

**Archived Information**

**FY 2005  
Program Performance  
Plan**

**(Revised After Appropriations)**

U.S. Department of Education  
December 30, 2004

**Corrected: 01/31/2005**

# Contents

Introduction.....	1
Key To Legislation.....	1

## Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement

APEB: American Printing House for the Blind.....	4
CRA: Training and Advisory Services .....	8
ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers.....	10
ESEA: Advanced Credentialing.....	15
ESEA: Advanced Placement.....	16
ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity.....	18
ESEA: Arts In Education .....	19
ESEA: Charter Schools Grants .....	20
ESEA: Civic Education: Cooperative Education Exchange.....	22
ESEA: Comprehensive School Reform.....	23
ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities .....	25
ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development .....	27
ESEA: Early Reading First .....	30
ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians.....	33
ESEA: Educational Technology State Grants .....	35
ESEA: English Language Acquisition.....	38
ESEA: Even Start.....	48
ESEA: Excellence in Economic Education.....	53
ESEA: Foreign Language Assistance .....	54
ESEA: Impact Aid Basic Support Payments and Payments for Children with Disabilities .....	55
<i>Impact Aid Basic Support Payments</i>	
<i>Impact Aid Payments for Children with Disabilities</i>	
ESEA: Impact Aid Construction.....	57
ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants .....	58
ESEA: Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies .....	61
ESEA: Javits Gifted and Talented Education .....	63

**Goal 2 (Continued)**

ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries ..... 65  
ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance..... 67  
ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships ..... 70  
ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program..... 73  
ESEA: National Writing Project ..... 81  
ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program ..... 82  
ESEA: Parental Assistance Information Centers ..... 87  
ESEA: Reading First State Grants ..... 88  
ESEA: Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution ..... 93  
ESEA: Ready to Teach ..... 94  
ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television..... 95  
ESEA: Rural Education ..... 99  
ESEA: School Leadership ..... 101  
ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities..... 103  
ESEA: Special Programs for Indian Children ..... 105  
ESEA: Star Schools Program..... 108  
ESEA: State Assessments ..... 111  
ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs ..... 115  
ESEA: Teaching of Traditional American History..... 116  
ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies ..... 117  
ESEA: Transition To Teaching ..... 121  
ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers ..... 123  
ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice..... 125  
ESEA: Women’s Educational Equity ..... 126  
ESRA: National Assessment..... 127  
ESRA: Regional Educational Laboratories..... 129  
HEA: High School Equivalency Program ..... 131  
HEA: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders ..... 132  
HEA: Teacher Quality Enhancement ..... 134  
IDEA: Special Education Grants for Infants and Families ..... 136  
IDEA: Special Education Grants to States ..... 140

**Goal 2 (Continued)**

IDEA: Special Education Parent Information Centers ..... 149  
IDEA: Special Education Personnel Preparation ..... 152  
IDEA: Special Education Preschool Grants ..... 157  
IDEA: Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination ..... 160  
IDEA: Special Education Technology and Media Services ..... 163  
MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths ..... 165  
VTEA: Occupational and Employment Information ..... 167  
VTEA: Tech-Prep Demonstration ..... 168  
VTEA: Vocational Education National Programs ..... 171  
VTEA: Vocational Education State Grants and Tech-Prep Education State Grants ..... 174  
*Vocational Education State Grants*  
*Tech-Prep Education State Grants*

**Goal 3: Develop Safe Schools and Strong Character**

ESEA: Alcohol Abuse Reduction ..... 182  
ESEA: Civic Education: We the People ..... 184  
ESEA: Close-Up Fellowships ..... 185  
ESEA: Elementary and Secondary School Counseling ..... 186  
ESEA: Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners ..... 188  
ESEA: Mentoring Program ..... 190  
ESEA: Physical Education Program ..... 192  
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Other National Programs ..... 193  
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants ..... 195

## Goal 4: Transform Education into an Evidence-Based Field

ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination .....	202
RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research .....	211

## Goal 5: Enhance the Quality of and Access to Postsecondary and Adult Education

AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities.....	222
AEFLA : Adult Education State Grants.....	224
AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy .....	232
ATA: Assistive Technology Alternative Financing .....	234
ATA: Assistive Technology Programs .....	235
EDA: Gallaudet University.....	236
EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf.....	244
ESEA: Community Technology Centers .....	248
HEA: Aid for Institutional Development Title III & Title V .....	250
<i>AID Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions</i>	
<i>AID Minority Science and Engineering Improvement</i>	
<i>AID Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions</i>	
<i>AID Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities</i>	
<i>AID Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions</i>	
<i>AID Strengthening Institutions</i>	
<i>AID Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities</i>	
HEA: Byrd Honors Scholarships .....	253
HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents in School .....	255
HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program.....	258
HEA: Demonstration Projects to Ensure Quality Higher Education for Students with Disabilities.....	260
HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.....	262
HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP) .....	264
HEA: Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) .....	269

**Goal 5 (Continued)**

HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Programs .....273  
*International Education and Foreign Language Studies Domestic Programs*  
*International Education and Foreign Language Studies--Institute for International Public Policy*  
*MECEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Overseas Programs*

HEA: Javits Fellowships .....278

HEA: Student Financial Assistance Policy .....280  
*SFA Federal Direct Student Loans*  
*SFA Federal Family Education Loan Program & Liquidating*  
*SFA Federal Pell Grants*  
*SFA Federal Perkins Loans*  
*SFA Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants*  
*SFA Federal Work-Study*  
*SFA Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnerships*

HEA: Student Aid Administration.....286

HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers .....288

HEA: TRIO McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement .....289

HEA: TRIO Student Support Services.....291

HEA: TRIO Talent Search .....293

HEA: TRIO Upward Bound.....294

HEA: Underground Railroad Program.....297

HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults .....299

NLA: Literacy Programs for Prisoners .....302

RA: Client Assistance State Grants.....303

RA: Independent Living Centers and State Grants .....305  
*Independent Living Centers*  
*Independent Living State Grants*

RA: Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals .....307

RA: Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers .....309

**Goal 5 (Continued)**

RA: Projects with Industry ..... 310  
RA: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights ..... 313  
RA: Supported Employment State Grants..... 314  
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs ..... 316  
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Grants for Indians ..... 319  
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Recreational Programs ..... 321  
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants..... 322  
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training..... 326  
20 USC: Howard University..... 329  
VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions ..... 339

**All Goals**

DEOA: Office for Civil Rights - 2005 ..... 342



# INTRODUCTION

The strategic goals and objectives set forth in the Department of Education's *FY 2002 - 2007 Strategic Plan* form the context for the broad outcomes that the Department believes should characterize American education. We continue our commitment to these 6 goals and the 26 related objectives.

The Department administers more than 150 programs in support of these goals and objectives. This *Revised FY 2005 Program Performance Plan* presents the individual program performance plans, which align to the individual program's provisions and the audience that it serves. In addition, selected measures from these plans have been identified as key measures at the strategic level. These strategic-level measures are presented in our *Revised FY 2005 Performance Plan*, located on our Web site at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2005plan/program.html>.

## Key to Legislation:

APEB = Act for the Promotion of Education for the Blind  
AEFLA = Adult Education and Family Literacy Act  
AID = Aid for Institutional Development  
ATA = Assistive Technology Act  
CRA = Civil Rights Act  
DEOA = Department of Education Organization Act  
EDA = Education of the Deaf Act  
ESEA = Elementary and Secondary Education Act  
ESRA = Education Sciences Reform Act  
FIE = Fund for the Improvement of Education

HEA = Higher Education Act  
HKNCA = Helen Keller National Center Act  
IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act  
MECEA = Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act  
MVHAA = McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act  
NLA = National Literacy Act  
RA = Rehabilitation Act  
SFA = Student Financial Assistance Programs  
VTEA = Vocational and Technical Education Act  
USC = United States Code



# Goal 2

## APEB: American Printing House for the Blind – 2005

**Program Goal: Pre-college-level blind students will receive appropriate educational materials that result in improved educational outcomes**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Appropriate, Timely, High-Quality Educational Materials Are Provided To Pre-College-Level Blind Students To Allow Them To Benefit More Fully From Their Educational Programs.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Customer satisfaction: The American Printing House's customers/consumers will agree that the educational materials provided through the act are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Trustees-Percentage that agree</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The survey instrument used by APH was constructed with the input of an external research firm and was designed to measure the levels of customer/consumer satisfaction with each of the factors. The survey was distributed to 147 ex officio trustees as well as to various professional groups whose members work in the field of blindness. Additionally, the survey was available on the APH Web site. This made it easily available for response by individuals who were not on a specific mailing list, but who were encouraged to respond through invitations on list servs and</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Survey of Ex Officio Trustees; Input from Research and Publications Advisory Committees; consumer surveys, and teacher surveys.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.            Data supplied by the American Printing House for the Blind. No formal verification procedure</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	95			
1999	96	95		
2000	96.50	96		
2001	97	96		
2002	99	96		
2003	98.75	96		
2004	99.50	96		
2005		98		
<i>Advisory Committees-Percentage that agree</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	100	100		

<b>2000</b>	100	100	in various newsletters and announcements. The Web-based format also provided accessibility to visually impaired individuals who require alternate media.	applied.
<b>2001</b>	100	100		
<b>2002</b>	100	100		
<b>2003</b>	100	100		
<b>2004</b>	100	100		
<b>2005</b>		100		
<i>Consumers-Percentage that agree</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>1999</b>	90			
<b>2000</b>	100	95		
<b>2001</b>	97	95		
<b>2002</b>	96	95		
<b>2003</b>	100	95		
<b>2004</b>	99	95		
<b>2005</b>		95		
<i>Teachers - Percentage that agree</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2002</b>	96			
<b>2003</b>	97	96		
<b>2004</b>	98	96		
<b>2005</b>		96		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Trustees--Percentage that agree</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The American Printing House worked with an independent Research Corporation to develop a survey that would obtain more reliable information from its trustees and from teachers.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Survey of Ex Officio Trustees and Survey of Teachers (2003).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by the American Printing House for the Blind.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	98			
1999	98	98		
2000	97	99		
2001	97	99		
2002	100	99		
2003	99.50	99		
2004	100	99		
2005		99		
<i>Teachers--Percentage that agree</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	93			
2003	95	95		
2004	99	95		
2005		95		

<b>Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Student Achievement: The percentages of students who attain identified concepts or skills during the field testing of products in four areas--low vision, early childhood, multiple disabilities, and tactile graphics.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Percentage of students</i>								
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>				<b>Performance Targets</b>			
	Low Vision	Early Childhood	Multiple Disabilities	Tactile Graphics	Low Vision	Early Childhood	Multiple Disabilities	Tactile Graphics
<b>2005</b>					999	999	999	999
				<p><b>Progress:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p>		<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>		

## CRA: Training and Advisory Services – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.004D - Training and Advisory Services

**Program Goal: To support access and equity in public schools and help school districts solve equity problems in education related to race, gender, and national origin.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide high-quality technical assistance and training to public school districts in addressing equity in education.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Training and technical assistance services result in the promotion of policies and practices to ensure that all children regardless of race, gender, or national origin have equal access to quality education and equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of customers of the Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices in eliminating, reducing, or preventing harassment, conflict, and school violence.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Equity Assistance Center Customer Survey and Equity Assistance Center Annual Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<b>2006</b>		999		
<i>The percentage of customers of the Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices ensuring that students of different race, national origin, and gender have equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<b>2006</b>		999		



Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Training and technical assistance services result in products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to education policy or practice.												
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>The percentage of customers that report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high usefulness to their policies and practices.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Equity Assistance Center Customer Survey and Equity Assistance Center Annual Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 -  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets										
2005		999										
2006		999										

## ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.287 - Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers

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

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.**

Targets and Performance Data														Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of regular program participants whose math/English grades improved from fall to spring.</i>															
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets						<b>Additional Source Information:</b> 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Report/PPICS  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005		
<b>2000</b>	43	45	36	37	39	41									
<b>2001</b>	43	46	37	39	40	43	45	45	45	45	45	45			
<b>2002</b>	41.10	44.20	37.20	39.40	39.40	42.30	45	45	45	45	45	45			
<b>2003</b>	42.70	45.20	35.50	37.40	40	42.10	45	45	45	45	45	45			
<b>2004</b>							45	45	45	45	45	45			
<b>2005</b>							45	45	45	45	45	45			

<i>Percentage of regular program participants whose achievement test scores improved from below grade level to at or above grade level.</i>														
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets							
	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle School Math	Middle School English	Overall Math	Overall English	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle School Math	Middle School English	Overall Math	Overall English		
<b>2000</b>	5.80	5.10	3.90	3.90	4.80	4.50								
<b>2001</b>	5	4.10	8.10	5.50	6.60	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>2002</b>	3.70	4	2	3.90	3.70	4.10	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>2003</b>	5.10	4.30	3.70	4.40	4.50	4.40	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>2004</b>							6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>2005</b>							6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6

  

<i>Percentage of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.</i>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Elementary	Middle or High School Math	Overall	Elementary	Middle or High School Math	Overall
<b>2000</b>	76	64	69			
<b>2001</b>	74	71	73	75	75	75
<b>2002</b>	76.30	73.60	75.50	75	75	75
<b>2003</b>	77.70	73.40	76.60	75	75	75
<b>2004</b>				75	75	75
<b>2005</b>				75	75	75

**Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Behavior: Students participating in the program will show improvement through measures such as school attendance, classroom performance, and decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors.							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data								<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Reports/PPICS</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Teacher reports are subjective and thus subject to variation over time and</p>
<i>Percentage of students with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior</i>								
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets				
	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall		
2000	62	57	59	70	70	70		
2001	73	75	74	75	75	75		
2002	76	76.90	76.30	75	75	75		
2003	77.60	76.10	77.50	75	75	75		
2004				75	75	75		
2005				77	77	77		

		across sites.
--	--	---------------

**Objective 8.2 of 2: 21st Century Community Learning Centers will offer high-quality enrichment opportunities that positively affect student outcomes such as school attendance and academic performance, and result in decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Core educational services: More than 85 percent of Centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.</b>		
<p style="text-align: center;">Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Assessment of Progress</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Sources and Data Quality</p>
<p><i>Percentage of 21st Century Centers reporting emphasis in at least one core academic area.</i></p>		
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Year</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Actual Performance</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Performance Targets</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2000</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">97</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">85</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2001</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">96</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">85</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2002</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">94.80</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">85</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2003</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">96.10</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">85</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2004</b></p>		<p style="text-align: center;">85</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2005</b></p>		<p style="text-align: center;">100</p>
<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report/PPICS</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by grantees.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data collection for web-based system will be upgraded periodically.</p>		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in technology</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report/PPICS</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data collection for Web-based system will be upgraded periodically.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	70	85		
2001	79	85		
2002	80.60	85		
2003	81.30	85		
2004		85		
2005		85		
<i>Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in other areas.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	97	85		
2001	95	85		
2002	96	85		
2003	95.90	85		
2004		85		
2005		100		

## ESEA: Advanced Credentialing – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.925 - Advanced Certification or Advanced Credentialing

**Program Goal: Support teachers seeking advanced certification through high-quality professional teacher enhancement programs designed to improve teaching and learning.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To increase the number of National Board Certified Teachers.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The number of teachers awarded National Board Certification will increase annually.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>Cumulative number of teachers certified.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The target has been set at an increase of 5,000 National Board-certified teachers each year. Currently, 49 states and approximately 490 localities offer some kind of incentive for teachers to apply for National Board Certification; these incentives have helped to increase the number of applicants for National Board certification. (These incentives include fee support, salary supplements, and license portability.) However, budget shortfalls in the states are having an impact on the incentives offered and thus the number of candidates.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Board reports <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	23,936			
2003	32,142			
2004		35,000		
2005		40,000		
2006		45,000		
2007		50,000		

## ESEA: Advanced Placement – 2005

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.330B - Advanced Placement Test Fee Program  
84.330C - Advanced Placement Incentives Program

**Program Goal: To increase the number of low-income high school students prepared to pursue higher education**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Encourage a greater number of low-income students to participate in the AP and IB programs and pass the exams.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Students served: The number of low-income students who are successful on AP and IB tests.</b>			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data for (a) are available annually in November. New performance measures have been established for (b), (c) and (d). The FY 2005 target for (b), (c), and (d) is to set the baseline. Data for these measures will be available annually in December.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> Advanced Placement Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
<i>(a) Number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income students nationally.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>1999</b>	92,570	83,300		
<b>2000</b>	102,474	102,000		
<b>2001</b>	112,891	112,200		
<b>2002</b>	140,572	124,180		
<b>2003</b>	166,649	154,629		
<b>2004</b>	190,350	170,092		
<b>2005</b>		183,314		
<b>2006</b>		220,000		
<i>(b) Number of IB tests taken by low-income students nationally.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2005</b>		999		



<i>(c) Percentage of low-income students served by the API program who receive a passing score on AP tests.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<i>(d) Percentage of low-income students served by the API program who receive a passing score on IB tests.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		

## ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.356A - Alaska Native Educational Programs

**Program Goal: Alaska Native Education Program Internal Goal**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Support supplemental educational programs to benefit Alaska Natives.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Percentage of participants benefiting from the Alaska Native Education program will increase.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of students participating in the program that meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science or reading.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> For the first two measures, the FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 5 percent. Dropout rates is a new measure for FY 2005. FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 5 percent.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee performance report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>				999
<b>2005</b>				999
<i>The percentage of Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs that improve on measures of school readiness.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>				999
<b>2005</b>				999
<i>The dropout rate of Alaska Native and American Indian middle school students in the Anchorage School District.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>		999		

## ESEA: Arts In Education

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.351C - Professional Development for Arts Educators--Arts in Education  
 84.351D - Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination Grants Program  
 84.351E - Arts in Education

**Program Goal: To help ensure that all program participants meet challenging state academic content standards in the arts.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Activities supported with federal funds will improve the quality of standards-based arts education for all participants.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Percentage of participants who benefit from standards-based arts education and meet state standards in the arts will increase.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>(a) The percentage of students participating in arts models programs who demonstrate higher achievement than those in control or comparison groups.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%. For measure (b), data will be disaggregated for low-income participants and for those with disabilities.</p> <p>VSA=Very Special Arts JFK=John F. Kennedy</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> Arts in Education Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> For performance measure (a): Independent Evaluation conducted, with first performance reports due in 2004.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>				999
<i>(b) The number of students who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the VSA and JFK Center for Performing Arts.</i>		<p>VSA=Very Special Arts JFK=John F. Kennedy</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> Arts in Education Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> For performance measure (a): Independent Evaluation conducted, with first performance reports due in 2004.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
	students with low-income disabilities			students with low-income disabilities
<b>2005</b>				999      999

## ESEA: Charter Schools Grants – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.282 - Charter Schools

**Program Goal: To support the creation of a large number of high-quality charter schools.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Encourage the development of a large number of high-quality charter schools that are free from state or local rules that inhibit flexible operation, are held accountable for enabling students to reach challenging state performance standards, and are open to all students.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: State legislation: The number of states that have charter school legislation.</b>			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of states with charter school legislation (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico)</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State educational agencies (SEA); state legislatures.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> There is variation in the definition of charter school and authorizing agency in state charter school legislation.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
<b>1995</b>	12		
<b>1996</b>	19		
<b>1997</b>	27		
<b>1998</b>	31		
<b>1999</b>	38		
<b>2000</b>	38	40	
<b>2001</b>	39	42	
<b>2002</b>	40	42	
<b>2003</b>	41	43	
<b>2004</b>		44	
<b>2005</b>		44	

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Charter operations: The number of charter schools in operation.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of charter schools in operation</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
1995	100		
1996	255		
1997	428		
1998	790		
1999	1,100		
2000	1,700	2,060	
2001	2,110	2,667	
2002	2,431	3,000	
2003	2,700	3,000	
2004	2,996	3,000	
2005		3,300	
		<p><b>Explanation:</b> There has been a positive trend toward meeting this objective.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Center for Education Reform Annual Survey: State Education Agencies.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. On site monitoring by ED and data from the Center for Education Reform.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Differences in the definition of charter schools (i.e., some states count multiple sites as single charters, while others count them as multiple charters) cause variability in the counts among SEAs. There is sometimes disagreement about numbers of charter schools in operation among the agencies that do the counting.</p>

## ESEA: Civic Education: Cooperative Education Exchange – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.304A - Cooperative Education Exchange

**Program Goal: To enhance the attainment of the third and sixth national goals by educating students about the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide exemplary curricula and teacher training for teachers from emerging democracies under the Cooperative Civic and Economic Education program**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Quality of teacher training: The extent to which training under the program has improved the quality of instruction for students			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of teachers participating in training or professional development activities under the program (in the United States and in participating foreign countries) that have demonstrated improved quality of instruction.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Of funds appropriated under the Cooperative Education Exchange portion of the Civic Education program 37.5 percent must be distributed, as required by statute, to the Center for Civic Education and 37.5 percent must also be distributed to the National Council on Economic Education. The remaining 25 percent of this appropriation supports competitive awards (and continuations) to eligible entities. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	2005 Cohort	2005 Cohort	
<b>2005</b>		999	
			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data will come from program evaluations supported by the grantee.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>

## ESEA: Comprehensive School Reform – 2005

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.332A - ESEA Comprehensive School Reform  
84.332B - Comprehensive School Reform Quality Initiatives

**Program Goal: To enable low-performing students to improve their achievement to meet challenging standards**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Student achievement in core subjects generally will show marked improvement in Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) program schools.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Reading/language arts</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  <b>Limitations:</b> The data for this indicator were self-reported by state educational agencies.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<i>Mathematics</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: The number of schools providing high-quality curriculum and instruction and improving student outcomes will increase each year.**

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Impact on school improvement: By 2014, no schools that have received CSR program funds will be designated as in need of improvement, while CSR funds continue to be targeted on the lowest achieving schools.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of principals in Title I schools reporting that they are implementing a research-based school reform model</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Increasing numbers of Title I schools are implementing research-based school reform models to improve curriculum and instruction. The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program is meeting its purpose of increasing awareness of and support for comprehensive school reform among states, districts and schools, and acts as a catalyst for how Title I funds can be used in schoolwide programs to support the adoption of research-based comprehensive school reform programs. The student achievement data at CSR schools collected for 2002 and 2003 were found to be incomplete and inconsistent, and hence were not used. A contractor will work with the states to complete the data collection process and to provide quality assurance.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999(baseline)/2000.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> NCES.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are taken from a nationally representative sample of Title I schools; data are not available for all Title I schools. Because data are based on self-reports, it is difficult to judge the extent to which reform programs are comprehensive and research based. An examination of school documents on a subsample of Title I schools will allow some indication of the quality of comprehensive school reform efforts in Title I schools in general.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	31			
2000	46			
2001	62	55		
2002		60		
2003		70		
2004		72		
2005		74		



## ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.354A - Charter Schools Facilities Program

**Program Goal: Increase the number of charter school facilities acquired, constructed or renovated.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Increase funds available for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Leveraged funds: The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, construction, or renovation of charter school facilities (in millions).</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Baseline data were collected in 2003. We reported initially that the 2003 baseline was \$99 million; that has been revised to \$105 million. Definition of Leverage: The number of dollars (in millions) leveraged consists of the dollar amount raised (versus the amount contributed to the financing from the grant) as a direct result of the guarantee. If the grantee received a non-Department of Education grant (including a New Markets Tax Credit allocation) and is using it to provide additional leveraging for a school served by the federal grant, funds leveraged from these other funds may also be counted as funds leveraged by the federal grant. A grantee may count senior debt toward the total amount of</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> These multi-year grants received all the funding at the beginning of the first project period. As no reports are required for continuation funding, grantees were given a full year of performance before reporting data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	105			
2004	70	100		
2005		100		
2006		100		

	<p>funds leveraged if it uses grant funds to guarantee or insure subordinate debt but not the senior debt to which it is tied. Likewise, grantees may count subordinate debt toward the total amount of funds leveraged if it only uses grant funds to credit-enhance senior debt.</p>	
--	--	--

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the number of charter schools facilities acquired, constructed or renovated.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: The number of charter schools served through this indicator.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of charter schools served through this indicator.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005</p>	
2003	20			
2004		20		
2005		20		

## ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.349A - Early Childhood Educator Professional Development

**Program Goal: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development (ECEPD)**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Early childhood educators will more frequently apply research-based approaches in early childhood instruction and child development and learning, including establishing literacy-rich classrooms.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>ECEPD teachers' scores on ELLCO.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Teacher performance documentation; documented use of the Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO). The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Documentation of application of research-based approaches, as recorded by mentors or supervisors working with participating educators (i.e., logs or reports); pre and post evaluation of educator lesson plans; results of the ELLCO.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> May 2004</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Not all ECEPD grantees use the ELLCO literacy environment checklist. Data collected only represent the sample of grantees who use the checklist.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		999		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy and numeracy skills.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																				
<p><i>Percentage of children who demonstrate improved readiness for school in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy, and numeracy skills.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th colspan="2">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="2">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Cognitive</td> <td>Social / Emotional</td> <td>Cognitive</td> <td>Social / Emotional</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			Cognitive	Social / Emotional	Cognitive	Social / Emotional	2004			999	999	2005			999	999	<p><b>Progress:</b> Documented use of Get It Got It GO, the Developmental Indicators for the Assessment of Learning (DIAL-3), and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-III). The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Results of Get It Got It Go, DIAL-3, and PPVT-III.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> May 2004</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the PPVT and the Individual Growth and Development Indicators available from Get It, Got it, Go! Not all ECEPD grantees use the PPVT or the Individual Growth and Development Indicators.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets																						
	Cognitive	Social / Emotional	Cognitive	Social / Emotional																					
2004			999	999																					
2005			999	999																					

<p><b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Demonstrated skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction: One year following instruction from a teacher who participated in an Early childhood Educator Professional Development program, children will demonstrate that they have the skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction at the end of the kindergarten year.</b></p>									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>The percentage of children who demonstrate that they have the skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction at the end of the kindergarten year.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	<p><b>Progress:</b> Documented use of the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS).</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Results of DIBELS.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> May 2005</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
2005		999							

## ESEA: Early Reading First – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.359 - Early Reading First

**Program Goal: To support local efforts to enhance the early language, literacy, and prereading development of preschool-aged children through strategies and professional development based on scientifically based reading research.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Preschool-aged children will attain the necessary early language, cognitive and prereading skills to enter kindergarten prepared for continued learning, including the age appropriate development of oral language and alphabet knowledge.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Language: The percent of children who demonstrate age-appropriate development of receptive language.															
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
<p><i>The percentage of preschool-aged children participating in Early Reading First (ERF) programs who demonstrate age-appropriate oral language skills as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>Receptive</td> <td>Receptive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Receptive	Receptive	2004		999	2005		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%. The first full program year for Early Reading First grantees is FY 2003-2004. Early Reading First preschool children will take a Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III pretest and a posttest after the year of Early Reading First intervention. Posttest scores of ERF preschool children will be compared to the national norms provided by the test publisher.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Early Reading First Program Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.            The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition (PPVT) nationally normed tests which has been validated internally and correlated with other measures of cognitive development.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets													
	Receptive	Receptive													
2004		999													
2005		999													

		<p><b>Limitations:</b> Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the PPVT. Not all Early Reading First grantees use the PPVT to measure cognitive development.</p>									
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Alphabet Knowledge: The average number of letters that preschool-aged children in ERF programs are able to identify as measured by the Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask on the PALS Pre-K assessment.</b></p>											
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>									
<p><i>The number of letters ERF children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004		999	2005		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%. FY 2003-2004 is the first program year for Early Reading First grantees. The first Early Reading First Performance Report is due December 2004. The PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask is a measure of alphabet knowledge that will be administered to ERF preschool children with scores reported in the ERF Performance Report.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Early Reading First Program Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      The PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask is a measure that has been validated using a statewide sample of typically developing children.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Not all Early Reading First grantees use the PALS Pre-K Uppercase</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets									
2004		999									
2005		999									

		<p>Letter Naming Subtask to measure alphabet knowledge. Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Early Reading First grantees will be encouraged to use the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask as the measure of alphabet knowledge.</p>
--	--	---



## ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians – 2005

- CFDA Numbers:**
- 84.209 - Native Hawaiian Family Based Education Centers
  - 84.210 - Native Hawaiian Gifted and Talented
  - 84.296 - Native Hawaiian Community-Based Education Learning Centers
  - 84.297 - Native Hawaiian Curriculum Development, Teacher Training and Recruitment
  - 84.316 - Native Hawaiian Higher Education Pr
  - 84.362A - Native Hawaiian Education

**Program Goal: Native Hawaiian Education Program Internal Goal**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To support innovative projects that provide supplemental services that address the educational needs of Native Hawaiian children and adults.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Percentage of participants who will benefit from the Native Hawaiian Education program will increase				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of teachers involved with professional development activities that address the unique education needs of program participants will increase.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 5%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee performance report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> February 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>				999
<i>The percentage of Native Hawaiian children participating in the early education program provided by Alu Like, Inc. that improve on measures of school readiness and literacy.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2004</b>		999		

<b>2005</b>		999		
<i>The percentage of students participating in the program that meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science, or reading.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2004</b>		999		
<b>2005</b>		999		

## ESEA: Educational Technology State Grants – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.318X - Enhancing Education Through Technology

**Program Goal: To facilitate the comprehensive and integrated use of educational technology into instruction and curricula to improve teaching and student achievement.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Fully integrate technology into the curricula and instruction in all schools by December 31, 2006 (FY 2007) to enhance teaching and learning. .**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of districts receiving sufficient EETT funds that have integrated technology.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 5%.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA), Consolidated Performance Report; Program Monitoring.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> November 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		999		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: To help ensure that students and teachers in high-poverty, high-need schools have access to educational technology comparable to that of students and teachers in other schools.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Internet access in high poverty classrooms: Internet access in high-poverty school classrooms will be comparable to that in other schools.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of classrooms with internet access.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Low-poverty classrooms	High-poverty classrooms	Low-poverty classrooms	High-poverty classrooms
<b>2004</b>			100	100
<b>2005</b>			100	100
		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The number of high-poverty schools with Internet access continues to rise. As high-poverty schools increasingly obtain access to the Internet, it is likely that their classroom connections will subsequently increase.</p>		
		<p><b>Source 1: NCES Survey/Assessment</b>  <b>Survey/Assessment:</b> Fast Response Survey System.  <b>References:</b> National Center for Education Statistics Study - Internet Access in U.S. Public Schools and Classrooms.</p> <p><b>Source 2: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> National Evaluation.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Policy and Program Studies Service- National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS).  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 06/06/2003.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated Performance Report, Program Monitoring</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Poverty</p>		

		<p>measures are based on data on free and reduced-price lunches, which may underestimate school poverty levels, particularly for older students and immigrant students.</p>
--	--	---

**Objective 8.3 of 3: To provide professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and school administrators to develop capacity to effectively integrate technology into teaching and learning.**

