0.1
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	Yes	The long-term goals are the same as the annual goals. With annual performance information available for both goals, ED will be able to track annual progress against its short-term targets while also tracking progress against its long-term goals.	The GPRA indicators track enrollment rates and targets are set to improve upon the current baseline performance levels.	14%	0.1
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	Yes	Annual performance reports (APRs) are required of all grantees and their performance is measured (including the allocation of prior experience points) on the basis of how well they meet program goals.	Performance reports collect data on student persistence, high school completion, and college enrollment rates.	14%	0.1
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	UB projects are often linked with Talent Search, GEAR UP, and Student Support Services projects, creating a pipeline of services through college. Some projects share project directors to oversee all programs with coordinators providing day-to-day management.	There are several UB grantees that also have GEAR UP, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, SSS, and McNair grants. Another example is the San Diego State University project which coordinates with NSF.	14%	0.1
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	No	The recently completed impact evaluation of this program was the first in over two decades. While this evaluation is of sufficient scope, this program has not had regular evaluations to guide program management and discern program impacts. ED has begun formulating a long-term evaluation plan for TRIO programs that will include Institute of Education Sciences (IES) intervention studies.	The next interim evaluation report should be released in early 2003.	14%	0.0
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	Some funds for UB have been requested and allocated to provide work-study opportunities and recruit higher risk students per evaluation findings with the intent of improving program performance. However, the amount of funds allocated for these purposes has been very small, and no specific outcome goals for these initiatives have been set.	Less than 10% of funds have been allocated for improving program performance ($16 million for higher risk students and $9 million for work-study).	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	Action steps have been developed to improve program performance and make changes to the competitive process. Steps have been taken to develop annual goals, including short- and long-term targets.	A multi-step plan for improving program performance, including an invitational priority and regulatory changes to serve higher risk students, has been developed. Prior to this plan, the Department initiated the UB Participant Expansion Initiative and the newly authorized work study provisions.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**71%**

Questions		Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
Questions		**Ans.**	**Explanation**	**Evidence/Data**	**Weighting**	**Weighted Score**
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	No	Project performance information is not used to improve program performance even though it is used for grantee management, such as scoring prior experience points during each program competition (every 4 years), and assessing the degree to which grantees achieved their stated goals and objectives. Efforts are being made to use NSLDS data to validate project performance.	In addition to scoring 15 prior experience points in each competition, staff work with project directors in developing partnership agreements to ensure that goals are attainable yet ambitious based on information included in newly funded proposals and staff's assessment of reports from the grantees. If grantees do not demonstrate sustained progress, continuation awards can and have been withheld.	9%	0.0
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	This program has not instituted an appraisal system that holds Federal managers accountable for grantee performance. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is planning to implement an agency-wide system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. Grantee performance is monitored on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. Grantees that do not meet Federal requirements are required to submit improvement plans and can have grants reduced or discontinued for serious or persistent failures to comply.	Follow-up efforts to Inspector General reports have resulted in several SSS and UB grantees (Creighton University, Independence College, Miami-Dade, Winston Salem State College, etc.) being designated as high risks. They are required to submit monthly reports of activities and expenditures and staff conduct site visits.	9%	0.0
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	Funds are obligated in a timely matter but IG reports have indicated that monitoring of expenditures needs improvement. New office-wide monitoring plans are being implemented.	Staff now monitor grantees' draw-down of funds by reviewing grantees' financial reports (GAPS). A memo explaining the consequences of excessive draw-downs was sent to all TRIO grantees. In addition, grantees must submit a written request before any accounts are reopened after the close of a grant cycle.	9%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	Yes	The TRIO program office relies on competitive sourcing to "farm-out" technical and other administrative tasks that it does not have the expertise and staff to fill. However, the program has no formal procedures for measuring and improving the cost efficiency of its operations.	TRIO administration funds support multiple contracts to provide database, technical assistance, and reporting support. Electronic APRs also create efficiencies in reporting.	9%	0.1
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	Education's 2004 Budget submission satisfies the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute less than 1% percent of the program's full costs. However, Education has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess the impact of the Federal investment.		9%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	The TRIO program office has not been revealed to have internal control weaknesses and follows Departmental guidelines for financial management.		9%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	TRIO has developed a plan for responding to IG concerns regarding insufficient grantee monitoring and unclear reporting requirements.	The TRIO program office has developed a detailed monitoring plan that emphasizes conducting on-site visits to newly funded projects, high-risk projects (evidence of mismanagement, constant turnover in leadership, etc.). In 2001, staff began visiting all new UB projects and continue to do so.	9%	0.1
8 (Co 1.)	*Are grant applications independently reviewed based on clear criteria (rather than earmarked) and are awards made based on results of the peer review process?*	Yes	Independent peer review panels are used to score and rank all applications.	TRIO administration funds are used to pay for the peer review process. 100% of grants are subject to review.	9%	0.1

Questions		Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (Co 2.)	*Does the grant competition encourage the participation of new/first-time grantees through a fair and open application process?*	No	The TRIO program office provides outreach and technical assistance to new grantees, but significant competitive preference is given to existing grantees for their prior experience. The statute and regulations provide up to 15 bonus points for prior experience.	Over 95% of grantees are successful in reapplying for funds. Without additional funds for awards, few if any new projects would be first-time grantees.	9%	0.0
10 (Co 3.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	New procedures have been developed for improving the monitoring of expenditures based on IG concerns.	In addition to increasing efforts at on-site monitoring, the TRIO program office continues to review all reports (APRs, partnership agreements, interim performance reports, audits) that grantees are required to submit and make follow-up calls to clarify questions and concerns.	9%	0.1
11 (Co 4.)	*Does the program collect performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	No	The TRIO program office does collect and compile data from performance reports, and occasionally produces a program profile report. However, this data is not readily available to the public, is not available on the internet, and does not reflect program impacts.	Student privacy concerns are currently being examined and may be a barrier to providing readily available data.	9%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**55%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	ED has recently finalized its goals and targets for Upward Bound but does not yet have information to measure program progress. UB's latest evaluation findings indicate significant impacts for some groups of students, namely those with lower educational expectations. One of ED's new goals is to improve performance in the enrollment rates of these student groups.	Evaluation findings revealed UB increases 4-year college enrollment rates by 22% points for higher risk students and 5% points overall. However, there is no overall impact on college enrollment because the program is poorly targeted, serving students who are not most in need of services. ED will use APR data for subsequent reporting upon its new targets.	25%	0.0

Long-Term Goal I:	Maintain college enrollment rate of low-income, first-generation college students
Target:	Performance baseline is 65%, same as the five-year target
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Targets are new. Information will be available from future APRs
Long-Term Goal II:	Increase college enrollment rate of higher-risk low-income, first-generation college students
Target:	37% by 2007, 3% higher than the current baseline of 34%.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Targets are new. Information will be available from future APRs

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	No	ED's annual goals for this program are the same as the long-term goals. Annual targets are set as a proportion of the long term targets.	2004 APR data will begin to inform about annual progress for ED's goals.	25%	0.0

Key Goal I:	Increase college enrollment rate of higher-risk low-income, first-generation college students
Performance Target:	Increase to 35% in 2003, with subsequent annual increase of .5% until 2007.
Actual Performance:	Targets are new. Information will be available from future APRs.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	N/A	The program does not lend itself to the development of efficiency measures that link the Federal investment to program outcomes.		0%	
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	N/A	The overall performance of UB indicates that it can have positive effects if appropriately targeted, but there are no comparable programs with outcome data against which it can be judged.	Upward Bound has significant impacts on some groups of students but is not well targeted to serve these students. A multi-step plan has been put in place to better target students who are shown to benefit.	0%	
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	Small Extent	The evaluation findings are those of an independent contractor hired by the Department to conduct a longitudinal study with a matched comparison group and case studies.	The evaluation indicates significant impacts for some groups of students, but no overall impact.	50%	0.2

Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Section Score				**100%**	**17%**

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: Troops-to-Teachers
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Innovation and Improvement
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	60%	27%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The purpose of the program is to assist eligible members of the Armed Forces to obtain teacher certification and become highly qualified teachers and to facilitate their employment in high-need schools and school districts.

