FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Goal: To improve postsecondary education by making grants to institutions in support of reform and innovation.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Supports Objective 3.2 by helping to ensure the high quality of educational programs through reform and innovation.

FY 2000—$74,249,000

FY 2001—$31,200,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: PROMOTE REFORMS THAT IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF TEACHING AND LEARNING AT POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS.

Indicator 1.1 Quality of postsecondary reforms: The percentage of innovative educational reforms that are tested and implemented will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
FIPSE projects scoring A, B, or C in overall quality			**Status:** FY 2000 target met in 1999.	**Source:** Final Report Score Card. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000 (will revise to match indicators more closely).
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997:	84%		**Explanation:** The perfect figure for 1999 reflects the quality of FIPSE's grant awards and improved monitoring systems. FIPSE expects project quality to remain at approximately this level. Seventy-three percent of its projects scored "A" or "B." Special attention is being given to raise this number by improving the quality of "C"-graded projects.	
1998:	88%			**Validation Procedure:** Data supplied by FIPSE program officers upon review of project reports. Special monitoring of "C"-graded projects.
1999:	**100%**	**No target set**		
2000:		100%		
2001:		100%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Constructing new site visit instrument to collect on-site data on quality of reforms.

Indicator 1.2 Replication of projects: The number of projects that are adapted in full or in part, or whose materials are used by other institutions, will increase over the number in previous years.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
FIPSE grantees reporting full or partial project dissemination to others			**Status:** FY 2000 target met in 1999.	**Source:** Final Report Score Card, 1998. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000 (will revise to match indicators more closely).*
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998:	92%		**Explanation:** FIPSE considers itself successful on this measure if 9 of every 10 projects result in project models being adapted/replicated on other campuses. The current figure slightly exceeds this benchmark, and FIPSE has set its FY 2000 target higher than that.	
1999:	**100%**	**No target set**		
2000:		100%		Performance Report Score Card, 1998 *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000 (will revise to match indicators more closely).
2001:		100%		
				E-mail survey of 1990-99 grantees. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000 (will revise to include additional e-mail addressees).

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Validation Procedure: Data supplied by project directors in response to survey instruments; visits by external evaluator. Same or similar questions in two report cards yield similar results. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Self-reported data. Special dissemination initiatives planned for FY2000, including a dissemination conference and monograph, will produce additional dissemination data that may validate the data above.

OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASE PARTICIPATION AND COMPLETION RATES OF STUDENTS IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION.

Indicator 2.1 Student completion rate: Participants in FIPSE persistence-related projects will complete postsecondary education at higher rates than in previous years.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of retention/completion projects reporting improved student persistence rates			**Status:** Positive movement toward target.	**Source:** Final Report Score Card. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000 (will revise to match indicators more closely).
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** Projects addressing persistence issues face numerous difficulties in implementation. Past experience suggests that a 75 percent success rate would be extraordinary.	
1997:	48%			
1998:	35%			**Validation Procedure:** Data reported by directors of access/retention projects.
1999:	**62%**	**No target set**		
2000:		75%		
2001:		80%		**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data are self-reported. Small sample size.

OBJECTIVE 3: INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF FIPSE PROGRAMS.

Indicator 3.1 Projects sustained: The number of projects sustained at least 2 years beyond Federal funding will be maintained or increased beyond current level.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects reporting full or partial institutionalization on their home campuses			**Status:** Positive movement toward target.	**Source:** E-mail survey of 1990-99. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* FY 2000 (will revise to include additional e-mail addressees).
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Explanation:** FIPSE's emphasis on institutional contributions to projects and development of long-term continuation plans are designed to imbed projects within campus structures. If 9 of 10 FIPSE projects achieve institutionalization, FIPSE will have achieved its purpose. However, FIPSE will set its target higher than that.	
1998:	93%			
1999:	**96%**	**No target set**		Final Report Score Card *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000 (will revise to match indicators more closely).
2000:		100%		
2001:		100%		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Validation Procedure: Self-reports and campus visits by program officers. New, common site visit evaluation form is being developed to validate narrative reports and furnish additional cross-project data. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** External evaluations planned for major FIPSE programs in FY 2000 and 2001. It has been difficult to quantify descriptive site visit reports until we have the new evaluation form is available.

OBJECTIVE 4: IMPROVE SERVICE DELIVERY AND CUSTOMER SATISFACTION FOR FIPSE PROGRAMS.

Indicator 4.1 Project directors, overall satisfaction with FIPSE programs and services: Satisfaction levels from previous year will be met or exceeded.		
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of grantees reporting that FIPSE staff provides full support	**Status:** FY 2000 targets met in 1999. **Explanation:** FIPSE staff has agreed to devote the current year to improving project monitoring and technical assistance efforts. A comprehensive set of monitoring procedures is being developed. Annual and final report guidelines are being revised, focusing on indicator variables.	**Source:** Survey of project directors at annual meeting, 1999; project survey, annual, 1999; e-mail survey of 1990-98 grantees, annual, 2000; Final Report Score Card, annual, 1999. (Revisions planned; see notes above). *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure:** Triangulation of four measures noted above, all yielding similar results. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** E-mail survey being expanded to greater numbers of faculty and staff who are now online.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997:	98%	
1998:	98%	
1999:	**100%**	**No target set**
2000:		100%
2001:		100%

KEY STRATEGIES

<u>Strategies Continued from 1999</u>
- ❖ FIPSE will continue to support promising innovative strategies for increasing institutional performance and the quality of teaching.
- ❖ FIPSE will continue to provide outreach seminars to under-served populations, full technical assistance to prospective grantees, and feedback to all unsuccessful applicants.

<u>New or Strengthened Strategies</u>
- ❖ Access to higher education and program completion will be highlighted as major guideline priorities of the Comprehensive Project. FIPSE will support innovative strategies for increasing program completion and disseminate successful programs nationally.
- ❖ FIPSE will support development and testing of new models of project adaptation and dissemination.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES
- ❖ On international education programs, consults regularly with the State Department and USIA.
- ❖ On congressional earmarks, FIPSE assisted the Department of Defense in awarding $8 million in grants.
- ❖ On evaluation and peer review procedures, FIPSE advises the evaluation team of the National Endowment for the Arts.
- ❖ On teacher education, FIPSE assists on review sites and evaluation for the Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers To Use Technology Program.
- ❖ On learning through technology, FIPSE assists in the development of peer review procedures and evaluation techniques for the Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships Program.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL
- ❖ Salaries and Expenses (S&E) funds may be insufficient to fully implement planning for improved monitoring and evaluation.

INDICATOR CHANGES
From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)
Adjusted—None.
Dropped
- ❖ In accordance with departmental recommendations that the number of indicators be pared, 2-year-old Indicators 1.2 (number of qualifying projects) and 1.3 (number of national awards) were dropped, along with Objectives 3 (encourage international cooperation), 4 (prepare students for work in new international contexts), 5 (maintain or increase FIPSE programs' effectiveness through dissemination), and 7 (increased leverage of grant funds); Indicators 8.1 (reduce turnaround time), 9.1, and 9.2 (improve communication); and Objective 10 (maintain high levels of technical assistance).

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)
Adjusted—None.
Dropped
- ❖ Indicator 4.2 (novice application success rate) was dropped; while FIPSE continues to use it for internal purposes, this indicator did not reflect program outcomes or effectiveness.
- ❖ Indicator 4.4 was dropped because it tapped largely the same pool of applicants as 4.1, on the same variable—satisfaction with programs and services.
New—None.