<p><b>Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Professional Development: In districts that receive funding from the State Grant program, the percentage of teachers that meet their state technology standards will increase.</b></p>		
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>
<p><i>Percentage of teachers that meet state technology standards</i></p>		
<p><b>Year</b></p>	<p><b>Actual Performance</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Targets</b></p>
<p><b>2004</b></p>		<p>999</p>
<p><b>2005</b></p>		<p>999</p>
		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 5%.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated Performance Report, Program Monitoring, State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> November 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>

## ESEA: English Language Acquisition – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.365A - English Language Acquisition Formula Grant Program

**Program Goal: To help limited English proficient students learn English and reach high academic standards**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Improve English proficiency and academic achievement of students served by Title III.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 7: The percentage of states that have demonstrated the alignment of English language proficiency (ELP) assessments with ELP standards.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of states that have demonstrated the alignment of English language proficiency (ELP) assessments with ELP standards.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> States are providing information regarding aligned English language proficiency assessments with English language proficiency standards for the first time under NCLB. Many states participated in consortia designed to develop aligned standards and assessments; however, the consortia encountered delays in progress due to the technical requirements for such an alignment. It is anticipated that the states will continue at their present rate and meet the time line indicated.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data Source: Consolidated Annual Performance Report. EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system). <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		10		
2007		40		
2009		70		
2011		100		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 7: The percentage of states that have demonstrated their English language proficiency standards are linked to academic content standards in English language arts or reading.																		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>The percentage of states that have demonstrated their English language proficiency standards are linked to academic content standards in English language arts or reading.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011</td> <td></td> <td>50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		10	2007		20	2009		30	2011		50	<p><b>Explanation:</b> For the first time, states are to provide evidence of linking English language proficiency standards and academic content standards under NCLB to ensure meaningful experience in the content classroom for limited English proficient (LEP) students and preparing them to understand when taking the same content assessments as all students. Demonstrating linking requires a variety of resources in terms of time, funding and experts to guide the form that these demonstrations will take, over which states have varying degrees of control. This variance could result in delays for states trying to provide evidence. It is anticipated that the time line provided will be sufficient to achieve the targets.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data Source: Consolidated Annual Performance Report. EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system). <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																
2005		10																
2007		20																
2009		30																
2011		50																

Indicator 8.1.3 of 7: The percentage of states have met state targets for Title III annual measurable achievement objectives.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of states that have met state targets for Title III annual measurable achievement objectives.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> Based on 9/03 submissions by states the average annual measurable achievement objective (AMAO) for attainment and making progress is reflected in the performance target. The third AMAO for LEP students (in the state) served by Title III is to demonstrate those states meeting their AYP targets (submitted in 1/03). Average annual percentage increases vary depending on the LEP population in the state and available resources in serving these students. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 10%. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 20%. The target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 40%. The target for FY 2010 is the baseline plus 70%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data Source: Consolidated Annual Performance Report. EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2006				999
2007				999
2008				999
2009				999
2010		999		



Indicator 8.1.4 of 7: The percentage of states that have met state targets for making progress in English for LEP students who have received Title III services.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>The percentage of states that have met state targets for making progress for LEP students who have received Title III services.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 10%. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 20%. target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 40%. The target for FY 2010 is the baseline plus 70%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data Source: Consolidated Annual Performance Report. EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2006		999		
2007		999		
2008		999		
2009		999		
2010		999		

Indicator 8.1.5 of 7: The percentage of states that have met state targets for attainment in learning English who have received Title III services.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of states that have met state targets for attainment in learning English who have received Title III services.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 10%. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 20%. target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 40%.The target for FY 2010 is the baseline plus 70%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data Source: Consolidated Annual Performance Report. EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2006				999
2007				999
2008				999
2009				999
2010				999

Indicator 8.1.6 of 7: The percentage of states that have met state targets for making AYP for LEP students who have received Title III services.																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The percentage of states that have met state targets for making AYP for LEP students who have received Title III services.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	2007		999	2008		999	2009		999	2010		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 10%. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 20%. target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 40%.The target for FY 2010 is the baseline plus 70%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data Source: Annual Performance Report. EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2006		999																			
2007		999																			
2008		999																			
2009		999																			
2010		999																			

Indicator 8.1.7 of 7: The states' LEP graduation rate targets for the Title III served students.																		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>The percentage of states that have met state targets for LEP graduation rates for Title III-served student.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2007		999	2008		999	2009		999	2010		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> This measure is an added measure of result and will be reported based on information collected through EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system) thus not imposing a new reportable item through any other means of data collection but providing an effective measure of success through the programs provided in Title III. Projections are based upon state increases from the baseline data year. The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 10%. target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 15%.The target for FY 20010 is the baseline plus 20%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data Source: Consolidated Annual Performance Report. EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system).  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2006 - 2007 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2007 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																
2007		999																
2008		999																
2009		999																
2010		999																

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the quality of teachers of LEP students.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Of programs serving preservice teachers, the rate of placement of graduates in an instructional setting serving LEP students, within one year of graduation, will be higher than the placement rate of preservice teachers nationally.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress						
<p><i>Of preservice teachers the rate of placement of graduates in an instructional setting serving LEP students within one year of graduation.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Performance Reports.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2005		999						

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Highly qualified teachers: The percentage of program completers who meet No Child Left Behind Highly Qualified Teacher requirements.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of program completers who are Highly Qualified Teachers</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2005		999	

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Improve English proficiency and academic achievement of students served by the Native American and Alaska Native Children in School Program.**

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: English Proficiency: Students in the program will annually demonstrate progress on English measures.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of projects in which three-quarters of students made gains in English proficiency.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> This is a new program. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2005</p> <p>Operational definitions of LEP students vary. Data are self-reported.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				999
2006				50
2007				75

## ESEA: Even Start – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.213 - Even Start, State Educational Agencies

**Program Goal: To help break the cycle of poverty and illiteracy by improving the educational opportunities of the nation's low-income families through a unified family literacy program that integrates early childhood education, adult literacy and adult basic education, and parenting education.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: The literacy of participating families will improve.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of Even Start adults showing significant learning gains on measures of literacy and Even Start LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition as measured by the CASAS and the TABE.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2003 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2004 is the baseline plus 1%. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 2%.</p> <p>CASAS = Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System                      TABE=Tests of Adult Basic Education</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report (CPRs)</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> May 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  <b>Limitations:</b> Currently, the CPRs and PBDMI do not provide data in a format to report on performance for this indicator. Data for 2003 are dependent upon the format of the revised CPR and additions to the PBDMI.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Reading	English Language Acquisition	Reading			English Language Acquisition
<b>2003</b>			999			999
<b>2004</b>			999			999
<b>2005</b>			999	999		



Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Adult educational attainment: Percentage of Even Start parents who earn a high school diploma and the percentage of parents who earn a General Equivalency Diploma (GED).							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Percentage of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal or General Equivalency Diploma (GED) attainment goal that earn a high school diploma or equivalent.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2003 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2004 is the baseline plus 1%. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 2%.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> May 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Currently, the CPRs and PBDMI do not provide data in a format to report on performance for this indicator. Data for 2003 are dependent upon the format of the revised CPR and additions to the PBDMI. Definitions of high school diploma and GED may vary across programs.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	High School diploma	General Equivalency Diploma (GED)				High School diploma	General Equivalency Diploma (GED)
<b>2003</b>						999	999
<b>2004</b>						999	999
<b>2005</b>			999	999			

Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Children's language development: Percentage of Even Start children that are entering kindergarten who demonstrate age-appropriate development of receptive language.																		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>Percentage of Even Start children that are entering kindergarten who are achieving age-appropriate benchmarks on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>Receptive</td> <td>Receptive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Receptive	Receptive	2003		999	2004		999	2005		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Even Start children will take a Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III pre-test and a posttest in the year prior to kindergarten. Posttest scores of Even Start children will be compared to the national norms provided by the test publisher. The FY 2003 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2004 is the baseline plus 1%. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 2%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> May 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition (PPVT) nationally normed tests, which have been validated internally and correlated with other measures of cognitive development.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Not all Even Start programs use the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III to measure receptive language development. Data collected represent the sample of Even Start programs that use the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III. Currently, the CPRs and PBDMI do not provide data in a format to report on performance for this indicator. Data for 2003 are dependent upon the format of</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																
	Receptive	Receptive																
2003		999																
2004		999																
2005		999																

		<p>the revised CPR and additions to the PBDMI.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Even Start programs will be encouraged to use the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III as the measure of receptive language development.</p>						
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Alphabet Knowledge: The score Even Start children attain on the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.</b></p>								
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>						
<p><i>The number of letters Even Start children can identify as measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> May 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p>The PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask is a measure that has been validated using a statewide sample of typically developing children.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Not all of the Even Start programs use the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask to measure alphabet knowledge. Data collected represent the sample of Even Start programs that</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2005		999						

		<p>use the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Even Start programs will be encouraged to use the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter naming Subtask as the measure of alphabet knowledge.</p>
--	--	---

## ESEA: Excellence in Economic Education – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.215B - Excellence in Economic Education

**Program Goal: To promote economic and financial literacy among all students in kindergarten through grade 12.**

**Objective 8.1 of 5: To increase students' knowledge of, and achievement in, economics to enable the students to become more productive and informed citizens.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Percent Teachers Trained: The percentage of students of teachers trained under the grant project who demonstrate an improved understanding of personal finance and economics as compared to similar students whose teachers have not had the training provided by the program.</b>											
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<i>The percentage of students taught by teachers trained under this grant who demonstrate improved understanding of personal finance issues.</i>											
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2005</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2006</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1%. The FY 2004 grantees should have data for this indicator no later than 90 days after the end of their grant period. Their current grant period ends 6/30/2006, so data should be available around 9/30/2006. Also grantees received funds only from the FY 2004 appropriations.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets									
2005		999									
2006		999									

## ESEA: Foreign Language Assistance – 2005

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.293B - Foreign Language Assistance Grants (LEAs)  
84.293C - Foreign Language Assistance Program (SEAs)

**Program Goal: Assist local and state educational agencies in establishing, improving or expanding foreign language study for elementary and secondary school students.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To improve the foreign language proficiency of students served by the Foreign Language Assistance program.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of projects</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> This program was previously funded under Title VII IASA. The performance indicator and performance targets for FLAP were revised after the program was reauthorized under Title V of NCLB. FY 2004 data will establish the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual performance reports. <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 200 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. ED attestation process <b>Limitations:</b> Limitations: There are no statutory reporting requirements. Grant reports indicate a multitude of various assessment measurements used to determine and plot student growth in language ability.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2005</b>		50		
<b>2006</b>		75		

## ESEA: Impact Aid Basic Support Payments and Payments for Children with Disabilities – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.041 - Impact Aid

**Program Goal: To provide appropriate financial assistance for federally connected children who present a genuine burden to their school districts**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Make payments in a timely manner**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of applicants paid within 60 days of appropriation.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program office files.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> April 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	75			
1998	87			
1999	13	90		
2000	96	90		
2001	73	90		
2002	63	90		
2003	98	90		
2004	95	90		
2005		90		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Make accurate payments**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Overpayment forgiveness requests: The number of requests to forgive overpayments of Basic Support Payments, and payments for Children With Disabilities.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>Number of requests to forgive overpayments of Basic Support payments</i>				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program office files.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	5	10		
2000	2	10		
2001	10	10		
2002	4	10		
2003	3	10		
2004	3	10		
2005		10		



## ESEA: Impact Aid Construction – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.041C - Impact Aid Construction Grants

**Program Goal: To provide appropriate financial assistance for federally connected children who present a genuine burden to their school districts**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Improve the quality of public school facilities used to educate federally connected children.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of LEAs reporting that the overall condition of their school buildings is adequate.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data collected from LEA application for Impact Aid Section 8003 payments.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported by Impact Aid applicants. Assessment of the condition of school facilities may differ depending on the judgment of the individual responding.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000		70		
2001	44	70		
2002	43	70		
2003	47	70		
2004	54	70		
2005		70		

## ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.367 - Improving Teacher Quality State Grants

**Program Goal: To improve teacher and principal quality and increase the number of highly qualified teachers in the classroom and highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Show an annual increase in the percentage of highly qualified teachers.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of core academic classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. FY 2003 actual performance was estimated from State Consolidated Plans submitted in Sept. 2003. Data for FY04 will not be collected. Data for FY05 will be available December 04.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI); 2004-2005 school survey</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	75			
2005		90		
2006		95		
2007		100		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Highly qualified teachers in low-poverty schools: Percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers by low-poverty schools.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers in low-poverty schools.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. FY 2003 actual performance was estimated from State Consolidated Plans submitted in Sept. 2003. Data for FY04 will not be collected. Data for FY05 will be available December 04.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI)</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003	85			
2005				90
2006				95
2007		100		
Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Highly qualified teachers in elementary schools: Percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of core academic classes in elementary schools taught by highly qualified teachers.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. FY 2003 actual performance was estimated from State Consolidated Plans submitted in Sept. 2003. Data for FY04 will not be collected. Data for FY05 will be available December 04.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report, PBDMI</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003	80			
2005				90
2006				95
2007		100		

Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Highly qualified teachers in secondary schools: The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in secondary schools.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of core academic classes in secondary schools taught by highly qualified teachers.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. FY 2003 actual performance was estimated from State Consolidated Plans submitted in Sept. 2003. Data for FY04 will not be collected. Data for FY05 will be available December 04.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report, PBDMI</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003	75			
2005				85
2006				92
2007		100		

## ESEA: Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.060 - Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies

**Program Goal: To help American Indian and Alaska Native children achieve to the same challenging standards expected of all students by supporting access to programs that meet their unique educational and culturally related academic need.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: American Indian and Alaska Native students served by LEAs receiving Indian Education Formula Grants will progress at rates similar to those for all students in achievement to standards, promotion, and graduation.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Student achievement: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will meet or exceed the performance standards established by national assessments.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 4 who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> NAEP assessments for reading and math are not administered annually. National trends indicate performance in reading and math are declining.	<b>Source: NCES Survey/Assessment Survey/Assessment:</b> National Assessment of Educational Progress.  <b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2000, 2002; Schools and Staffing Survey, 1997.  <b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> NCES. Data validated by National
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	63			
2002	51	60		
2003	47	62		
2005		53		
<i>Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 8 who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	61			
2003	57	66		
2005		63		

<p><i>Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 4 who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP</i></p>			<p>Center for Education Statistics review procedures and National Center for Education Statistics statistical standards.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The small sample (for the sub-population of American Indian and Alaska Native students) means there is a high degree of standard error surrounding the estimates and limits data collection and possibilities for comparison to other populations. These estimates will vary greatly until a larger population is surveyed.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	
1996	57		
2000	40		
2002		64	
2003	64	66	
2005		66	
<p><i>Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 8 who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP</i></p>			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	
1996	51		
2000	47		
2002		62	
2003	52	64	
2005		54	

## ESEA: Javits Gifted and Talented Education – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.206A - Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Student Education

**Program Goal: To improve the teaching and learning of gifted and talented students through research, demonstration projects, personal training, and other activities of national significance.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Develop models for developing the talents of students who are economically disadvantaged, are limited English proficient, and/or have disabilities.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Model Effectiveness: The number of new evidence-based project designs, targeting at-risk children that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists and practitioners.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of new evidence-based project designs with average reviewer ratings for quality of "high and above"</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1%.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data supplied by Center.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
2006		999		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Model Effectiveness: The number of projects with significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations as indicated by scientifically based evaluations.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The number of projects with significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Based on evaluations of gifted and talented programs</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2006				999
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Capacity Building: The number of high quality projects targeting at-risk children, with evidence of effective professional development focusing on Gifted and Talented education delivered to a significant number of practitioners, as measured by an independent review panel of qualified scientists and practitioners.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The number of project designs with average reviewer ratings for quality of "high and above"</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Based on review panel data</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				999
2006		999		



## ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.364 - Literacy through School Libraries

**Program Goal: To improve literacy skills and academic achievement of students by providing students with increased access to up-to-date school library materials and resources.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the literacy skills of students served by the Improving Literacy Through School Libraries program.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of schools/districts served by Improving Literacy Through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The first program year for grantees receiving funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries is 2003-2004. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Improving Literacy Through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; program evaluation of 2005 by Department of Education.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		999		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Enhance the school library media collection at grantee schools/districts to align with curriculum.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: School library media collection: The comparison between the rate at which the school library media collection is increased at schools participating in the grant program and non-participating schools.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>Difference in rate of increase between participating schools and non-participating schools.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The first program year for grantees receiving funds from Improving Literacy Through School Libraries is 2003-2004. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Improving Literacy Through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; program evaluation of 2005 by Department of Education.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		999		

## ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.165 - Magnet Schools Assistance

**Program Goal: Students have access to high-quality education in desegregated magnet schools.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Federally funded magnet schools will eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation in targeted elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group students.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The percentage of magnet schools whose student applicant pool in relation to the general student population in the school reduces, eliminates, or prevents minority group isolation increases annually.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of magnet schools whose student applicant pool reduces, prevents, or eliminates minority group isolation.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> The Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) grants are three-year grants. New cohorts of grantees are established in SY 2004-05 (cohort 1) and in SY 2007-08 (cohort 2). The FY 2005 target is to set the baseline for cohort 1. The FY 2008 target is to set the baseline for cohort 2. The expectation is that the starting point for performance targets for cohort 2 will be higher than the previous starting point, but will not build directly on 2007 results because the participating schools will be different.</p>		<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> Magnet Schools Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self reported.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets				
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1				Cohort 2
<b>2005</b>			999				
<b>2008</b>				999			

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Magnet school students meet their state's academic achievement standards.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: The percentage of magnet schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed the State's annual yearly progress standard increases annually.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed state annual progress standard.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> New cohorts of grantees are established in SY 2004-05 (cohort 1) and in SY 2008-09 (cohort 2). The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 1. The FY 2009 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 2. Actual performance data for 2005 will be obtained by comparing the SY 2004-05 data with Spring 2004 test results. Similarly, actual performance data for 2009 will be obtained by comparing the SY 2008-09 data with spring 2008 test results.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual state test results required by NCLB</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 state educational agencies.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are frequently late in being released.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2				Cohort 1	Cohort 2
2005						999	
2009						999	
Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: The percentage of magnet schools that meet or exceed the state's annual yearly progress standard increases annually.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of magnet schools that meet or exceed the state's annual yearly progress standard.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> Explanation: New cohorts of grantees are established in SY 2004-05 (cohort 1) and in SY 2008-09 (cohort 2). The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 1. The FY 2009 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 2. Actual performance data for 2005 will be obtained by comparing the</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State test results required by NCLB</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 state educational agencies.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2				Cohort 1	Cohort 2
2005						999	
2009						999	

	<p>SY 2004-05 data with Spring 2004 test results. Similarly, actual performance data for 2009 will be obtained by comparing the SY 2008-09 data with spring 2008 test results.</p>	<p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are frequently late in being released.</p>
--	--	--

## ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.366A - Mathematics and Science Partnership program

**Program Goal: To improve the quality of mathematics and science teachers and increase both the number of highly qualified math and science teachers and the achievement of students participating in Mathematics and Science Partnerships programs.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: To increase the number of highly qualified mathematics and science teachers in schools participating in Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) programs.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in MSP schools: the number or percentage of elementary certified teachers who significantly increase their knowledge of mathematics and science.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of K-5 teachers who significantly increase their knowledge of mathematics and science.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 20%.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Project Annual Reports  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2004</b>		999		
<b>2005</b>		999		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of highly qualified middle school (grades 6-8) teachers.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 20%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Evaluation. Individual annual reports from Partnership projects.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		999		
<i>Percentage of highly qualified high school (grades 9-12) teachers</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		999		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: To increase the percentage of students in classrooms whose teachers are participating in Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) programs who score at the proficient or advanced level in mathematics and science on state assessments.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Student achievement in MSP schools: the percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced on state mathematics assessments.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced in mathematics.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Performance Report; PBDMI  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Student achievement in MSP schools: the percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced on State science assessments.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of students at proficient or advanced levels in science.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. Targets for subsequent years will be set based on those data that are collected and analyzed.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Performance Report; PBDMI  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
- No Data -				



## ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.011 - Migrant Education\_State Grant Program

**Program Goal: To assist all migrant students in meeting challenging academic standards and achieving graduation from high school (or a GED program) with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Along with other federal programs and state and local reform efforts, the Migrant Education Program (MEP) will contribute to improved school performance of migrant children.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 6: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the elementary school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in reading.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of states meeting performance target in reading at the elementary level for migrant students</i>					<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The states reporting assessment data for migrant students fluctuate from one year to the next.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	States that meeting target	States that reported results or above proficient	Percent of States that at or above proficient		
<b>1996</b>	4	10	50		
<b>1997</b>	4	15	50		
<b>1998</b>	7	18	50		
<b>1999</b>	2	19	50		

<b>2000</b>	5	26	50			
<b>2001</b>	6	23	50			
<b>2002</b>				8	27	50
<b>2003</b>				10	32	50
<b>2004</b>				14	36	50
<b>2005</b>				16	38	50

States are also redesigning assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such, the indicator does not represent performance in the same states or on the same measures from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children were included in the assessment systems.

**Improvements:** It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the state assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 6: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the middle school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in reading.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of states meeting performance target in reading for middle school migrant students</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The states reporting assessment data for migrant students fluctuate from one year to the next. States are also redesigning assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such, the indicator does not represent performance in the same states or on the same measures from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children were included in the assessment systems.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	States that meeting target	Percent of States that reported results or above proficient	Percent of States that reported results or above proficient	
1996	2	10	50	
1997	3	15	50	
1998	6	18	50	
1999	4	18	50	
2000	2	23	50	
2001	7	21	50	
2002			9 25 50	
2003			11 29 50	
2004			15 32 50	
2005			17 34 50	

				<p><b>Improvements:</b> It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.</p>		
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.3 of 6: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the elementary school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in mathematics.</b></p>						
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<p><i>Number of States meeting performance target in math for elementary school migrant students.</i></p>					<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The states reporting assessment data for migrant students fluctuate from one year to the next. States are also redesigning assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such, the indicator does not represent</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>			
	States that meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States that meeting target		Percent of students at or above proficient
<b>1996</b>	4	10	50			
<b>1997</b>	5	15	50			
<b>1998</b>	9	18	50			
<b>1999</b>	6	19	50			
<b>2000</b>	7	25	50			
<b>2001</b>	10	23	50			
<b>2002</b>				12		27 50

<b>2003</b>		14	32	50		<p>performance in the same states or on the same measures from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children were included in the assessment systems.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.</p>
<b>2004</b>		18	36	50		
<b>2005</b>		20	38	50		

**Indicator 8.1.4 of 6: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the middle school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in mathematics.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of states meeting performance target in math for middle school migrant students.</i>					<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The states</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	States that meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	Percent of States that at or above proficient	
<b>1996</b>	3	10	50		

<b>1997</b>	3	15	50						<p>reporting assessment data for migrant students fluctuate from one year to the next. States are also redesigning assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such, the indicator does not represent performance in the same states or on the same measures from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children were included in the assessment systems.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.</p>
<b>1998</b>	7	18	50						
<b>1999</b>	4	18	50						
<b>2000</b>	2	22	50						
<b>2001</b>	4	20	50						
<b>2002</b>				6	24	50			
<b>2003</b>				8	28	50			
<b>2004</b>				12	32	50			
<b>2005</b>				14	34	50			

Indicator 8.1.5 of 6: Reducing Dropout Rate: More states have a decreasing percentage of migrant students who dropout from secondary school (grades 7 - 12).							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Number of states meeting performance target for dropout rate for migrant students.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report.(proposed).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data on the number of high school migrant dropouts is not available currently.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> An element of the forthcoming Consolidated State Performance Report will collect information on the number and percentage of migrant students who drop out of school between the grades 7 through 12 annually.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets					
	States that meeting target	Percent of States that reported results				States that meeting target	Percent of States that drop out of school
<b>2004</b>			999	999	999		
<b>2005</b>			999	999	999		

Indicator 8.1.6 of 6: Achieving High School Graduation: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will graduate from high school.								
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality			
<i>Number of states meeting performance target for high school graduation of migrant students.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report. (proposed).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data on the number of migrant students who graduate from high school are not available currently.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> An element of the forthcoming Consolidated State Performance Report will collect information on the number and percentage of migrant students who graduate from high school annually.</p>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
	States that meeting target	States that reported results				States that meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students who graduate from high school
<b>2004</b>						999	999	999
<b>2005</b>			999	999	999			



## ESEA: National Writing Project – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.928 - National Writing Project (OII)

### Program Goal: To improve the quality of student writing and learning

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To support and promote the establishment of teacher training programs designed to improve the writing skills of students and teachers.**

#### Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Students taught by the National Writing Project (NWP) teachers will show improved student writing skills.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>Percentage of students of NWP trained teachers who achieve effectiveness in major areas of writing competence such as persuasive and rhetorical.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004		999	2005		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> No data were available for SY 2003-2004. Therefore the FY 2005 target is to set the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Sites will determine assessment instruments to be used (possible examples are Academy for Educational Development-derived tests and the NAEP Test of Writing) in cooperation with the NWP Research Division.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  <b>Limitations:</b> NWP sites measure effectiveness using different instruments, so data are difficult to aggregate.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
2004		999											
2005		999											
<p><i>Percentage of students of NWP trained teachers who demonstrate clear control of the writing conventions of usage, mechanics, and spelling will increase.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999					
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
2005		999											

## ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.013 - Title I Program for Neglected and Delinquent Children

**Program Goal: To ensure that neglected and delinquent children and youth will have the opportunity to meet the challenging state standards needed to further their education and become productive members of society.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Neglected or delinquent (N or D) students will improve academic and vocational skills needed to further their education or obtain employment.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of N or D students obtaining diploma, diploma equivalent, or employment.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. This measure was new for FY 2003 and represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data will be collected through a State Performance Report which includes information from Subpart I State Agency awardees. Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	8	999		
2004		8.40		
2005		8.80		

		<p><b>Limitations:</b> Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data collected for 2003 provided the baseline. New data are collected annually; targets are based on baseline data.</p>												
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: High school course credits: The number of high school course credits earned by neglected or delinquent students will increase.</b></p>														
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>												
<p><i>Average number of high school course credits earned by N or D students will increase.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>78.40</td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>82.32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>86.24</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	78.40	999	2004		82.32	2005		86.24	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. This indicator was a new indicator for FY 2003 and represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data will be collected through a state performance report that includes information from Subpart I State Agency awardees. Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets												
2003	78.40	999												
2004		82.32												
2005		86.24												

		<p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data collected for 2003 will provide a baseline. After 2003, the Department will collect data annually and set targets based on the baseline.</p>						
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Academic skills: Neglected or delinquent students shall have the same opportunities to learn as students served in regular classrooms. The academic skills of neglected or delinquent students served will increase, closing this gap.</b></p>								
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>						
<p><i>Percent of N or D students that improve academic skills as measured on approved and validated measures.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> This indicator represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success. The FY 2004 target was to establish the baseline, but data were not collected. Therefore, the FY 2005 target is to establish the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data from state</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2005		999						

		<p>assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data collected for 2003 will provide a baseline. After 2003, the Department will collect data annually and set targets based on the baseline.</p>												
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Transition plan: The percentage of students who have a high-quality transition plan will increase.</b></p>														
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>												
<p><i>Percent of N or D students with transition plans to return to local school programs.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>40</td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>44</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	40	999	2004		42	2005		44	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. This is a new measure for FY 2003 and represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data will be collected through a state performance report that includes information from Subpart I State Agency awardees. Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data from state</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets												
2003	40	999												
2004		42												
2005		44												

		<p>assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data collected for 2003 will provide a baseline. After 2003, the Department will collect data annually and set targets based on the baseline.</p>
--	--	---

# ESEA: Parental Information and Resource Centers – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.310A - Parental Assistance and Local Family Information Centers

**Program Goal: To increase information and options for parents.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Federally funded PIRC programs provide parents of children attending schools that are not making adequate yearly progress with the information they need to understand their state accountability systems and their rights and opportunities for supplemental services and public school choice.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The number of parents of children attending schools that are not making adequate yearly progress who are participating in PIRC activities designed to provide them with the information necessary to understand their state accountability systems and the rights and opportunities for supplemental services and public school choice afforded to their children under section 1116 of the ESEA.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of parents of children attending schools that are not making adequate yearly progress and who participate in PIRC activities that receive information on their state accountability systems, rights and opportunities for supplemental services, and public school choice options.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Performance reporting requirements for the PIRC program are being revised to incorporate the collection of information needed to respond to this indicator. This was a new indicator based on a program priority for 2004. There is insufficient information available to pre-determine a reasonable baseline number for the first year. Consequently, actual data collected for the first year will serve as the baseline and growth based on that number will be used to establish the performance targets for succeeding years. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 5%. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 10%. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 15%.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> Magnet Schools Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2004</b>		999		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<b>2006</b>		999		
<b>2007</b>		999		

## ESEA: Reading First State Grants – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.357 - Reading First State Grants

**Program Goal: To improve kindergarten through third-grade student achievement in reading by supporting state and local educational agencies in establishing reading programs that are based on scientifically based reading research.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: To increase the percentage of students that learn to read proficiently by the end of third grade.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Reading Achievement in Reading First Schools: Increased percentages of grade 1-3 students will read at grade level or above in schools participating in Reading First programs, as measured by meeting or exceeding the Proficient level of performance on state reading assessments.</b>						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of students in Reading First schools in grades 1-3 meeting or exceeding Proficient level in reading.</i>						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3
<b>2003</b>				999	999	999
				<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2003 target is to establish a baseline. Targets for subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported.		<b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b>  <b>Additional Source Information:</b> Reading First Annual Performance Report. Recipients of Reading First grants, as required by statute, will submit Annual Performance Reports on reading results for students in grades 1, 2, and 3.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003



				<p><b>Data Available:</b> February 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>																						
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Reading Achievement in Reading First Schools for At-Risk Students: Increased percentages of grade 1-3 at-risk Reading First students will read at grade level or above, as measured by meeting or exceeding the proficient level of performance on state reading assessments.</b></p>																										
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality																				
<p><i>Percentage of at-risk RF students in grades 1-3 meeting or exceeding Proficient level in reading.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Year</th> <th colspan="3">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="3">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Grade 1</th> <th>Grade 2</th> <th>Grade 3</th> <th>Grade 1</th> <th>Grade 2</th> <th>Grade 3</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> <td>999</td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets			Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	2003				999	999	999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2003 target is to establish a baseline. Targets for subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported. Data for this measure will be presented and made available in an alternate format.</p>		<p><b>Source:</b> Performance Report Contractor Performance Report   <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> February 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets																					
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3																				
2003				999	999	999																				