Evidence: Section 2302(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Numerous reports indicate that there is a shortage of highly qualified teachers to fill the nation's classrooms, especially in high-need school districts and public charter schools and in the fields of science, mathematics, and special education.

Evidence: The 1999-2000 Schools and Staffing Survey includes information on the percentage of students taught by teachers who are not certified or teaching "out of field" in subject-matter areas at the middle- and high-school levels for the 1999-2000 school year. At Middle Schools: In mathematics, 75 percent were taught by a certified teacher and 47 percent were taught by a teacher who had a major or minor in mathematics. Seventy-six percent of students taking science were taught by a certified teacher, and 59 percent were taught by a teacher with a major or minor in a science field. At High Schools: In mathematics, 83 percent were taught by a certified teacher and 82 percent were taught by a teacher with a major or minor. Eighty-five percent of students taking science were taught by a teacher certified to teach science and 86 percent were taught by a teacher with a major or minor in a science field.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Many of this program's activities are similar to those in the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants and Transition to Teaching programs. However, the program provides a unique delivery mechanism that focuses on a special population that has a strong potential to become highly qualified teachers and stay in the classroom for many years.

Evidence: There are no other Federal efforts to recruit this unique group of potential teachers with significant subject-matter expertise.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Operationally, this program has succeeded in getting individuals into the classroom. However, it does not overcome design flaws in many States' alternative certification programs, which are not sufficiently streamlined.

Evidence: Program participants are dependent on State certification systems to obtain certification; many of these State certification systems require participants to meet burdensome requirements even when they are participating in alternative certification programs.

Program: Troops-to-Teachers
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Innovation and Improvement
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	60%	27%	

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly?
Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: This program is highly targeted on high-poverty districts and districts that have difficulty recruiting highly qualified teachers.

Evidence: Of the 5,079 Troops participants who have become teachers from 1994 to the present, 78 percent of those who received financial assistance and were hired as teachers are still teaching. In addition, about 84 percent are men, 37 percent are minorities, and 24 percent teach mathematics or science.

2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?
Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The two new long-term performance goals for this program are: 1) The percentage of program recuits who become highly qualified teachers and, 2) The percentage of Troops-to-Teachers participants who remain in teaching for three or more years after placement in a teaching position in a high-need school district.

Evidence: Baseline data is not yet available for these measures

2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?
Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department will develop targets and timeframes for performance measures once baseline data becomes available.

Evidence: ED cannot set reliable targets for these new long-term indicators without baseline data.

2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?
Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The two new annual performance goals for this program are: 1) The percentage of individuals recruited by Troops-to-Teachers who become "highly qualified" math and science teachers (per the No Child Left Behind definition) and, 2) The percentage of Troops-to-Teachers participants who remain in teaching for three or more years after placement in a teaching position in a high-need school district. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Baseline data is not yet available for these measures

2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?
Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: While the Department has not yet established baselines for the annual measures, ambitious targets have been set as percentages above the baselines.

Evidence: ED cannot set reliable targets for these new annual indicators without baseline data.

Program: Troops-to-Teachers
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Innovation and Improvement
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	60%	27%	

2.5 Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: By law, the Department sends program funds to the Department of Defense, which obligates funds to the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES). DANTES is working with the Department to continue collecting appropriate performance data about the program, including data to report on the PART indicators and for the required 2006 Report to Congress. DANTES has previously collected useful information about the persistence rates and demographic characteristics of Troops-to-Teachers program completers.

Evidence: DANTES targets recruitment on participants with skills and knowledge in high-need subject areas. While the PART measures for this program reflect a new set of metrics, they are still similar in spirit to the preexisting program focus: placing individuals with rich content knowledge in high-need classrooms.

2.6 Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department is planning to conduct a survey of the Troops-to-Teachers and Transition to Teaching programs that will provide outcome data, but not data about educational impacts.

Evidence: Although this program is too small for the Department to conduct an evaluation of the program because of competing priorities, outside independent entities have occasionally conducted evaluations of the program.

2.7 Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: ED has not satisfied the first part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program, at this time, does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess (whether directly or indirectly) the impact of the Federal investment. However, ED has satisfied the second part of this question in that ED's budget submissions show the full cost of the program (including S&E). ED's 05 integrated budget and performance plan includes the program's annual and long-term goals.

Evidence:

2.8 Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?

Answer: YES — Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department will begin to track its new annual and long-term performance measures adopted through the PART process.

Evidence: ED and DANTES will begin collection of baseline data for the measures in the next year.

Program: Troops-to-Teachers
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Innovation and Improvement
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	60%	27%	

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The Department is working with DANTES to collect high-quality performance information and baseline information for the new performance measures. In addition, the program will develop implementation strategies based on its baseline performance data. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: The Department is revising its agreement with DANTES to ensure that DANTES collects high-quality data on a regular basis.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to EDPAS which links employee performance to relevant Strategic Plan goals and action steps, and is designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. To receive a "Yes," the ED needs to: (1) identify for OMB the federal managers for this program; and (2) demonstrate the relationship between these managers' performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures; and (3) demonstrate the relationship between program partner's performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures.

Evidence:

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Funds are obligated within the timeframes set out by Department schedules and used for the purposes intended.

Evidence:

3.4 **Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing "One-ED" -- an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements. A "yes" answer is likely once the One-ED process is applied to this program's relevant business functions.

Evidence:

Program: Troops-to-Teachers
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Innovation and Improvement
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	60%	27%	

3.5 **Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The program collaborates and coordinates with other teacher quality programs in the Department.

Evidence: For example, the Teacher Quality Policy Group meets regularly to discuss teacher quality issues in programs authorized by the No Child Left Behind Act. In addition, the Department is in the process of developing common performance measures for teacher quality programs that includes Troops to Teachers.

3.6 **Does the program use strong financial management practices?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Recent agency-wide audits have not identified deficiencies in the financial management of this program.

Evidence:

3.7 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: While major material internal management deficiencies have not been identified for this program, DANTES has implemented data-driven procedures to diagnose potential management problems.

Evidence: DANTES has established a data analysis process to maintain a close scrutiny of program activity. Program data related to the number of individuals registering, applications for financial assistance, funds obligated and expensed, and teachers hired are reviewed at least weekly. DANTES maintains a database containing information on every individual registering for the program, including contact information, personal information (gender, ethnic background, DOB, branch of service, rank, military job skill, years of service, etc), academic background, certification program enrollment, teaching assignments, financial assistance provided, fulfillment of teaching obligation, and counseling notes.

