



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

February 1, 2008

MEMORANDUM

To: Deborah Price
Assistant Deputy Secretary
Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools

From: Keith West /s/
Assistant Inspector General for Audit Services

Subject: Office of Inspector General's Independent Report on the *U.S. Department of Education's Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2007*, dated January 30, 2008.

Attached is our authentication of management's assertions contained in the *U.S. Department of Education's Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2007*, dated January 30, 2008, as required by section 705(d) of the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. § 1704(d)).

Our authentication was conducted in accordance with the guidelines stated in the Office of National Drug Control Policy Circular: *Drug Control Accounting*, dated May 1, 2007.

If you have any questions or wish to discuss the contents of this authentication, please contact Michele Weaver-Dugan, Director, Operations Internal Audit Team, at (202) 245-6941.

Attachment



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

February 1, 2008

Office of Inspector General's Independent Report on the U.S. Department of Education's Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2007, dated January 30, 2008.

We have reviewed management's assertions contained in the accompanying Performance Summary Report, titled *Department of Education Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2007*, dated January 30, 2008. The U.S. Department of Education's management is responsible for the Performance Summary Report and the assertions contained therein.

Our review was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. A review is substantially less in scope than an examination, the objective of which is the expression of an opinion on management's assertions. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion.

We performed review procedures on the "Performance Summary Information," "Assertions," and "Criteria for Assertions" contained in the accompanying Performance Summary Report. In general, our review procedures were limited to inquiries and analytical procedures appropriate for our review engagement. We did not perform procedures related to controls over the reporting system noted in the attached report.

Based on our review, nothing came to our attention that caused us to believe that management's assertions, contained in the accompanying Performance Summary Report, are not fairly stated in all material respects, based upon the Office of National Drug Control Policy Circular: *Drug Control Accounting*, dated May 1, 2007.

Keith West /s/
Assistant Inspector General for Audit Services

Department of Education



Performance Summary Report Fiscal Year 2007

In Support of the

National Drug Control Strategy

As required by ONDCP Circular: *Drug Control Accounting*

January 30, 2008

Department of Education

Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Transmittal Letter 1

Performance Summary Information..... 2

 Safe Schools/Healthy Students 2

 Student Drug Testing..... 3

 Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants Program..... 7

 Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse..... 13

Assertions 17

 Performance Reporting System..... 17

 Methodology for Establishing Performance Targets17

 Performance Measures for Significant Drug Control Activities 18

Criteria for Assertions 18

Mr. John P. Higgins, Jr.
Inspector General
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20202-1510

Dear Mr. Higgins:

As required by Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) Circular *Drug Control Accounting*, enclosed please find detailed information about performance-related measures for key drug control programs administered by the U.S. Department of Education, in accordance with the guidelines in the circular dated May 1, 2007. This information corresponds to the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program, which is the Department's only Drug Control Budget Decision Unit displayed in the *National Drug Control Budget Summary*.

Consistent with the instructions in the ONDCP Circular, please provide your authentication to me in writing and I will transmit it to ONDCP along with the enclosed Performance Summary Report. As you know, ONDCP requests these documents by February 1, 2008 if possible. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about the enclosed information.

Sincerely,

Deborah A. Price
Assistant Deputy Secretary for
Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools

Performance Summary Information

Safe Schools/Healthy Students

Measure 1: The percentage of grantees demonstrating a decrease in substance abuse over the three-year grant period (Safe Schools/Healthy Students – FY 2004 and FY 2005 Cohorts)

Table 1

Cohort	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Target	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target
2004	n/a	n/a	n/a	75	90	pending	none
2005	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	none	pending	86.25

The measure. This performance measure is for the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative, a joint project of the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Justice. The initiative provides grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to support the development and implementation of a comprehensive plan designed to prevent student drug use and violence and support healthy youth development.

This measure, one of four for this initiative, focuses on one of the primary purposes of the initiative – reduced student drug use. The initiative, and this measure, is directly related to the National Drug Control Strategy’s goal of preventing drug use before it begins. Grantees select and report on one or more measures of prevalence of drug use for students. For the FY 2004 – 2006 cohorts, those grantee measures are not common across grant sites but, rather, reflect priority drug use problems identified by sites.

FY 2007 Performance Results. Because the measure is established to look at progress over the three-year grant period, it has just a single target for the third year of implementation of each cohort. Sites were not required to provide or collect baseline data at the time of application or before program interventions were implemented, so grantees provided baseline data for their selected measures related to drug use after year one (for example in FY 2005 for the FY 2004 cohort). Grantees from the FY 2004 cohort provided data in late November 2007 as part of a semi-annual performance report. Those data will be aggregated later in FY 2008 to determine if the FY 2007 target for the cohort has been met. Interim data for the 2005 cohort will also be reported on the same approximate time schedule.

FY 2008 Performance Targets. The FY 2005 cohort will be providing data for this measure near the end of 2008. The 2007 target for this cohort was set based on the results from the FY 2004 cohort; we calculated an increase of 15 percentage points in terms of grantees demonstrating decreased substance abuse in year two of the FY 2004 cohort. Because GPRA measures for this initiative were first implemented for the FY 2004 cohort, targets for this initial cohort represented our judgment at the time, given

the significant size of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grants and the emphasis on research-based programs that is central to the initiative. We elected to revise the target for the FY 2005 cohort for the measure based on the actual performance to date (implementation year two) of the FY 2004 cohort. Based on our professional judgment, it seemed that the revised target of 86.25 percent was appropriately aggressive and that attaining that target would be a meaningful outcome for the program, while acknowledging that our target for the initial (FY 2004) cohort may have been unrealistic.