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Reading Achievement Statewide: Increased percentages of students will read at grade level or above, as measured by meeting or exceeding the Proficient level on the NAEP reading assessment.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of fourth-grade students scoring at or above Proficient in reading on the NAEP.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> Data for this measure will be presented and made available in an alternate format.	<b>Source:</b> NCES Survey/Assessment <b>Survey/Assessment:</b> National Assessment of Educational Progress.  <b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> February 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> NCES.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2000	28			
2002	30			
2003	30			31
2005		32		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: To decrease the percentage of kindergarten through third grade students in schools participating in Reading First who are referred for special education services based on their difficulties learning to read.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Referrals to Special Education: Decreasing percentages of RF K-3 students will be referred for special education services based on their difficulties learning to read.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>Percentage of RF K-3 students referred for special education services.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2003 target is to establish a baseline. Targets for subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported. Data for this measure will be presented and made available in an alternate format.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Reading First Annual Performance Report. Recipients of Reading First grants, as required by statute, will submit an Annual Performance Report that includes data for this indicator.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> February 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		

**Objective 8.3 of 3: To advance the success of the Reading First program by monitoring the progress of states in implementing their approved state plans.**

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Implementation of Reading First Programs: The percentage of states that demonstrate progress in the implementation of their Reading First programs, as outlined in their approved state plans, will reach 100%.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of states that demonstrate progress in implementing approved Reading First plans.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2003 target is to establish a baseline. Targets for subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported. Data for this measure will be presented and made available in an alternate format.</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> February 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003				999

## ESEA: Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution – 2005

**Program Goal: To motivate low-income children to read.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To distribute books and to provide reading strategies to low-income children, their families, and service providers.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Reading is Fundamental will provide books and scientifically based reading services to low-income children at risk of educational failure due to delays in reading.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of low-income children who receive books and reading services through the Reading is Fundamental Program.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee performance report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	3,713,541	999		
2004		3,899,218		
2005		4,089,895		
2006		4,270,572		

## ESEA: Ready to Teach – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.286 - Ready to Teach

**Program Goal: To improve student achievement by developing high-quality, standards-based digital professional development to teachers and by developing high-quality, standards-based digital classroom content.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To use multiple digital technologies to develop and deliver digital courses and classroom content, and to provide training to teachers using these materials.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Students participating in Ready to Teach will demonstrate enhanced academic achievement.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of students who participate in Ready To Teach programs and demonstrate enhanced academic achievement.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 5%. The following data may be collected: test scores, participation in more rigorous course-taking, or any other established measure of achievement. Materials developed under Ready To Teach are intended for distribution beyond the project period.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Outside contractors' evaluation reports and projects' annual performance reports  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Validated by outside contractors for evaluation and by Department staff.  <b>Limitations:</b> Because of shifting demographics, some students may not remain in the assigned school district, but steps are being taken to track these students.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2004				999
2005				999

## ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.295 - Ready-To-Learn Television

**Program Goal: The Ready-to-Learn Television Program will enhance the learning strategies of preschool and early elementary children.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Develop, produce, and distribute high-quality televised educational programming for preschool and early elementary school children.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Children ages 3-6 years old who view literacy based Ready-to-Learn shows will demonstrate expressive vocabulary skills and emergent literacy skills.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>(a) Percentage of children ages 3-6 years old who viewed literacy based Ready-to-Learn television shows that demonstrate expressive vocabulary skills at or above national norms.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>Children Ages 3-6</td> <td>Children Ages 3-6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>28.40</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>40</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>40</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Children Ages 3-6	Children Ages 3-6	2003	28.40		2004	40		2005		40	<p><b>Explanation:</b> <i>Sesame Street</i> and <i>Between the Lions</i> are the literacy based RTL programs that have been included for purposes of this measure. 25 percent of Head Start children scored at or above national norms in expressive vocabulary skills and emergent literacy skills. Children participating in full-year Head Start programs who score at or above national norms for expressive vocabulary and emergent literacy skills can be expected to increase by approximately 9 percent annually. The 5 percent annual increase is ambitious because, unlike Head Start, Ready-to-Learn services are not "full year." Further, at least some children in the Ready-to-Learn target populations achieve at lower baseline levels than comparable populations of children</p>	<p><b>Source 1: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> National Evaluation.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Head Start Family &amp; Child Experiences Survey: Longitudinal Findings on Program Performance 3rd Progress Report.  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 09/30/2003.</p> <p><b>Source 2: Non-NCES Survey/Research</b>  <b>Collecting Agency:</b> Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.  <b>Survey/Research Report Title:</b> Ready to Learn National Evaluation.  <b>References:</b> Woodcock-Munoz Language Survey Normative Update Picture Vocab Test &amp; Woodcock</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
	Children Ages 3-6	Children Ages 3-6																	
2003	28.40																		
2004	40																		
2005		40																	
<p><i>(b) Percentage of children ages 3-6 years old who viewed literacy based Ready-to-Learn television shows that demonstrate emergent literacy skills at or above national norms.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>Children Ages 3-6</td> <td>Children Ages 3-6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>54.90</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Children Ages 3-6	Children Ages 3-6	2003	54.90									
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
	Children Ages 3-6	Children Ages 3-6																	
2003	54.90																		

2004	75		<p>who participated in the National Head Start study. Ready-to-Learn services included in this measure have 4 target populations: children with limited literacy, children with disabilities, rural children, and children whose primary language is not English.</p>	<p>Munoz Letter-Word Identification Test.</p> <p><b>Source 3: Non-NCES Survey/Research</b>  <b>Collecting Agency:</b> WestED.  <b>Survey/Research Report Title:</b> PBS Ready-to-Learn Performance Indicator Study of Viewing Effects.  <b>References:</b> Proportion of students age equivalent or higher on the Woodcock-Munoz Language Survey Normative Update Picture Vocab Test &amp; Woodcok-Munoz Normative Update Letter-Word Identification Test.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005                      Validated By: Mathematica and reviewed by ED staff.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data is only being collected on preschool children because it is prohibitively expensive to include elementary school through 3rd grade children. The parents/child educators of all children included in the sample attended Ready-To-</p>
2005		40		



				Learn workshops.	
<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Parents who attend workshops will demonstrate daily reading to their children.</b>					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of parents who attend workshops that demonstrate daily reading to their children.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Thirty-seven percent of Head Start parents read to their children on a daily basis. The source for this statistic was the Head Start Evaluation sited in indicator number one. This statistic was used for developing our baseline.</p>	<p><b>Source 1: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Other.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Survey (paper &amp; pencil, Internet, telephone) of parent and child educator workshop attendees. WestEd.  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 07/15/2004.</p> <p><b>Source 2: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Other.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Mathematica-Research Contractor. Data collected from parents in face-to-face interviews..  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 09/30/2003.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005                      Mathematica, contractor and reviewed by Department staff.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data collected by contractor are self-reported from parents. Indicator may no longer be used after FY 2005.</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>			
	Parents	Parents			
<b>2003</b>	56.50				
<b>2004</b>	68				
<b>2005</b>		53			

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Percentage of parents and child educators who actively implement the Ready To Learn Triangle (View, Do, Read).																		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>Percentage of parents and child educators who actively implement the Ready-to-Learn Triangle following attendance at a Ready-to-Learn Workshop.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>Parents and Child Educators</td> <td>Parents and Child Educators</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>43.75</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>61.50</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>54</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Parents and Child Educators	Parents and Child Educators	2003	43.75		2004	61.50		2005		54	<p><b>Explanation:</b> PBS contracts with 148 Ready-to-Learn stations (PBS affiliates) to conduct workshops, distribute reading materials and newsletters in English and Spanish, and engage in other ancillary Ready-to-Learn program activities. The Ready-to-Learn "View, Do and Read" Learning Triangle is designed to enhance young children's learning by encouraging them to interact with the people and objects around them.</p>	<p><b>Source 1: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Other.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Mathematica - Research Contractor. Data collected from parents in face-to-face interviews. Data collected from child educators by phone interviews..  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 09/30/2003.</p> <p><b>Source 2: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Other.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Survey (pencil &amp; paper, Internet, telephone) of parent and child educator workshop attendees. WestEd.  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 07/15/2004.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005                      Mathematica and reviewed by Department staff.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data collected by contractor are self-reported by parents and child educators. Indicator may no longer be used after FY 2005.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																
	Parents and Child Educators	Parents and Child Educators																
2003	43.75																	
2004	61.50																	
2005		54																

## ESEA: Rural Education – 2005

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.358A - Small, Rural School Achievement Program  
84.358B - Rural Education Achievement Program

**Program Goal: Raise educational achievement of students in small, rural school districts.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Local educational agencies (LEAs) participating in the Small Rural Schools Achievement (SRSA) Program will make adequate yearly progress after the third year.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Adequate Yearly Progress: Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress.</b>			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress after three years.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The target for FY 2005 is to set the baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 5%.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated Performance Report, State Report Card, Evaluation Survey, NCES &amp; PBDMI</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
<b>2005</b>		999	
<b>2006</b>		999	

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Local educational agencies (LEAs) participating in the Rural and Low-Income Schools (RLIS) program will make adequate yearly progress after the third year.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Adequate Yearly Progress: Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress after three years.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The target for FY 2005 is to set the baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 5%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated Performance Report, State Report Card, Evaluation Survey, NCES &amp; PBDMI</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
2006		999		

**Objective 8.3 of 3: LEAs will participate in the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.**

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Participation.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of eligible school districts utilizing the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	61			
2005		65		

## ESEA: School Leadership – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.363A - School Leadership Program

**Program Goal: To increase the number of qualified assistant principals and principals serving in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To recruit and train teachers and individuals from other fields to become assistant principals and principals who will serve in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of all new recruits who enroll and complete training programs to become assistant principals or principals in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.</i>			<b>Progress:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.	<b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> School Leadership Grantee Performance Report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> February 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  <b>Limitations:</b> Each grantee uses its own method of recording and reporting data, and inconsistencies exist.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2004</b>		999		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<i>The percentage of new assistant principals or principals receiving full certification/licensure.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2004</b>		999		
<b>2005</b>		999		

<i>The percentage of fully certified/licensed assistant principals and principals who apply for positions in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2004</b>		999		
<b>2005</b>		999		

## ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.215L - FIE/Smaller Learning Communities

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Students in schools receiving smaller learning communities implementation grants will demonstrate continuous improvement in achievement in core subjects, as well as exhibit positive behavioral changes.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Academic achievement: Increasing percentages of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants will score at or above basic on state and local reading and math assessments.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of students scoring at or above basic on state and local reading and math assessments.</i>					<b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b>  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Percentage Meeting Levels in Reading	Percentage Meeting Levels in Math	Percentage Meeting Levels in Reading	Percentage Meeting Levels in Math	
<b>2001</b>	65.70	57.10			
<b>2003</b>	54.90	50.45	66.70	58.10	
<b>2004</b>			70	60	
<b>2005</b>			74	63	

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Graduation: Increasing percentages of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants will graduate from high school.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants who graduate from high school (based on 9th grade enrollment).</i>			<b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b>  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2001	59.20		
2003	56.60	60.20	
2004		63	
2005		66	
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Postsecondary Transition: Increasing percentages of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants plan to attend a 2- or 4-year college.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants planning to attend a 2- or 4-year college.</i>			<b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b>  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2001	69.90		
2003	66.50	70.90	
2004		74	
2005		78	



## ESEA: Special Programs for Indian Children - 2005

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.299A - Indian Education Special Programs for Indian Children  
84.299B - Indian Education--Professional Development Grants

### Program Goal: Special Programs for Indian Children

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Discretionary programs will focus on improving educational opportunities and services for American Indian and Alaska Native children and adults.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Increasing percentages of the teacher and principal workforces serving American Indian and Alaska Native students will themselves be American Indian and Alaska Native.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p style="text-align: center;">Targets and Performance Data</p> <p><i>The percentage of program participants who become principals/vice principals/school administrators with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Principals</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Principals</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Principals	Principals	<b>2005</b>		20	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Projects for preservice teacher training began in FY 2000 and were completed in FY 2003. Three-year projects for pre-service administrative training were only funded in FY 2001 and were completed in FY 2004.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Office of Indian Education Project Performance Reports; Schools and Staffing Survey 1999; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools (1998-99 and 2000-01).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> NCES.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
	Principals	Principals											
<b>2005</b>		20											
<p><i>Percentage of program participants who become teachers in schools with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Teachers</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Teachers</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Teachers	Teachers					
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
	Teachers	Teachers											

<b>2005</b>		23		<p><b>Limitations:</b> Sample size is small and it is costly to add supplemental samples to data collection programs. National sample results in an under representation in sample count.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Monitor the number of American Indian and Alaska Native students through LEAs' reporting on program effectiveness in their Annual Performance Report.</p>
<i>The percentage of program participants who receive full state licensure.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		75		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Discretionary programs will focus on improving educational opportunities and services for Indian children and adults.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Increasing percentages of preschool American Indian and Alaska Native students will possess school readiness skills gained through a scientifically based research designed curriculum that prepares them for kindergarten.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of 3-4 year old children achieving educationally significant gains on a measure of language and communication development based on curriculum benchmarks.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> Data		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>				46
<i>Percentage of 3-4 year old children achieving educationally significant</i>				

<p><i>gains on prescribed measure of cognitive skills and conceptual knowledge, including mathematics, science and early reading based on curriculum benchmarks.</i></p>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>		46
<p><i>Percentage of 3-4 year old children achieving educationally significant gains on prescribed measure of social development that facilitates self-regulation of attention, behavior and emotion based on curriculum benchmarks.</i></p>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>		46

## ESEA: Star Schools Program – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.203 - Star Schools

**Program Goal: To improve student learning and teaching through the use of distance learning technologies.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Promote the delivery of challenging content in core subjects.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of students demonstrating improvement in reading, math, or science.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> This was a new indicator in 2003. FY 2003 data were collected, but deemed insufficient to recognize as a baseline. Subsequently, FY 2004 data established the baseline.	<b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> Star Schools Grantee Performance Report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Based on program review of the data reported by the grantee(s).  <b>Limitations:</b> Sample sizes are very small, due to limited number of grantees. Data are difficult to aggregate because
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2003</b>	69.30	999		
<b>2004</b>	64.89	999		
<b>2005</b>		69		

				grantees do not use a standard instrument to measure student achievement.
<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Challenging content aligned with state or district standards at all academic levels (including high school credit, advanced placement, adult education, and Graduate Equivalency Diploma courses).</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of full credit courses or modules offering challenging content that is aligned with state and district standards.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is lower than in 2004 because the number of grantees decline as grants are closed out. Between 1999 and 2002, inconsistencies in data collection yielded unreliable results.	<b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> Star Schools Grantee Performance Report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Based on program review of the data reported by the grantee(s). Program review includes: examining the procedures that grantees use to align standards to content at all academic levels; and verifying the evidence provided for alignment.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
1995	30			
1997	81			
1998	105			
1999	126			
2000	921			
2001	387			
2002	1,502	1,000		
2003	1,338	1,600		
2004	1,373	1,700		
2005		1,300		
<i>Number of students and educators participating.</i>				<b>Limitations:</b> Data were originally collected and reported using whole
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2003	18,820			

		<p>numbers; however, as the total number of grantees has decreased, it is no longer possible to meaningfully demonstrate progress. Data are self-reported by projects. Evidence of alignment with standards has been particularly difficult to assess.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Planned improvements include verifying whether projects use content experts to review and validate the extent to which a) content is challenging, or b) standards are appropriate for the content delivered.</p>
--	--	---

## ESEA: State Assessments – 2005

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.368A - Enhanced Assessment Grants  
84.369 - Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

**Program Goal: To support states in the development of state assessments.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: By the 2005-2006 school year, all states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics in grades three through eight and high school and will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (3-5, 6-8 and high school) in science, all on which are aligned with their content specific academic content standards.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 5: Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades 3 through 8 and in high schools in reading/language arts that align with the state's academic content standards.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of states (including DC and PR) that have reading/language arts assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> States are required to have reading/language arts assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school by 2005-2006. The 2006 performance target of 52 is set to reflect the compliance of 50 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2004</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		18		
2006		52		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 5: Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades 3 through 8 and in high schools in mathematics that align with the state's academic content standards.																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The number of states (including DC and PR) that have mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>52</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004		999	2005		18	2006		52	2007		52	2008		52	<p><b>Explanation:</b> States are required to have reading/language arts assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school by 2005-2006. The 2006 performance target of 52 is set to reflect the compliance of 50 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2004</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2004		999																			
2005		18																			
2006		52																			
2007		52																			
2008		52																			



<b>Indicator 8.1.3 of 5: Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (3-5, 6-8 and high school) in science that align with the state's academic content standards.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The number of states (including DC and PR) that have science assessments in each grade span (grades 3-5, 6-8, and high school).</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> States are not required to have science assessments in grades 3-8 and high school until 2007-2008. This performance measure reflects a long term goal based on requirements set up in NCLB. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>				999
<b>2005</b>				18
<b>2006</b>				21
<b>2007</b>				25
<b>2008</b>				52

Indicator 8.1.4 of 5: Field Testing Reading: States field testing assessments in reading/language arts.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The number of states that have completed field testing of the required assessments in reading/language arts.</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Reports and state Web sites.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003	16			
2004	19			
2005				30
2006		52		
Indicator 8.1.5 of 5: Field Testing Math: States field testing assessment in mathematics.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The number of states that have completed field testing of the required assessments in mathematics.</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Reports and state Web sites</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003	16			
2004	19			
2005				30
2006		52		

## ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.298 - Innovative Education Program Strategies

**Program Goal: To support state and local programs that are a continuing source of innovation and educational improvement.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To encourage states to use flexibility authorities in ways that will increase student achievement.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Improved student achievement: School districts that direct Title V funds to activities designated as strategic priorities by the U.S. Department of Education will be more likely to achieve adequate yearly progress than those that use funds for all other activities. Strategic priorities include (1) those that support student achievement, and enhance reading and math, (2) those that improve the quality of teachers, (3) those that ensure that schools are safe and drug free, (4) and those that promote access for all students.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of LEAs meeting AYP.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> School year 2002-2003 data were used to set the baseline. Performance targets for FY 2004 were set at the baseline plus 5%. FY 2005 performance targets were increased by 1%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State Report Cards; Title V Monitoring; Consolidated State Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> February 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Of districts targeting Title V Funds, the % achieving AYP	Of districts not targeting Title V Funds, the % achieving AYP	Of districts targeting Title V Funds, the % achieving AYP			Of districts not targeting Title V Funds, the % achieving AYP
<b>2003</b>	65	55	65			55
<b>2004</b>			68			58
<b>2005</b>			69	59		

## ESEA: Teaching of Traditional American History – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.215X - Teaching of Traditional American History

**Program Goal: To improve student achievement by providing high-quality professional development to elementary and secondary-level teachers of American history.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Demonstrate the effectiveness of professional development activities for secondary-level teachers of American history through the increased achievement of their students.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Students in experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational effectiveness in Teaching American History projects will demonstrate higher achievement on course content measures and/or statewide U.S. history assessments than students in control and comparison groups.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>(a) Percentage of students in studies of educational effectiveness who demonstrate higher achievement than those in control or comparison groups.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2004</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>2004</b>		999	<b>2005</b>		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> a) The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%. b) FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> Teaching American History Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2004</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
<b>2004</b>		999											
<b>2005</b>		999											
<p><i>(b) Percentage of school districts that demonstrate higher educational achievement for students in TAH classrooms than those in control or comparison groups.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>2005</b>		999					
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
<b>2005</b>		999											

## ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.010 - Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies

**Program Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: The performance of low-income students will increase substantially in reading and mathematics.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Fourth-grade reading proficiency: The number of states administering fourth-grade reading assessments that report an increase in the percentage of low-income students who perform at either the proficient or advanced performance levels will increase annually.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<i>The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade low-income students meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in reading on state assessments.</i>								
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2005</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		25	<p><b>Explanation:</b> School year 2002-2003 was the first year for which states were required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated Performance Report. Actual performance data for 2005 will be obtained by comparing school year 2004-2005 data to school year 2003-2004 data.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB; State Performance Report; PBDMI</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2005		25						

<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Eighth-grade mathematics proficiency: The number of states administering eighth-grade mathematics assessments that report an increase in the percentage of low-income students who perform at either the proficient or advanced performance levels will increase annually.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress						
<p><i>The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade low-income students meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in mathematics on state assessments.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		25	<p><b>Explanation:</b> School year 2002-2003 is the first year for which states are required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated Performance Report. Actual performance data for 2005 will be obtained by comparing school year 2004-2005 data to school year 2003-2004 data.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB; State Performance Report; PBDMI</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2005		25						

**Objective 8.2 of 3: AYP status**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Making AYP: Number of states that report an increase in schools making AYP.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress						
<p><i>The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of schools making adequate yearly progress.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		10	<p><b>Explanation:</b> School year 2002-2003 is the first year for which states are required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated Performance Report. Actual performance data for 2005 will be obtained by comparing school year 2004-2005 data to school year 2003-2004 data.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated Performance Report; PBDMI</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2005		10						

		<p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                  Contractor conducts edit checks.</p>
--	--	--

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Performance of low-income students in high-poverty schools will increase in reading and mathematics.**

<p><b>Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: NAEP Performance - Fourth-Grade Reading: The percentage of low-income fourth-grade students who score at or above Basic and at or above Proficient in reading on the NAEP.</b></p>					
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>			<p>Assessment of Progress</p>		<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>
<p><i>The percentage of low-income fourth-grade students scoring at or above Basic and Proficient in reading on the NAEP.</i></p>					
<p><b>Year</b></p>	<p><b>Actual Performance</b></p>		<p><b>Performance Targets</b></p>		
	<p>At or above Proficient</p>	<p>At or above Basic</p>	<p>At or above Proficient</p>	<p>At or above Basic</p>	
<p><b>2000</b></p>	<p>13</p>	<p>39</p>			
<p><b>2002</b></p>	<p>16</p>	<p>46</p>	<p>14</p>	<p>40</p>	
<p><b>2003</b></p>	<p>15</p>	<p>44</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>41</p>	
<p><b>2005</b></p>			<p>17</p>	<p>43</p>	
<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCES - NAEP  <b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> November 2005  <b>Limitations:</b> NAEP is not aligned with state assessments.</p>					

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: NAEP Performance - Eighth-Grade Mathematics: The percentage of low-income eighth-grade students who score at or above Basic or at or above Proficient in mathematics on the NAEP.					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of low-income eighth-grade students scoring at or above Basic and Proficient in mathematics on the NAEP.</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		<b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCES - NAEP  <b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> November 2005  <b>Limitations:</b> NAEP is not aligned with state assessments.
	At or above Proficient	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At or above Basic	
2000	10	41			
2003	11	47	11	43	
2005			13	45	



## ESEA: Transition To Teaching – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.350 - Transition to Teaching

**Program Goal: To increase the number of mid-career professionals, qualified paraprofessionals, and recent college graduates who become highly qualified teachers in high-need schools in high-need LEAs and teach for at least three years.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Recruit and retain highly qualified teachers in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>(a) Percentage of all TTT participants who become highly qualified teachers and teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Baselines: 2003 for measures (a) and (b); 2006 for measure (c). For all 2003 baseline data, September 2003 is the end of the first performance period for Transition grantees. Under the Transition program, all participants are required to serve in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for at least three years. (ED will use the statutory definitions of high need schools and high need LEAs.)	<b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> Transition to Teaching Grantee Performance Report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005  <b>Limitations:</b> Each grantee uses its own method of recording and reporting data and inconsistencies exist. ED expects to pilot a uniform reporting system in 2004 that will be fully operational in
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	54			
2005		70		
2006		80		
2007		85		
2008		85		
<i>(b) Percentage of all TTT participants who become highly qualified math or science teachers will increase.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	19			

2005		25		2005. This system is expected to improve data quality over time but may require adjustments to the performance targets.
2006		25		
2007		25		
2008		25		
<i>(c) Percentage of new, highly qualified Transition to Teaching teachers who teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for at least three years.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: The percentage of Transition to Teaching teachers who receive full state certification or licensure.</b>	
2006		999		
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of teachers receiving full certification/licensure.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> This measure applies to the Transition to Teaching Program under NCLB, which differs from the previous program and its measures. Therefore, FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> Transition to Teaching Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2005</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2005		999		

## ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.815 – Troops-to -Teachers

**Program Goal: To increase the number of military personnel or qualified participants in a reserve component who become highly qualified teachers in high-need LEAs and teach for at least three years.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To provide schools in high-need LEAs with highly qualified teachers who are former military or reserve component personnel.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Recruitment: Recruit and retain highly qualified teachers in high-need LEAs.</b>		
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>(a) Percentage of recruits who become highly qualified teachers.</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	71	
<b>2005</b>		75
<i>(b) Percentage of recruits who become highly qualified math and science teachers.</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	26	
<b>2005</b>		28
<b>2006</b>		30
<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. Progress for target (a) (HQ teachers) will be reported by November 30 in 2005 and 2010. Progress for target (b) (m/s teachers) will be reported annually by November 30 in 2004, 2005, 2006. Progress for target (c) will be reported by November 30 in 2003, 2005, and 2010. (a) The length of time required for recruits to become highly qualified teachers varies.</p>		
<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> Troops to Teachers Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> DANTES annual performance reports. Collection period: Data on financial stipends: Annually, by fiscal year. Data on teacher placements: Annually, by school year.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> November</p>		

<p><i>(c) 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 LEA.</i></p>			<p>2004</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2005		80	
2006		99	

## ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.361 - Voluntary Public School Choice

**Program Goal: To assist states and local school districts in creating, expanding, and implementing a public school choice program.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: The Voluntary Public School Choice Program increases options for public school choice.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The number and percentage of families who exercise public school choice will increase annually.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>(a) The number of students who have the option of attending participating VPSC schools selected by their parents.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2004 data established the baseline for (a) and (b). The number of students who have the option of attending participating VPSC schools is the total of all students eligible to apply for transfers. In some instances, grantees may not have slots available for all students applying for a transfer. For instance, VPSC in Chicago includes 23 schools, but the transfer option is offered districtwide. Nine sites reported that 3,694 students transferred under VPSC. The percentage of students participating in VPSC (b) is the percentage of students who transfer among those eligible to participate across the 13 total grantees. (a) Performance target is the estimated number of participating students when projects are fully implemented, excluding Florida, for which no estimate was possible. (b) The target for 2005 is the baseline plus 2%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Evaluation of the Voluntary Public School Choice Program.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> November 2005</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2004</b>	755,148			
<b>2005</b>		849,864		
<i>(b) The percentage of students participating at each site who exercised school choice by changing schools.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2004</b>	11			
<b>2005</b>		13		

## ESEA: Women’s Educational Equity – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.083 - Women's Educational Equity Act Program

**Program Goal: To promote gender equity in education in the United States.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To ensure equal access to mathematics, science and computer science educational courses, programs and careers for women and girls.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>(a) Percentage of female students enrolled in advanced mathematics and science courses (including computer science).</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2005</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2006</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> These are new measures. FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. For (a), the FY 2005 target is 5% more than the baseline and the FY 2006 target is 3% more than the 2005 target. For (b), the target for FY 2005 is 10% more than the baseline and the target for FY 2006 is 7% more than the 2005 target. Prior performance indicators represented selected data elements collected by the WEEA Center in Boston, only. The new indicators reflect data from individual grantees' performance reports and are better aligned with the funding intent.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> Women's Educational Equity Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> February 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  <b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported by grantees.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
2005		999											
2006		999											
<p><i>(b) Number/percentage of students who indicate increased knowledge of and intent to pursue career options in mathematics and the sciences (including computer science).</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2005</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2006</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	2006		999		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
2005		999											
2006		999											
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2005</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2006</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	2006		999		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
2005		999											
2006		999											
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2005</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2006</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	2006		999		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
2005		999											
2006		999											

## ESRA: National Assessment – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.902 - Assessments

**Program Goal: To collect, analyze, and disseminate information on the condition of education in the United States and to provide comparative international statistics.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Timeliness of NAEP data for reading and mathematics assessment in support of the President's No Child Left Behind initiative.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The time from the end of data collection to initial public release of results in reading and mathematics assessments shall be reduced from 15 months to 6 months.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of months from end of data collection to initial public release of results.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCES</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> NCES.            Data will be validated by determining number of months between actual end of data collection and the release date.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> NCES has added an additional goal in GPRA, i.e., "Timeliness of</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	8	6		
2005		6		
2007		6		

		<p>NAEP data for Reading and Mathematics Assessment in support of the President's No Child Left Behind Initiative." In addition, NCES is developing a monitoring system to measure external uses of NCES products. Both volume and actual use will be documented in the monitoring system, for specific user groups. The monitoring system will establish baseline measures of usage and application of NCES products from which long-term outcomes can be established.</p>
--	--	---



## ESRA: Regional Educational Laboratories – 2005

**Program Goal: Support evidence-based educational improvement through high-quality, relevant applied research development, technical assistance, and dissemination.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide high-quality, relevant products and project designs for making policy decisions and improving educational practice.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of evidence-based products and project designs with average reviewer ratings for quality of "high" and above. If there is a large number of new evidence-based products and project designs, a random sample may be assessed.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Report of independent review panel</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		999		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Relevance of products and project designs: The percentage of all products and project designs that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of a random sample of all products and project designs with average ratings for relevance of "high " and above.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Report of independent review panel  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data collected biennially.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2004				999
2005		999		

## HEA: High School Equivalency Program – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.141A - High School Equivalency Program

**Program Goal: To assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students in obtaining the equivalent of a high school diploma, and, subsequently, to begin postsecondary education, enter military service, or obtain employment.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: An increasing percentage of HEP participants will complete the program and receive their GED.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of HEP participants receiving a GED</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The percentage of HEP students who receive the GED decreased for several reasons. First, the GED requirements changed. Secondly, grantees had difficulties getting students tested at GED testing centers. Finally many of the centers were not prepared to test in Spanish. In addition new projects experienced difficulties because of late grant notification dates.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> April 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> OME is working with grantees to provide detailed information within the annual performance reports.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996	70			
1997	70			
1998	66			
1999	72			
2000	73			
2001	58			
2002	53			
2003	63	60		
2004		60		
2005		65		

## HEA: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.331A - Grants to States for Workplace and Community Transition Training for Incarcerated Youth Offenders

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

### Objective 8.1 of 1: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of students participating in the program completing a postsecondary education certificate, associate of arts or bachelor's degree in the facility during the program year</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are provided in periodic reports from grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are based on continuous enrollment. Therefore, the current enrollment is being compared to the outcome of graduates, including individuals served in the prior year and those still</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002		50		
2003		50		
2004	50	50		
2005		50		
2006		55		
2007		60		

		<p>enrolled at year end. This distorts the numbers when the program is either growing or contracting. Programs differ in objectives and degrees/certificates offered, so very different outcomes are being combined. Reporting is inconsistent from state to state. Some data being combined may not be reliable.</p>
--	--	---

## HEA: Teacher Quality Enhancement – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.336 - Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants

**Program Goal: To improve the quality of teacher education and initial certification standards, and to improve the knowledge and skills of all teachers, particularly new teachers and teachers who work in high-need areas.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the skills and knowledge of new teachers by funding the development of state policies that strengthen initial licensing standards and the development of state or local policies/programs that reduce the number of uncertified teachers.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Pass rates: Pass rates will increase for preservice teachers taking subject matter competency tests as part of State licensure requirements, in the states that receive funds from the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program for states to prepare teachers that are highly competent in the academic content areas in which they will be teaching (HEA, Title II, Sec. 202 (d) (1)).**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of preservice teachers taking and passing subject matter competency tests as part of state licensure requirements.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> States use a variety of different licensure and certification exams or batteries of exams, the reporting guide for the Secretary's Report asks states to report across six categories of tests: basic skills; professional knowledge and pedagogy; academic content areas; and performance assessments. The guide also call for a single "summary rate" that reflects the total of the graduates' testing experience.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p> <p>The data collection, with statistical data quality checks, meets the requirements of Title II of the Higher Education</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	93			
2001	93			
2002	94			
2005		95		
2006		100		

	Act, which created a national reporting system on the quality of teacher preparation.
--	---

**Objective 8.2 of 2: To reform teacher preparation programs in partnership with high need school districts and schools of arts and sciences to produce highly qualified teachers.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Highly qualified teachers: The percentage of program completers who are highly qualified teachers</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of program completers who are highly qualified teachers.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data will establish the baseline. "Highly qualified" is defined in No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Title IX, Sec. 9101. A program completer is defined as a graduate of a teacher preparation program, because many graduates of teacher preparation programs get a certificate or some other evidence of program completion, not a degree. Certification is not necessarily simultaneous with program graduation; program completion, therefore, allows a reasonable period of time for graduates to pass the certification examinations.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> The annual performance report is being revised to collect data based on the NCLB definition of "highly qualified" teacher.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported through annual performance reports.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				80
2006				85
2007				90

# IDEA: Special Education Grants for Infants and Families – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.181 - Special Education\_Grants for Infants and Families with Disabilities

**Program Goal: To enhance the development of infants and toddlers (0-3) with disabilities and support families in meeting the special needs of their child.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: The functional development of infants and toddlers will be enhanced by early intervention services.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: FUNCTIONAL ABILITIES: The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in Part C that exhibit improved and sustained functional abilities			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in Part C that exhibit improved and sustained functional abilities</i>			<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Part C Annual Performance Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2007 OSEP is currently determining a data collection methodology for this indicator.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2006		999	



Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: <b>FAMILY CAPACITY: The percentage of families participating in Part C that report that early intervention services have increased their capacity to enhance their child's development.</b>			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>Percentage of families participating in Part C that report that early intervention services have increased their capacity</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data for 1998 and 2001 were obtained from the IDEA National Early Intervention Study (NEILS).</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Part C Annual Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2006 - 2007</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2008 OSEP is currently determining a data collection methodology for this indicator.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	72			
2001	73			
2002		80		
2003		80		
2004		80		
2005		80		
2006		80		
2007		80		
2008		83		
2009		87		
2010		90		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: All infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families will receive early intervention services in natural environments that meet their individual needs.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: INFANTS SERVED: The number of states that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under the age of 1 through Part C			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p style="text-align: center;">Targets and Performance Data</p> <p><i>Number of states that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under the age of 1 through Part C.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>21</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>21</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>23</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>23</td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>28</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	21		2002	21		2003	23		2004	23	37	2005		27	2006		28	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The 1 percent threshold in this indicator is based on the prevalence rates of 5 conditions: 0.4% severe mental retardation; 0.2% hearing impairment; 0.1% visual impairment; 0.2% physical conditions (spinal bifida, CP, etc.); and 0.1% autism.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under Part C of IDEA and U.S. Census data.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2001	21																								
2002	21																								
2003	23																								
2004	23	37																							
2005		27																							
2006		28																							
<p style="text-align: center;">Targets and Performance Data</p> <p><i>Number of states that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, through Part C.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>25</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>25</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>27</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>28</td> <td>40</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	25		2002	25		2003	27	20	2004	28	40								
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2001	25																								
2002	25																								
2003	27	20																							
2004	28	40																							
Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: INFANTS AND TODDLERS SERVED: The number of States that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, through Part C			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p style="text-align: center;">Targets and Performance Data</p> <p><i>Number of states that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, through Part C.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>25</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>25</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>27</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>28</td> <td>40</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	25		2002	25		2003	27	20	2004	28	40		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State reported data under IDEA Section 618 and U.S. Census data.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006</p>						
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2001	25																								
2002	25																								
2003	27	20																							
2004	28	40																							
<p style="text-align: center;">Targets and Performance Data</p>																									

2005		31		
2006		32		
<b>Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: SERVICE SETTINGS: The percentage of children receiving early intervention services in home or in programs designed for typically-developing peers</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of children receiving early intervention services in home or in programs designed for typically developing peers</i>				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
1996	56			
1997	58			
1998	63			
1999	67			
2000	73	67		
2001	76	69		
2002	82	71		
2003	83	78		
2004		79		
2005		83		
2006		84		
2007		85		
2008		86		
2009		87		
2010		88		

# IDEA: Special Education Grants to States – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.027 - Special Education\_Grants to States

**Program Goal: Ensure all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education to help them meet challenging standards and prepare them for independent living and postsecondary education and/or competitive employment by assisting state and local educational agencies and families.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: All children with disabilities will meet challenging standards as determined by national and state assessments with accommodations as appropriate.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Performance on NAEP: The percentage of students with disabilities that meet or exceed basic levels in reading and math on the NAEP			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>Reading, fourth-grade -- The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic in reading on the NAEP.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCES.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> November 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> NCES.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Results of the NAEP scores for students with disabilities from this sample cannot be generalized to the total population of such students.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	23			
2002	29	33		
2003	29	35		
2005		35		
2007		35		
<i>Math, eighth-grade -- The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic in mathematics on the NAEP.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	26			

IDEA: Special Education Grants to States – 2005

Goal 2

<b>2003</b>	29	28		
<b>2005</b>		32		
<b>2007</b>		32		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Exclusion from NAEP: The percentage of students excluded from NAEP due to their disability			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			<p><b>Explanation:</b> For math, the percentage excluded from NAEP includes public and private school students. For reading, it includes only public school students.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCES <b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> November 2005</p>
<i>READING, 4TH GRADE</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	4			
2002	5			
2003	5			
2005		5		
2007		4		
<i>MATH, 8TH GRADE</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	3			
2003	3			
2005		3		
2007		3		

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Performance on State Assessments: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above on state assessments			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
Targets and Performance Data													
<p><i>The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in reading on state assessments.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		25	2006		25	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2004 data will establish the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> OESE State Consolidated Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2006</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
2005		25											
2006		25											
<p><i>The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in mathematics on state assessments.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		25	2006		25		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
2005		25											
2006		25											

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Secondary school students with disabilities will complete high school prepared for independent living and postsecondary education and/or competitive employment.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: Graduation Rate: The percentage of students with disabilities that graduate high school with a regular high school diploma			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Starting with 2004, we changed the way graduation rates are calculated and revised the Actual Performance data accordingly back to 1996.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under IDEA Section 618. Denominator includes graduation with diploma or certificate, dropout, maximum age, deceased, and not known to continue.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> August 2005</p>
<i>The percentage of students with disabilities that graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996	42			
1997	43			
1998	45			
1999	47			
2000	46			
2001	48			
2002	51			
2003	52			
2005		54		
2006		55		
2007		56		
2008		57		
2009		58		
2010		59		



Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: Dropout Rate: The percentage of students with disabilities that drop out of school			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Starting with 2004, we changed the way dropout rates are calculated and revised the Actual Performance data back to 1996.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.   <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> August 2005</p>
<i>Percentage of students with disabilities that drop out of school</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996	47			
1997	46			
1998	44			
1999	42			
2000	42			
2001	41			
2002	38			
2003	34			
2005		34		
2006		33		
2007		32		
2008		31		
2009		30		
2010		29		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of students with disabilities that are either competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within two years of leaving high school.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> National Longitudinal Transition Study I (NLTLS I) data - 52% from SY 1986-87; NLTLS II - 59% for SY 2003-04.	<b>Source: Other</b> <b>Other:</b> National Evaluation. <b>Sponsor:</b> NLTS II. <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 09/30/2002.  <b>Additional Source Information:</b> Postsecondary Outcomes Center.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	59			
2005		59.50		
2006		60		

**Objective 8.3 of 3: All children with disabilities will receive a free appropriate public education.**

**Indicator 8.3.1 of 3: Certified Teachers Under IDEA (Ages 6-21): The number of States with at least 90 percent of special education teachers of children with disabilities aged 6-21 fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																																				
<p><i>Number of States with at least 90 percent of special education teachers fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>35</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>36</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>37</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>36</td> <td>41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>36</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>37</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>33</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>30</td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>40</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1996	35		1997	36		1998	37		1999	36	41	2000	36	42	2001	37	42	2002	33	42	2003	30	37	2004		37	2005		39	2006		40	<p><b>Explanation:</b> There is a clustering of states around the 90 percent threshold in this indicator, which may result in unpredictable changes from year to year.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under IDEA section 618.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> August 2005   <b>Limitations:</b> Data reflect grades 1-12, not teachers teaching children aged 6-21. States maintain data by grades taught, not ages of students. State requirements for teacher certification vary widely (i.e., teachers fully certified in one state might not be considered eligible for full certification in another state).</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																						
1996	35																																							
1997	36																																							
1998	37																																							
1999	36	41																																						
2000	36	42																																						
2001	37	42																																						
2002	33	42																																						
2003	30	37																																						
2004		37																																						
2005		39																																						
2006		40																																						

Indicator 8.3.2 of 3: Highly Qualified Teachers Under NCLB: The number of special education teachers who teach core academic subjects that are highly qualified, consistent with NCLB				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of special education teachers who teach core academic subjects that are highly qualified.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for 2006 will be determined after receipt of the 2005 baseline data.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> NCES does not collect data on high qualified teachers because there is no standard definition.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				999
Indicator 8.3.3 of 3: Services Outside the Regular Classroom: The percentage of students ages 6-21 served outside of the regular classroom 60% or more of the day because of their disability				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percent of students served outside of the regular classroom 60% or more of the day due to their disability (as a percentage of the school population)</i>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Numerator: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618. Denominator: U.S. Census</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> August 2005</p>		
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
2001	2.85			
2002	2.81			
2003	2.77			
2005			2.69	
2006			2.65	

## IDEA: Special Education Parent Information Centers – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.328 - Special Education\_Parent Information Centers

**Program Goal: To provide training and information to parents of children with disabilities**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the quality of the parent training and information projects**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: HIGH-QUALITY PRODUCTS AND SERVICES: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<i>Percentage of products and services deemed to be of high quality</i>								
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="width: 40%; text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 45%; text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2005</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Panel of Experts</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2005</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2005		999						

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Parent Training and Information Centers' products and services will be used to improve results for children with disabilities in the target areas.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: RELEVANCE: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the target audiences of the information.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Stakeholder panel review.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>				999
<b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: USE: The percentage of all products and services used by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of all products and services used by target audiences</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Sample of recipients of products and services.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>				999

Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: COST PER OUTPUT: Cost per output defined as cost per unit of information, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Cost per output</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Sample of grantees products</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2006		999	

## IDEA: Special Education Personnel Preparation – 2005

**CFDA Number:** 84.325 - Special Education\_Personnel Preparation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

**Program Goal: To prepare service providers and leadership personnel in areas of critical need who are highly qualified to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the curricula of IDEA training programs to ensure that personnel preparing to serve children with disabilities are knowledgeable and skilled in practices that reflect the current knowledge base.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: RESEARCH-BASED CURRICULUM: The percentage of projects incorporating evidence-based curriculum will increase.</b>		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress
<i>Percentage of projects incorporating evidence-based curriculum.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	
<b>2006</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	
		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Researcher/expert panel review of a sample of program curricula.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006</p>



Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: KNOWLEDGEABLE AND SKILLED SCHOLARS: The percentage of scholars who are knowledgeable and skilled in evidence-based practices.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of scholars who are knowledgeable and skilled in evidence-based practices.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Sample of scholars.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2006				999

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the supply of teachers and service providers who are highly qualified for and serve in positions for which they are trained.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 4: SCHOLARS EXITING PROGRAM: The percentage of scholars who exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance will decrease.</b>		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress
<i>Percentage of scholars who exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Personnel Preparation Annual Data Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	
<b>2005</b>	999	

Indicator 8.2.2 of 4: <b>SCHOLARS EMPLOYED UPON COMPLETION: The percentage of degree/certification program scholars who are employed upon program completion in the area(s) for which they were trained will increase.</b>			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of degree/certification program scholars who are employed upon program completion in the area(s) for which they were trained</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Personnel Preparation Annual Data Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> February 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2003	79		
2005		82	
2006		83	
2007		85	
2008		86	
2009		88	
2010		89	

<p><b>Indicator 8.2.3 of 4: SCHOLARS EMPLOYED AND FULLY QUALIFIED: The percentage of degree/certification program completers who are employed upon program completion in the area(s) for which they are trained AND are fully qualified under IDEA and under NCLB as appropriate will increase.</b></p>									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>Percentage of degree/certification program completers who are employed upon program completion in the area(s) for which they are trained AND are fully qualified under IDEA and under NCLB</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Sample of scholars in the field -- post-completion.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
2005		999							
<p><b>Indicator 8.2.4 of 4: SCHOLARS EMPLOYED THREE OR MORE YEARS: The percentage of degree/ certification scholars who maintain employment beyond program completion for three or more years in the areas for which they are trained will increase.</b></p>									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>Percentage of program completers that maintain employment for at least three years in the areas for which they were trained.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Sample of scholars in the field -- post completion.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
2005		999							

## IDEA: Special Education Preschool Grants – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.173 - Special Education\_Preschool Grants

**Program Goal: To help preschool children with disabilities enter school ready to succeed by assisting states in providing special education and related services.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Preschool children with disabilities will receive special education and related services that result in increased skills that enable them to succeed in school.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: SERVICE SETTING: The percentage of children receiving special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of children with disabilities receiving special education and related services with typically developing peers (early childhood settings and home).</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> August 2005</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> OSEP is planning to change the data collection by 2006-07 to reflect where the child spends most of his or her time, as opposed to where the child is receiving special education services.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	41			
2000	40			
2001	39			
2002	40	39		
2003	38	40		
2004	37	40		
2005		41		
2006		42		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: CERTIFIED PRESCHOOL TEACHERS UNDER IDEA: The number of states with at least 90 percent of preschool special education teachers fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching																																				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																																	
<p><i>Number of states with at least 90 percent of special education teachers of children ages 3-5 that are fully certified in the area in which they are teaching.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>34</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>35</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>37</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>34</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>36</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>35</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>34</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>32</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>38</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1996	34		1997	35		1998	37		1999	34		2000	36		2001	35		2002	34		2003	32		2005		37	2006		38	<p><b>Explanation:</b> There is a clustering of states around the 90 percent threshold in this indicator, which may result in unpredictable changes from year to year.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> August 2005</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> States maintain data by grades taught, not by ages of students taught. Therefore, these data are for teachers teaching pre-kindergarten and kindergarten.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Certification of related services personnel are not included because those requirements vary even more widely than requirements for teachers. (e.g., some states certify sign language interpreters, but other states do not). OSEP will implement follow-up actions regarding increasing emphasis on related services personnel; possibly follow-up on SPeNSE study.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																		
1996	34																																			
1997	35																																			
1998	37																																			
1999	34																																			
2000	36																																			
2001	35																																			
2002	34																																			
2003	32																																			
2005		37																																		
2006		38																																		

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: IMPROVED SKILLS: The percentage of preschool children with disabilities that improve their early language/communication, early literacy and social-emotional skills				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of preschool children with disabilities that improve their early language/communication, early literacy and social-emotional skills</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> This indicator focuses on early language/ communication, early literacy and social-emotional skills because these skills are the best indicators of success in later years. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Initial data for 2005 from the IDEA Pre-elementary Education Longitudinal Study (PEELS). Subsequent years' data collection methodology will be determined through the Early Childhood Outcome Center, and will utilize State-reported data under the Annual Performance Reports and IDEA section 618.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2007</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2006				999

## IDEA: Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.326 - Special Education\_Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

**Program Goal: To assist states and their partners in systems improvement through scientific-based practices.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the quality of technical assistance and dissemination projects.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: HIGH QUALITY PRODUCTS AND SERVICES: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products.</b>		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress
<i>Percentage of products and services deemed to be of high quality</i>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Panel of Experts</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2005</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	
<b>2005</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p>



**Objective 8.2 of 2: TA&D products and services will be used to improve results for children with disabilities in the target areas.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: RELEVANCE: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the target audiences of the technical assistance and disseminations.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Stakeholder panel review.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>				999
<b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: USE: The percentage of all products and services used by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of all products and services used by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Sample of recipients of products and services.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2006	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>				999

<b>Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: COST PER OUTPUT: Cost per output defined as cost per unit of technical assistance, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating.</b>		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress
Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Cost per output</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	
<b>2006</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b> 999	

## IDEA: Special Education Technology and Media Services – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.327 - Special Education\_Technology and Media Services for Individuals with Disabilities

**Program Goal: To promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology and media services to improve results for children with disabilities.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Increase the relevance of research in technology to address the needs of children with disabilities.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: RELEVANCE: The percentage of new research projects in technology judged to be of high relevance to improving outcomes of children with disabilities as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.</b>											
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="padding: 5px;"><i>Percentage of technology research projects judged to be of high relevance</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><b>Year</b></td> <td style="width: 40%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><b>Actual Performance</b></td> <td style="width: 45%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><b>Performance Targets</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><b>2005</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">999</td> </tr> </table>	<i>Percentage of technology research projects judged to be of high relevance</i>			<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	<b>2005</b>		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Panel of qualified practitioners.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
<i>Percentage of technology research projects judged to be of high relevance</i>											
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>									
<b>2005</b>		999									

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the quality of technology research and technical assistance and dissemination projects.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Quality: Quality of technology research proposals.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of newly funded technology research proposals judged to be of high quality by a panel of researchers.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Panel of researchers.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				999
Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: QUALITY: Technical Assistance & Dissemination				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of products and services judged to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Expert panel.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				999

## MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.196 - Education for Homeless Children and Youth

**Program Goal: To ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education as is provided to other children and youth.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Homeless children and youth will have greater access to a free and appropriate public education.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: State assessment participation: Percentage of homeless students that participate annually in the state assessments in reading and mathematics will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of homeless children and youth, grades 3-8, included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics as reported by LEA subgrantees.</i>					<p><b>Explanation:</b> Baseline data were from a one-time collection from 2002. The 2002 results could not be disaggregated by subject matter. In 2004, the FY 2002 data were incorrectly reported (20%). The performance was actually 24%, aggregate figure for reading and math. Data were not collected in 2003. Beginning with 2004, data were reported disaggregated by subject matter.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> The data to be collected from states are from LEAs that have subgrantees and are capable of reporting such data. However, approximately only 10% of all school districts receive subgrant funds.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> November 2005                      Data collected by state assessments are validated by the individual state's data quality standards procedures.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math		
<b>2004</b>	16	15				
<b>2005</b>			17	16		

		<p>Data will reflect information principally from LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Collecting these data is not a statutory requirement; at this time, states will be required to provide program improvement data by 2006.</p>																								
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: State assessment achievement: Percentage of homeless students meeting or exceeding state's proficiency level or standard in reading and mathematics.</b></p>																										
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>																								
<p><i>Percentage of homeless students, grades 3-8, meeting or exceeding state proficiency standards in reading/language arts and mathematics.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Year</th> <th colspan="2">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="2">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Reading</th> <th>Math</th> <th>Reading</th> <th>Math</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>30</td> <td>24</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>36</td> <td>36</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>34</td> <td>26</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		Reading	Math	Reading	Math	2002	30	24			2004	36	36			2005			34	26	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2002 baseline data were from a one-time collection. Data were not collected in 2003.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> November 2005                      Data collected by state assessments are validated by the individual state's data quality standards procedures. Data will reflect information principally from LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.</p>
Year		Actual Performance		Performance Targets																						
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math																						
2002	30	24																								
2004	36	36																								
2005			34	26																						
		<p><b>Limitations:</b> There is no statutory requirement for annual data collections to determine year to year progress.</p>																								

## VTEA: Occupational and Employment Information – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.346 - Occupational and Employment Information State Grants

### Program Goal: To provide support to career guidance and academic counseling programs.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase access to and improve career and academic guidance and counseling services.

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Provide Quality Resources: Increasing numbers of customers will receive technical assistance by their states on the availability and use of America's Career Resource Network career development resources, and increasing numbers of career development products will be disseminated to customers through America's Career Resource Network.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of customers receiving technical assistance and number of products disseminated to customers (students, parents, teachers, counselors, administrators, and others) through America's Career Resource Network.</i>					<p><b>Explanation:</b> We provided a low estimate for the number of products to be disseminated to customers in the first year of the Career Resource Network because we thought only a few states would be able to fully implement their programs. However, more states than anticipated implemented programs and disseminated more products than expected.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> America's Career Resource Network Annual Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Semi-Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by states on an OMB-approved report form.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The number of products is a duplicated count; that is, it accounts for multiple copies of the same product being disseminated to one or more customers.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Number of Customers	Number of Products	Number of Customers	Number of Products		
2001	25,910	8,540,106	20,000	8,000,000		
2002	39,404	5,573,349				
2003	55,081	8,041,241				
2004	72,730	8,284,464	20,000	8,527,748		
2005			25,000	8,527,000		

## VTEA: Tech-Prep Demonstration – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.353 - Tech-Prep Demonstration Grants

**Program Goal: To provide opportunities and incentives for Tech-Prep students to enroll in postsecondary education after high school graduation.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: To create a program infrastructure to ensure student persistence and success in Tech-Prep education.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Percentage of program participants who stayed in the Tech-Prep program as they transitioned from 11th to 12th grade.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of program participants who stayed in the Tech-Prep program as they transitioned from 11th to 12th grade.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. Actual performance data for 2005 will be obtained by comparing SY 2004-2005 data with SY 2003-2004 data.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2005</b>		80		



Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Percentage of program participants who graduated from high school.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of program participants who graduated from high school.</i>		<b>Progress:</b> FY 2004 data will establish the baseline.	<b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b>  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				75
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Percentage of program participants who enrolled in a postsecondary education following high school graduation.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of program participants who enrolled in postsecondary education following high school graduation.</i>		<b>Progress:</b> FY 2004 data will establish the baseline.	<b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b>  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				70

**Objective 8.2 of 2: To provide opportunities for students to participate in Tech-Prep programs.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: An increase in the number of program participants.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			<p><b>Progress:</b> 2003 was the first time that the data were reported.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> .</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p>
<i>Number of participants enrolled in the program.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	661			
2005		725		

## VTEA: Vocational Education National Programs – 2005

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

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Increase the use of rigorous research findings to inform program direction and improve state and local practices, through the identification of research-based education practices and communicating what works to practitioners, parents and policy-makers.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Conduct quality research: By 2005, all research studies conducted by the National Centers for Research in Career and Technical education will represent rigorous design as defined by the Department's definition of evidence-based research.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of research studies with rigorous designs</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Progress toward future targets likely. Studies of the center are designed in alignment with the Department's increased emphasis on rigorous methodology and scientifically based approaches. The center will be judged successful when the results of its research are rapidly and readily available to inform educational practice and policy development; and are judged by an independent external peer review process.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Independent review panel assessments.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> February 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	71			
2003	83			
2004		100		
2005		100		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Disseminate quality research: By 2005, increasing numbers of customers will be using the products and services of the National Centers for Research and Dissemination in Career and Technical Education.									
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality			
<i>Number of customers receiving electronic and print materials or information from the Centers</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> Progress toward future targets is likely, given the Department's increased emphasis on disseminating high-quality research products and related services.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Centers Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> February 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The number of customers does not represent an unduplicated count of individuals receiving information through the Centers.</p>				
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets		
	Electronic	Print	Total				Electronic	Print	Total
2000	273,546	273,546							
2001	1,569,999	131,254	1,701,253						300,000
2002	3,004,898	219,729	3,224,627						350,000
2003	6,054,535	13,567	6,068,102						
2004							2,300,000	100,000	2,400,000
2005				2,300,000	50,000	2,350,000			

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Improve and expand the use of accountability systems and effective program strategies at the high school and postsecondary levels that promotes student achievement, performance and successful transition.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: By fall 2005, all states will have data systems with the capacity to include information on all indicators and subindicators for secondary and postsecondary programs.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p>Percentage of states that have data systems with the capacity to include information on all indicators and subindicators for secondary and postsecondary programs.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Percentage of Performance</td> <td>Percentage of Target</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>92</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>97</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>98</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Percentage of Performance	Percentage of Target	2001	92		2002	97		2003	98		2004		100	2005		100	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Actual performance is based on the percentage of States that were able to report data on each of the four core indicators included in the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act. It is important to note that Department does not gather information on what percentage of all school systems, school districts and community colleges are included in the states' data.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State Combined Annual Performance Reports - Data and Narrative</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> February 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      State Directors for Career and Technical Education attest to data. Data also are checked for accuracy and completeness through a five-step data auditing process by ED staff and an outside contractor.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> States use different measures and strategies to report data.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> ED is working with states to improve their data quality.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
	Percentage of Performance	Percentage of Target																							
2001	92																								
2002	97																								
2003	98																								
2004		100																							
2005		100																							

## VTEA: Vocational Education State Grants and Tech-Prep Education State Grants – 2005

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.048 - Vocational Education\_Basic Grants to States  
84.101 - Vocational Education\_Indians Set-aside  
84.243 - Tech-Prep Education  
84.259 - Native Hawaiian Vocational Education

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

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Ensure that vocational concentrators, including special populations, will achieve high levels of proficiency in mathematics, science, and English.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Academic Attainment: An increasing percentage of vocational concentrators, including special populations, will meet state-established academic standards.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of vocational concentrators meeting state-established academic standards</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Performance targets for 2005 have been adjusted to reflect past trends for progress on this indicator. A new measure was added for Tech-Prep students.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> States have set their goals using a three-year rolling average but OVAE's</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Percentage of vocational concentrators	Percentage of vocational concentrators		
<b>1998</b>	33			
<b>1999</b>	45			
<b>2000</b>	44			
<b>2001</b>	70			
<b>2002</b>	71	72		
<b>2003</b>	75	74		

<b>2004</b>		76		goals are set using incremental growth. This difference in goal-setting methodology will result in severe disassociation between states' goals and OVAE's goals. The disassociation will also result in increasing the likelihood that OVAE will fail to meet its goals this year and in future years. Under Perkins III, states are allowed maximum flexibility in their data collection procedures and protocols. The differing data streams limit data validity and reliability at the national level.
<b>2005</b>		77		
<i>Percentage of Tech-Prep students who meet state-established academic standards.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	Percentage of Tech-Prep students who meet state-established academic standards.	Percentage of Tech-Prep students who meet state-established academic standards.		
<b>2001</b>	79			
<b>2002</b>	71			
<b>2005</b>		77		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Ensure that secondary and postsecondary concentrators, including special populations, will achieve high levels of proficiency in core curriculum areas, including mathematics, science, and English.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Skills Proficiencies: An increasing percentage of secondary and postsecondary vocational concentrators, including special populations, will meet state recognized skill standards.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>Percentage of secondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally adopted skill standards, using state-recognized approaches</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>39</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>61</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>59</td> <td>63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>64</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>79</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2000	39		2001	61		2002	59	63	2003	64	65	2004		70	2005		79	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Performance targets for 2005 have been adjusted to reflect past trends for progress on this indicator.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> States have set their goals using a three-year rolling average, but OVAE's goals are set using incremental growth. This difference in goal setting methodology will result in severe disassociation between states' goals and OVAE's goals. The disassociation will also result in increasing the likelihood that OVAE will fail to meet its goals this year and in future years. Under Perkins III, states are allowed maximum</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2000	39																								
2001	61																								
2002	59	63																							
2003	64	65																							
2004		70																							
2005		79																							
<p><i>Percentage of Post secondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally-adopted skill standards, using state-recognized approaches</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>Percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally adopted skill standards</td> <td>Percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally adopted skill standards</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>76</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>76</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>76</td> <td>77</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally adopted skill standards	Percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally adopted skill standards	2000	76		2001	76		2002	76	77								
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
	Percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally adopted skill standards	Percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally adopted skill standards																							
2000	76																								
2001	76																								
2002	76	77																							



<b>2003</b>	77	78	flexibility in their data collection procedures and protocols. The differing data streams limit data validity and reliability at the national level.
<b>2004</b>		80	
<b>2005</b>		79	

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Ensure that concentrators, including special populations, make successful transitions to further education and employment.**

<b>Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Secondary Student Outcomes: An increasing proportion of vocational concentrators, including special populations, will attain high school diplomas, enter postsecondary programs, or attain employment.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of vocational concentrators who have completed high school and transitioned to postsecondary education or employment</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or Employment	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or Employment
<b>2000</b>	80	79		
<b>2001</b>	84	84		
<b>2002</b>	84	84	85	85
<b>2003</b>	84	84	86	86
<b>2004</b>			88	87
<b>2005</b>			87	87
<i>Percentage of Tech-Prep students who have completed high school and transitioned to postsecondary education</i>				
			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Performance targets for 2005 have been adjusted to reflect past trends for progress on this indicator. A new measure was added for Tech-Prep students. Tech-Prep students enrolled in post-secondary education may be a duplicate count. Further analysis and assumptions relative to duplicate counts would be required to report placement in postsecondary education for 2003; however, these data will be available in May 2004. Tech-Prep high school completion rates are arrived at by the sum of the number of Tech-Prep students who passed or exceeded the State target divided by the total number of Tech-Prep students. States have set their goals using a three-year rolling average, but OVAE's goals are set using incremental growth. This difference in goal-setting methodology</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> There is a substantial lag each year before performance data can be reported. In addition, states collect placement data from six months to one year after the school year resulting in a further lag in data reporting. Rather a composite of the</p>

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education
2001	87			
2002	87			
2005			87	87

will result in severe disassociation between states' goals and OVAE's goals. The disassociation will also result in increasing the likelihood that OVAE will fail to meet its goals this year and in future years. Under Perkins III, states are allowed maximum flexibility in their data collection procedures and protocols. The differing data streams limit data validity and reliability at the national level.

diversity of the states, their measures, measurement approaches and definitions that vary from state to state. Significant latitude was given states in the identification and development of baseline data for each of the Core Indicators, and thus there is variability in results. States have set their goals using a three-year rolling average, but OVAE's goals are set using incremental growth. This difference in goal-setting methodology will result in severe disassociation between states goals and OVAE goals. The disassociation will also result in increasing the likelihood that OVAE will fail to meet its goals this year and in future years. Under Perkins III, states are allowed maximum flexibility in their data collection procedures and protocols. The differing data streams limit data validity and reliability at the national level.