3.CO1 **Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: By law, funds for this program are obligated to a single entity -- DANTES. However, DANTES then supports only eligible candidates from the military, as proscribed by the statute.

Evidence:

3.CO2 **Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: Depatment of Education program staff work closely with staff from DANTES and monitor DANTES's activities through annual reports that include performance data. In addition, DANTES funds 33 State support offices to assist participants with State certification requirements and employment leads in a total of 44 States. The State offices submit monthly activity reports and semiannual performance and financial reports to DANTES.

Evidence:

Program: Troops-to-Teachers
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Innovation and Improvement
Type(s): Competitive Grant

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
100%	50%	60%	27%	

3.CO3 **Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 10%

Explanation: The Department collects performance data annually from DANTES but has not yet displayed this information to the the public in a meaningful manner.

Evidence:

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: It is too early to determine whether the program is achieving its long-term performance goals. The Department will establish the baseline in FY 2004.

Evidence:

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: It is too early to determine whether the program is achieving its annual performance goals. The Department will establish the baseline in FY 2004.

Evidence:

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence:

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?** Answer: NA Question Weight: 0%

Explanation: While common measures are being explored for ED's teacher quality programs, this program serves a unique niche by exclusively recruiting retiring military personnel. When more performance information becomes available for other ED teacher programs, valid comparisons may be made on considerations of teacher persistence and qualifications.

Evidence:

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?** Answer: LARGE EXTENT Question Weight: 40%

Explanation: An independent evaluation of the program was conducted in 1998. Although the data are somewhat dated, it provides valuable information about the program. While the study contains no impact data, 71 percent of school administrators surveyed said that new Troops-to-Teachers staff were at least "above average" as compared to their other non-Troops first-year teaching colleagues.

Evidence: Profile of Troops-to-Teachers by the National Center for Education Information. Authors: C. Emily Feistritzer, Michael D. Hill, and George G. Willett. A survey of Troops-to-Teachers participants in 1998, addressing their characteristics and attitudes toward teaching, teacher preparation, and teaching careers. Responses on a number of survey items were compared to responses of traditionally prepared public school teachers.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: Troops-to-Teachers
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Office of Innovation and Improvement

Measure: The percentage of individuals recruited by Troops-to-Teachers who become highly qualified math and science teachers. (targets under development)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	TBD		

Measure: The percentage of Troops-to-Teachers participants who remain in teaching for three or more years after placement in a teaching position in a high-need school district. (targets under development)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Annual
2004	TBD		

Measure: The percentage of program recruits who become highly qualified teachers. (targets under development)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2005	TBD		

Measure: The percentage of Troops-to-Teachers participants who remain in teaching for three or more years after placement in a teaching position in a high-need school district. (targets under development)

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual	**Measure Term:** Long-term
2005	TBD		

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Block/Formula Grants

Name of Program: Vocational Education State Grants

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	No	The program provides financial assistance to states in support of a variety of efforts, including improving students' academic skills and technical skills, preventing drop outs, increasing graduation rates, increasing post-secondary and advanced degree placement, and improving job outcomes. These multiple and potentially overlapping objectives have caused ambiguity among stakeholders as to the central purpose of the program.	The Department has received feedback from stakeholders that the broad scope and varied activities of the program have caused confusion at the local level about the key objectives of the program.	20%	0.0
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Data indicate that a significant number of students are graduating from high school and community college without the necessary academic and technical competencies to be productive members of the workforce.	National Assessment of Vocational Education; Consolidated Annual Performance Reports.	20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	No	The program is not designed such that there is consensus among stakeholders on the program's key objectives. Moreover, because the impacts of the program are not currently known, the effect of reducing or increasing the federal investment in this program is unclear.	The lack of information on program impact is due in large part to deficiencies in performance reporting, including problems with data quality.	20%	0.0
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	No	The Federal contribution provides support for services that are provided to students at the state and local level. Because Federal and state funds are commingled, the extent of the value added of the Federal investment is unclear.	There are a variety of Federal programs that seek to improve academic skills and ensure that students get into college and succeed. The diverse and varied goals of this program overlap with the goals of many other programs.	20%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	No	There are a number of program design features that warrant improvement, including for example, focusing the scope and objectives of the program and developing a more rigorous performance accountability framework.	The Department has received feedback from stakeholders that the broad scope and varied activities of the program has caused confusion and implementation problems at the local level because of ambiguity surrounding the key objectives of the program.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**20%**
Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	No	Consistent with measures established under the job training common measures framework, the Department is working to develop several long-term indicators and performance targets that are tied to short term goals and are consistent with the program's scope and activities.		14%	0.0
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	No	Through the common measures matrix, the program has established a limited set of performance indicators designed to measure program performance/progress, including for example, placement in employment, degree attainment, and skill attainment. However, the Department must establish numerical targets and ensure that performance data exists to report on those targets. In addition, any short-term measures (whether the common measures or additional measures) must be linked to long-term goals. To the extent performance targets are set by states, a process should be put in place to ensure that state-defined targets are appropriately rigorous and that a methodology can be developed for aggregating performance data at the national level.	The Department has made efforts to establish performance targets for each of the common performance measures. However, data integrity problems have made it difficult to assess past performance or establish a valid baseline. The Department believes that without such information, it is premature to establish performance targets.	14%	0.0
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	No	While the program receives regular and timely annual performance information from grantees, the information cannot yet be tied to a strategic planning framework where a limited number of annual performance goals demonstrate progress to achieving long-term goals.	Instructions for this question indicate that a "no" is required if the program received a "no" for both questions 1 and 2 of this section.	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	Yes	Considerable collaboration and coordination occurs at both the Federal level (e.g., with DOL) and at the grantee level (e.g., with WIA title I one-stops)		14%	0.1
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	Yes	The National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) is an independent analysis, conducted every 5 years, and tracks appropriate program outcomes. However, the NAVE does not measure the marginal effects that the Federal investment has on state vocational education programs.		14%	0.1
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	The program does not have a strategic planning framework where a limited number of annual performance goals demonstrate progress toward achieving long-term goals. Thus, at this time, performance goals are not currently aligned with budget policy.	There is limited reliable data informing on critical performance measures. Specifically, educational and employment outcome data are not uniform across states and cannot be aggregated (e.g., states set their own thresholds, states have different definitions for who is a Voc Ed. student).	14%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	The Department has undertaken a process to make strategic planning improvements. This process is being coordinated with the Department's ongoing development of a reauthorization proposal as well as the development of the common measures framework.		14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**43%**

