

Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement

Key Measures

Improving student proficiency and closing the achievement gap are the cornerstones of the Department's work. In FY 2007, the Department administered 77 distinct programs that supported Goal 2, Improve Student Achievement. From the universe of measures that help determine these programs' effectiveness, the Department identified 10 key measures to report our progress. Results on these key measures are shown below. See page 34 for an explanation of the documentation fields for the key measures.

Reading Achievement

Research shows that students who fail to read well by the fourth grade have a greater likelihood of dropping out of school and encountering diminished life opportunities. Providing consistent support for reading success from the earliest age has critically important benefits. National reading initiatives support local efforts through competitive grants that enhance the school readiness of young children. Additional federal support for reading instruction goes to states through the large formula grants for disadvantaged students (Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies), for special education (Special Education Grants to States), and for vocational education (Career and Technical Education State Grants).

2.1.A IDEA: Special Education Grants to States. The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading. [1521]	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2007	36
2005	33
2003	29
2002	29
2007 target of 35 exceeded.	

U.S. Department of Education, National Assessment of Educational Progress.

2.1.B Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies. The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3–8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on state reading assessments. [89a04b]	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2007	Target is 60.9
2006	55.3
2005	52.6
2004	49.7
2006 target of 57.9 not met; 2007 data expected Sept. 2008.	

U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), EDEN/EDFacts.

Analysis of Progress. In measure 2.1.A, the 2007 target of 35 was exceeded. In measure 2.1.B, the 2006 target of 57.9 was not met. Measures 2.1.A and 2.1.B are new key measures for FY 2006, replacing measures targeting the number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade low-income students and the number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by scoring at or above proficient on state assessments in reading/language arts.

In measures 2.1.A and 2.1.B, year refers to school year. For example, 2006 refers to school year 2005–06. For 2004 and 2005, the targets for measure 2.1.B were not in place because the measures were not developed until 2006 for the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review of Title I, Part A. The new baseline (SY 2005–06) and future comparison year (SY 2006–07 and beyond) data used students tested within grades 3–8 during the given year to establish a national percentage of students at least proficient for each year. Prior to SY 2005–06, states tested a different number of grades because they were not required to test all students in grades 3–8 until SY 2005–06.

Data Quality. 2.1.A data are validated by the National Assessment of Educational Progress. 2.1.B data are self-reported by grantees and given a thorough review by Department staff who conducted follow-up as necessary. Beginning for SY 2004-05 reporting Consolidated State Performance Report data are submitted electronically by states.

Target Context. As planned and documented in the 2006 PART of ESEA, Title I, Part A, the Department calculated new baselines using SY 2005–06 data. The targets are based on the statutory goal of 100 percent proficiency by SY 2013–14.

Additional Information. For measure 2.1.A, the next national collection of data will be 2009. For measure 2.1.B, all states, except Nebraska, submitted SY 2005–06 performance data for students in grades 3–8. Nebraska provided data for grades 4 and 8 only.

2.1.C ESEA: English Language Acquisition	Fiscal Year	Actual
The percentage of limited English proficient students receiving Title III services who have attained English language proficiency. [1830]	2007	Target is 20
New key measure in 2007; 2007 data expected Dec. 2008.		

Analysis of Progress. Measure 2.1.C was a new key measure for FY 2007, replacing a measure targeting the number of states with programs that achieved English language proficiency.

Data Quality. Data for measure 2.1.C are self-reported by grantees.

U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR)
EDEN/EDFacts

Additional Information. Beginning in FY 2007, data will be available through EDFacts.



Mathematics Achievement

American students’ performance on international mathematics assessments provides a compelling rationale for intensive, targeted initiatives designed to strengthen the mathematics skills of our students. Results from the 2003 Program for International Student Assessment suggest that American high school students continue to lag behind students in other countries in mathematics. The gap in mathematics learning between American students and students in other countries is widening. A second survey will be conducted in 2012.