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Postsecondary Student Outcomes: Increasing proportions of postsecondary vocational students, including special populations, will have a positive placement in one or more of the following categories of outcomes: retention in and completion of a postsecondary degree or certificate, placement in military service, or placement or retention in employment.																												
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																								
<p><i>Percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators who have completed postsecondary education and have a positive placement in military or employment.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Postsecondary Degree/Certificate/ Completion</td> <td>Placement in Military or Employment</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>32</td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>37</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>41</td> <td>86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>41</td> <td>83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>44</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Postsecondary Degree/Certificate/ Completion	Placement in Military or Employment	2000	32	82	2001	37	84	2002	41	86	2003	41	83	2004		45	2005		44	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Performance targets for 2005 have been adjusted to reflect past trends for progress on this indicator.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																										
	Postsecondary Degree/Certificate/ Completion	Placement in Military or Employment																										
2000	32	82																										
2001	37	84																										
2002	41	86																										
2003	41	83																										
2004		45																										
2005		44																										



# Goal 3

## ESEA: Alcohol Abuse Reduction – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.184A - Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse Program

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Support the implementation of research-based alcohol abuse prevention programs in secondary schools.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Reduce Binge Drinking: The extent to which students decrease their rate of binge drinking.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of grantees whose target students show a measurable decrease in binge drinking.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Grantees will collect data concerning binge drinking behavior of students served by the grant as a grant condition. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee performance reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort				2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
<b>2005</b>						999	
<b>2006</b>				999			

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Improve students' attitudes relative to alcohol abuse: The extent to which students' attitudes relative to alcohol abuse change.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who believe that alcohol abuse is harmful to their health.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Grantees will collect information about the attitudes of students served under the program relative to perception of health risk and social disapproval of alcohol abuse as a grant condition. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.		<b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort				2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
<b>2005</b>						999	
<b>2006</b>							999
<i>The percentage of grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who disapprove of alcohol abuse.</i>							
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort				2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
<b>2005</b>						999	
<b>2006</b>							999

## ESEA: Civic Education: We the People – 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.929A - We the People Program  
84.929C - We the People Program

**Program Goal: To enhance the attainment of the third and sixth national goals by educating students about the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide high quality civic education curricula to elementary and secondary school students through the "We the People: Citizen and the Constitution" program.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of teachers participating in training or professional development activities provided as part of the "We the People" program that will have demonstrated improved quality of instruction through an evaluation will increase.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> 100 percent of funds appropriated under the We the People portion of the Civic Education program must be distributed, as required by statute, to the Center for Civic Education. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee evaluations reported via Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		



## ESEA: Close-Up Fellowships – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.927A - Close-Up Fellowship Program

**Program Goal: To improve participants' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding the three branches of government.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Make progress toward full financial independence from federal funding**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Increased private funding: An increasing amount of grantees' funding that is allocated for teachers and economically disadvantaged students will come from non-federal sources.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Amount of funding (in dollars)</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	865,000			<b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> Close-Up Foundation Grantee Performance Report.  <b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual audit and grantee's analysis of internal financial documents, 2003.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies. Data from audited program records.
2001	1,047,340	955,000		
2002	1,137,975			
2004		970,000		
2005		975,000		

## ESEA: Elementary and Secondary School Counseling – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.215E - Elementary and Secondary School Counseling Discretionary Grants

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Support the hiring of qualified personnel to expand available counseling services for elementary school students.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Student/Counselor ratio: Progress of grantees in reducing student/counselor ratio to meet American School Health Association recommended ratios**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of grantees closing the gap between their student/mental health professional ratios and the student/mental health professional ratios recommended by the American School Health Association (ASHA).</i>				<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.		<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Grantee Performance Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.		
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort					2005 Cohort
<b>2005</b>			999					
<b>2006</b>				999				

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Student disciplinary actions: Number of referrals and suspensions in participating schools.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Number of referrals for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the program.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.		<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Grantee Performance Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort				2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
<b>2005</b>						999	
<b>2006</b>							999
<i>Number of suspensions for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the program.</i>							
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort				2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
<b>2005</b>						999	
<b>2006</b>							999

## ESEA: Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners – 2005

**CFDA Number:** 84.215Y - Educational, Cultural, Apprenticeship, and Exchange Programs for Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, and their Historical Whaling and Trading Partners in Massachusetts

**Program Goal: To develop innovative, culturally based educational programs, cultural exchanges and internships and apprentice programs to assist Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and children and families of Massachusetts linked by history and tradition, to learn about their shared culture and tradition.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Grantees will demonstrate increased capability to produce and disseminate educational programs (including internships) that highlight the historical trading and whaling patterns and cultural themes among partner museums and the communities they serve (including schools and other institutions).**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Number/percentage of shared products, resources (including collections) and technical staff exchanges that result in new or enhanced capabilities among partner institutions that address programmatic goals.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number/percentage of partnership exchanges</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 10%.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Reports (Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners)  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2004</b>		999		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<i>Number of new partner capabilities</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2004</b>		999		
<b>2005</b>		999		

<i>Number/percentage of individual participants involved in educational and cultural enrichment activities (including online participants).</i>			<b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported by grantee.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	
<b>2004</b>		999	
<b>2005</b>		999	
<i>Number/percentage of schools, community groups, and family programs involved in educational and cultural enrichment activities.</i>			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	
<b>2004</b>		999	
<b>2005</b>		999	
<i>Number/percentage of participants in a culturally based youth internship program involving career awareness, leadership and job skills development</i>			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	
<b>2004</b>		999	
<b>2005</b>		999	

## ESEA: Mentoring Program – 2005

**CFDA Number:** 84.184B - ESEA Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Mentoring Program

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide grants to community-based organizations and local school districts to support mentoring programs for high-risk youth.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Sustained mentoring matches: Proportion of student/mentor matches that are sustained for over one year.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>The percentage of student/mentor matches that are sustained by the grantees for a period of 12 months.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 5px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Year</th> <th style="width: 45%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 40%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><b>2006</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>2006</b>		999	<p><b>Progress:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual grantee performance report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
<b>2006</b>		999						

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Improved academic achievement: Proportion of mentored students demonstrating improved academic competencies.									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>The percentage of mentored students who demonstrate improvement in core academic subjects as measured by grade point average after 12 months.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual grantee performance report. <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
2006		999							
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Unexcused absences: Proportion of mentored students with unexcused absences.									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>The percentage of mentored students who have unexcused absences from school.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual grantee performance report. <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
2005		999							

## ESEA: Physical Education Program – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.215F - Carol M. White Physical Education Program

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Support the implementation of effective physical education program and strategies.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Meeting state physical education standards: Program evaluations will demonstrate that program activities are helping grantees meet state standards for physical education</b>					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of students served by the grant who make progress toward meeting state standards for physical education.</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from annual grantee performance reports to ED.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	
<b>2005</b>			999		
<b>2006</b>				999	
<i>The percentage of students served by the grant actively participating in physical education activities.</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	
<b>2005</b>			999		
<b>2006</b>				999	



## ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Other National Programs – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.184 - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities\_National Programs

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

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in improving student behaviors and school environments.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Safe Schools/Healthy Students			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>The percentage of SS/HS grant sites that experience a decrease in the number of violent incidents at schools during the 3-year grant period.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Grantees submit data for these performance measures, as required by GPRA, via an annual report. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<i>The percentage of SS/HS grant sites that experience a decrease in substance use during the 3-year grant period.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<i>The percentage of SS/HS grant sites that improve school attendance during the 3-year grant period.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		
			<b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005	
			<b>Data Available:</b> September 2005	
			<b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.	

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Student Drug Testing grantees will make substantial progress in reducing substance abuse incidence among target students.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of student drug testing grantees experiencing a 5 percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-month drug use by students in the target population served by these grants.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Grantees submit data for these performance measures as required by GPRA, via an annual report. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b>  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2005		999		
<i>The percentage of student drug testing grantees experiencing a 5 percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-year drug use by students in the target population served by these grants.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2005		999		

## ESEA : Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants – 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.186A - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: State Grants  
84.186B - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Governors'

### Program Goal: Develop Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-free Learning Environments

Objective 8.1 of 1: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of programs that reflect scientifically based research.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 6: Illegal drugs at school: The proportion of students in grades 9-12 who were offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who were offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The long-term goal for this program is 26 in 2009. Data are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control  <b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies.  <b>Limitations:</b> Data are collected every other year from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	29			
2003	29			
2005		28		
2007		27		
2009		26		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 6: Students using marijuana: Percentage of students who used marijuana one or more times during the past 30 days																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who used marijuana one or more times during the past 30 days.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>24</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>22</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	24		2003	22		2005		21	2007		19	2009		18	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The long term goal for this program is 18 in 2009. Data are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies.                      Data are collected every other year from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2001	24																				
2003	22																				
2005		21																			
2007		19																			
2009		18																			

Indicator 8.1.3 of 6: Binge drinking: The proportion of students grades 9-12 who report engaging in episodic heavy (binge) drinking.																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The percentage of students grades 9-12 who had five or more drinks of alcohol in a row (that is, within a couple of hours) one or more times during the past 30 days.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	30		2003	28		2005		27	2007		26	2009		25	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The long term goal for this program is 25 in 2009. Data are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies.</p> <p>Data are collected every other year from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2001	30																				
2003	28																				
2005		27																			
2007		26																			
2009		25																			

Indicator 8.1.4 of 6: Fights at School: Proportion of students in grades 9-12 reporting being involved in a fight at school.																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The percentage of students grades 9-12 who were in a physical fight on school property one or more times during the past 12 months.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>13</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>13</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	13		2003	13		2005		12	2007		12	2009		11	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The long term goal for this program is 11 in 2009. Data are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are collected every other year from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2001	13																				
2003	13																				
2005		12																			
2007		12																			
2009		11																			

Indicator 8.1.5 of 6: Students carrying weapons to school: The proportion of students in grades 9-12 who carried a weapon on school property																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The percentage of students grades 9-12 who carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property one or more times during the past 30 days.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>6</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>6</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	6		2003	6		2005		5	2007		5	2009		4	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The long term goal for this program is 4 in 2009. Data are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are collected every other year from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2001	6																				
2003	6																				
2005		5																			
2007		5																			
2009		4																			

Indicator 8.1.6 of 6: Use of research based programs: The proportion of SDFSCA State Grants-funded programs and practices that are research based.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of drug and violence prevention programs/practices supported with SDFSCA State Grant funds that are research based.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data will be reported to ED via state performance reports. Targets will be established once baseline data are available.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Department will issue contract for an Evaluation Study</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> November 2005</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				999
<i>The percentage of SDFSC-funded research-based drug and violence prevention programs/practices that are implemented with fidelity.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		



# Goal 4

## ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.305 - Education Research

**Program Goal: Transform education into an evidence-based field.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Raise the quality of research funded or conducted by the Department.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: The percentage of newly funded research proposals funded by IES that receive an average panel review score of excellent.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
<p><i>The percentage of new research proposals funded by the Department's National Center for Education Research that receive an average score of excellent or higher from an independent review panel of qualified scientists.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">2003</td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">88</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">2004</td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">97</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">2005</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	88		2004	97		2005		100		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> The average panel review score for each newly funded IES research proposal will be calculated.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the peer review panel. Inclusion of only senior scientists leading researchers in their fields assures the quality of the data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets														
2003	88															
2004	97															
2005		100														

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Whether or not the modal rating (most common judgment) of an independent review panel of qualified scientists is that new research and evaluation publications by IES are of high quality.																		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>Whether or not the modal rating (most common judgment) of an independent review panel of qualified scientists is that new research and evaluation publications by IES are of high quality. (Data tables will indicate "2" for "Yes", "1" for "No", "0" for "No new publications/evaluations issued").</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	0		2004	0		2005		2	2006		2	<p><b>Explanation:</b> No new research/evaluation publications were issued in 2003 or 2004. The indicator was changed from focusing on percentages of publications deemed to be of high quality to focusing on whether or not the modal response (most common judgment) of the review panel is that new IES publications are of high quality. This is because the number of IES research and evaluation publications is currently quite small. With very small numbers, percentages are not very meaningful, because changes in one or two reports can translate into large changes in percentages. In this case, focusing on whether the most common rating is that publications are of high quality is a more meaningful indication of the overall judgment of the review panel.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> IES selects a random sample of new research and evaluation publications from IES. Publications are distributed to senior scientists in the field for review.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel. Inclusion of only eminent senior scientists who are distinguished professors in their institutions, editors of premier research journals, and leading researchers in education and special education assures the quality of the data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																
2003	0																	
2004	0																	
2005		2																
2006		2																

Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>32</td> <td>32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>100</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>97</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>90</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	32	32	2002	100	75	2003	97	75	2004	90	75	2005		75		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> IES researchers evaluate all newly funded research and evaluation proposals by IES to identify projects that address causal questions and of those projects, those that use randomized experimental designs to answer those questions. Data will be collected annually. The 75% target for 2002-2005 recognizes that some high-quality research addressing causal questions will not be able to employ randomized experimental designs.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the proposal reviewers. Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as a</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2001	32	32																			
2002	100	75																			
2003	97	75																			
2004	90	75																			
2005		75																			

		<p>check of inter-rater agreement in which the two IES researchers independently evaluate a subset of proposals (with minimum inter-rater agreement of 90%), minimizes threats to the validity and reliability of data. Presence of a causal question is defined as instances in which the investigation is designed to examine the effects of one variable on a second variable. A causal relation might be expressed as one variable influencing, affecting, or changing another variable. A randomized experimental design is defined as instances in which there are (a) an experimental (treatment) group and one or more comparison groups, and (b) random assignment of participants to treatment and comparison groups, or random assignment of groups (e.g., classrooms or schools) to treatment and comparison conditions. If a proposal includes a design in which two or more groups of participants are compared, but the PI does not explicitly indicate that random assignment</p>
--	--	---

		<p>procedures will be used, the proposal is recorded as not using a randomized experimental design.</p>															
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Of new research and evaluation publications funded by IES that address causal questions, the percentage of publications that employ randomized experimental designs.</b></p>																	
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>															
<p><i>Of new research and evaluation publications funded by IES that address causal questions, the percentage of publications that employ randomized experimental designs.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>100</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>0</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>0</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	100	75	2003	0	75	2004	0	75	2005		75	<p><b>Explanation:</b> No new research/evaluation publications were issued in 2003 or 2004.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> IES researchers evaluate all newly funded research and evaluation publications by IES to identify projects that address causal questions and of those projects, those that use randomized experimental designs to answer those questions. Data will be collected annually. The 75% target recognizes that some high quality studies will not be able to employ randomized experimental designs.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Evaluations are only as good</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets															
2002	100	75															
2003	0	75															
2004	0	75															
2005		75															

		<p>as the qualifications of the proposal reviewers. Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as a check of inter-rater agreement in which the two IES researchers independently evaluate a subset of publications (with minimum inter-rater agreement of 90%), minimizes threats to the validity and reliability of data. Presence of a causal question is defined as instances in which the investigation is designed to examine the effects of one variable on a second variable. A causal relation might be expressed as one variable influencing, affecting, or changing another variable. A randomized experimental design is defined as instances in which there are (a) an experimental (treatment) group and one or more comparison groups, and (b) random assignment of participants to treatment and comparison groups, or random assignment of groups (e.g., classrooms or schools) to treatment and comparison conditions. If a publication includes a design in which two</p>
--	--	---

		<p>or more groups of participants are compared, but does not explicitly indicate that random assignment procedures will be used, the publication is recorded as not using a randomized experimental design.</p>
--	--	---

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the relevance of our research in order to meet the needs of our customers.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: The percentage of new research projects funded by IES that are deemed to be of high relevance to education practice as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.</b>				
<b>Targets and Performance Data</b>		<b>Assessment of Progress</b>	<b>Sources and Data Quality</b>	
<i>The percentage of new research projects funded by IES that are deemed to be of high relevance to education practice as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> External panel of qualified practitioners will evaluate the relevance of a random sample of newly funded research proposals. Data will be collected annually. The final target of 75% recognizes that some important research may not seem immediately relevant, but will make important contributions over the long term.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 -</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2001</b>	21			
<b>2002</b>	25			25
<b>2003</b>	60			37
<b>2004</b>				50
<b>2005</b>				65
<b>2006</b>				75



		<p>2005  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                  Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel.                  Inclusion of only experienced practitioners and administrators in education and special education assures the quality of the data.</p>															
<p><b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse Web site.</b></p>																	
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>															
<p><i>The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse Web site.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>1,522,922</td> <td>1,000,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>4,249,668</td> <td>2,000,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>4,500,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>5,000,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	1,522,922	1,000,000	2004	4,249,668	2,000,000	2005		4,500,000	2006		5,000,000	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> What Works Clearinghouse. Baseline data for number of annual hits is FY 2003.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                  A Web-based program will automatically count the hits on this Web site.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets															
2003	1,522,922	1,000,000															
2004	4,249,668	2,000,000															
2005		4,500,000															
2006		5,000,000															

Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: The percentage of WWC Web site users surveyed randomly who responded to the following statement, "Evidence provided on the WWC Web site is useful in making decisions about education programs and practices," by checking "agree" or "strongly agree."									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>The percentage of WWC Web site users surveyed randomly who responded to the following statement, "Evidence provided on the WWC Web site is useful in making decisions about education programs and practices," by checking "agree" or "strongly agree."</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		30		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data collected in 2005 will be the baseline data. Subsequent targets will be adjusted after we have the baseline data. There were no available data in 2003 or 2004.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
2005		30							

## RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.133 - National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research

**Program Goal: To conduct high-quality research that leads to high-quality research products**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Advance knowledge through capacity building: Increase capacity to conduct and use high-quality and relevant disability and rehabilitation research and related activities designed to guide decision-making, change practice and improve the lives of individuals with disabilities.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>percentage of NIDRR-supported fellows, post-doctoral trainees, and doctoral students who publish results of NIDRR-sponsored research in refereed journals.</i>					<p><b>Explanation:</b> The wording of this measure was revised the first quarter of FY05 based on recommendations from NIDRR's PART review. This is an output-oriented annual performance measure. The FY 2005 target is to set a baseline. 2005 data will come from the revised Web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system containing information on all three target groups (i.e., fellows, postdoctoral trainees, and doctoral students). Baseline analyses will evaluate the merits of developing submeasures of this indicator to reflect different expectations for publication by size and type of award and to capture the</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, Model Systems, DRRPs, and ARRTs).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Post-doctoral Fellows	Doctoral trainees	Post-doctoral Fellows	Doctoral students		
<b>2005</b>			999	999		

	<p>success of NIDRR's capacity-building efforts among persons with disabilities and others from diverse backgrounds. The target for 2006 will be based on 2005 data findings.</p>	<p>NIDRR is planning to work with other ED staff to conduct an audit of publications entered into the Web-based reporting system to verify grantees' self-reports of peer-reviewed journal articles.</p>						
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: By 2015, at least 10% of all projects will be multisite, collaborative controlled trials of interventions and programs.</b></p>								
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>						
<p><i>Percentage of active projects conducting multisite, collaborative controlled trials. (Long-term Measure)</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Based on recommendations from NIDRR's PART review, this measure was added as a long-term measure. This is a new output-oriented long-term measure. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline, from project monitoring information and data from the existing project performance reporting system (APPR).</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, Model Systems, and DRRPs).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NIDRR administrative data and reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2005		999						

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Advance knowledge through research and related activities: Generate scientific-based knowledge, technologies, and applications to inform policy, change practice, and improve outcomes.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: The average number of publications per award based on NIDRR-funded research and development activities in refereed journals.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>The average number of publications per award based on NIDRR-funded research and development activities in refereed journals. (Annual Measure)</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>2.74</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>2.84</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	2.74		2003	2.84	8	2004		5	2005		5	<p><b>Progress:</b> The 2002 baseline was determined in FY 2004. NIDRR worked out significant data management and verification problems associated with this measure. These problems were resolved in July 2004, allowing NIDRR to report nonduplicative and verifiable averages for both 2002 and 2003 using rigorous criteria established by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) to determine peer-review status. Actual values include the combined NIDRR-funded RERCs, RRTC's, and Model Systems programs. To capture all the refereed journal articles published in a given calendar year, data collection for this measure must span two years of performance reports. Accordingly, data on 2004 refereed publications will not be available until September 2005.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> The average number of peer-reviewed journal articles published in 2003 per award varied</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, DBTACs, Model Systems, DRRPs, FIP, and SBIRs).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> The refereed status of journal articles for 2002 and 2003 publications was determined using criteria established by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI), which was recommended for this purpose by the National Library of Education. NIDRR classified journal articles published in 2003 as "peer-</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
2002	2.74																		
2003	2.84	8																	
2004		5																	
2005		5																	

	<p>across program types from a high of 4.95 for Model Systems (183 publications/37 centers) to 1.66 for RRTCs (48/29) and .96 for RERCs (22/23). The same ordering was observed for 2002-refereed publications, although the numbers were different. Average peer-reviewed publications per award increased approximately 1.5 points for Model Systems (from 3.48), whereas RRTCs declined by almost the same amount (from 2.89), and RERCs stayed relatively the same (from 1.1 to .96). Variations in performance by program type are most likely due to differences in the nature of R&amp;D activities conducted (i.e. medical rehabilitation research vs. psychosocial research and engineering design) and differences in publication practices and expectations associated with these disciplines. Variations over time probably have more to do with changes in the number and types of centers reporting in a given year as a result of natural fluctuations in funding cycles.</p>	<p>reviewed" if the journal title appeared on ISI's listing as of October 2004.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005</p> <p>NIDRR is planning to work with other ED staff to conduct an audit of publications entered into the Web-based project performance reporting systems to verify grantees' self-reports of publications.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data on 2002 and 2003 peer-reviewed publications are limited to only the three NIDRR program funding mechanisms (i.e., RERCs, RRTCs, SCI, TBI and Burn Model Systems) that were required to provide citations in the existing APPR. In addition, data for these two years may underrepresent the number of refereed publications due to terminating centers with no-cost extensions of 6 months or longer, which would delay the submission of final reports beyond the data collection</p>
--	--	---

		<p>period for the 2002 and 2003 measures. Another possible limitation involves reliance on a single aggregate measure of scientific productivity regardless of amount of award or nature of research conducted. Refereed journal articles may be a better indicator of scientific productivity for awards in medical rehabilitation research than they are for other areas of NIDRR's portfolio related to community integration and product development.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> NIDRR plans to correct these limitations through the redesigned APPR, which will collect publication data from four additional program funding mechanisms (DBTACs, DRRPs, FIPs, and KDU projects), and additional analyses of variations in publication rates across program mechanisms with the aim of creating sub-measures.</p>
--	--	--

Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: Percentage of new studies funded by NIDRR that assess the effectiveness of interventions, programs, and devices using rigorous and appropriate methods.									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>Percentage of new studies that assess the effectiveness of interventions, programs, and devices using rigorous and appropriate methods.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Based on recommendations from NIDRR's PART review, this measure was added. This is an activity-oriented annual measure. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. 2005 data will come from the revised Web-based annual project performance reporting system (APPR) and judgments of expert panelists participating in NIDRR's new portfolio assessment system.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, Model Systems, DBTACs, DRRPs, and FIPs.).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Review by expert panels.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> April 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> To reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of collecting qualitative judgments from experts panels in 2004 and 2005, NIDRR will experiment with using Internet-based alternatives to face-to-face program-review-type meetings.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
2005		999							



Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: Percentage of grantee research and development that has appropriate study design, meets rigorous standards of scientific and/or engineering methods, and builds on and contributes to knowledge in the field.																		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>Percentage of grantee research and development that has appropriate study design, meets rigorous standards of scientific and/or engineering methods, and builds on and contributes to knowledge in the field.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>54</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>67</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	54	65	2003	67	70	2004		70	2005		999	<p><b>Progress:</b> No data are reported for this measure for 2004 due to two interrelated factors: (1) only 20 of the 47 formative reviews slated for calendar year 2004 were conducted because of delays in contract approval and scheduling; and (2) NIDRR is currently redesigning its performance assessment system to convert from a reliance on program reviews of individual centers within a single program funding mechanism to portfolio assessments of clusters of related projects that cut across program mechanisms and year of award. The portfolio approach has the advantage of increasing the size and representativeness of the projects reviewed and thereby reducing fluctuations in scores due to cohort effects rather than to actual changes in performance. The initial phase of this system will be conducted in 2005, with pilot data available by September. Full implementation will take several years to complete. This measure was revised since 2004 to clarify the standards of R&amp;D excellence upon which expert</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Qualitative data from formative and/or summative program review meetings with expert panels.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> To date the data for this indicator have been limited to the three largest program funding mechanisms within the NIDRR portfolio -- i.e., RERCs, RRTC's and Model Systems.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> NIDRR plans to correct this limitation, beginning in 2005.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																
2002	54	65																
2003	67	70																
2004		70																
2005		999																

	<p>judgments will be based. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Data for 2002 and 2003 come from the summative program reviews conducted with 28 and 9 centers, respectively. The percentages reported are based on the number of projects in each year that scored 4 or 5 on the following NIDRR center of excellence indicators for R&amp;D: appropriateness of study designs, rigor with which standards of scientific and/or engineering methods are applied, and the degree to which the research builds on and contributes to the improvements. NIDRR plans to correct this limitation, beginning in 2005 with the initial implementation of the new performance assessment system, which will include other types of R&amp;D projects.</p>	
--	---	--

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Advance knowledge through translation and dissemination: Promote the effective use of scientific-based knowledge, technologies, and applications to inform policy, improve practice, and enhance the lives of individuals with disabilities.**

<b>Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Number of new or improved assistive and universally designed technologies, products, and devices developed by grantees that are judged by an expert panel to be effective in improving outcomes and have the potential to be transferred to industry for commercialization.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress						
<p><i>Number of new or improved assistive and universally designed technologies, products, and devices that are judged by an expert panel to be effective in improving outcomes and have the potential to be transferred to industry for commercialization.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Based on recommendations from NIDRR's PART review, this measure was reworded for 2005. This is an output-oriented annual performance measure. Baseline data were not collected in FY 2004 as expected. The FY 2005 target is to establish a preliminary baseline using the 2005 pilot version of the redesigned web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and judgments of expert panels.</p> <p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1820-0642 Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination &amp; Utilization Projects).  <b>Program:</b> National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research.  <b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Expert panel review.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2005		999						

		<p>Review by expert panel.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> To reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of collecting qualitative judgments from experts panels, in 2004 NIDRR will experiment with using Internet-based alternatives to face-to-face program-review-type meetings.</p>
--	--	---

# Goal 5

## AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.191 - Adult Education\_National Leadership Activities

### Program Goal: National Programs (Adult Education and Literacy Act) (new-2002) - 2002

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The National Reporting System (NRS), which supports performance-based reporting, will be fully implemented in all states to consistently provide high-quality learner assessment data.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of states yielding high-quality learner assessment data.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Performance reporting is largely on learner assessment data. The NRS requires greater validity and reliability of this data. OVAE policies are requiring continuous improvement of state-level assessment data. States are at various levels of expertise and capacity to collect high-quality assessment data. Approximately 50% of states currently have assessment policies that yield quality data.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State Annual Performance Reports - Data and Narrative</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Program monitoring and data review and analysis by ED and Data Quality Certification Process. Data will be verified by electronic checks and expert staff analysis, and by requiring confirmation and attestation of data by state directors. State data are also</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2002</b>	50			
<b>2003</b>	65	75		
<b>2004</b>		95		
<b>2005</b>		96		

		<p>checked independently by ED/OVAE during on-site monitoring and state audit reviews.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Total data quality and full systems development are dependent on investments of staff and resources by states to adopt and adapt the models developed and promoted by ED/OVAE; and they are supported by the technical assistance and expertise provided by ED.</p>
--	--	---

## AEFLA: Adult Education State Grants – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.002 - Adult Education\_State Grant Program

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide adult learners with opportunities to acquire basic foundation skills (including English language acquisition), complete secondary education, and transition to further education and training and to work.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 5: Basic skill acquisition: The percentage of adults in Adult Basic Education programs who acquire the level of basic skills needed (validated by standardized assessments) to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																											
<p><i>Percentage of adults in Adult Basic Education programs who acquire the level of basic skills needed to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Percentage of adults</td> <td>Percentage of adults</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>40</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>31</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>44</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>26</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>36</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>37</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>38</td> <td>41</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Percentage of adults	Percentage of adults	1997	40		1998	31		1999	44		2000	26	40	2001	36	40	2002	37	40	2003	38	41	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Indicator has been changed to require validation of basic skills acquisition through standardized assessment. Because of change to the indicators, new performance target/baseline has been established. FY 2001 data established the baseline. Data reflect percent of Adult Education Learners (adults with limited basic skills) who demonstrated a level of basic skill proficiency needed to advance to the next educational functioning level. Educational functioning levels range from beginning literacy through high school. Revised indicators require validation of basic</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third-tier recipient of these data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																													
	Percentage of adults	Percentage of adults																													
1997	40																														
1998	31																														
1999	44																														
2000	26	40																													
2001	36	40																													
2002	37	40																													
2003	38	41																													



2004		42	<p>skill proficiency through standardized assessment. New targets reflect new standard.</p>	<p>on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>
2005		42		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 5: Basic English language acquisition: Percentage of adults enrolled in English Literacy programs will acquire (validated by standardized assessment) the level of English language skills needed to complete the levels of instruction in which they enrolled.																																				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																																	
<p><i>The percentage of adults enrolled in English literacy programs who acquire the level of English language skills needed to complete the levels of instruction in which they enrolled.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>49</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>20</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>31</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>34</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>36</td> <td>44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>45</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1996	30		1997	28		1998	28		1999	49		2000	20	40	2001	31	40	2002	34	42	2003	36	44	2004		45	2005		45	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Indicator has been changed to require validation of basic skill acquisition through standardized assessment. Because of change to the indicator, new performance target/baseline has been established. Data reflect percentage of English literacy learners (adults with minimal English language skills) who demonstrated a level of English language proficiency needed to advance to the next educational functioning level. Educational functioning levels range from beginning-level English literacy through advanced-level English literacy. Revised indicators requires validation of English proficiency through standardized assessment. New targets reflect new standard.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third-tier recipient of these data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the (OVAE) implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																		
1996	30																																			
1997	28																																			
1998	28																																			
1999	49																																			
2000	20	40																																		
2001	31	40																																		
2002	34	42																																		
2003	36	44																																		
2004		45																																		
2005		45																																		

		<p>review.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>
--	--	---

<b>Indicator 8.1.3 of 5: Secondary completion: Percentage of adults with a high school completion goal and who exit during the program year that earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality		
<p><i>The percentage of adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.</i></p>	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Because of change to the indicator, new performance benchmark targets have been established. FY 2001 data established the baseline. The performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners with a goal to complete high school in secondary level programs of instruction who, upon exit, had earned their high school diploma or GED credential within the reporting period.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third-tier recipient of these data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local</p>		
<b>Year</b>			<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
			Percent of adults	Percent of adults
<b>1996</b>			36	
<b>1997</b>			37	
<b>1998</b>			33	
<b>1999</b>			34	
<b>2000</b>			34	40
<b>2001</b>			33	40
<b>2002</b>			42	40
<b>2003</b>	44	41		
<b>2004</b>		42		