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)						
1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	No	While grantees provide regular and timely performance information for a series of existing performance measures, there are data quality problems that affect the validity and reliability of the data. Moreover, current performance information is not yet linked to a strategic goals framework (see Sec II, q 1 & q 2), nor is it consistent with the common measures at this time.	The Department has made progress in using existing performance information to manage the program, e.g., imposing conditions on grantees through requirements for improvement plans. Data quality issues include lack of a uniform definition of who is a Voc Ed. student as well as an inability to use state-level performance data to develop national estimates.	11%	0.0
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	This program has not instituted an appraisal system that holds Federal managers accountable for grantee performance. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is planning to implement an agency-wide system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. Grantee performance is monitored on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. Grantees that do not meet Federal requirements are required to submit improvement plans and can have grants reduced or discontinued for serious or persistent failures to comply.		11%	0.0
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	Funds are obligated within the timeframes set out by Department schedules and used for the purposes intended.		11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	No	This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.	The common measures framework includes an efficiency measure -- cost per participant. The Department estimates that the cost per participant is $102 for high school students and $122 for post-secondary students. However, the lack of valid outcome data makes it impossible to link these costs to the achievement of program goals. Moreover, these figures will need further refinement once ED can establish a uniform definition of a Voc. Ed. participant.	11%	0.0
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	Education's 2004 Budget satisfies the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute less than 1 percent of the program's full costs. However, Education has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The program does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess the impact of the Federal investment.		11%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	The program has a positive audit history, with no evidence of internal control weaknesses.		11%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	The program has improved its monitoring process through increased review of grantee budgets and performance as well as taking steps to increase accountability through conditions on state grants.		11%	0.1
8 (B 1.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	The Department maintains information on grantee activities through consolidated annual reports, site visits and compliance monitoring, and technical assistance activities.		11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (B 2.)	*Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	Yes	The performance reports are annual and widely disseminated. Work needs to be done to both rectify data quality problems and make data quality problems more transparent.		11%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**56%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	Consistent with measures established under the job training common measures framework, the Department is working to develop several long-term indicators and performance targets that are tied to short term goals and are consistent with the program's scope and activities.		20%	0.0

Long-Term Goal I (post-sec):	Participants placed in employment.
Target:	X%
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal II (post-sec):	Participants retaining employment.
Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal III (post-sec):	Earnings increase
Target:	Earnings will increase by X%
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal IV (post-sec/optional):	Attainment of a degree or certificate by participants.
Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal I (secondary):	Participants placed in employment or education.
Target:	X%
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal II (secondary):	Attainment of a degree or certificate by participants.
Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Long-Term Goal III (secondary):	Attainment of literacy and numeracy skills by participants.				
	Target:	Literacy and numeracy skills of participants will increase by X%.				
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.				
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	No	Through the common measures matrix, the program has established a limited set of performance indicators designed to measure program impacts, including for example, placement in employment, degree attainment, and skill attainment. However, the Department must establish numerical targets and ensure that performance data exists to report on those targets. In addition, any short-term measures (whether the common measures or additional measures) must be linked to long-term goals.	The Department has made considerable efforts to accumulate the necessary data to inform on the common measures. However, ongoing data quality issues make reliable aggregation of state performance data impossible. For example, the Department estimates that 37% of postsecondary student participants earn a degree or certificate. However, States have varying definitions of who a "postsecondary student participant" is, raising concerns about the reliability of ED's estimate.	20%	0.0

Key Goal I (post-sec):	Participants placed in employment.
Performance Target:	X%
Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Key Goal II (post-sec):	Participants retaining employment.
Performance Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Key Goal III (post-sec):	Earnings increase
Performance Target:	Earnings will increase by X%
Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Key Goal IV (post-sec/optional):	Attainment of a degree or certificate by participants.
Performance Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Key Goal I (sec):	Participants placed in employment or education.
Performance Target:	X%
Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Key Goal II (sec):	Attainment of a degree or certificate by participants.
Performance Target:	X% of participants.
Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Key Goal III (sec):	Attainment of literacy and numeracy skills by participants.
Performance Target:	Literacy and numeracy skills of participants will increase by X%.
Actual Performance:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	No	The common measures framework includes an efficiency measure -- cost per participant. The Department estimates that the cost per participant is $102 for high school students and $122 for post-secondary students. However, the lack of valid outcome data makes it impossible to link these costs to the achievement of program goals. Moreover, these figures will need further refinement once ED can establish a uniform definition of a Voc. Ed. participant.		20%	0.0
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	No	To date, the Department has been unable to provide data that informs on the common measures. NAVE results and individual State performance reports (non-aggregated) indicate that vocational education as currently constituted is not effective in achieving academic and employment outcomes.		20%	0.0
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	No	The most recent NAVE was released in December, 2002. Historically, the NAVE has provided mixed results in terms of whether program goals are achieved. The 1994 NAVE concluded that vocational education provides little or no measurable advantage for high school students in terms of high school completion, postsecondary enrollment, and academic achievement. Preliminary results from the 2002 NAVE confirm the 1994 findings and find further that substituting vocational courses for academic courses adversely affects student academic achievement and college enrollment. However, the 2002 NAVE did find that taking a high school vocational course (versus taking no vocational courses) may have a positive impact on earnings.	1994, 2002 NAVE.	20%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**0%**

OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Block/Formula Grants

Name of Program: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants

Section I: Program Purpose & Design (Yes,No, N/A)						
	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	*Is the program purpose clear?*	Yes	The program's purpose is clearly defined in the authorizing statute and regulations: To provide services to individuals with disabilities so they can prepare for and engage in gainful employment.	Section 100 (a) (2) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and 34CFR part 361.1 and 361.5 (16).	20%	0.2
2	*Does the program address a specific interest, problem or need?*	Yes	Program addresses the specific need to help individuals with disabilities obtain employment. Individuals with disabilities are employed at lower rates than their nondisabled peers.	According to the 1994-95 National Health Interview Survey -- 79 percent of adults without disabilities were working at time of interview and only 37 percent of those with disabilities were employed.	20%	0.2
3	*Is the program designed to have a significant impact in addressing the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	The Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Grants to States program is the primary Federal vehicle for helping individuals with disabilities prepare for and obtain employment. Each year, about 1.2 million individuals with disabilities are in various stages of the VR process. Federal funding pays for over 80% of the program's costs, and performance data shows that this program helps many of these individuals with disabilities obtain employment (see IV.2). Given the large Federal share of total spending, and the unique role this program plays (see I.4), eliminating Federal funding for VR would significantly affect program outcomes.	The I.4 response discusses the program's unique role, and IV.2 provides some annual outcome data. Per the authorizing statute, the State matching requirement for this program is 21.3 percent; VR program data shows that most States do not provide much more than this amount.	20%	0.2

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
4	*Is the program designed to make a unique contribution in addressing the interest, problem or need (i.e., not needlessly redundant of any other Federal, state, local or private efforts)?*	Yes	While the federal government supports many other job training programs, most of them are not tailored to meet the specific needs of individuals with disabilities. Individuals with disabilities often have special needs when it comes to job training and employment. For instance, individuals with disabilities receive the following services under the VR program: supported employment services (e.g., job coaches); personal assistance on the job; modified workplaces; assistive technologies (e.g., a screen reader for a blind individual); family support (so family members can help an individual obtain employment); and other services that individuals without disabilities normally would not benefit from or do not require. These services are generally not provided through other Federally-supported job training programs. Also, the Federal government's other disability-specific job training programs -- such as the Social Security Administration's Ticket to Work program and Projects with Industry -- often work through the VR program. VR agencies, for instance, are statutorily authorized to act as Employment Networks in the Ticket to Work program.	Section 103 of the Rehabilitation Act lists the services provided under the VR program, many of which are specific to individuals with disabilities. Section 101(a)(5) of the Act requires VR agencies to give priority to serving individuals with the most significant disabilities, many of whom benefit from the specialized services provided under VR (about 86% of the individuals served are individuals with significant disabilities). Section 1148(c) of the Ticket to Work and Workforce Incentives Improvement Act explains the role of VR agencies in the Ticket to Work program. According to Department of Education evaluations and data, many individuals served by Projects with Industry grantees also receive services under the VR State Grants program.	20%	0.2
5	*Is the program optimally designed to address the interest, problem or need?*	Yes	While other approaches are potentially more effective than the current VR program (such as direct vouchers for employment services), there is no conclusive evidence that this is true.		20%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**100%**