On the Program for International Student Assessment, 15-year-old students in the United States scored lower than students in 20 other countries belonging to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

To raise the number of highly qualified teachers in mathematics and science, and to increase the number of students reaching proficiency in these subjects, school districts use federal resources from the Mathematics and Science Partnership program. The program connects university professors, business leaders, and staff from nonprofit or for-profit organizations with educators from high-need school districts to improve science and mathematics learning. The results from a descriptive analysis of successful applications to the program indicate that this partnership program is on track in meeting its goals.

Highlights of the descriptive analysis show that 90 percent of the partnership projects link content to state mathematics and science standards. Ninety-two percent offer teachers summer institutes with an average of 64 hours of instruction and 48 hours of follow-up instruction. Two-thirds administer content knowledge tests to teachers, conduct observations, and make pretest and posttest comparisons, and 92.2 percent include partnerships with professors from mathematics or science departments in key planning or oversight roles. The preliminary evaluation pointed to one potential problem area for many of the projects: the quality of project evaluation plans. In response to this

finding, the Department enlisted the Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy to produce “How to Solicit Rigorous Evaluations of Mathematics and Science Partnerships Projects” for state coordinators of the programs.

2.2.A IDEA: Special Education Grants to States. The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in mathematics. [1523]

Fiscal Year	Actual
2007	33
2005	31
2003	29

2007 target of 33 met.

U.S. Department of Education, National Assessment of Educational Progress.

2.2.B Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies. The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3–8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on state math assessments. [89a04c]

Fiscal Year	Actual
2007	Target is 58.3
2006	52.3
2005	50.7
2004	47.6

2006 target of 56.2 not met; 2007 data expected Sept. 2008.

U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) EDEN/EDFacts.

Analysis of Progress. In measure 2.2.A, the 2007 target of 33 was met. In measure 2.2.B, the 2006 target of 56.2 was not met. Measures 2.2.A and 2.2.B are new key measures for FY 2006, replacing measures targeting the number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade low-income students and the number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by scoring proficient or above on state assessments in mathematics.

In measure 2.2.B, the 2006 target of 56.2 was not met. Measure 2.2.B is a new key measure for FY 2006, replacing a measure of targeting the number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by scoring at or above proficient on state assessments in mathematics.

For measures 2.2.A and 2.2.B, year refers to school year. For example, 2006 refers to school year 2005–06. For 2004 and 2005, the targets for the measure 2.2.B were not in place because the measure was not developed until 2006 for the PART review of Title I, Part A. The new baseline (SY 2005–06) and future comparison year (SYs 2006–07 and beyond) data used students tested within grades 3–8 during the given year to establish a national percentage of students at least proficient for each year. Prior to SY 2005–06, states tested a different number of grades because they were not required to test all students in grades 3–8 until that year.

Data Quality. Data in measure 2.2.A are validated by the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Data in measure 2.2.B are self-reported by grantees and given a thorough review by Department staff who conducted follow-up as necessary. Beginning with SY 2004–05 reporting, Consolidated State Performance Report data are submitted electronically by states.

Target Context. For measure 2.2.B, all states, except Nebraska, submitted SY 2005–06 performance data for students in grades 3–8. Nebraska provided data for grades 4 and 8 only. As indicated in the 2006 PART, the Department calculated new baselines using SY 2005–06 data because this was the first year that states were required to test all students in the grades 3–8 range.

Additional Information. For measure 2.2.A, the next national collection of data will be 2009. For measure 2.2.B, of the states for which SY 2003–04 estimates were developed, the District of

Columbia, Kentucky, Missouri, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Vermont, and Washington had submitted data through EDEN. The math and reading/language arts data (reading only for Missouri, Vermont, and Washington), however, appeared inaccurate compared with the SY 2003–04 and SY 2004–05 collections, so the SY 2003–04 estimates were used instead of the submitted data.