2005		46		<p>programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>	
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.4 of 5: Transition to postsecondary education or training: Percentage of enrolled adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who exit during the program year that enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.</b></p>					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<p><i>Percentage of adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.</i></p>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Because of the change to the indicator, new performance benchmarks/targets have been established. FY 2001 data established the baseline. The new performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners with a goal of further education or training who, upon exit from adult education, enrolled in a postsecondary education or training program.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>				<b>Performance Targets</b>
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults			Number of adults Percentage of adults
<b>1996</b>	175,255				
<b>1997</b>	178,520				
<b>1998</b>	158.167				

<b>1999</b>	148,803		<p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third-tier recipient of these data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and a data quality review.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>	
<b>2000</b>	161,650	300,000		
<b>2001</b>		25		
<b>2002</b>		30		25
<b>2003</b>		30		26
<b>2004</b>				27
<b>2005</b>				30

Indicator 8.1.5 of 5: Transition to work: The percentage of unemployed adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Because of the change to the indicator, new performance benchmark targets have been established. FY 2001 data established the baseline. The 2001 performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners with an employment goal who, upon exit from an adult education program, obtain a job.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third tier recipient of these data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting</p>	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults			Number of adults Percentage of adults
1996	306,982				
1997	340,206				
1998	294,755				
1999	409,062				
2000	454,318				425,000
2001		36			
2002		39			36
2003		37	37		
2004			38		
2005			40		

		<p>and a data quality review.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>
--	--	--

## AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.257 - National Institute for Literacy

**Program Goal: To provide knowledge and resources to improve literacy instruction across the lifespan**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Translate findings from scientifically based or the most rigorous research available into useful information and products for practitioners**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of recipients who say they will use the product and/or information to improve instructional practice and/or service delivery within six months.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> This measure was new for FY 2004. FY 2004 data established the baseline. In future years, the program will add a follow-up component to determine actual use of information versus intention only.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Contractor Training &amp; Technical Assistance evaluations.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004	100	999		
2005		95		



**Objective 8.2 of 2: Disseminate high-quality information and resources on literacy.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Dissemination: Disseminate high-quality information and resources on literacy.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of visitors to NIFL Web site</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> FY 2005 data will establish the baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> NIFL will use software that tracks the length of time visitors stay on the "special collections" of high-quality literacy resources.  <b>Frequency:</b> Monthly. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		1.50		
<i>Percentage of visitors to any of the "special collections" of high quality literacy resources who stay 5 minutes or more.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		35		

## ATA: Assistive Technology Alternative Financing - 2005

**Program Goal: To increase availability of, funding for, access to, and provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Facilitate the change of laws and policies to obtain increased availability or provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of loans to individuals with disabilities per \$1 million federal investment and state matching funds</i>					<p><b>Explanation:</b> Comparing the data across years is difficult because this is a fairly new program and the number of years of participation differs among grantees. Further analysis of trends and performance outcomes is needed. The AFP program allows for other, non-loan financing mechanisms. NIDRR will further evaluate the AFP to identify factors that have a potentially adverse effect on the program activities and program performance outcomes. NIDRR will use the results of this evaluation to develop strategies to improve outcomes.</p> <p>NIDRR = National Institute of Disability and Rehabilitation Research</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Web-based reporting system.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Fed dollars in Millions	State dollars in Millions	# of loans	# of loans per 1million dollars invested		
<b>2000</b>	3.80	3.80	247	33		
<b>2001</b>	13.60	4.60	594	33		
<b>2003</b>	35.80	13	753	15		
<b>2004</b>				33		
<b>2005</b>				33		

## ATA: Assistive Technology Programs – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.224 - Assistive Technology

**Program Goal: To increase availability of, funding for, access to, and provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Facilitate the change of laws and policies to obtain increased availability or provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Outcomes-oriented measure: the percentage of grantees whose activities resulted in legislative and/or policy changes that are deemed to have increased the availability or provision of assistive technology devices and/or services**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of grantees whose activities resulted in legislative and/or policy changes that are deemed to have increased the availability or provision of assistive technology devices and/or services</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> As of FY 02, all 56 grantees reported versus 51 in FY 01, leading to full participation of state grantees to better reflect the Department's focus on accountability and outcomes-oriented measures. The grantees have sustained their previous performance level, which is most likely reflective of progress made earlier in the program and thus suggests revision of the performance indicator. Recent enactment of the Assistive Technology (AT) Act of 2004 warrants reevaluation of the current performance indicator and target. RSA will maintain the measure for FY 2005, but will reevaluate and revise as necessary so that it is consistent with new statutory requirements under the AT Act of 2004.</p>	<p><b>Source: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Other.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Web-based grantee information.  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 12/31/2003.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005  <b>Limitations:</b> The data for FY 01 is based on information submitted by only 51 of the 56 grantees; the data for FY 02 is based on information submitted by all 56 grantees.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	95			
1998	95			
1999	88	95		
2000	50	95		
2001	78	95		
2002	63	95		
2003	63	95		
2004		95		
2005		95		

## EDA: Gallaudet University – 2005

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.910A - Gallaudet University Programs and Elementary and Secondary Education Programs  
 84.910B - Gallaudet University Endowment Grant  
 84.910D - Gallaudet University Construction Program

**Program Goal: To challenge students who are deaf, graduate students who are deaf, and graduate students who are hearing, to achieve their academic goals and obtain productive employment, provide leadership in setting the national standard for best practices in education of the deaf and hard of hearing, and establish a sustainable resource base.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: The University Programs and the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School will optimize the number of students completing programs of study.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Enrollment at Gallaudet University: Maintain minimum enrollment numbers in Gallaudet's undergraduate, graduate, and professional studies programs, as well as the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School as established by Gallaudet University.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality			
<i>University Enrollment</i>				<b>Explanation:</b> The University realized that the prior system of calculating enrollment in these areas presented a danger of double counting the same student. Under the new counting method, if a degree-seeking student or a graduate special student is also enrolled in a professional studies course that	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Collegiate Office of Enrollment Services, and Clerc Center student database, FY 2005 enrollment as of October 2004, summarized in Gallaudet's FY 2004 annual report, submitted in 2005.					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets							
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional					Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional
			Studies							Studies
<b>1998</b>	1,339	714	92							
<b>1999</b>	1,300	628	70					1,250	700	70
<b>2000</b>	1,318	541	86	1,250	700	70				
<b>2001</b>	1,321	625	93	1,250	700	70				

<b>2002</b>	1,243	517	92	1,250	700	70
<b>2003</b>	1,243	617	154	1,250	700	70
<b>2004</b>	1,236	506	70	1,250	700	70
<b>2005</b>	1,207	451	176	1,250	650	70
<i>Clerc Center Enrollment</i>						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>			
	Model Sec. School	Kendall Elem. School	Model Sec. School	Kendall Elem. School		
<b>1998</b>	224	137				
<b>1999</b>	209	117	225	140		
<b>2000</b>	219	135	225	140		
<b>2001</b>	205	148	225	140		
<b>2002</b>	188	148	225	140		
<b>2003</b>	190	152	225	140		
<b>2004</b>	186	145	225	140		
<b>2005</b>	182	142	225	140		

student will be counted only once. The new counting method has an impact on both the graduate and professional studies enrollment numbers. The university will continue to implement the new method so that future reports will be comparable. It should also be noted that there was an increase of 20 degree-seeking graduate students this year to 425 students.

**Frequency:** Annually.  
**Collection Period:** 2005 - 2006  
**Data Available:** October 2006  
**Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center. No formal verification procedure applied.

**Improvements:**  
 Gallaudet has implemented a new method for calculating its Graduate and Professional Studies enrollment numbers in order to present a more accurate enrollment picture.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Student retention rate: Increase the undergraduate retention rate and increase or maintain the graduate student retention rate.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>University Student Retention Rates - %</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Graduate
1998	72			
1999	73		75	
2000	72	78	76	80
2001	71	82	76	82
2002	73	98	76	
2003	71	86	79	
2004	73	89	79	86
2005			79	86
			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Gallaudet is committed to increased focus on retention of students at all levels and particular attention to the success of first year students.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Collegiate Office of the Register records, summarized in the FY 2004 annual report, submitted in 2005.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by Gallaudet University.</p>

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Student graduation rates: By 2008, the undergraduate graduation rate will reach 48 percent; the graduate student and Model Secondary School student graduation rates will be increased or maintained.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>University Students' Graduation Rates - %</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Graduate
1998	41			
1999	42		41	
2000	41	82	42	80
2001	41	82	43	80
2002	42	82	44	
2003	42	82	45	
2004	42	84	45	82
2005			46	83
2006			47	
2007			47	
2008			48	
<i>Clerc Center - Model Secondary School graduation rate - %</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Graduate
1998	93			
1999	88		94	
2000	98		94	
			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The undergraduate graduation rates are calculated as the number of graduates in one year over the number of entering students six years previously. Consistent with other universities, Gallaudet students are taking longer to complete baccalaureate studies. Gallaudet continues to institute new strategies to improve its undergraduate graduation rate. In fiscal year 2004, 71 percent of the Model School seniors completed all graduation requirements by the end of their senior year. However, as of this report, an additional 19 percent have deferred graduation until 2005 in order to complete graduation requirements and IEP goals. Therefore, the total projected graduation rate for the fiscal year 2004 senior class is expected to be 90 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Collegiate Office of the Registrar and the Clerc Center Office of Exemplary Programs and Research records, summarized in FY 2004 annual report, submitted in 2005.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The Clerc Center (MSSD) graduation rates reported here give an incomplete picture of the graduation status of seniors from fiscal year 2001 onward. There is a need to reconceptualize how</p>

<b>2001</b>	90	94	<p>performance is assessed to make this indicator a more valid reflection of actual graduation rates. Graduation from MSSD is more than completion of required course work. Graduation signals that students have successfully met their IEP goals, so that graduation becomes an IEP decision. Students may graduate at the end of their senior year, or they may make the decision, as part of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) process, to change their graduation so they may continue to pursue their IEP goals, or they may elect to take the fifth year option. Clerc Center personnel are currently in the process of redefining graduation outcomes and indicators at MSSD to reflect progress through school and changes in graduation requirements and program options. The Clerc Center will work with the Department in an effort to propose a revised</p>
<b>2002</b>	80	94	
<b>2003</b>	71	94	
<b>2004</b>	71	94	
<b>2005</b>		94	



		indicator(s) and performance measure(s) to better show MSSD graduation rates.
--	--	---

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Gallaudet works in partnership with others to develop and disseminate educational programs and materials for deaf and hard-of-hearing students.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Use of the Demonstration Schools' expertise: Other programs and/or institutions adopting innovative curricula and other products, or modifying their strategies as a result of Model and Kendall's leadership, will be maintained or increased.</b>																																
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																														
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="3"><i>Numbers of programs adopting Model/Kendall innovative strategies/curricula</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Year</b></td> <td><b>Actual Performance</b></td> <td><b>Performance Targets</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>1998</b></td> <td>41</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>1999</b></td> <td>52</td> <td>41</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2000</b></td> <td>62</td> <td>41</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2001</b></td> <td>39</td> <td>41</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2002</b></td> <td>56</td> <td>41</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2003</b></td> <td>54</td> <td>41</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2004</b></td> <td>91</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td>55</td> </tr> </table>	<i>Numbers of programs adopting Model/Kendall innovative strategies/curricula</i>			<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	<b>1998</b>	41		<b>1999</b>	52	41	<b>2000</b>	62	41	<b>2001</b>	39	41	<b>2002</b>	56	41	<b>2003</b>	54	41	<b>2004</b>	91	50	<b>2005</b>		55	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The cumulative number of programs using MSSD/KDES expertise since 1998 is 395. The number of new programs adopting innovations from year to year will vary and depends in part on the number and type of strategies and curricula being disseminated by the Clerc Center and the financial and personnel resources available within other programs for training and implementation activities.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Records of the Clerc Center Office of Training and Professional Development, summarized in the FY 2004 Annual Report, submitted in January 2005.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center.</p>
<i>Numbers of programs adopting Model/Kendall innovative strategies/curricula</i>																																
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>																														
<b>1998</b>	41																															
<b>1999</b>	52	41																														
<b>2000</b>	62	41																														
<b>2001</b>	39	41																														
<b>2002</b>	56	41																														
<b>2003</b>	54	41																														
<b>2004</b>	91	50																														
<b>2005</b>		55																														

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Curriculum and extra-curricular activities prepare students to meet the skill requirements of the workplace or to continue their studies.**

<b>Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the University: Gallaudet's bachelor's graduates will either find employment commensurate with their training and education or attend advanced education or training programs during their first year after graduation.</b>					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of graduates that are employed or in advanced education or training during first year after graduation</i>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	Students Employed	Students in Advanced Education or Training	Students Employed	Students in Advanced Education or Training	
<b>2001</b>	90	38	77	38	
<b>2002</b>	89	49			
<b>2003</b>	79	40			
<b>2004</b>	73	38	80	40	
<b>2005</b>			81	41	
			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Gallaudet has disaggregated this indicator to provide the percentages in each category of students, those actually employed and those students who were in advanced education or training programs. In the past, these two categories were combined. The percents total more than 100 percent because some respondents were employed and undertook a program of advanced education or training in the same year. Advanced education and training includes students enrolled in a master's or Ph.D. program, a vocational or technical program, or another type of program, e.g., law school or medical school.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> University study on the status of graduates' employment and advanced studies, February 2003.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by Gallaudet University.</p>

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the Model Secondary School: A high percentage of the Model Secondary School graduates will either find jobs commensurate with their training or will attend postsecondary programs.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of Model Secondary School graduates that are in jobs or postsecondary programs during first year after graduation</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Clerc Center Exemplary Programs and Research.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p>Data supplied by Gallaudet University.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2000	74		
2001	72	80	
2002	90	80	
2003	82	80	
2004	83	80	
2005		81	

## EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf – 2005

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.908A - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Operations  
 84.908B - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Endowment Program  
 84.908C - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Construction Program

**Program Goal: To provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate programs and professional studies with state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, undertake a program of applied research; share NTID expertise and expand outside sources of revenue**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate and professional studies with outstanding state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, complemented by a strong arts and sciences curriculum and supplemented with appropriate student support services.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Enrollment: Maintain a minimum student body of undergraduates, graduates, and educational interpreters as established by NTID.					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality		
Targets and Performance Data					<b>Explanation:</b> This goal focuses on the total enrollment, as year-to-year shifts in specific programs may result in the individual targets either being exceeded or not met. There are also human and physical resource limitations to the number of students NTID can serve. The	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office records, FY 2004 as of October 2003.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005		
<i>Number of students</i>								
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets				
	Undergraduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.	Undergraduate			Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.
<b>1995</b>	1,035	59	10					
<b>1996</b>	1,038	59	27					
<b>1997</b>	1,069	72	32					
<b>1998</b>	1,085	84	36					

<b>1999</b>	1,135	93	50	1,080	100	50	undergraduate program and Educational Interpreter program enrollments are below target primarily due to more rigorous entrance requirements. More aggressive recruitment efforts have paid off in the Educational Interpreter Program and NTID expects the same results next year with undergraduate programs.	<b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification applied.
<b>2000</b>	1,084	77	59	1,080	100	50		
<b>2001</b>	1,089	75	55	1,080	100	50		
<b>2002</b>	1,125	53	60	1,080	100	75		
<b>2003</b>	1,093	65	73	1,080	100	75		
<b>2004</b>	1,064	92	114	1,080	100	75		
<b>2005</b>	1,055	100	126	1,080	100	90		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Maximize the number of students successfully completing a program of study**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Graduation rate: By 2008, the overall student graduation rate will be 60 percent.						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Student graduation rates, in percent</i>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Sub-Overall Baccalaureate		Baccalaureate	Sub-Overall Baccalaureate		Baccalaureate
<b>1997</b>	50	50	51			
<b>1998</b>	51	50	57			
<b>1999</b>	53	50	61			
<b>2000</b>	53	50	63	53	51	61
<b>2001</b>	54	50	64	53	51	61
<b>2002</b>	57	54	66	53	52	61
				<b>Explanation:</b> The Institute's goal is to maintain or increase the rate for students in sub-baccalaureate programs and increase the rate for students in baccalaureate programs.		<b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office Records.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by the National Technical

<b>2003</b>	56	52	68	53	52	61	Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.
<b>2004</b>	56	51	68	57	52	69	
<b>2005</b>				57	52	69	
<b>2006</b>				58	53	70	
<b>2007</b>				59	53	71	
<b>2008</b>				60	54	72	

**Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Student retention rate: The first-year student overall retention rate for students in sub-baccalaureate and baccalaureate programs will meet or exceed established targets.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality
<i>Student retention rates, in percent</i>							
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets			<b>Additional Source Information:</b> NTID Registrar office records  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.
		Sub-Overall Baccalaureate		Sub-Overall Baccalaureate		Baccalaureate	
<b>1997</b>	76	85	84				
<b>1998</b>	74	73	81				
<b>1999</b>	74	69	84				
<b>2000</b>	74	69	85	74	73	84	
<b>2001</b>	74	68	86	74	74	84	
<b>2002</b>	77	72	87	74	74	84	
<b>2003</b>	76	70	86	74	74	84	
<b>2004</b>	75	70	86	74	74	84	
<b>2005</b>				75	74	86	

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Prepare graduates to find satisfying jobs in fields commensurate with the level of their academic training.**

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Placement rate: Maintain a high percentage of graduates placed in the workforce.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>Placement rate, in percent</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Placement rate data are reported the year after graduation. The Institute believes that a 95 percent placement rate represents an appropriate ongoing target, but economic conditions have deteriorated to a point where it is affecting students' ability to find permanent placement. The placement rates are calculated as the percentage of graduates who are employed among those who want to be employed. Those individuals who continue their education or who are not seeking employment, for whatever reasons, in the respective years are not included. The Bureau of Labor Statistics uses this same methodology.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Technical Institute for the Deaf Placement Records for FY 2003</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1995	94			
1996	96			
1997	97			
1998	95			
1999	94	95		
2000	90	95		
2001	92	95		
2002	89	95		
2003	93	95		
2004		95		
2005		95		

## ESEA: Community Technology Centers – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.341 - Community Technology Centers

**Program Goal: To provide disadvantaged residents of economically distressed urban and rural communities with increased access to information technology and related training.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Disadvantaged students within distressed communities receiving community technology centers grants will have greater access to services that helped them to improve their academic performance.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of disadvantaged students in high schools, within distressed areas, who have received instruction in reading and math and other academic support that helped them to improve their academic performance.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Initial grants were awarded in September 2003. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		999		



Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Increasing numbers of grantees will provide adult education.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Number of grantees providing adult education.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> Initial grants were awarded in September 2003. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2004				999
2005		999		

## HEA: Aid for Institutional Development Title III & Title V – 2005

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.031 - Higher Education\_Institutional Aid  
 84.031B - Strengthening HBCU's and Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions  
 84.031N - Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions  
 84.031S - Title V Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program  
 84.031T - Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities  
 84.120A - Minority Science and Engineering Improvement

**Program Goal: To improve the capacity of Minority-Serving Institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Improve the academic quality of participating institutions.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Academic Quality: The percentage of Title III and Title V project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that have been met or exceeded.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> To better measure the success of these programs, new GPRA indicators were developed in 2002 based on the new Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR was designed with extensive consultation with the grant community. These indicators provide program success information across the diverse types of institutions as well as across the seven different programs within this one GPRA program report. The long-term goal for this measure is 93 for 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By FED</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2002	88			75
2003				75
2004				75
2005				90.50
2006				91
2007				91.50

<b>2008</b>		92		Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.  <b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.
<b>2009</b>		92.50		
<b>2010</b>		93		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the institutional management and fiscal stability of the participating Institutions.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Institutional Management and Fiscal Stability: The percentage of Title III and Title V project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management and fiscal stability that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management or fiscal stability that have been met or exceeded.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> To better measure the success of these programs, new GPRA indicators were developed in 2002 based on a new Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR was designed with extensive consultation with the grant community. These indicators provide program success information across the diverse types of institutions as well as across the seven different programs within this one GPRA program report. The long-term goal is 92.5 for 2009.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.  <b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2002</b>	86	75		
<b>2003</b>		75		
<b>2004</b>		75		
<b>2005</b>		90.50		
<b>2006</b>		91		
<b>2007</b>		91.50		
<b>2008</b>		92		
<b>2009</b>		92.50		
<b>2010</b>		93		

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Improve the student services and student outcomes of the participating Institutions.**

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Student Services and Student Outcomes: The percentage of Title III and Title V project goals relating to the improvement of student services and student outcomes that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.																																	
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																														
<p><i>The percentage of Title III and Title V project goals relating to the improvement of student services or student outcomes that have been met or exceeded.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>78</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>86</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	78	75	2003		75	2004		75	2005		81	2006		82	2007		83	2008		84	2009		85	2010		86	<p><b>Explanation:</b> To better measure the success of these programs, new GPRA indicators were developed in 2002 based on the new Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR was designed with extensive consultation with the grant community. These indicators provide program success information across the diverse types of institutions as well as across the seven different programs within this one GPRA program report. The long-term goal is 86 for 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																															
2002	78	75																															
2003		75																															
2004		75																															
2005		81																															
2006		82																															
2007		83																															
2008		84																															
2009		85																															
2010		86																															

## HEA: Byrd Honors Scholarships – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.185 - Byrd Honors Scholarships

**Program Goal: To promote student excellence and to recognize exceptionally able students who show promise of continued excellence**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: BYRD SCHOLARS WILL SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT HIGH RATES.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of Byrd scholars graduating within 4 years</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> The data suggest that Byrd recipients are graduating within four years at a rate far exceeding the rate at which all college students complete their education, i.e, within six years (about 53%).</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by states, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are based on grantee reports of varying quality and accuracy on the number of Byrd Scholars graduating. For example, six</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2002</b>	98	90		
<b>2003</b>		26		
<b>2004</b>		26		
<b>2005</b>		95		

		<p>states reported more graduates than seniors. In addition, three states reported more graduates than four-year grant recipients. Although these seemingly reporting anomalies are potentially explainable, they do raise questions about the accuracy of the data.</p>
--	--	--

## HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents in School – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.335 - Child Care Access Means Parents in School

**Program Goal: To support the participation of low-income parents in the postsecondary education system through the provisions of campus-based child care services.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase access for low-income parents to postsecondary institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Median percentage of persistence rate (1999 Cohort)</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> For the 1999 cohort of students receiving child care services, performance data were collected through 18-month Performance Reports (covering the period September 1999 through February 2001) and 36-month performance reports (covering the period September 1999 through August 2002). These data are presented under 2001 and 2002 --reflecting the end of the respective performance periods. For the 2001 cohort of students receiving child care services, performance data were collected through 18-month performance reports (covering the period October 2001 through March 2003) and are presented under 2003</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantees are required to submit 18-month and 36-month performance reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are supplied by child care centers with no formal verification procedure provided.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2001	79			
<i>Median percentage of persistence rate (2001 cohort)</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2003	78	80		
2004		80		
<i>Median percentage of persistence rate (2002) Cohort</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2004		80		
2005		80		
<i>Median percentage of persistence rate (2005) Cohort</i>				

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	the end of the performance period. The 36-month performance report will contain data through September 2004. Data for the 2002 cohort of students are being collected for the 18-month performance report for the period September 2002 through March 2004 and for the 36-month performance report for the period ending August 2005. Data for the upcoming 2005 cohort will be reported in 2007 (18 month report) and 2008 (36 month report).	
2007		80		
2008		80		
<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Completion rate: The percentage of students receiving child care services who complete postsecondary education.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Median percentage of completion rate (1999 cohort)</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> For the 1999 cohort of students receiving child care services, performance data were collected through 18-month Performance Reports (covering the period September 1999 through February 2001) and 36-month performance reports (covering the period September 1999 through August 2002). These data are presented under 2001 and 2002 --reflecting the end of the respective performance periods. For the 2001 cohort of students receiving child care services, performance data were collected through 18-month performance reports (covering the</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantees are required to submit 18-month and 36-month performance reports.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are supplied by child care centers with no formal verification procedure provided.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
- No Data -				
<i>Median percentage of completion rate (2001 cohort)</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	25			
2004		30		
<i>Median percentage of completion rate (2002 cohort)</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		30		
2005		30		



<i>Median percentage of completion rate (2005 cohort)</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2007</b>		30
<b>2008</b>		30

period October 2001 through March 2003) and are presented under 2003, the end of the performance period. The 36-month performance report will contain data through September 2004. Data for the 2002 cohort of students are being collected for the 18-month performance report for the period September 2002 through March 2004 and for the 36-month performance report for the period ending August 2005. Data for the upcoming 2005 cohort will be reported in 2007 (18 month report) and 2008 (36 month report).

## HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.149A - College Assistance Migrant Program

**Program Goal: Assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students to successfully complete their first academic year of college and to continue at a postsecondary institution.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: All CAMP students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: CAMP first year completion: Eighty-five percent of CAMP participants will successfully complete the first academic year of study at a postsecondary institution.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>CAMP participants completing the first year of their academic or postsecondary program.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data were supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure has been applied.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b>                      Improvements will be addressed in the Office of Migrant Education 2004 data Improvement plan.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	82			
2002	80			
2004		83		
2005		85		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: A majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first year of college continue in postsecondary education.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: CAMP students continue in Postsecondary: A Majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first year of college will continue in postsecondary education.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of CAMP students who after completing first year continue their postsecondary education.</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> April 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p>Data were supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure has been applied.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2001	78		
2002	75		
2004		79	
2005		80	

## HEA: Demonstration Projects to Ensure Quality Higher Education for Students with Disabilities – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.333 - Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive a Higher Education

**Program Goal: To improve the quality of higher education for students with disabilities.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that faculty and administrators in institutions of higher education increase their capacity to provide a high-quality education to students with disabilities.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Teacher Training: The percentage of professors at grantee institutions who have received training on teaching methods for students with disabilities.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of professors trained.</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data will be provided by grantees. No formal verification procedure is anticipated.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data will be self-reported.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	
<b>2005</b>		999	

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Instructional resources produced: The number of comprehensive instructional resources regarding college students with disabilities produced and disseminated by grantees			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of instructional resources produced and disseminated</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. The target for FY 2005 is to maintain the baseline. Program staff is developing a new annual performance report. This report will capture data for this indicator. The new report is expected to report on data for 2004 which will be available in 2005.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data will be provided by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data will be self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2005		999	

## HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.116 - Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

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

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Promote reforms that improve the quality of teaching and learning and Postsecondary institutions.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Replication of projects: The percentage of projects that are adapted in full or in part, or whose materials are used by other institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of FIPSE grantees reporting full project dissemination to others</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FIPSE considers itself successful on this measure if 90% or more projects result in project models being adapted by other campuses.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Final Report Scorecard</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Similar results from site visit scorecard.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data supplied by project directors in response to survey instruments. Have revised form to match indicators more closely. Planning an external evaluation of the Comprehensive Program through PES around these indicators.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	92			
1999	100			
2000	83	100		
2001	96	85		
2002	94.50	95		
2003	88	95		
2004		95		
2005		95		
2006		95		
2007		95		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Institutionalization of FIPSE programs**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Projects sustained: The percentage of projects sustained beyond Federal funding.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of projects reporting institutionalization on their home campuses</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> FIPSE's emphasis on institutional contributions to projects and development of long-term continuation plans are designed to embed projects within campus structures. Expect the rate of institutionalization to be in the 90-100% range, but not 100% each year.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Final Report Scorecard. Assessment of projects based on review of final reports sent in at the completion of projects.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Similar Data from Site Visit Score Card. Assessment of project drawn from on-site visitation and evaluation of projects).</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data supplied as a result of the assessment of project final reports submitted by project directors.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Planning modification of assessment to work with planned on-line assessment for 2003. External evaluation of the Comprehensive Program is currently underway.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
1998	93			
1999	96			
2000	94			100
2001	100			95
2002	96			95
2003	96			95
2004				95
2005				95
2006				95
2007		95		

## HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP) – 2005

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.334 - Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs  
 84.334A - GEAR-UP Partnership Grants  
 84.334S - GEAR-UP State Grants

**Program Goal: To significantly increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Increase the academic performance and preparation for postsecondary education of GEAR UP students.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Completion of academically challenging curricula: Percentage of GEAR UP students who passed prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade and Algebra 1 by the end of the 9th grade.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Percentage of GEAR UP students who passed prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade and the percentage of GEAR UP students who passed Algebra 1 by the end of the 9th grade.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Historical performance data through 2002 show the percentages of GEAR UP students who were enrolled in prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade. Data for 2003 reflect the percentage of GEAR UP students who were enrolled in prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade and in Algebra 1 by the end of the 9th grade. Data beginning in 2004 are collected on successful completion of core academic subjects and other college preparatory courses. Standards to enter and complete above grade-level</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency and to assess</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	Prealgebra	Algebra 1				Prealgebra	Algebra 1
<b>2001</b>	18						
<b>2002</b>	18						
<b>2003</b>	22	30				19	19
<b>2004</b>	29	21				20	20
<b>2005</b>						25	50
<b>2006</b>			30	60			



<b>2007</b>		35	70	<p>math courses (such as prealgebra and Algebra I for 7th graders) are becoming more rigorous. This practice may limit the percentage of students in many schools served by GEAR UP who are entering and completing such courses. Data for each year were obtained from the GEAR UP annual performance reports. For example: data for year 2004 were obtained from the GEAR UP Annual Performance Report covering April 2003 - March 2004.</p>	<p>extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.</p>
-------------	--	----	----	--	---

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Increase the rate of high school graduation and participation in postsecondary education of GEAR UP students.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Attendance and promotion: GEAR UP students will have high rates of attendance in school and be promoted to the next grade level on time.</b>																											
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																								
<p><i>Percentage of GEAR UP 7th graders with fewer than five unexcused absences in the first two quarters of the academic year.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Attendance</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Attendance</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2001</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">83</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2002</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">88</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2003</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">87</td> <td style="text-align: center;">89</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2004</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">83</td> <td style="text-align: center;">90</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">90</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2006</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">91</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Attendance	Attendance	<b>2001</b>	83		<b>2002</b>	88		<b>2003</b>	87	89	<b>2004</b>	83	90	<b>2005</b>		90	<b>2006</b>		91	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data reflect the percentages of GEAR UP 7th graders with fewer than 5 unexcused absences in the first 2 quarters of the academic year and those promoted to the next grade level. Data will continue to be collected on school attendance and grade level promotions. Standards for promotion have become more rigorous in many school districts and states that have GEAR UP programs.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality clarity and</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																									
	Attendance	Attendance																									
<b>2001</b>	83																										
<b>2002</b>	88																										
<b>2003</b>	87	89																									
<b>2004</b>	83	90																									
<b>2005</b>		90																									
<b>2006</b>		91																									

HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP) – 2005

Goal 5

2007		92			consistency, and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.
<i>Percentage of GEAR UP 7th graders promoted to the next grade level.</i>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>			
	Promotion	Promotion			
2001	98				
2002	97				
2003	98	97			
2004	91	97			
2005		97			
2006		98			
2007		98			
<b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: High school graduation and participation in postsecondary education: GEAR UP students will have high rates of high school graduation and postsecondary education enrollment.</b>					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of GEAR UP students who have completed high school.</i>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>			
2008		70			
2009		72			
2010		73			
<i>Percentage of former GEAR UP students who are enrolled in college.</i>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>			
2008		60			
			<b>Explanation:</b> Data will be collected in future years on GEAR UP students' high school completion and postsecondary education enrollment. The long-term goal for the percentage of GEAR UP students who have completed high school is 73 in 2010, and the long term goal for the percentage of former GEAR-UP students who are enrolled in college is 65 in 2010.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2007 - 2008 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2008 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. GEAR UP staff review performance report data for	

HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP) – 2005

Goal 5

<b>2009</b>		62		quality, clarity, and consistency, and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.
<b>2010</b>		65		

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Increase GEAR UP students' and their families' knowledge of postsecondary education options, preparation, and financing.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of parents of GEAR UP students that have knowledge of available financial aid.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data reflect the percentages of GEAR UP students and their parents who have talked to school counselors, advisors, or someone else about academic preparation for college and college entrance requirements, as well as the percentages of GEAR UP students' parents who have talked to school counselors, advisors, or someone else about availability of financial assistance. Data will continue to be collected on students' and parents' knowledge of postsecondary education entrance requirements, costs of attendance, and financial aid opportunities.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency, and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Parents: Aid	Parents: Aid		
<b>2001</b>	24			
<b>2002</b>	31			
<b>2003</b>	35	32		
<b>2004</b>	34	33		
<b>2005</b>		35		
<b>2006</b>		37		
<b>2007</b>		40		

HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP) – 2005

Goal 5

<i>Percentage of GEAR UP students and their families that have knowledge of necessary academic preparation for college.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Students: Prep	Parents: Prep	Students: Prep	Parents: Prep
2001	50	31		
2002	53	39		
2003	57	43	54	40
2004	62	42	56	42
2005			61	46
2006			66	48
2007			75	50

## HEA: Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.200 - Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need

**Program Goal: To increase the number of persons trained at the highest academic level**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To increase the number of students of superior academic ability completing the terminal degree in designated areas of national need in order to alleviate that need.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Graduate School Completion: Increase the percentage of GAANN fellows who obtain the terminal degree in an area of national need.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of GAANN fellows completing the terminal degree in the designated areas of national need.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The program office developed a database to collect this information. The data provided by the NSF's Survey of Earned Doctorates gives the national average for doctoral recipients in the sciences at 28%. The 2002 year information contains data from the 1997 cohort. 2003 year information contains data from the 1998 cohort, as well as the final performance reports from those in the 2000 cohort that finished in 2003. The 1998 cohort had a large number of PhD's and successful students, and the 2000 cohort had a large number of successful students as well. We believe that this is the reason for the substantial increase in the completion rate. However, at this stage there is not a sufficient basis</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1840-0748 GAANN Final Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	12	12		
2002	28	12		
2003	47			
2005		28		
2006		29		
2008		30		
2009		30		
2010		31		

	<p>for assuming that this unusually high rate will continue. For this reason, we are not increasing the targets at this time. However, we will reevaluate our targets if future data indicate that it would be appropriate. Data received in December 2004 will be available March 2005. Performance data includes students who have passed prelims. The long-term goal for the percentage of GAANN fellows completing the terminal degree in the designated areas of national need is 31 in 2010.</p>	
--	--	--

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Enrollment of Underrepresented Populations: The percentage of GAANN fellows from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds completing the terminal degree in the designated area of national need.															
Targets and Performance Data						Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality						
<i>The percentage of GAANN fellows from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds completing the terminal degree in the designated areas of national need.</i>						<p><b>Explanation:</b> The program office has developed a database to collect this information. Data in 2002 is from 1997 cohort. Data in 2003 is from 1998 cohort and from those in the 2000 cohort that finished. The FY 2003 data set the baseline. Data in 2004 will include those in the 2000 cohort that finish as well as those in the 2001 cohort that finish. The 2004 data will become available in spring 2005. The long-term goal for the percentage of GAANN fellows from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds completing the terminal degree in the designated area of national need is 1, 11, 10, 5, and 41 for American Indians, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black or African American, Hispanic/Latino, and women, respectively, in 2010.</p>			<p><b>Source: Performance Report</b>  <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1840-0748 GAANN Final Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The performance of the GAANN program is limited in that the authorizing legislation recommends, but does not mandate, that grantees seek individuals from traditionally underrepresented groups when awarding fellowships. However, in responding to the selection criteria, grantees must address plans to include students from underrepresented groups.</p>						
Year	Actual Performance										Performance Targets				
	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Women						American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Women
2002	1	11	10	5	38										
2003	0	6	7	2	35						999	999	999	999	999
2004	1	6	10	4	36						0	6	7	2	35
2005											1	8	7	6	39
2006											1	11	10	5	39
2007											1	11	10	5	39.50
2008											1	11	10	5	40
2009											1	11	10	5	40.50
2010						1	11	10	5	41					

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Time to completion.: The median duration of time from entering graduate school until degree completion will be less than that of comparable doctoral students as identified annually in the Survey of Earned Doctorates.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Time to Degree completion</i>			<p><b>Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research</b>  <b>Collecting Agency:</b> NSF.  <b>Survey/Research Report Title:</b> Survey of Earned Doctorate.  <b>References:</b> .  <b>Web Site:</b> <a href="http://http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/ssed/start.htm">http://http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/ssed/start.htm</a>.  <b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Administrative Records  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2005		6.45	
2006		6.40	
2007		6.40	
2008		6.40	
2009		6.40	
2010		6.40	
		<p><b>Progress:</b> The baseline for this indicator will be established in December 2004.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> The program has developed a database to collect this information. Data received December 2004 will be available March 2005. Actual performance is compared to NSF's Survey of Earned Doctorates in which the current average time to degree for comparable degrees is 7.5 years</p>	



## HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Programs – 2005

- CFDA Numbers:**
- 84.015A - National Resource Centers Program
  - 84.015B - Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship Program
  - 84.016 - Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs
  - 84.017 - International Research and Studies
  - 84.018 - International: Overseas Seminars Abroad\_Bilateral Projects
  - 84.019 - International: Overseas\_Faculty Research Abroad
  - 84.021 - International: Overseas\_Group Projects Abroad
  - 84.022 - International: Overseas\_Doctoral Dissertation
  - 84.153 - Business and International Education Projects
  - 84.220 - Centers for International Business Education
  - 84.229 - Language Resource Centers
  - 84.269 - Institute for International Public Policy
  - 84.274 - American Overseas Research Centers
  - 84.337 - Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access

**Program Goal: To meet the nation's security and economic needs through the development of a national capacity in foreign languages, and area and international studies.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Maintain a US Higher Education system able to produce experts in less commonly taught languages and area studies who are capable of contributing to the needs of US Government, academic and business institutions.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 7: Course Offerings: The number of foreign language course offerings by Title VI institutions.</b>			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of foreign language course offerings by Title VI institutions.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Data for FY 2004 will be available in 2005.  <b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Information  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	
<b>2005</b>		20,000	

			<p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> February 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>						
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 7: Instructional Materials: The number of comprehensive instructional resources (assessments, publications, curricular materials, etc.) produced at Title VI institutions for higher education.</b></p>									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>The number of comprehensive instructional resources produced at Title VI institutions for higher education.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>90</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		90	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data for FY 2004 will be available in 2005.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Information  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> February 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
2005		90							

Indicator 8.1.3 of 7: Teacher Training: The number of K-12 teachers trained through the Title VI and Fulbright Hays Programs.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The number of K-12 teachers trained through the Title VI and Fulbright Hays Programs.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> Data for FY 2004 will be available in 2005.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Information  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> February 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
2005		5,000		
Indicator 8.1.4 of 7: Employment: The percentage of NRC and IIPP Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government service, and national security.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of NRC and IIPP Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government service, and national security.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> Data for FY 2004 will be available in 2005. Data for this measure reflect a combination of NRC and IIPP participants. See next measure for transition to disaggregated data. NRC= National Resource Centers; IIPP= Institute for International Public Policy.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Information  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> February 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
2001	48.50			
2002	53.70			
2003	46.10			
2005		50		

Indicator 8.1.5 of 7: Employment: The percentage of NRC Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government service, and national security.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of NRC Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government service, and national security.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> Data for this measure reflect only NRC graduates.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Information  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				47.50
Indicator 8.1.6 of 7: Increase the percentage of critical languages taught.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of critical languages taught, as reflected by the list of critical languages referenced in the HEA Title VI program statute.</i>			<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Information  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2004	71			
2005		74		

Indicator 8.1.7 of 7: Increase the average competency score of Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship recipients.												
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>The average competency score of Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship recipients at the end of one full year of instruction (post-test) minus the average competency score at the beginning of the year (pre-test).</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>1.20</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>1.20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	1.20		2005		1.20		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Information</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets										
2003	1.20											
2005		1.20										

## HEA: Javits Fellowships – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.170 - Javits Fellowships

**Program Goal: To provide financial assistance to graduate students who have demonstrated superior academic ability, achievement, and exceptional promise**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: TO ENABLE STUDENTS OF SUPERIOR ABILITY IN THE ARTS, HUMANITIES, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES TO COMPLETE THEIR TERMINAL DEGREE.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Rates of doctorate attainment by Javits fellows 7 years from enrollment</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The Survey of Earned Doctorates collects only information on attainment of a doctorate degree. Some Javits fellows pursue programs in fields for which the terminal degree is below the doctorate level; their attainment is not accounted for. The program office is in the process of developing a database to collect this information. Upon receipt of the GAANN data, we plan to draw a comparison to a national representative group. The long-term goal for this measure is 33 in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program performance reports, 2002; Survey of Earned Doctorates, 1999.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The new Annual Performance Report will require grantees to report completion data on their fellows (thus obtaining</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	30			
1999	26			
2003	31	29		
2004	31	30		
2005		31		
2006		31		
2007		32		
2008		32		
2009		33		
2010		33		

			completion information on both doctoral programs and those programs where the master's of fine arts is the terminal degree).																					
<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Time to degree completion: Average time to degree completion for Javits fellows will be less than the national average.</b>																								
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<i>Average time to degree completion for Javits fellows.</i> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>6.30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>6.30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>6.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>6.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>6.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>6.20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	6.30		2004	6.30		2005		6.30	2006		6.30	2007		6.20	2008		6.20	<p><b>Explanation:</b> According to the most recent data provided by the Survey of Earned Doctorates, the median time to degree completion rate for all comparable graduate programs in the United States was 7.5 years in 2002. The long term goal for this measure is 6.1 in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Survey of Earned Doctorates</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																						
2003	6.30																							
2004	6.30																							
2005		6.30																						
2006		6.30																						
2007		6.20																						
2008		6.20																						

## HEA: Student Financial Assistance Policy – 2005

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.007 - Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants  
 84.032 - Federal Family Education Loans  
 84.033 - Federal Work-Study Program  
 84.037 - Perkins Loan Cancellations  
 84.038 - Federal Perkins Loan Program\_Federal Capital Contributions  
 84.063 - Federal Pell Grant Program  
 84.069 - Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership  
 84.268 - Federal Direct Student Loans

**Program Goal: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants, loans, and work-study in an efficient, financially sound and customer-responsive manner.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Ensure that low- and middle-income students will have the same access to postsecondary education that high-income students do.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Percentage of unmet need: The percentage of unmet need considering all sources of financial aid, especially for low-income students.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of Unmet Need for Undergraduates</i>			<b>Progress:</b> In the past, data were estimated for years in between National Postsecondary Student Aid Studies (NPSAS), which are conducted approximately every four years. However, upon reconsideration of the estimation methodology, OPE decided in 2001 to discontinue these between survey estimates.	<b>Source: Other</b> <b>Other:</b> Record/File. <b>Sponsor:</b> National Postsecondary Student Aid Study. <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 01/31/2005.  <b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1995	23			
1996	23			
1997	22			
1998	21.20			
1999	20.80			



<b>2000</b>	21.20					
<b>2003</b>				19.20		
<b>2004</b>				19.20		
<b>2008</b>				18.70		
<i>Percentage of Unmet Need for Low Income Undergraduates.</i>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Dependent	Independent With Kids	Independent Without Kids	Dependent	Independent With Kids	Independent Without Kids
<b>1996</b>	46.30	54.70	52.50			
<b>1997</b>	44.50	51.60	49			
<b>1998</b>	42.90	51.10	49			
<b>1999</b>	41.80	50.20	48.50			
<b>2000</b>	43.10	60.60	46.20			
<b>2003</b>				41.10	58.60	44.20
<b>2004</b>				41.10	58.60	44.20
<b>2008</b>				40.10	57.60	43.20

Therefore, no data are anticipated for 2001, 2002, or 2003. Data for 2004 (school year 2003-2004) will be available in January 2005.

**Explanation:** Long-term goal for percentage of unmet need for undergraduates is 18.7 in 2008. Long-term goal for percentage of unmet need for low-income undergraduates is 40.1 for dependent, 57.6 for independent with children, and 43.2 for independent without children in 2008.

collected every four years.

**Frequency:** Other.  
**Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004  
**Data Available:** January 2005  
**Validated By:** No Formal Verification.  
**Limitations:** NPSAS data are collected only every four years.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: College enrollment rates: Postsecondary education enrollment rates for all students, and the enrollment gap between low- and high-income high school graduates.						
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of high school graduates aged 16-24 enrolling immediately in college - Total</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data for both 2002 and 2003 (School years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003) are both anticipated by March 2005. The delay in receiving the data is due to the Census Bureau's reweighing of the data based upon information from the 2000 Decennial Census. Data are already collected for these years but are being analyzed.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.  <b>Limitations:</b> Small subgroup sample sizes for low-income students lead to large yearly fluctuations in enrollment rates. Three-year weighted averages are used to smooth out these fluctuations.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets				
1995	61.90					
1996	65					
1997	67					
1998	65.60					
1999	62.90					
2000	63.30					
2001	61.70					
2003		65				
2004		67				
2005		67				
<i>The percentage of high school graduates aged 16-24 enrolling immediately in college by income.</i>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Low	High	Difference	Low	High	Difference
1995	41.20	83.40	42.20			
1996	41.50	78	36.50			
1997	47.10	82	34.90			

<b>1998</b>	50.60	77.30	26.70		
<b>1999</b>	50.90	76	25.10		
<b>2000</b>	48.50	77.10	26.60		
<b>2001</b>	47.80	79.80	32		
<b>2003</b>				50	80
<b>2004</b>				52	81
<b>2005</b>				52	81

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Targeting of Pell Grants: Pell Grant funds will continue to be targeted to those students with the greatest financial need: at least 75 percent of Pell Grant funds will go to students below 150 percent of poverty level.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of Pell Grant funds going to students below 150 percent of the poverty line.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Increases in the maximum award without other changes in the formulas used to award Pell grants will tend to lower the percentage of funds going to the neediest students.</p>	<p><b>Source: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Record/File.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Pell Grant Applicant/Recipient File..  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 03/30/2004.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> August 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>1997</b>	82			
<b>1998</b>	80			
<b>1999</b>	78	75		
<b>2000</b>	78	75		
<b>2001</b>	79	75		
<b>2002</b>	78	75		
<b>2003</b>	76	75		
<b>2004</b>		75		
<b>2005</b>		75		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Ensure that more students will persist in postsecondary education and attain degrees and certificates.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Completion rate: Completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in four-year and less-than-four-year programs; and the gap in completion rates between minority and nonminority students.								
Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of full-time degree seeking students completing a four-year degree within 150 percent of the normal time required.</i>								
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets	
	Total	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference between Black and White	Difference between White and Hispanic	Total	
<b>1997</b>	52.50	35.50	55.50	39.10	20	16.40		
<b>1998</b>	52.60	34.50	55.80	39.10	21.30	16.70		
<b>1999</b>	53	35.80	56	40.90	20.20	15.10		
<b>2000</b>	52.40	35.70	55.40	41.50	19.70	13.90		
<b>2002</b>	54.40	38.20	57.20	44.80	19	12.40		
<b>2003</b>	54.30	38.50	57.30	43.50	18.80	13.80	54	
<b>2004</b>							55	
<b>2005</b>							55	
							<p><b>Explanation:</b> 2002 and 2003 data have been received, and work is proceeding on the 2001 data. Analysis was not done in order of data received.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Graduation Rate Survey (GRS)</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data are subject to both Census and NCES validation procedures.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Prior to the implementation of the Graduation Rate Survey (GRS), data were voluntarily submitted by institutions representing 87 percent of four-year students and 77 percent of two-year students.</p>

<i>The percentage of full-time degree seeking students completing a less than 4-year program within 150% of the normal time required.</i>							
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets
	Total	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference Between Black and White	Difference Between White and Hispanic	Total
<b>1997</b>	30.90	22.80	32.60	26.20	9.80	6.40	
<b>1998</b>	32.20	25.10	33.80	29.90	8.70	3.90	
<b>1999</b>	34.40	29.50	35.30	32.50	5.80	2.80	
<b>2000</b>	32.70	26.50	34	30.10	7.50	3.90	
<b>2002</b>	29.30	23.30	30.70	27	7.40	3.70	
<b>2003</b>	30.60	26.10	31.70	30.10	5.60	1.60	34
<b>2004</b>							35
<b>2005</b>							35

## HEA: Student Aid Administration – 2005

### Program Goal: Student Aid Administration

#### Objective 8.1 of 1: Student Aid Administration

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Reduce or maintain FSA business process unit cost			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>Unit Cost of Application Processing</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FSA has completed defining and validating the ABC methodology that it will use. In addition, reporting has been redesigned to address GAO concerns as well as the current needs of FSA. However, additional work is required from FSA subject matter specialist to allocate baseline resource data prior to using the ABC information. This effort will continue in FY 2005 and will be accomplished by the end of the calendar year. We will develop baseline unit costs for the business processes referenced. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2005 target is to maintain the level of the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> FSA Activity-Based Cost Model will be used to collect data. The model is currently under construction with a target date of December 2004.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost		
2004		999		
2005		999		
<i>Unit Cost of Origination and Disbursement</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost		
2004		999		
2005		999		
<i>Unit Cost of Direct Loan Repayment</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost		
2004		999		
2005		999		

<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="3"><i>Unit Cost of Direct Loan Consolidation</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Year</b></td> <td><b>Actual Performance</b></td> <td><b>Performance Targets</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>\$ Unit Cost</td> <td>\$ Unit Cost</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2004</b></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </table>			<i>Unit Cost of Direct Loan Consolidation</i>			<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost	<b>2004</b>		999	<b>2005</b>		999							
<i>Unit Cost of Direct Loan Consolidation</i>																								
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>																						
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost																						
<b>2004</b>		999																						
<b>2005</b>		999																						
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="3"><i>Unit Cost of Default Collections</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Year</b></td> <td><b>Actual Performance</b></td> <td><b>Performance Targets</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>\$ Unit Cost</td> <td>\$ Unit Cost</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2004</b></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </table>			<i>Unit Cost of Default Collections</i>			<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost	<b>2004</b>		999	<b>2005</b>		999							
<i>Unit Cost of Default Collections</i>																								
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>																						
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost																						
<b>2004</b>		999																						
<b>2005</b>		999																						
<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Pell Grant overpayments</b>																								
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="3"><i>The percentage of Pell grant overpayments</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Year</b></td> <td><b>Actual Performance</b></td> <td><b>Performance Targets</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2001</b></td> <td>3.40</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2002</b></td> <td>3.30</td> <td>3.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2003</b></td> <td>3.10</td> <td>3.10</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2004</b></td> <td>2.80</td> <td>3.10</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td>3.10</td> </tr> </table>		<i>The percentage of Pell grant overpayments</i>			<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	<b>2001</b>	3.40		<b>2002</b>	3.30	3.40	<b>2003</b>	3.10	3.10	<b>2004</b>	2.80	3.10	<b>2005</b>		3.10		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b>                  Analysis of sampled Internal Revenue Service (IRS) income data compared to data reported on the Department of Education's Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) reported by the Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) and the Common Origination and Disbursement (COD) system.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005</p>
<i>The percentage of Pell grant overpayments</i>																								
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>																						
<b>2001</b>	3.40																							
<b>2002</b>	3.30	3.40																						
<b>2003</b>	3.10	3.10																						
<b>2004</b>	2.80	3.10																						
<b>2005</b>		3.10																						

## HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.066A - TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers

**Program Goal: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase postsecondary enrollment rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of EOC participants enrolling in college.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers' participants enrolling in college.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The 2000 baseline from the EOC Annual Performance Reports are the only data currently available. Data for 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 are in house and are being analyzed.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p>The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2000	57			
2004				57
2005				57.50
2006				58
2007		58.50		



## HEA: TRIO McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.217A - TRIO - McNair Post-baccalaureate Achievement

**Program Goal: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase postsecondary persistence and completion rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Graduate school enrollment and persistence: Percentages of McNair participants enrolling and persisting in graduate school.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of TRIO McNair participants enrolling in and persisting in graduate school.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> The 1998-99 annual performance reports provided the baseline data for the McNair program. These annual performance reports have been used to determine if the performance targets for graduate school enrollment and persistence have been met.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> The re-designed McNair annual performance report that all grantees are required to submit annually. Additional data will be forthcoming from a national study of the McNair Program.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.            The annual performance report is self-reported data; a</p>		
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
	Enrollment	Persistence	Enrollment					Persistence
1999	35	48						
2000	35	75	35					48
2001	40	66	35					48
2002	39	65	35					48
2003			36					75
2004			36					75
2005			36	70				

		<p>variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The primary data source is the annual performance report that comprises self-reported data.</p>
--	--	--

## HEA: TRIO Student Support Services – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.042A - TRIO Student Support Services

**Program Goal: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase postsecondary persistence and completion rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary persistence and completion: Percentages of Student Support Services participants persisting and completing a degree at the same institution.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of TRIO Student Support Services participants persisting and completing a degree at the same institution.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data from the national study of the Student Support Services Program provide the baseline data (1999 actual performance). The re-designed Student Support Services' annual performance report has been used to determine if the performance targets for college persistence have been met. The six-year college completion baseline of 29% includes only SSS students who remain at the same school through graduation. It has been set at this level because the annual performance reports will only report the academic progress of SSS participants that remain at the grantee institution. Preliminary data show that the graduation rate of SSS participants</p>		<p><b>Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation:</b> Higher Education. <b>Section:</b> <u>A Study of the Talent Search Program (1995) Analysis and Highlights.</u></p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> The re-designed Student Support Services performance report that all grantees are required to submit annually.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	College Persistence	College Completion				College Persistence	College Completion
1999	67	29					
2000	67					67	29
2001	70					67	29
2002	72					67	29
2003						68	29.50
2004						68.50	30
2005						69	30.50
2006			69.50	30.50			

2007		70 31	<p>who were college freshmen in 2001-2002 is 12%. This rate is calculated after four years (not six years as with the baseline data) and does not include those SSS participants who completed an associate's degree within four years. Thus, we expect the graduation rate to increase as additional years of data become available. The long-term goals for SSS are to increase the persistence and completion rates to 70% and 31%, respectively, by 2007.</p>	<p>The baseline data from the National Study of the Student Support Services Program met the data collection standards of the Department of Education. The annual performance report comprises self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The national study was a longitudinal evaluation of program participants and a comparison group. Data from this study have provided the baseline on persistence and graduation rates. Since this longitudinal evaluation cannot be used to measure program improvements annually, the annual performance reports have been used to assess attainment of persistence targets and will be used to determine four-year graduation rates beginning with the 2001-02 data and six-year graduation dates beginning with the 2003-2004 data that should be available in late 2005.</p>
------	--	-------	---	--

## HEA: TRIO Talent Search – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.044 - TRIO\_Talent Search

**Program Goal: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase postsecondary enrollment rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of Talent Search participants enrolling in college.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of TRIO Talent Search participants enrolling in college.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The 2000 baseline data from the Talent Search Annual Performance Reports are the only data currently available. Data from 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 are in house and are being analyzed.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Program Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> April 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p>The annual performance report comprises self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2000</b>	73			
<b>2004</b>		73.50		
<b>2005</b>		74		
<b>2006</b>		74.50		
<b>2007</b>		75		

## HEA: TRIO Upward Bound – 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.047 - TRIO\_Upward Bound  
84.047M - TRIO - Upward Bound Math/Science

**Program Goal: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase postsecondary enrollment rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of Upward Bound participants enrolling in college.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of TRIO Upward Bound participants and higher-risk participants enrolling in college.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The 2005 plan reflects two changes to the measures and targets for the Upward Bound Program. The first change is the elimination of project persistence (length of participation in program) as an indicator since it does not measure program outcomes. The indicator had been selected as an interim measure because the national evaluation of the Upward Bound Program found a correlation between length of participation in the program and the educational outcomes of participants. Better measures of program success, however, are now available. The second change is to track separately</p>		<p><b>Source: ED Evaluation Evaluation:</b> Higher Education. <b>Section:</b> <u>A Study of the Talent Search Program (1995) Analysis and Highlights.</u></p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> The re-designed Upward Bound performance report that all grantees are required to submit annually since 2000-01.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	Overall Enrollment	High-Risk Enrollment				Overall Enrollment	High-Risk Enrollment
2000	65	34					
2002						65	
2003						65	35
2004						65	35.50
2005						65	36
2006						65	36.50
2007			65	37			

	<p>the effect of the program on higher-risk students. This change reflects (1) the findings of the national evaluation of the Upward Bound Program that found the program has significant effects on higher-risk students and (2) recent funding initiatives encouraging Upward Bound projects to serve more higher-risk students. With a greater proportion of Upward Bound participant being higher-risk students, maintaining the current college enrollment rate of 65% demonstrates continual program improvements. The program's effectiveness with higher-risk students is expected to increase by one-half of one percent.</p>	<p>Verification. The baseline data from the National Evaluation of the Upward Bound Program meet the data collection standards of the Department of Education. The annual performance report comprises self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The national evaluation is a longitudinal study of program participants and a comparison group selected by random assignment. Data from this study have provided the baseline on college enrollment rates. Since this longitudinal evaluation cannot be used to measure program improvements annually, the annual performance reports will be used to determine if targets are met beginning with the 2002-03 data, which should be available in mid to late 2004. It should also be noted that the definition of higher-risk student used in the national evaluation is</p>
--	--	---

		<p>somewhat different than the criteria used by Upward Bound projects funded under the Upward Bound Initiative.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Status: Data from the national evaluation of the Upward Bound Program provide the baseline (2000 actual performance). The redesigned annual Upward Bound performance report will be used to determine if the performance targets are met for the program overall and the higher risk students. Beginning with the 2001 report for project years 1999-2000 and 2000-01, Upward Bound projects have been submitting individual participant data that can be used to track the academic progress of project participants. Since most Upward Bound participants start in their freshman or sophomore year of high school, a cohort college enrollment rate will be available in late 2004.</p>
--	--	--



## HEA: Underground Railroad Program – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.345 - Underground Railroad Educational and Cultural Program

**Program Goal: To provide grants to support research, exhibition, interpretation, and collection of artifacts related to the history of the Underground Railroad**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To support research and education related to the history of the Underground Railroad.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Fundraising initiatives: Private sector support will increase by 5 percent each year (old measure).**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Private sector support (in dollars)</i>				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Performance Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	33,717,762			
2002	35,000,000			
2003	39,000,000			
2004	57,000,000	41,000,000		
2005		62,000,000		
2006		72,000,000		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Projects sustained: The percentage of projects sustained beyond Federal funding (new measure).			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of projects sustained beyond Federal funding.</i>			<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Performance Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2005		999	

# HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.904A - Helen Keller National Center

**Program Goal: Individuals who are deaf-blind will become independent and function as full and productive members of their local community.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: ENSURE THAT INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE DEAF-BLIND RECEIVE THE SPECIALIZED SERVICES AND TRAINING THEY NEED TO BECOME AS INDEPENDENT AND SELF-SUFFICIENT AS POSSIBLE.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Services to consumers at headquarters: By 2008, the training program at headquarters will increase the number of adult consumers who have achieved successful employment to 45% or less restrictive setting outcomes to 75%.</b>						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of adult consumers placed in employment and those in less restrictive settings.</i>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	% in Less Adult consumers	% Restrictive Settings	% Placed in Employment Settings	% in Less Adult consumers	% Restrictive Settings	% Placed in Employment Settings
<b>1999</b>	75		45	85		38
<b>2000</b>	82		52	90		45
<b>2001</b>	87	71	38	90	59	45
<b>2002</b>	85	80	27		59	45
<b>2003</b>	100	70	42.50			
<b>2004</b>	98	69	46	95	70	45
<b>2005</b>				95	70	45
						<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Each consumer's final transition plan will include information on employment and living situation to which he/she is returning</p>

2006		95	70	45		<p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are based upon self-reported data from the grantee and are not independently verified. Follow-up services are limited due to budgetary restraints.</p>
2007		95	75	45		
2008		95	75	45		
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Services to consumers at headquarters: To increase the percentage of training goals achieved by consumers participating in the training program.</b></p>						
Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<p><i>Percentage of identified training goals successfully achieved by participants</i></p>						
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets			<p><b>Explanation:</b> 90% represents the percent of training goals achieved by all 98 adult consumers served during the 2004 program year. These measurable instructional objectives are mutually developed by the consumer and his/her instructors.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005                      Review of consumer Individualized Training Plans (ITP)</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data is based upon self-reported data from the grantee and is not independently verified.</p>
2001	92	86				
2002	90					
2003	88					
2004	90	88				
2005		88				
2006		88				
2007		90				
2008		90				

**Objective 8.2 of 2: ENSURE THAT DEAF-BLIND CONSUMERS AND THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS RECEIVE THE SERVICES THEY NEED TO FUNCTION MORE INDEPENDENTLY IN THE HOME COMMUNITY.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Regional services to consumers and families: Helen Keller National Center will maintain or increase the number of consumers and family members served through its regional offices.						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number served through Helen Keller National Center</i>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Consumers	Families	Organizations	Consumers	Families	Organizations
1999	1,336	368	976	1,250	400	
2000	1,340	461	995	1,300	400	950
2001	1,727	484	913	1,400	425	1,000
2002	1,932	487	1,090	1,500	400	1,050
2003	1,982	611	1,288			
2004	2,031	512	1,042	1,700	450	1,050
2005				1,700	450	1,050
				<p><b>Explanation:</b> The number of consumers, families, professionals, and organizations/agencies served fluctuates from year to year. In establishing the targets, trend data were used from prior years.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> HKNC Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. HKNC regional reps maintain client case summary files that indicate activity with individual consumers, family members, professionals, organizations and agencies.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Client case summary reports do not measure the level of service provided or impact of the services on the lives of the consumers and family members.</p>