Section II: Strategic Planning (Yes,No, N/A)

1	*Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?*	No	The VR program has annual performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program. However, to date the Department of Education has not established measurable long-term performance goals for this program.	Government Performance and Results Act performance indicators, and the performance indicators mandated under section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act.	14%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Does the program have a limited number of annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the long-term goals?*	Yes	The VR program has a limited number of annual performance goals that are discrete, quantifiable, and measurable. Some of these annual performance goals are similar to the common measures for job training programs. Performance targets are in place for FY 2002, FY 2003, and 2004.	See annual goals in Section IV.2.	14%	0.1
3	*Do all partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) support program planning efforts by committing to the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?*	Yes	State grantees are required to annually report data to the Department of Education. The Department uses these data to measure program performance on a national and State-by-State basis. However, from State to State, VR agencies have different philosophies as to the clientele that should be served, appropriate job placements for VR clients, and the focus VR agencies should place on job placement as opposed to independent living skills.	Program regulations at 34CFR 361. Subpart D	14%	0.1
4	*Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs that share similar goals and objectives?*	No	As a required One-Stop partner under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA), VR agencies are required to coordinate with specific Department of Labor programs, and the programs administered Office of Vocational and Adult Education (also within ED). The VR program also coordinates with SSA's Ticket to Work program. Finally, the VR program coordinates with ED's Special Education programs on the school to work transition of individuals with disabilities. However, at the federal level the VR program has historically not coordinated well with these other programs, even though many of them are within the same agency. Fortunately, there are promising signs that this collaboration may be improving. For instance, last year the Rehabilitation Services Administration (which administers VR) worked with other agenceis to develop common measures for job training programs.	The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Ticket to Work and Workforce Incentives Improvement Act, and the Workforce Investment Act all require VR agencies to collaborate with other federal programs.	14%	0.0
5	*Are independent and quality evaluations of sufficient scope conducted on a regular basis or as needed to fill gaps in performance information to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness?*	Yes	The Department of Education initiated a longitudinal study of the VR program in 1992, and completed this study in 2001. While the Department has no plans at this time to conduct another large scale comprehensive evaluation, it is in the process of developing a 5-year evaluation plan.	The Department's longitudinal study tracked 8,500 VR consumers at 37 locations for three years. The study examined attributes of those served, services provided, costs, resources available, local environments, and both short and long-term outcomes.	14%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
6	*Is the program budget aligned with the program goals in such a way that the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on performance is readily known?*	No	The VR program does not have a good sense of how increases in federal appropriations translate into improved performance on program goals. The disconnect between program funding and goals is exacerbated by the fact that the VR program's funding is classified as mandatory, and automatically receives an inflationary increase each year.	Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 100(b)(1).	14%	0.0
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its strategic planning deficiencies?*	Yes	There is evidence that the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), which administers the VR program, has taken steps to address its strategic planning deficencies. For instance, RSA worked with other agencies to develop common measures for job training programs, and is continuing to develop the Standards and Indicators for VR performance required by Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act.	The FY 2004 President's Budget includes the common measures for job training programs developed by the Department of Education and other agencies. In the coming year, these agencies will develop guidelines for comparing the performance of similar programs using these measures.	14%	0.1
Total Section Score					**100%**	**57%**

Section III: Program Management (Yes,No, N/A)

1	*Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?*	No	The Department of Education regularly collects credible performance information from the VR State agencies, and uses this information to monitor State activities and provide technical assistance. Still, overall the Department's use of this information to manage the VR program is weak. This information is also not timely, which makes it harder for the Department to use it to manage the program.		11%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
2	*Are Federal managers and program partners (grantees, subgrantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?*	No	This program has not instituted an appraisal system that holds Federal managers accountable for grantee performance. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is planning to implement an agency-wide system -- EDPAS -- that links employee performance to progress on strategic planning goals. Grantee performance is monitored on an annual basis through review and approval of annual budget plans, compliance reviews, audits, and site visits. Further, the VR program uses statutorily-required Standards and Indicators to increase State accountability for performance. Grantees that do not meet Federal requirements are required to submit improvement plans and can have grants reduced or discontinued for serious or persistent failures to comply.	Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 106.	11%	0.0
3	*Are all funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?*	Yes	The Department of Education obligates all VR program funding in the current year. States may carry over funding to the next fiscal, but must match funds in the current year (see matching requirement in I.3). Before the end of the fiscal year, States return funds they cannot obligate to ED for reallotment to other States. Grantees are also required to report expenditures to the Department (on an SF-269), and conduct an independent annual audit.	The VR program has not lapsed Federal funds. When the Department of Education (ED) determines that a State has spent VR funds for an unallowable activity (typically arising from an audit), ED issues a Program Determination Letter and requests repayment. Although ED issues Program Determination Letters whenever necessary, they are rare.	11%	0.1
4	*Does the program have incentives and procedures (e.g., competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?*	No	This program has not yet instituted procedures to measure and improve cost efficiency in program execution. However, as part of the President's Management Agenda, the Department is implementing an agency-wide initiative to re-evaluate the efficiency of every significant business function, including the development of unit measures and the consideration of competitive sourcing and IT improvements.		11%	0.0

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Does the agency estimate and budget for the full annual costs of operating the program (including all administrative costs and allocated overhead) so that program performance changes are identified with changes in funding levels?*	No	The Department of Education's FY 2004 Budget materials satisfy the first part of the question by presenting the anticipated S&E expenditures (including retirement costs) for this program, which constitute one percent of the program's full costs. While this is a small percentage of the total, the administrative costs associated with this program are high compared to the Deparment's other formula grant programs. ED has not satisfied the second part of the question because program performance changes are not identified with changes in funding levels. The VR program does not have sufficiently valid and reliable performance information to assess the impact of the Federal investment.		11%	0.0
6	*Does the program use strong financial management practices?*	Yes	No internal control weaknesses have been reported by auditors.		11%	0.1
7	*Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?*	Yes	There is evidence that the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), which administers the VR program, has taken steps to address its strategic planning deficencies. For instance, RSA worked with other agencies to develop common measures for job training programs, and is continuing to develop the Standards and Indicators for VR performance required by Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act.		11%	0.1
8 (B 1.)	*Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?*	Yes	Section 107 of the Rehabilitation Act requires RSA to conduct annual reviews and periodic on-site monitoring to determine whether State VR agencies are complying substantially with the provisions of its State plan (established under section 101 of the Act) and with the VR Evaluation Standards and Performance Indicators (established under section 106). RSA uses a uniform instrument to monitor State VR agency performance and maintain accountability in States' expenditure of federal funds.		11%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
9 (B 2.)	*Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?*	No	RSA collects performance data from VR agencies on an annual basis, but these data have not been timely, and are not readily available to the public. To illustrate this problem, performance data on the Standards and Indicators were not available online until recently. Also, RSA has failed to publish an annual report to Congress on the VR program (and other Rehabilitation Act programs), as required in the statute, since 1997.	Limited data are available on the Department of Education's website.	11%	0.0
Total Section Score					**100%**	**44%**