High School Completion

There is a consensus for high school reform among governors, business leaders, for-profit and nonprofit leaders, and the Department. This reform must start with an honest calculation of graduation rates. Accurate graduation rates are crucial to meeting the requirements of *No Child Left Behind*. States are required to set high school graduation rate targets as one indicator for measuring a high school's progress.

One of the major complications for states to accurately calculate high school graduation rates is the lack of a comprehensive data collection system that tracks students over time. Until states have the capacity to collect these data, the Department has committed to publishing two sets of state graduation rates: state-reported rates and standardized rates prepared by the Department. According to a Government Accountability Office report, as of July 2005, 12 states used a graduation rate definition referred to as the cohort definition, which tracks students from when they enter high school to when they leave. Thirty-two states used a definition based primarily on the number of dropouts over a four-year period and the number of graduates. For its calculation, the Department uses enrollment and other data found in the Common Core of Data at the National Center for Education Statistics.

Additional effort to reform our nation's high schools is evident in the Department's initiative to support formula grants to state educational agencies that reserve a portion of the funds to support the development of additional reading/language arts and mathematics assessments as part of their state assessment systems and award the remaining funds competitively to local educational agencies to implement targeted interventions in high-need secondary schools to increase student achievement and narrow achievement gaps.

2.3.A Special Education Grants to States. The percentage of students with disabilities that graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma. [1527]

Fiscal Year	Actual
2007	Target is 57
2006	56.5
2005	54
2004	54
2003	52
2002	51
2001	48
2000	46
1999	47
1998	45
1997	43
1996	42

2006 target of 56 exceeded; 2007 data expected Oct. 2008.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs, section 618 state-reported data.

2.3.B Special Education Grants to States. The percentage of students with disabilities who drop out of school. [1528]

Fiscal Year	Actual
2007	Target is 28
2006	26.2
2005	28
2004	31
2003	34
2002	38
2001	41
2000	42
1999	42
1998	44
1997	46
1996	47

2006 target of 29 exceeded; 2007 data expected Oct. 2008.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs, section 618 state-reported data.

Analysis of Progress. For measure 2.3.A, the FY 2006 target of 56 has been exceeded. The nation is continuing to make steady progress ensuring that students with disabilities graduate from high school at increasing rates within the mainstream curriculum.

Data Quality. Data are self-reported by grantees.

Target Context. The graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students aged 14 and older with disabilities who graduated with a regular diploma by the total number of students with disabilities in the same age group who graduate with a regular diploma, receive a certificate of completion, reach the maximum age for services, die, drop out, or move and are not known to have continued in education.

Additional Information. This includes calculations for 57 entities (50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, Northern Marianas and the Bureau of Indian Affairs).

Analysis of Progress. For measure 2.3.B, the FY 2006 target of 29 was exceeded. Dropout rates for students with disabilities continue to decline proportionally with the increase in graduation rates.

Data Quality. Data are self-reported by grantees.

Target Context. The dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students aged 14 and older with disabilities who dropped out or moved and are not known to have continued in education by the total number of students with disabilities in the same age group who graduate with a regular diploma, receive a certificate of completion, reach the maximum age for services, die, drop out, or move and are not known to have continued in education.

Additional Information. This includes calculations for 57 entities (50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, Northern Marianas and the Bureau of Indian Affairs).

Advanced Placement Participation

Enrollment in Advanced Placement courses has nearly tripled over the past decade. Participation by minority and low-income students has increased, but an access gap continues. According to the College Board, the number of public school students from low-income families who took the Board’s Advanced Placement exams increased by more than 25 percent between 2005 and 2006, and the total number of low-income students taking AP exams has doubled since 2001. However, participation in Advanced Placement programs is still highly correlated with family income. In 2006, low-income students took only 13.7 percent of all AP tests. The College Board currently identifies only the number of tests taken by low-income students, as opposed to the number of low-income students who took the exams.