## NLA: Literacy Programs for Prisoners – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.255 - Literacy Programs for Prisoners

### Program Goal: Literacy Programs for Prisoners (Adult Education and Literacy Act)

#### Objective 8.1 of 1: Literacy Programs for Prisoners (Adult Education and Literacy Act)

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Prisoner Life Skills Attainment: The proportion of prisoners who attain measurable gains of enhanced life skills in one or more of the life skills domains taught under these projects.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
<p><i>The number of prisoners from the cohort of grant program projects who attain measurable gains of enhanced life skills in one or more of the life skills domains (e.g., self-development, communication skills, job and financial skills development, education, interpersonal and family relationship development, stress and anger management, or others) taught under these projects.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>949</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>996</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>1,046</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004	949		2005		996	2006		1,046		<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets														
2004	949															
2005		996														
2006		1,046														

## RA: Client Assistance State Grants – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.161 - Rehabilitation Services\_Client Assistance Program

**Program Goal: To provide assistance and information to help individuals with disabilities secure the benefits available under the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants program and other programs funded under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Resolve cases at lowest possible level**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Alternative dispute resolution (ADR): Through FY 2008, the percentage of cases resolved through the use of ADR will be maintained at a rate of 84%.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of cases resolved through ADR</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2001 data established the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> CAP performance report, RSA-227.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialists. Onsite compliance reviews are conducted, and random sampling of onsite files is cross-checked with reported data for verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The collection instrument does not contain</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2001</b>	84			
<b>2002</b>	85			
<b>2003</b>	82			
<b>2004</b>		84		
<b>2005</b>		84		
<b>2006</b>		84		
<b>2007</b>		84		
<b>2008</b>		84		

		known data limitations.
--	--	-------------------------

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Accurately identify problem areas requiring systemic change and engage in systemic activity to improve services under the rehabilitation act.**

<p><b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Effects of systemic change: By FY 2008, the percentage of CAPs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will increase to a rate of 55%.</b></p>																																									
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>																																							
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="3"><i>Percentage of CAPs that reported that their systematic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice</i></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>50.90</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>43</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>44</td> <td>44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>45</td> <td>45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>54</td> <td>46</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>48</td> <td>47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>49</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>55</td> </tr> </table>	<i>Percentage of CAPs that reported that their systematic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice</i>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1998	50.90		1999	43		2000	44	44	2001	45	45	2002	54	46	2003	48	47	2004		49	2005		50	2006		52	2007		54	2008		55	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Performance percentage is based on the reporting of successful systemic change activity by 27 of 56 CAPs. FY 1999 data established the baseline. Performance trends are based on actual data reported for FY 2000 through 2003.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> CAP performance report, RSA-227, narrative section.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data will be limited because they are self-reported and in a narrative format. The data submitted are reviewed by program specialists, but data validity will be unattainable.</p>
<i>Percentage of CAPs that reported that their systematic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice</i>																																									
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																							
1998	50.90																																								
1999	43																																								
2000	44	44																																							
2001	45	45																																							
2002	54	46																																							
2003	48	47																																							
2004		49																																							
2005		50																																							
2006		52																																							
2007		54																																							
2008		55																																							



## RA: Independent Living Centers and State Grants – 2005

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.132 - Centers for Independent Living  
84.169 - Independent Living\_State Grants

**Program Goal: Support individuals with significant disabilities, including older blind individuals served by Independent Living programs, in the achievement of their independent living goals.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Increase the number of individuals with disabilities who live independently in community-based housing.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of individuals who leave long-term care facilities and other institution for community-based living due to services provided by a CIL.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> RSA/IL has been reporting this measure for several years. Trend data from FY 2000-2003 suggest that CILs have been successful in increasing by about 10 percent per year the number of individuals moved from long-term care facilities or other institutions to community-based housing. Future performance targets have been increased 10 percent per year.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA Annual Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> May 2005</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The instructions contained in the 704 reports have been revised to ensure that reporting for this measure is valid across grantees.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	1,372	850		
2001	1,777	900		
2002	2,012	900		
2003	1,996			
2005		2,677		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Improve the efficiency and transparency of the IL Title VII, Part B Independent Living Program.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Make Title VII, Part B data available to the public.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Number of months from data due date to the release of data to the public.</i>			<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Review of data received and office files.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> May 2006	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				5

## RA: Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.177 - Rehabilitation Services\_Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who are Blind

**Program Goal: Support individuals with significant disabilities, including older blind individuals served by Independent Living programs, in the achievement of their independent living goals.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Through the provision of services (either directly or through contracts), increase the percentage of consumers receiving services funded through OB Title VII, Chapter 2 funds who report having access to services needed to improve their ability to live more independently and participate fully in their communities.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Increase the percentage of Title VII, Chapter 2 consumers who report having access to previously unavailable assistive technology aids and devices, and increase the percentage of Title VII, Chapter 2 consumers who report improved ADL skills.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of Title VII, Chapter 2, consumers who report having access to previously unavailable assistive technology aids and devices; and the percentage of Title VII, Chapter 2, consumers who report improved ADL skills.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> This is a new measure for the OB program. The expectation is that the FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. Each subsequent year will increase by 1 percent.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual 7-OB reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> July 2006 Review of 7-0B reports by regional staff.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
	AT	ADL	AT					ADL
<b>2005</b>			999					999

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Improve the efficiency and transparency of the IL Title VII, Chapter 2 Older Blind Program.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Make Title VII, Chapter 2 data available to the public.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Number of months from data due date to the release of data to the public.</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual 7-OB report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> July 2006</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				7
2006				5

## RA: Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.128G - Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Program

**Program Goal: To increase employment opportunities for migrant and seasonal farmworkers who have disabilities**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that eligible Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers with disabilities receive Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) services and achieve employment.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Individuals who achieve employment outcomes: Within project-funded states, the percentage of migrant or seasonal farmworkers with disabilities served by VR and the projects, who achieve employment outcomes is higher than those who do not access the project.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of individuals served who were placed in employment.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> Targets for the VR only category are represented as static numbers because the focus of these projects is to improve the performance for the VR + Project participants.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Rehabilitation Services Administration agency state data from the RSA-911</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> By 2005, it is anticipated that data quality will be more dependable.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets				
	VR & Project	VR Only	VR & Project				VR Only
<b>2002</b>	65	53.10					
<b>2003</b>	66	59					
<b>2004</b>			62				53
<b>2005</b>			65	53			

## RA: Projects with Industry – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.234 - Projects with Industry

### Program Goal: Projects with Industry Program (PWI) Internal Goal

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Ensure that PWI services (through partnerships with business and industry) result in competitive employment, increased wages, and job retention for individuals with disabilities.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Placement rate of individuals with disabilities into competitive employment: The percentage of individuals served who are placed in competitive employment will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of individuals served who were placed in competitive employment</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 performance was lower than FY 2002 because it was the first year of a new grant cycle. FY 2004 is expected to show an increase because the grants from FY 2003 are now in their second year. FY 2005 is also expected to show an increase because the grants will be in the last year of a grant cycle. An error was discovered in this measure after the FY 2004 Program Performance Plan (PPP) had been published. However, it has been corrected for FY 2005 and 2006.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Compliance Indicator and Annual Evaluation Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Web-based automatic edit checks. In addition, staff check data for "reasonableness."</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The primary limitation of the data is that they are self-reported. Technical assistance and</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	59			
1998	49			
1999	59	61		
2000	61.90	61		
2001	62.40	62		
2002	63.20	62.20		
2003	54.20	62.40		
2004		62.70		
2005		63		

			regular monitoring is provided to grantees in order to receive updated reports from the grantee regarding progress toward meeting project goals.																																							
<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Change in earnings of individuals who are placed in competitive employment: By FY2008, Projects with Industry projects will report that participants placed in competitive employment increase earnings by an average of at least \$250 per week.</b>																																										
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																																							
<p><i>Average increase in weekly earnings in dollars</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>207</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>209</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>226</td> <td>209</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>252</td> <td>218</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>236</td> <td>218</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>234</td> <td>226</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>242</td> <td>231</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>233</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>238</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>242</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>245</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>250</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1997	207		1998	209		1999	226	209	2000	252	218	2001	236	218	2002	234	226	2003	242	231	2004		233	2005		238	2006		242	2007		245	2008		250	<p><b>Explanation:</b> An error was discovered in this measure after the FY 2004PPP had been published. However, it has been corrected for FY 2005 and 2006.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Compliance Indicator and Annual Evaluation Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Web-based reporting system conducts automatic edit checks. In addition, staff check data for "reasonableness."</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Same as Indicator 1.1. In addition, performance data on this indicator are further limited because grantees submit an average aggregate figure of participants' wages.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																								
1997	207																																									
1998	209																																									
1999	226	209																																								
2000	252	218																																								
2001	236	218																																								
2002	234	226																																								
2003	242	231																																								
2004		233																																								
2005		238																																								
2006		242																																								
2007		245																																								
2008		250																																								

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Ensure that PWI services are available for individuals with the most need.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Percentage of individuals served who were unemployed for 6 months or more prior to program entry who are placed in competitive employment: The percentage of previously unemployed individuals served who are placed into competitive employment will increase.</b>																																
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress																														
<p><i>Percentage of previously unemployed individuals served who were placed in competitive employment</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>60</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>48</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>58</td> <td>62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>60.80</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>67.20</td> <td>61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>64.70</td> <td>61.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>54</td> <td>63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>65</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1997	60		1998	48		1999	58	62	2000	60.80	60	2001	67.20	61	2002	64.70	61.20	2003	54	63	2004		64	2005		65	<p><b>Explanation:</b> An error was discovered in this measure after the FY 2004 PPP had been published. However, it has been corrected for FY 2005 and 2006.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Compliance Indicator and Annual Evaluation Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Same as Indicator 1.1</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																														
1997	60																															
1998	48																															
1999	58	62																														
2000	60.80	60																														
2001	67.20	61																														
2002	64.70	61.20																														
2003	54	63																														
2004		64																														
2005		65																														



## RA: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.240 - Program of Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights

### Program Goal: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) Internal Goal

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Identify problem areas requiring systemic change and engage in systemic activities to address those problems.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of PAIRs that reported that their systemic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Actual performance percentage based on 43 out of 57 PAIRs reporting successful systemic change activities in FY 2003. Performance trends are based on actual data reported for FY 2000 through 2003. These data demonstrate significant annual increases in the percentage of PAIRs achieving changes in policies and practices, making it difficult to accurately assess trends and performance.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1820-0627 Annual Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) Program Performance Report. <b>Program:</b> RSA Form 509.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied through uniform data reporting. Once data are submitted appropriate review will be conducted by program specialists.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data will be limited because they are self-reported and in a narrative format. The data submitted will be reviewed by program specialists, but data validity will be unattainable.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	54			
2001	68			
2002	81			
2003	75			
2004		77		
2005		79		
2006		80		
2007		81		
2008		82		

## RA: Supported Employment State Grants – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.187 - Supported Employment Services for Individuals with Severe Disabilities

**Program Goal: Individuals with disabilities served by the Supported Employment State Grant program will achieve high-quality employment.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase the number of individuals with the most significant disabilities who have received supported employment services but achieve competitive employment outcomes.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal achieving competitive employment: Increase the percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieve a competitive employment outcome (including supported employment outcomes in which the individual receives the minimum wage or better).**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieve a competitive employment outcome</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> This indicator has been a GPRA indicator for a number of years. With this indicator, RSA examines state agency performance regarding supported employment for individuals with the most significant disabilities. Individuals in supported employment can achieve competitive employment (with wages at or above the minimum wage), although not all individuals in supported employment do achieve these competitive wages. RSA wants to encourage state agencies to help individuals with disabilities in supported employment to achieve these</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005 Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Accuracy/consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors'</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	69.60			
1998	69.10			
1999	73.30	71		
2000	77.30	71.50		
2001	79.20	77.40		
2002	90.50	77.60		
2003	92.70	77.80		
2004		78		
2005		93		

	<p>competitive employment outcomes. In FYs 2002 and 2003, state VR agencies surpassed their targets for this indicator, and therefore the FY 2005 target has been adjusted accordingly.</p>	<p>interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.</p>
--	---	---

# RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.235 - Rehabilitation Services Demonstration and Training\_Special Demonstration Programs

**Program Goal: To expand, improve, or further the purposes of activities authorized under the Act**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: EXPAND AND IMPROVE THE PROVISION OF REHABILITATION SERVICES THAT LEAD TO EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Expansion: Projects will be judged to have successfully implemented strategies that contribute to the expansion of services for the employment of individuals with disabilities according to the percentage of individuals served and placed into employment by the projects.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of individuals who were provided employment services through projects and who were placed into employment</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2001 data established the baseline. The data reflect information provided by projects that are funded through the Special Demonstrations program and use the Web-based reporting system.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Web-based Annual Performance Reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The Web-based system that grantees use for reporting provides raw data, but does not aggregate the</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
	Percent of individuals placed into employment			Percent of individuals placed into employment
<b>2001</b>	23			
<b>2002</b>	20			
<b>2003</b>	27			
<b>2005</b>		24		

				<p>numbers needed, which has resulted in hand counting to obtain the information required.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The Department of Education internal programmer is being assisted by an outside contractor to correct this problem.</p>																																		
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Improvement: It is anticipated that the impact of interactions, presentations, and information made to and by state VR agencies will increase referral of individuals to or from VR agencies, thereby expanding service provision.</b></p>																																						
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																																		
<p><i>Percentage of referrals to and from VR and projects.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Year</th> <th colspan="2">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="2">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Referrals to VR from Projects</th> <th>Referrals from VR to Projects</th> <th>Referrals to VR from Projects</th> <th>Referrals from VR to Projects</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>8</td> <td>37</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>8</td> <td>29</td> <td>10</td> <td>58</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>20</td> <td>22</td> <td>10</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>10</td> <td>62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>13</td> <td>33</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		Referrals to VR from Projects	Referrals from VR to Projects	Referrals to VR from Projects	Referrals from VR to Projects	2001	8	37			2002	8	29	10	58	2003	20	22	10	60	2004			10	62	2005			13	33	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2001 data established the baseline. The data reflect information provided by projects that are funded through the Special Demonstrations program and use the Web-based reporting system.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Web-based Annual Performance Reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The Web-based system that grantees use for reporting provides raw data</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets																																		
	Referrals to VR from Projects	Referrals from VR to Projects	Referrals to VR from Projects	Referrals from VR to Projects																																		
2001	8	37																																				
2002	8	29	10	58																																		
2003	20	22	10	60																																		
2004			10	62																																		
2005			13	33																																		

		<p>but does not aggregate the numbers needed, which has resulted in hand counting to obtain the information required.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The Department of Education internal programmer is being assisted by an outside contractor to remedy this problem.</p>
--	--	--

## RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Grants for Indians – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.250 - Rehabilitation Services\_American Indians with Disabilities

**Program Goal: To improve employment outcomes of American Indians with disabilities who live on or near reservations by providing effective tribal vocational rehabilitation services.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that eligible American Indians with disabilities receive vocational rehabilitation services and achieve employment outcomes consistent with their particular strengths, resources, abilities, capabilities, and interests.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Percentage of individuals who leave the program with employment outcomes: By the end of FY 2008, at least 65 percent of all eligible individuals who exit the program after receiving services under an individualized plan for employment will achieve an employment outcome.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of individuals who leave the program with employment outcomes.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 was the first year that a Web-based system was used to collect annual data for this program. However, not all grantees reported; and, for those who did, some data were missing. The 2004 data are preliminary, based on 93% of grantees reporting, and may change. The accuracy and validity of the data should improve as grantees gain more experience with the new reporting form and begin to collect and maintain the required data.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.            Data are supplied by project grantees, and no formal verification procedure has been applied.  <b>Limitations:</b> RSA staff must contact grantees regarding missing or apparently inconsistent data. This is a time consuming process.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	58			
1999	61			
2000	62	61		
2001	65	62		
2002	64	62		
2003	66	64.10		
2004	61.60	64.50		
2005		65		
2006		65		

<b>2007</b>		65		<b>Improvements:</b> Continued technical assistance will ensure that grantees are providing uniform data.
<b>2008</b>		65		



## RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Recreational Programs – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.128J - Recreational Programs

### Program Goal: Recreational Programs Internal Goal

#### Objective 8.1 of 1: Recreational Programs Internal Objective 1

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Project Continuation: The percentage of recreation programs sustained after federal funding ceases.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of projects in operation 1, 2, and 3 years after federal funding ceases.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> Previous reporting reflected only programs in operation 1 year after federal funding ceased. This new measure will indicate the cumulative number of programs in existence 1, 2, and 3 years following the end of federal funding. Number of programs being tracked after federal funding ceases: FY 1999 (N=4); 2000 (N=8); 2001(N=6); 2002 (N=9); 2003 (N=6); 2004 (N=10); 2005 (N=8). For 1999-2001, 12 of the 18 programs were still in operation.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Telephone monitoring</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2005</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Contacting past grantees.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
<b>2001</b>	66			
<b>2002</b>	80			
<b>2003</b>	75			
<b>2004</b>	83			66
<b>2005</b>		66		

## RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.126A - Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants

**Program Goal: Individuals with disabilities served by the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants program will achieve high-quality employment.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that individuals with disabilities who are served by the vocational rehabilitation (VR) state grants program achieve employment consistent with their particular strengths, resources, abilities, capabilities, and interests.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Employment Outcomes: Increase the percentage of (a) general and combined state VR agencies that assist at least 55.8% of individuals who receive services to achieve employment outcomes and (b) state VR agencies for the blind that assist at least 68.9% of individuals who receive services to achieve employment outcomes.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies that assist at least 55.8 percent of individuals receiving services to achieve employment.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>75</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>66</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	75		2003	66		2004		83	2005		75	<p><b>Explanation:</b> This indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on Indicator 1.2 in Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve employment of all individuals whose cases were closed after receiving services. In order to pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 55.8%, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 68.9%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005 Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Accuracy/consistency of reporting is</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
2002	75																		
2003	66																		
2004		83																	
2005		75																	
<p><i>Percentage obtaining employment for VR agencies for the blind</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>75</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	75												
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
2002	75																		

<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>58</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> </table>	2003	58		2004		83	2005		75			contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.						
2003	58																	
2004		83																
2005		75																
<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Competitive Employment: Increase the percentage of (a) general and combined state VR agencies that assist at least 72.6 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment and (b) state VR agencies for the blind that assist at least 50 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment.</b>																		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<i>Percentage obtaining competitive employment for general and combined VR agencies</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> This indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on Indicator 1.3 in Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve competitive employment of all individuals who achieve employment. To pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 72.6%, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 35.4%.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005 Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.  <b>Limitations:</b> Accuracy/consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees.															
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>96</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>96</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>94</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year			Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	96		2003	96		2004		93	2005		94	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets														
2002	96																	
2003	96																	
2004				93														
2005				94														
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>96</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2002			96														
2002	96																	
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>96</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2003			96														
2003	96																	
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>93</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2004		93															
2004		93																
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>94</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2005		94															
2005		94																
<i>Percentage obtaining competitive employment for VR agencies for the blind.</i>																		
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>79</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>87</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>87</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	79		2003	87		2004		85	2005		87			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																
2002	79																	
2003	87																	
2004		85																
2005		87																
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>79</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2002	79																
2002	79																	
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>87</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2003	87																
2003	87																	
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>85</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2004		85															
2004		85																
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>87</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2005		87															
2005		87																

				Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.															
<b>Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Competitive Employment for Individuals with disabilities: Increase the percentage of (a) general and combined state VR agencies for which at least 65 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities and (b) state VR agencies for the blind for which at least 89 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities.</b>																			
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<i>Percentage with significant disabilities for general and combined VR agencies.</i> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>96</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>100</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	96		2003	100		2004		89	2005		100	<b>Explanation:</b> This indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on Indicator 1.4 in 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals achieving competitive employment who have significant disabilities. To pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 62.4%, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 89 percent.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005 Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.  <b>Limitations:</b> Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
2002	96																		
2003	100																		
2004		89																	
2005		100																	
<i>Percentage with significant disabilities for VR agencies for the blind.</i> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>92</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>96</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>96</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	92		2003	96		2004		89	2005		96		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
2002	92																		
2003	96																		
2004		89																	
2005		96																	
<b>Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Competitive Employment: By 2008, (a) 91 percent of general and combined state VR agencies will assist at least 85</b>																			

percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment; and (b) 60 percent of state VR agencies for the blind will assist at least 65 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment.																											
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																								
<p><i>Percentage of general and combined state VR agencies assisting at least 85% of individuals to achieve competitive employment</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>84</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>89</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>91</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>91</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	84		2003	89		2004		67	2005		89	2006		89	2007		91	2008		91	<p><b>Explanation:</b> This long-term indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on Indicator 1.3 in Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve competitive employment of all individuals who achieve employment. To pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 72.6%, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 35.4%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005 Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluation Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Accuracy/consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																									
2002	84																										
2003	89																										
2004		67																									
2005		89																									
2006		89																									
2007		91																									
2008		91																									
<p><i>Percentage of state VR agencies for the blind assisting at least 65 percent of individuals to achieve competitive employment</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>50</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>54</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	50		2003	54		2004		48	2005		54	2006		54	2007		57	2008		60		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																									
2002	50																										
2003	54																										
2004		48																									
2005		54																									
2006		54																									
2007		57																									
2008		60																									

## RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.129 - Rehabilitation Long-Term Training

**Program Goal: To provide existing staff of public VR sector with continuing education to maintain and upgrade skills and knowledge.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: To provide graduates who work within the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) system to help individuals with disabilities achieve their goals.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Numbers trained: The number of students supported by RSA scholarships and the number of RSA scholars graduating will remain stable per constant \$1 million invested.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of scholars supported by RSA scholarships</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> After peaking in 2001, target performance decreased as college tuitions are rapidly increasing, while program funds are either level or decreasing.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual grantee reporting</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p>Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	1,600			
1998	1,550			
1999	1,665	1,473		
2000	2,390	2,000		
2001	2,540	2,000		
2002	2,232	2,000		
2003		2,050		
2004		2,050		
2005		2,100		

<i>The number of scholars graduating</i>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	800	
1998	817	
1999	832	729
2000	764	688
2001	841	700
2002	817	700
2003		725
2004		725
2005		725

  

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Percentage working: The percentage of graduates fulfilling their payback requirements through acceptable employment will increase annually.**

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>The percentage of graduates fulfilling their payback requirements through acceptable employment.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>72</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>71</td> <td>71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>85</td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>73</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2000	72	70	2001	71	71	2002	85	72	2003		72	2004		74	2005		73	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Targets were reduced for FY 2005, since more accurate data are being collected and indicate a lower performance level. There are two ways to increase the number of new graduates: increase the total number of graduates, or increase the ratio of new to returning students. At present there are not enough graduates entering state VR agencies to replace departing staff.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual granteed reporting form</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> We are using a new reporting system, which is being refined.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																					
2000	72	70																					
2001	71	71																					
2002	85	72																					
2003		72																					
2004		74																					
2005		73																					

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Maintain and upgrade the knowledge and skills of personnel currently employed in the public VR system.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>Percentage of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their state's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standards</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>69</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>71</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>65</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td>77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>70</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2000	69		2001	71	70	2002	65	75	2003		77	2004		79	2005		70	<p><b>Explanation:</b> 2002 data provided the first comprehensive and systematic approach to collecting this information. Anticipate a leveling off in performance as staff turnover is at an all-time high due to retirements, and there is an insufficient pool of qualified candidate to replenish the staff positions.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Evaluation. Ongoing collection could be through the In-Service Training program's annual performance report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data would be supplied through external RSA contractor. No formal verification procedure applied.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2000	69																								
2001	71	70																							
2002	65	75																							
2003		77																							
2004		79																							
2005		70																							



## 20 USC: Howard University – 2005

**Program Goal: To assist Howard University with financial resources needed to carry out its educational mission.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND ACHIEVEMENT BY (1) RECRUITING BETTER STUDENTS, (2) IMPROVING STUDENT RETENTION, (3) IMPROVING GRADUATION RATES, AND (4) PROMOTING EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Better students: The average SAT scores of incoming freshmen will increase by 1 percent per year.									
Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Average SAT score of incoming freshman</i>									
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
	Math	Verbal	Total	% Change	Math	Verbal	Total	% Change	
1997	494	513	1,007						
1998	506	519	1,025	1.80					
1999	517	533	1,050	2.40		1,035			
2000	525	537	1,062	1.10		1,061	2.50		
2001	516	530	1,046	-1.50		1,073	1.10		
2002	534	545	1,079	3.20		1,065	.50		
2003	537	544	1,081	.20		1,080	1.40		
2004						1,082	.20		
2005						1,083	.10		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Student retention: Decrease attrition for undergraduate FTIC (first time in college) students by 2 percent until national average is bettered.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Attrition rates for undergraduate FTIC students</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	% National Rate	% HU Rate	%	
1997	26.70	19.60		
1998	26.40	17.60		
1999	25	16		
2000	20	15.10	15	
2001	20.20	12.90	14	
2002	21	14.90	13	
2003	32.70	14.90	13	
2004			13	
2005			7	

**Additional Source Information:** The Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange. Howard University.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004

**Data Available:** March 2005

**Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Graduation rates: The undergraduate and graduate graduation rates will increase by 2 percent per year until the national average is reached or exceeded.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>6-year graduation rate</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Consortium Rate	HU Rate		
1997		49		
1998		40.90		
1999	54.20	46.10	43	
2000	54.10	48.70	48	
2001	54.90	51.30	50	
2002	54	48.80	52	
2003	45	54.80	52	
2004			55	
2005			58	
				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The reported 6-year national rate comes from the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange at the University of Oklahoma. Howard University is a member of the institution.</p>

Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Excellence in teaching and scholarship: The number of faculty in activities of the Fund for Academic Excellence will increase.						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of proposals</i>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Submitted	Funded	Participants	Funded	Participants	
1998	258	153	189			
1999	218	152	200			
2000	149	128	173	125	210	
2001	154	130	160	140	200	
2002	258	163	292	150	225	
2003	222	169	160	160	240	
2004				160	240	

**Explanation:** The principal goals for the Fund for Academic Excellence include 1) serving as a catalyst for increasing extramural research, 2) improving the quality of teaching and learning, and 3) encouraging new and junior faculty to participate in seeking institutional focused research.

**Additional Source Information:** Howard University  
**Frequency:** Annually.  
**Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004  
**Data Available:** March 2005  
**Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

**Objective 8.2 of 3: TO PROMOTE EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Grants received: The number of grant proposals that are funded will increase.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of grant proposals</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	232			
1998	279			
1999	299			
2000	252	301		
2001	261	260		
2002	250	270		
2003	313	275		

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Grant funding: The total funds received through research grants will increase.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Amount of funds received through research grants</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Value of Grants Received	% Change	Value of Grants Received	% Change
1997	45,268,427			
1998	44,057,827	-2.70		
1999	47,533,841	7.90		
2000	50,294,706	5.80	48,009,180	20
2001	53,416,128	6.20	51,700,000	
2002	63,000,000	17.90	53,800,000	
2003	65,608,032	4.10	65,000,000	
			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	

**Objective 8.3 of 3: INCREASE HOWARD UNIVERSITY'S FINANCIAL STRENGTH AND INDEPENDENCE FROM FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS.**

Indicator 8.3.1 of 4: Endowment: The value of the endowment each year will increase.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Market value of endowment (in millions)</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University &amp; the Chronicle of Higher Education.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Audited Financial Statements.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
1997	211.20		
1998	252.90		
1999	297		
2000	329.30	320	
2001	340.90	346	
2002	323.70		
2003	326.50		

Indicator 8.3.2 of 4: Outside support: The funds raised from all private sources will increase.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Alumni contributions (in millions)</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Audited Financial Statements.</p>
1997	11.80		
1998	8.40		
1999	9.20		
2000	13.90	11	
2001	18.40	14.50	
2002	18.30	18	
2003	42.40	20	
2004		35	
2005		35	



Indicator 8.3.3 of 4: Outside support—alumni: The participation rate of alumni who contribute to the school will increase.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Participation rate</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
1998	11.40		
1999	9.40		
2000	12.20	25	
2001	15	30	
2002	18	32	
2003	20	20.50	
2004		23	
2005		23	

Indicator 8.3.4 of 4: Cost savings at the Howard University Hospital: The difference between the hospital's net revenue (excluding federal appropriations) and total expenses will decrease.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Net Revenue</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
1997	170,084,807		
1998	183,789,977		
1999	204,360,845		
2000	213,879,600	184,510,111	
2001	216,598,823	193,735,617	
2002	225,252,566	203,422,397	
2003	214,206,000	226,394,000	
2004		234,522,000	
<i>Total Expense</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
1997	209,761,348		
1998	211,689,178		
1999	234,841,266		
2000	246,819,944	225,813,215	
2001	242,028,727	237,103,876	
2002	252,072,279	248,959,070	
2003	258,656,000	234,286,000	
2004		233,695,000	

## VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions – 2005

CFDA Number: 84.245 - Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that vocational students served in tribally controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institutions make successful transitions to work or continuing education.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary outcomes: An increasing percentage of vocational education students in the TCPVIP will receive an AA degree or certificate.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of vocational students in the TCPVIP who earn an AA degree or certificate.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Calculations of completion are based on degree completers relative to all students available to graduate (i.e.; students in their final semester).</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Percentage of students	Percentage of students		
<b>1999</b>	23			
<b>2000</b>	57	25		
<b>2001</b>	82	59		
<b>2002</b>	46	65		
<b>2003</b>	48	47		
<b>2004</b>	44	49		
<b>2005</b>		52		



The image features a horizontal rectangular area at the bottom with a marbled paper texture. The marbling consists of intricate, swirling patterns in shades of grey, white, and light brown. The text "All Goals" is centered within this marbled area.

**All Goals**

## DEOA: Office for Civil Rights - 2005

**Program Goal: To ensure equal access to education and promote educational excellence throughout the nation through the vigorous enforcement of civil rights.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: To provide high-quality customer service throughout the case-resolution process.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Customer Response: Percentage of satisfied customers.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish the baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected during the fiscal year (October 1 - September 30).  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005
<i>Percentage of respondents satisfied with OCR's customer service.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2005</b>		999		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: To obtain results by the efficient management of civil rights compliance activities.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Resolution of Complaints: Percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days of receipt.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days.</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected in OCR's Case Management System throughout the fiscal year (October 1- September 30).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
1997	80		
1998	81		
1999	80	80	
2000	78	80	
2001	84	80	
2002	89	80	
2003	91	80	
2004	92	80	
2005		80	