Section IV: Program Results (Yes, Large Extent, Small Extent, No)

1	*Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term outcome goal(s)?*	No	The Department has not established long-term outcome goals for its programs.		25%	0.0

Long-Term Goal I:	Participants placed in employment.
Target:	X%
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal II:	Participants retaining employment.
Target:	X%
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal III:	Earnings increase
Target:	X%
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal IV:	Efficiency
Target:	X%
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress will be reassessed once ED submits targets and data for new common measures goals.
Long-Term Goal V:	Of individuals obtaining employment, the percentage who obtain competitive employment will increase.
Target:	X%
Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress to be determined.
Long-Term Goal VI:	Among individuals exiting the program in competitive employment, the median ratio of their average hourly wage to the state's average hourly wage for all individuals in the state who are employed will increase.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
	Target:	X%				
	Actual Progress achieved toward goal:	Progress to be determined.				
2	*Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?*	Large Extent	In general. the program has been successful in meeting its annual performance goals.	Government Performance and Results Act annual reports. VR Standards and Indicators data.	25%	0.2

Key Goal/Common Measure I:	Percent of participants placed in employment.
Performance Target:	FY 1999: 61.0%; FY 2000: 62.7%; FY 2001: 63.0%; FY 2003: 63.2%; FY 2004: 63.2%
Actual Performance:	FY 1999: 62.5%; FY 2000: 62.6%; FY 2001: 60.7%
Key Goal/Common Measure II:	Participants retaining employment.
Performance Target:	X%
Actual Performance:	X%
Key Goal/Common Measure III:	Earnings increase
Performance Target:	X%
Actual Performance:	X%
Key Goal/Common Measure IV:	Efficiency
Performance Target:	X%
Actual Performance:	X%
Key Goal V:	Of individuals obtaining employment, the percent who obtain competitive employment (i.e., in an integrated setting at or above the minimum wage) will increase.
Performance Target:	FY 1999: 82.3%; FY 2000: 82.5%; FY 2001: 86.2%; FY 2003: 86.6%; FY 2004: 86.8%.
Actual Performance:	FY 1999: 83.1%; FY 2000: 86.0%; FY 2001: 87.6%.
Key Goal VI:	Among individuals exiting the program in competitive employment, the median ratio of their average hourly wage to the state's average hourly wage for all individuals in the state who are employed will increase.
Performance Target:	FY 1999: 0.57; FY 2000: 0.57; FY 2001: 0.57; FY 2002: 0.58; FY 2003: 0.58; FY 2004: 0.59
Actual Performance:	FY 1999: 0.56; FY 2000: 0.57; FY 2001: 0.56.

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
3	*Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?*	No	The Department of Education collects data that may be able to illustrate whether State VR agencies are becoming more efficient in achieving their program goals. In addition, an efficiency measure is included as part of the Common Measures exercise (see IV.1 and IV.2). However, to date, the Department has been unable to provide data that informs on the common measures, including efficiency. The answer to this question could change if the Department provides the necessary data. Still, one factor that may make it harder to show increasing efficiencies is that, by law, VR agencies must give priority to individuals with the most significant disabilities. Since this requirement has been in place, VR agencies have served an increasing number of individuals with significant disabilities (i.e., harder cases).	Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 101(a)(5)	0%	0.0
4	*Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs with similar purpose and goals?*	Small Extent	Past analyses has shown that VR agencies' job retention performance compared favorably to the former Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) program, and a cursory comparison to similar federal programs shows that VR grantees still performs relatively well. However, to date, the Department has been unable to provide data on the Common Measures, which will allow for a better comparison. The answer to this question could change to "Large Extent" or "Yes" when the Department provides the necessary Common Measures data.	In 1998, JTPA-funded programs had a 62% employment retention rate after 13 weeks. VR, in comparison, had a 84% retention rate after one year (source: the longitudinal study discussed in IV.5). In another comparison, VR and Projects with Industry have similar employment placement rates (both about 62%), even though the VR program services individuals with more significant disabilities (i.e., individuals who are typically harder to place).	25%	0.1

	Questions	Ans.	Explanation	Evidence/Data	Weighting	Weighted Score
5	*Do independent and quality evaluations of this program indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?*	Large Extent	The Department of Education recently completed a multi-year Longitudinal Study of the VR State Grants program. First initiated in 1992, this study tracked 8,500 VR consumers at 37 locations for three years, and provided comprehensive information on the VR program including: characteristics of the persons served; the services VR agencies provide; program costs; resources available; local environments; and both short and long-term outcomes. Data from this study show that VR participants benefit form the program, particularly in terms of improvements in employment and earning status. The study also found that VR consumers had excellent job retention rates.	Among the VR participants who obtained competitive employment, 84% were working one year after their case service records were closed (closure) and 78% were still working 3 years later. During this period, VR consumer's wages increased significantly, from $7.56/hour at time of closure to $13.48/hour three years later. Individuals with disabilities who obtained competitive employment worked, on average, about 35 hours a week.	25%	0.2
Total Section Score					**100%**	**42%**

Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

Program: William D. Ford Direct Student Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	33%	53%	

1.1 Is the program purpose clear? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program provides loans to undergraduate and graduate students to help fund postsecondary education costs at participating institutions. The program also provides interest subsidies for eligible low-income students to cover interest accrued while in school.

Evidence: The Direct Loans (DL) program's purpose is established in Section 451 of the Higher Education Act.

1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest or need? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program, in combination with other Federal student aid, helps individuals pay for postsecondary education. The program provides subsidized loans to low-income students and parents as well as unsubsidized loans to all students/parents regardless of income. In many cases loan recipients would not have access to credit at comparable interest rates, if at all, without this program. However, the statutorily fixed amount that students are allowed to borrow has not kept up with increases in tuition.

Evidence: Program eligibility and award criteria are discussed in Section 455 of the Higher Education Act.

1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: While different in structure, the Direct Loan and Family Federal Education Loan (FFEL) programs provide identical loans to the same population of students and parents.

Evidence: Sec. 421 (FFEL) and Sec. 451 (DL) of the Higher Education Act are structured to ensure that student borrowers receive identical benefits under either program.

1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency? Answer: NO Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: While the program has a lower credit subsidy rate than FFEL, there are inadequate market mechanisms in place to ensure optimal efficiency. The program is likely to become less cost efficient in 2006, when borrower interest rates revert from a market-sensitive variable rate to a fixed 6.8% rate.

Evidence: Efficiency of the DL program might be improved through market mechanisms, such as asset sales or auctioning off the right to originate loans.

1.5 Is the program effectively targeted, so that resources will reach intended beneficiaries and/or otherwise address the program's purpose directly? Answer: YES Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The program's statutorily-based needs analysis formula effectively targets subsidized loans based on financial need. As noted in the response to 1.2 above, in most cases loan recipients would not have access to credit at comparable interest rates, if at all, without this program. However, a disproportionate amount of the program's benefits are provided to borrowers who have been out of school for several years. For instance, by consolidating their loans, borrowers can currently lock in interest rates below 4%, reducing federal receipts as a result.

Evidence: Data from various Department financial management and operations reports, and longitudinal student aid analyses, demonstrate the extent to which these loans are targeted to low and moderate income students and families.