Some minority groups continue to be underrepresented among students who take Advanced Placement exams. In 2006, according to the College Board, African American students made up 13.7 percent of the nation’s student population but only 6.9 percent of AP test-takers in 2006 were African American. Hispanic students, on the other hand, accounted for 14 percent of all AP test-takers, the same rate as their share of the high school population. However, Hispanic students in the class of 2006 took over 53 percent of the total number of AP Spanish Language exams and 81 percent of AP Spanish Literature exams taken by all students in the class of 2006 during their high school years. The overall Hispanic participation rate is, thus, somewhat distorted by the inclusion of data on the two tests on which many Hispanic students may have an advantage. In all other subjects, the rate of participation of Hispanic students is below the national average.

2.3.C Advanced Placement. The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income public school students nationally. [1149]	Fiscal Year	Actual
	2007	Target is 230,352
	2006	267,286
	2005	223,263
	2004	187,691
	2003	157,334
	2002	132,459
	2001	105,138
	2000	92,083
	1999	87,149
2006 target of 209,411 exceeded; 2007 data expected Jan. 2008		

The College Board, Fee Reduction Summary Report.

Analysis of Progress. For measure 2.3.C, the FY 2006 target of 209,411 was exceeded. The FY 2005 measure was adjusted to focus on low-income students, and the Department obtained data from previous years to report on the new measure. The prior year data in the report and in budget submissions were adjusted to focus on low-income public school students only, as opposed to all low-income students. Prior year data included data for public and non-public school students.

Data Quality. The Fee Reduction Summary Report is a year-end accounting file that provides a final count of Advanced Placement test fee reductions granted. Test fee reductions are provided to students with acute need.

Target Context. The FY 2006 target was established based on public and non-public school data. The FY 2007 target was adjusted to focus on public school students. Targets for FY 2007 and forward are calculated based on the previous year’s target plus 10 percent.

Teacher Quality

The Department continues to work with states and school districts to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified, especially in core academic subjects. Monitoring visits to states indicate that states have made changes to their certification requirements. These changes include requiring more content knowledge, having teacher candidates pass written examinations, encouraging alternative certification programs, requiring teacher preparation institutions to improve their programs, requiring secondary school teachers to have a major in the subjects they teach, and implementing incentive systems to attract and retain highly qualified teachers.

Many local educational agencies had difficulty ensuring that special education and secondary mathematics and science teachers were highly qualified. In spring 2006, the Department reviewed states' progress in meeting the requirement that all teachers be highly qualified and requested states to submit revised plans for reaching the requirement by the end of SY 2006–07. *No Child Left Behind* requires that all public school teachers of core academic subjects meet the qualifications outlined in the definition by the end of SY 2005–06.

For the first time, the Congress legislated the requirement that teachers in every core academic class have a bachelor's degree, have a state license or a certificate, and be competent in the subjects they teach. In addition, the recently reauthorized *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* addresses teacher qualification and requires all special educators to be highly qualified. Resources provided to states to meet the requirement of a "highly qualified teacher" in every core academic class include major funding from the \$3 billion Improving Teacher Quality State Grants and the \$68 million Teacher Quality Enhancement Programs.

2.4.A Improving Teacher Quality State Grants. The percentage of core academic classes in elementary schools taught by highly qualified teachers. [1182]	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2007	Target is 100
2006	Target is 95
2005	93
2004	91
2003	85
2005 target of 90 exceeded; 2006 data expected Dec. 2007; 2007 data expected Dec. 2008	

2.4.B Improving Teacher Quality State Grants. The percentage of core academic classes in secondary schools taught by highly qualified teachers. [1183]	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2007	Target is 100
2006	Target is 92
2005	89
2004	88
2003	80
2005 target of 85 exceeded; 2006 data expected Dec. 2007; 2007 data expected Dec. 2008	

U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report, grantee submissions.

Analysis of Progress. The data reported through the *Consolidated State Performance Report* show that states are about 90 percent of the way toward having all classes taught by highly qualified teachers.

Data Quality. The Department continues to monitor states to ensure that the data they provide are determined using a definition of highly qualified teacher that is consistent with the statutory requirement. During monitoring visits to states over the past three years, the Department found that many states were confused about the definition of "highly qualified teacher," particularly for special education teachers. Most states now use the correct definition, and data are now generally accurate.

Discontinued Strategic Measures

The following measures were discontinued after FY 2006 but were reported as pending in the *FY 2006 Performance and Accountability Report*. The latest data are reported below.

	Measure	Fiscal Year	Target	Actual	Status
2.1.A	The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade low-income students meeting state performance standards by scoring at or above proficient on state assessments in reading/language arts. [1066]	2006	25	29*	Exceeded target
2.1.B	The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by scoring at or above proficient on state assessments in reading. [1519]	2006	25	25**	Target met
2.1.C	The number of states that met the target for attainment of English language proficiency [1830/2006]	2007	29	19	Target not met
2.2.A	The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade low-income students meeting state performance standards by scoring proficient or above on state assessments in mathematics. [1067]	2006	25	34***	Exceeded target
2.2.B	The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by scoring at or above proficient on state assessments in mathematics. [1520]	2006	25	20****	Target not met
2.4.A	The percentage of core academic classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers. [1180]	2006	95	Not Collected	Replaced with Current Measures

* 39 states tested fourth-grade students in reading in both SY 2004–05 and SY 2005–06.

** 38 states tested fourth-grade students in reading in both SY 2004–05 and SY 2005–06.

*** 45 states tested eighth-grade students in mathematics in both SY 2004–05 and SY 2005–06.

**** 47 states tested eighth-grade students in mathematics in both SY 2004–05 and SY 2005–06

Sources and Notes

2.1.A	U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report.
2.1.B	U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report.
2.1.C	U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report EDEN/EDFacts
2.2.A	U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report EDEN/EDFacts
2.2.B	U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report EDEN/EDFacts
2.4.A	U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report EDEN/EDFacts

Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement Program Performance Summary

Seventy-nine of our grant programs most directly support Goal 2. These programs are listed below. In the table, an overview is provided for the results of each program on its program performance measures. (See page 35 for the methodology of calculating the percentage of targets met, not met, and without data.) Individual program performance reports are available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2007report/program.html>. Appropriation and expenditure data for FY 2007 are included for each of these programs.

Program Name	PART Rating	Appropriations† FY 2007 \$ in millions	Expenditures‡ FY 2007 \$ in millions	Program Performance Results Percent of Targets Met, Not Met, Without Data											
				FY 2007			FY 2006			FY 2005			FY 2004		
				% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data
APEB: American Printing House for the Blind	RND	18	18	73	0	27	67	33	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
CFAA: Supplemental Education Grants	NA	18	16	/// (not funded)											
CRA: Training and Advisory Services	RND	7	7	80	20	0	100	0	0						
CTEA: Career and Technical Education National Programs	NA	10	12	0	0	100	0	20	80	60	40	0	60	40	0
CTEA: Career and Technical Education State Grants	I	1,182	1,354	0	0	100	47	53	0	50	50	0	27	73	0
CTEA: Occupational and Employment Information	RND	0	3	60	40	0	60	40	0	60	40	0	60	40	0
CTEA: Tech-Prep Demonstration	NA	0	4	0	0	100	67	33	0	33	37	0	0	100	0
CTEA: Tech-Prep Education State Grants	RND	105	103	0	0	100	67	33	0	33	67	0	0	100	0
ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers	A	981	721	0	0	100	44	50	6	0	100	0	50	50	0
ESEA: Academies for American History and Civics	NA	2	1	0	0	100									
ESEA: Advanced Credentialing	NA	17	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
ESEA: Advanced Placement	ME	37	32	0	0	100	80	20	0						
ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity	NA	34	38	0	100	0	33	67	0	100	0	0	0	100	0
ESEA: Arts In Education	NA	35	36	0	0	100	75	0	25	0	50	50			
ESEA: Charter Schools Grants	A	215	191	25	0	75	25	13	63	50	50	0	0	100	0