Program: William D. Ford Direct Student Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	33%	53%	

2.1 **Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?**
Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department's Strategic Plan includes measures on college enrollment rates (including closing the gaps between high- and low-income students, and minority and non-minority students) and the debt burden of students upon graduation. Given the scope of the loan programs (where nearly 1/2 of all undegraduates receive a direct or guaranteed federal loan), it is appropriate to use these overall postsecondary education measures to evaluate program performance. In addition, the Department has developed more specific goals related to student persistence and graduation rates for student aid recipients, as compared to the overall student population. The Department is establishing targets for these measures out to 2007. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Department of Education Strategic Plan; Goal 5, Objectives 5.1, 5.3. See "Measures" tab for specific program measures.

2.2 **Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?**
Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Specific targets and timeframes are shown in the "Measures" tab for annual goals only. The Department is working to develop specific long term targets and timeframes for all relevant performance measures.

Evidence:

2.3 **Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?**
Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department has annual and long term goals (through fiscal year 2007) for performance measures related to the student aid programs, and is in the process of adding two new measures on persistence and completion. The Department is working with OMB on developing an appropriate efficiency measure for this program.

Evidence: Department of Education Strategic Plan; Goal 5, Objectives 5.1, 5.3. See "Measures" tab for specific program measures.

2.4 **Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?**
Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Specific targets and timeframes are shown in the "Measures" tab. Targets and timeframes for the new measures are under development.

Evidence: See answer to 2.3.

2.5 **Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?**
Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: Program partners (i.e., schools) and Department contractors support the goals of the DL program, but are not required to report explicitly on the goals included in the Department's Strategic Plan. Participating institutions are required to report a wealth of program data through surveys such as the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS), the National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS), and the Department's financial systems. The Department uses these data and data from its contractors to measure program performance.

Evidence: IPEDS, NSLDS, Department of Education financial and program management reports

Program:	William D. Ford Direct Student Loans
Agency:	Department of Education
Bureau:	Federal Student Aid
Type(s):	Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	33%	53%	

2.6 **Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The General Accounting Office and the Department's Inspector General have conducted extensive audits of the program with recommendations for improved financial/program management. However, the Department has not commissioned any independent evaluations. Rather, the Department regularly collects data from DL program participants (i.e., postsecondary institutions) and Department contractors through a number of data systems and annual and longitudinal studies. These data collection efforts provide performance information used to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness.

Evidence: National Student Loan Data System; Integrated Postsecondary Data System; other Department of Education financial and program management reports; National Postsecondary Student Aid Study; Baccalaureate & Beyond; Beginning Postsecondary Student Longitudinal Study; High School and Beyond; National Education Longitudinal Study, 1988; National Household Education Survey; National Longitudinal Study, 1972; Recent College Graduates Study. GAO and OIG reports. DL servicing contractor reports.

2.7 **Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?**

Answer: NO Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department collects extensive DL program data that is used in concert with forecasting models to project the impact of funding, policy, and legislative changes on program costs. However, the Department has not yet established a link between these costs and its long-term performance goals. Moreover, the Department's forecasting model needs to be improved to better capture relevant program costs.

Evidence: Department of Education Direct Loan budget forecast and program cost model.

2.8 **Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?**

Answer: YES Question Weight: 12%

Explanation: The Department is developing additional goals related to student persistence and graduation rates, as compared to the overall population and has committed to making improvements to its credit forecasting model.

Evidence:

Program: William D. Ford Direct Student Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	33%	53%	

3.1 **Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: While the Department regularly collects data from Direct Loan program participants through a number of data systems and annual and longitudinal studies, these data submissions are not done in a timely manner. The lack of timely data contributed to the Department receiving a material weakness on its 2002 financial statement. While the data problem was upgraded to a reportable condition in the 2003 audit, the Department's financial records are often as much as two quarters behind actual program activity. The Department also needs to complete and implement the Office of Federal Student Aid's (OFSA's) comprehensive data strategy.

Evidence: National Student Loan Data System; Integrated Postsecondary Data System; other Department of Education financial and program management reports; National Postsecondary Student Aid Study; Baccalaureate & Beyond; Beginning Postsecondary Student Longitudinal Study; High School and Beyond; National Education Longitudinal Study, 1988; National Household Education Survey; National Longitudinal Study, 1972; Recent College Graduates Study.

3.2 **Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?** Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: ED's managers are subject to EDPAS, which links employee performance to relevant Strategic Plan goals and action steps, and is designed to measure the degree to which a manager contributes to improving program performance. OFSA federal managers are also subject to performance agreements developed under its Performance-Based Organization authority. Postsecondary institutions (the program partners) are held accountable through statutory cohort default rate penalties, annual compliance audits, and periodic program reviews, including site visits by ED. To receive a "Yes," ED needs to: (1) identify for OMB the federal managers for this program; (2) demonstrate the relationship between these managers' performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures; and (3) demonstrate the relationship between program partners' performance standards and the program's long-term and annual measures.

Evidence:

3.3 **Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?** Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: ED obligates DL funds obligated consistently with the overall program plan. The Department also has procedures for reporting actual expenditures, comparing them against the intended use, and taking timely and appropriate action when funds are not spent as intended. However, ED must take steps to ensure that only limited amounts of unobligated funds remain in the financing account at the end of the fiscal year. These funds should be returned to Treasury before the end of the year.

Evidence: Department of Education financial management reports

Program: William D. Ford Direct Student Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	33%	53%	

3.4 Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department has not yet completed a comprehensive unit-cost measurement system for the student aid programs. That said, the Department has instituted a number of procedures to measure and achieve efficiencies in program operations, including the One-ED initiative (yet to be fully applied to FSA) and a strengthened Investment Review Board to review and approve information technology purchases. In addition, many Direct Loan-related activities, such as default collection, are carried out through competitive contracts with substantial performance incentives.

Evidence: Department One-ED and Investment Review Board materials; debt collection and other FFEL-related contract materials.

3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Direct Loan program is part of a group of interrelated Federal, State, and institutional financial aid programs which work together to accomplish the shared goal of increasing access to higher education. The Federal student aid programs share a common application and needs analysis process that is also used by many States and institutions as the basis for their own need-based aid. In addition, institutional financial aid administrators package the various forms of aid to best meet the needs of each eligible student.

Evidence: Program structure, including aid packaging process and widespread use of the Free Applications for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA).

3.6 Does the program use strong financial management practices?

Answer: NO Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department has taken major steps to improve its financial management over the past several years. The Department received an unqualified audit opinion in FY 2002 and 2003, and is in compliance with major Federal financial management statutes such as the Credit Reform Act and the Debt Collection Improvement Act. That said,ED still needs to address the reportable conditions cited in the audit report.

Evidence: Reports completed by GAO, ED's Inspector General, and independent auditors.

3.7 Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Answer: YES Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: The Department has taken a number of major steps to improve internal management, one result of which is an unqualified opinion on its FY 2002 financial statement. These efforts include: the successful implementation of a new general ledger system; improved program reconciliations; an Investment Review Board to oversee information technology acquisitions, many of which directly involve DL program operations and oversight; and a new employee performance appraisal system tied directly to the Department's performance goals. However, the Department still needs to develop a unit cost framework and complete the One-ED strategic investment review process for the Office of Federal Student Aid.