Program Name	PART Rating	Appropriations†	Expenditures‡	Program Performance Results											
				Percent of Targets Met, Not Met, Without Data											
				FY 2007			FY 2006			FY 2005			FY 2004		
FY 2007 \$ in millions	FY 2007 \$ in millions		% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	
ESEA: Civic Education: Cooperative Education Exchange	NA	12	12												
ESEA: Comprehensive School Reform	A	2	142	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	100	0	0
ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities	NA	37	36	0	0	100	100	0	0	100	0	0	50	50	0
ESEA: Dropout Prevention Programs	NA	0	3												
ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development	NA	15	13	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	50	50	50	50	0
ESEA: Early Reading First	ME	118	95	0	0	100	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians	NA	34	39	0	100	0	33	67	0	100	0	0	0	100	0
ESEA: Educational Technology State Grants	RND	272	354	20	0	80	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
ESEA: English Language Acquisition	NA	669	660	0	17	83	40	60	0	100	0	0			
ESEA: Even Start	I	82	143	0	0	100	60	40	0	0	25	75	50	50	0
ESEA: Excellence in Economic Education	NA	1	2	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100			
ESEA: Foreign Language Assistance	RND	24	18	0	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	0			
ESEA: Fund for the Improvement of Education Programs of National Significance	NA	16	85												
ESEA: Impact Aid Basic Support Payments/ Payments for Children with Disabilities	RND	1,141	1,063	50	0	50	50	50	0						
ESEA: Impact Aid Construction	A	18	33	67	0	33	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
ESEA: Impact Aid Facilities Maintenance	NA	5	7												
ESEA: Impact Aid Payments for Federal Property	RND	64	60	0	100	0	0	100	0						
ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants	ME	2,887	2,953	0	0	100	33	0	67	100	0	0	100	0	0
ESEA: Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies	A	95	90	0	0	100	33	50	17	29	71	0			

Program Name	PART Rating	Appropriations†	Expenditures‡	Program Performance Results											
				Percent of Targets Met, Not Met, Without Data											
				FY 2007			FY 2006			FY 2005			FY 2004		
FY 2007 \$ in millions	FY 2007 \$ in millions		% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	
ESEA: Javits Gifted and Talented Education	NA	8	12	0	0	100	33	0	67	100	0	0			
ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries	NA	19	20	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	50	50	50	0	50
ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance	A	107	99	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100			
ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships	RND	182	142	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	50	50
ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program	A	387	343	0	0	100	58	8	33	92	8	0	83	17	0
ESEA: National Writing Project	RND	22	22	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	100	0
ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program	A	50	48	0	0	100	67	0	33	100	0	0	0	100	0
ESEA: Parental Information and Resource Centers	RND	40	36	0	0	100	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
ESEA: Reading First State Grants	E	1,029	1,025	0	0	100	100	0	0						
ESEA: Reading Is Fundamental/ Inexpensive Book Distribution	NA	25	25	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
ESEA: Ready to Teach	NA	11	13	0	0	100	0	0	100						
ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television	RND	24	19	0	0	100	0	0	100						
ESEA: Rural Education	RND	169	165	13	0	88	0	100	0	67	33	0	0	100	0
ESEA: School Improvement Grants	NA	125	0				0	0	100	33	67	0	100	0	0
ESEA: School Leadership	NA	15	15	0	0	100	100	0	0						
ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities	RND	94	110	0	29	71	0	0	100	33	67	0	33	67	0
ESEA: Special Programs for Indian Children	NA	19	20	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100			
ESEA: Star Schools Program	NA	12	17	0	0	100	0	0	100						
ESEA: State Assessments	A	408	418	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	100	0	100	0	0
ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs	RND	99	146	33	0	67	50	50	0	75	25	0	50	50	0
ESEA: Striving Readers	NA	32	24	0	0	100									
ESEA: Teaching American History	RND	120	95	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100
ESEA: Teacher Incentive Fund	NA	0	14												

Program Name	PART Rating	Appropriations†	Expenditures‡	Program Performance Results											
				Percent of Targets Met, Not Met, Without Data											
				FY 2007			FY 2006			FY 2005			FY 2004		
FY 2007 \$ in millions	FY 2007 \$ in millions	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data		
ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies	ME	12,838	12,587	0	0	100	0	50	50						
ESEA: Transition to Teaching	A	44	43	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	
ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers	A	15	16	0	0	100	67	33	0	100	0	0			
ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice	NA	26	29	0	0	100	0	0	100	100	0	0			
ESEA: Women's Educational Equity	NA	2	3	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	100	0			
ESRA: Comprehensive Centers	RND	56	57	25	0	75	0	100	0	///			/// (not funded)		
ESRA: National Assessment	E	93	116	100	0	0	(off year for collection)			100	0	0	(off year for collection)		
ESRA: Regional Educational Laboratories	NA	65	68	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100
ESRA: Statewide Data Systems	NA	25	11							///			/// (not funded)		
HEA: High School Equivalency Program	RND	19	18	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	100	0	0
HEA: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders	NA	23	19	100	0	0	100	0	0	0	100	0	100	0	0
HEA: Teacher Quality Enhancement	RND	60	71	0	0	100	100	0	0	100	0	0			
HERA: Aid for Elementary and Secondary Education (Hurricane Relief)	NA	0	370												
IDEA: Special Education Grants for Infants and Families	RND	436	431	20	40	40	33	67	0	33	67	0	33	67	0
IDEA: Special Education Grants to States	A	10,783	10,719	17	17	67	67	0	33	60	40	0			
IDEA: Special Education Parent Information Centers	RND	26	26	0	0	100	67	0	33						
IDEA: Special Education Personnel Preparation	RND	90	84	0	13	88	67	33	0	100	0	0			
IDEA: Special Education Preschool Grants	RND	381	387	33	33	33	50	50	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
IDEA: Special Education State Personnel Grants	NA	0	49	100	0	0	100	0	0	///			/// (not funded)		
IDEA: Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination	RND	49	46	0	0	100	33	0	67						

Program Name	PART Rating	Appropriations†	Expenditures‡	Program Performance Results											
				Percent of Targets Met, Not Met, Without Data											
				FY 2007			FY 2006			FY 2005			FY 2004		
FY 2007 \$ in millions	FY 2007 \$ in millions		% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	
IDEA: Special Education Technology and Media Services	RND	38	25	0	0	100	67	0	33	50	50	0			
MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths	NA	62	73	0	0	100	100	0	0	100	0	0			
Administrative and Support Funding for Goal 2#	NA	0	0												
TOTAL		36,281	*36,420												

† Budget for each program represents program budget authority.

‡ Expenditures occur when recipients draw down funds to cover actual outlays. FY 2007 expenditures may include funds from prior years' appropriations.

■ A shaded cell denotes that the program did not have targets for the specified year.

/// Denotes programs not yet implemented. (Programs are often implemented near the end of the year they are first funded.)

The Department does not plan to develop performance measures for programs, activities, or budgetary line items that are administrative in nature or that serve to support other programs and their performance measures.

* Expenditures by program do not include outlays in the amount of \$24 million for prior years' obligations for Goal 2 programs that were not funded in FY 2007 and FY 2007 estimated accruals in the amount of \$394 million.

- APEB: Act to Promote the Education of the Blind
- CFAA: Compact of Free Association Act, Amendments of 2003
- CRA: Civil Rights Act
- CTEA: Perkins Career and Technical Education Act
- ESEA: Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
- ESRA: Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002
- HEA: Higher Education Act of 1965
- HERA: Hurricane Education Recovery Act
- IDEA: Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
- MVHAA: McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

- PART Rating**
- E = Effective
 - ME = Moderately Effective
 - A = Adequate
 - I = Ineffective
 - RND = Results Not Demonstrated
 - NA = Program has not been assessed