Evidence: Department of Education FY 2002 and 2003 Accountability Reports; One-ED materials; Department strategic plan; Investment Review Board materials; implementation of EDPAS.

Program:	William D. Ford Direct Student Loans		
Agency:	Department of Education		
Bureau:	Federal Student Aid		
Type(s):	Credit		

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	33%	53%	

3.CR1 **Is the program managed on an ongoing basis to assure credit quality remains sound, collections and disbursements are timely, and reporting requirements are fulfilled?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Direct Loan data submissions are not done on a timely basis. Department financial records are often as much as two quarters behind actual program activity.

Evidence: GAO and Education Inspector General reports.

3.CR2 **Do the program's credit models adequately provide reliable, consistent, accurate and transparent estimates of costs and the risk to the Government?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 11%

Explanation: Financial reporting on credit programs remains a reportable condition in the Department's FY 2003 audit report, primarily related to the sufficiency of reliable data to develop and support estimation model assumptions. The audit report focused particular attention on the Department's assumptions for consolidated student loans, the volume of which has nearly tripled in the past five years. Additionally, OMB and the Department are continuing to improve the transparency of the modeling process and improve congruency with CBO estimates. Policy discussions involving possible model changes to incorporate probabilistic scoring and revisions in discounting methodology are ongoing.

Evidence: Department of Education Direct Loan budget forecasts and program cost model outputs.

4.1 **Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?**

Answer: SMALL EXTENT — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Direct Loan program has met or exceeded some of its long-term performance goals. The addition of new measures related to persistance and graduation rates will strengthen that Department's ability to assess program performance. However, these performance goals are newly established and no long-term data is yet available.

Evidence: See "Measures" tab.

4.2 **Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?**

Answer: SMALL EXTENT — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Direct Loan program has met or exceeded some of its annual performance goals. The addition of new measures related to persistance and graduation rates will strengthen the Department's ability to assess program performance. However, these performance goals are newly established and no long-term data is yet available.

Evidence: See "Measures" tab.

4.3 **Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?**

Answer: NO — Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: The Department has yet to develop and implement efficiency measures to quantitatively assess performance improvements.

Evidence:

Program: William D. Ford Direct Student Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid
Type(s): Credit

Section Scores				Overall Rating
1	2	3	4	Adequate
60%	75%	33%	53%	

4.4 **Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: Evidence suggests that competition between FFEL and DL has improved services to borrowers and participating institutions.

Evidence:

4.5 **Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?**

Answer: YES

Question Weight: 20%

Explanation: ED studies and program data indicate that Federal student loan programs are effective in increasing low-income individuals' access to postsecondary education. Moreover, comprehensive studies by the American Council on Education, the National Center for Education Statistics, and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, among others, have consistently found that student aid has a major impact on the enrollment and persistence of low-income students in higher education. However, GAO and IG audits continue to find material deficiencies in program/financial management.

Evidence: "Descriptive Study of 1995-1996 BPS: Six Years Later," NCES, 2003; "Low-Income Students: Who They Are and How They Pay for Their Education" NCES, 2002; "How Low-Inomce Students Finance Their Education," NCES, 1993; "Challenges to Maintaining Access in the 21st Century, Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, 1999; The Student Aid Game: Meeting Need and Rewarding Talent in American Higher Education, Micheal McPherson and Morton Owen Shapiro, 1998; Crucial Choices: How Students' Financial Decisions Affect Their Academic Success, American Council on Education, 2002; FY 2000, 2001, 2002 Department of Education Accountability Reports.

PART Performance Measurements

Program: William D. Ford Direct Student Loans

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Federal debt burden: The median Federal debt burden (yearly scheduled payments as a percentage of annual income) of borrowers in their first full year of repayment shall be less than 10 percent.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the success of Federal student aid programs in limiting excessive borrowing for higher education.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	>10%	6.5%
2000	>10%	6.4%
2001	>10%	
2002	>10%	
2003	>10%	

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Black and White full-time students in less-than-4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	5.8%
2000	Decrease	7.5%
2001	Decrease	
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Program: William D. Ford Direct Student Loans

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Hispanic and White full-time students in less-than-4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	2.7%
2000	Decrease	3.9%
2001	Decrease	
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Federal debt burden: The median Federal debt burden (yearly scheduled payments as a percentage of annual income) of borrowers in their first full year of repayment shall be less than 10 percent.

Additional Information: This measure tracks the success of Federal student aid programs in limiting excessive borrowing in pursuit of postsecondary education.

Year	Target	Actual
2003	>10	
2004	>10	
2005	>10	
2006	>10	
2007	>10	

Measure Term: Long-term

Measure: Enrollment rates: Postsecondary education enrollment rates will increase each year for all students.

Additional Information: The enrollment rate is defined as the percentage of high school graduates aged 16-24 enrolling immediately in college.

Year	Target	Actual
2003	Increase	

Measure Term: Long-term

PART Performance Measurements

Program: William D. Ford Direct Student Loans

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Enrollment rates: Postsecondary education enrollment rates will increase each year for all students.

Additional Information: The enrollment rate is defined as the percentage of high school graduates aged 16-24 enrolling immediately in college.

Measure Term: Long-term

Year	Target	Actual
2004	Increase	
2005	Increase	
2006	Increase	
2007	Increase	

Measure: Postsecondary Enrollment rates: The percent of high school graduates enrolling immediately in college will increase each year for all students.

Additional Information: The enrollment rate is defined as the percentage of high school graduates aged 16-24 enrolling immediately in college.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Increase	62.9%
2000	Increase	63.3%
2001	Increase	61.7%
2002	Increase	
2003	Increase	

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between low- and high-income high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	25.1%
2000	Decrease	28.1%
2001	Decrease	32.0%

PART Performance Measurements

Program: William D. Ford Direct Student Loans

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between low- and high-income high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between Black and White high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	6.5%
2000	Decrease	7.1%
2001	Decrease	7.9%
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Measure Term: Annual

Measure: Enrollment rates: The postsecondary enrollment gap between Hispanic and White high school graduates will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	14.4%
2000	Decrease	18.3%
2001	Decrease	15.6%
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Measure Term: Annual

PART Performance Measurements

Program: William D. Ford Direct Student Loans

Agency: Department of Education

Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Completion rates: The percent of full-time degree seeking students completing college within 150 percent of the normal time required will increase each year for all students.

Additional Information: The completion rate is defined as the percentage of full-time degree-seeking students completing within 150 percent of the normal time required.

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Increase	53.0%
2000	Increase	52.4%
2001	Increase	
2002	Increase	
2003	Increase	

Measure: Completion rates: Postsecondary education completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in less-than-4-year programs will improve.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Increase	34.4%
2000	Increase	32.7%
2001	Increase	
2002	Increase	
2003	Increase	

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Black and White full-time students in 4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	20.7%

PART Performance Measurements

Program: William D. Ford Direct Student Loans
Agency: Department of Education
Bureau: Federal Student Aid

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Black and White full-time students in 4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
2000	Decrease	19.7%
2001	Decrease	
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	

Measure: Completion rates: The postsecondary completion gap between Hispanic and White full-time students in 4-year programs will decrease each year.

Additional Information:

Measure Term: Annual

Year	Target	Actual
1999	Decrease	15.2%
2000	Decrease	13.9%
2001	Decrease	
2002	Decrease	
2003	Decrease	