Methodology. Data are collected by grantees, generally using student surveys. Data are furnished in the second of two semi-annual performance reports provided by grantees each project year. If grantees identified more than one measure of drug abuse, or provided data for individual school-building types (for example, separate data for middle and high schools), grantees were considered to have experienced a decrease in substance abuse if data for a majority of measures provided reflected a decrease. If a grant site provided data for an even number of measures and half of those measures reflected a decrease and half reflected no change or an increase, that grant site was judged not to have demonstrated a decrease in substance abuse. The response rate for the FY 2004 cohort for this measure was 35 percent. While most sites were able to provide some data related to this measure, we considered as valid data only data from sites that used the same elements/items in each of years one and two.

If data for this measure are not available at the time that performance reports are submitted, staff follow up with sites to attempt to obtain data for the measure. Grantees that fail to provide data are not included in the tabulation of data for the measures. Also, grantees that did not provide data for two consecutive project years (so that we could determine if a decrease in substance abuse had occurred) are not included in data report for the measure. Authorized representatives for the grant site sign the annual performance report and, in doing so, certify that to the best of the signers' knowledge and belief, all data in the performance report are true and correct and that the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relies on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and does not conduct further reviews.

Targets were established for this measure after the baseline data for the FY 2004 cohort were provided. Based on the final results for this first cohort, targets for future cohorts may need to be adjusted. (For example, the target for the FY 2005 cohort was already adjusted.)

Student Drug Testing

Measure 2: The percentage of student drug testing grantees that experience a 5 percent reduction in current (30-day) illegal drug use by students in the target population. (Student Drug Testing – FY 2003 and FY 2005 cohorts)

Table 2

Cohort	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Target	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a	33	50	pending	n/a
2005	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	33	pending	50

The measure. This measure is one of two measures for the Student Drug-Testing Programs grant competition. The competition provides discretionary grants to LEAs, community-based organizations, or other public and private entities to support implementation of drug testing of students, consistent with the parameters established by the U.S. Supreme Court or for students and their families that voluntarily agree to participate in the student drug testing program.

This measure is directly related to the National Drug Control Strategy's goal related to preventing drug use before it starts. Student drug testing has been prominently featured in recent annual versions of the strategy as a recommended drug prevention intervention.

FY 2007 Performance Results. Data for the FY 2003 cohort will be submitted as part of final reports for these grants. The grantees are currently operating under no-cost extensions; final reports were due at the end of 2007, and aggregate data will be available in March 2008.

We have completed a preliminary review of data submitted by the FY 2005 cohort for this measure and have identified significant concerns about the quality and comparability of the data. Grant sites have reported on prevalence rates for a variety of illegal drugs and have not always provided data from the same items/elements across project years one and two. Based on these concerns, we will be obtaining assistance from the U.S. Department of Education's Data Quality Initiative contractor to create and disseminate detailed data collection and reporting guidance for the program, as well as data standards that we will use to determine what constitutes valid data for this measure. After that project is complete in 2008, we will aggregate and report data for the FY 2005 cohort based on these standards and report it.

FY 2008 Performance Targets. We established targets for the percentage of grantees experiencing a 5 percent reduction in current illegal drug use after reviewing the first two years of data for the FY 2003 cohort of grant sites. Consistent with research that suggests that changes in student behavior related to student drug testing may not be realized immediately, we assumed that we could look for an increased number of grantees to experience positive change and, using our professional judgment, set that target at 50 percent of grantees. When we have received data for three project years from a single cohort of sites, we will revisit targets for future cohorts. We may also need to consider revising targets for future cohorts based on full results from the FY 2005 cohort because the FY 2003 cohort is very small (only 8 sites) and may not be typical of other cohorts.

Methodology Data are collected by grantees using student surveys. Data are provided as part of the grantees' annual performance reports. Grantees do not use the same survey items to collect data for this measure but, rather, self-select survey items (often from surveys already administered) in order to provide these data. Survey items may relate to different substances, but must collect information concerning current use in order to be included in the data reported for this measure. Grantees did not provide baseline data in their applications, so we have to wait until grantees provide data from project year one and two in order to determine if they have experienced a decrease in substance abuse. For the FY 2003 cohort, project implementation was delayed for one full year while grantees sought needed institutional review board clearance to drug test students, so performance data were received in 2005 and 2006. Only 3 of 8 grantees provided comparable data across the first two years of their project.

Authorized representatives for the grant site sign the annual performance report and, in doing so, certify that to the best of the signer's knowledge and belief, all data in the performance report are true and correct and that the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relies on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and does not conduct further reviews.

No new grants were awarded under this program in FY 2004.

The anticipated levels of decrease in substance abuse are consistent with those included in the National Drug Control Strategy – five percent per year. Targets were established following the report of baseline data for grant sites from the FY 2003 cohort.

Measure 3: The percentage of student drug testing grantees that experience a 5 percent reduction in past-year illegal drug use by students in the target population. (Student Drug Testing – FY 2003 and FY 2005 cohort)

Table 3

Cohort	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Target	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a	25	50	Pending	n/a
2005	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25	Pending	50

The measure. This measure is one of two measures for the Student Drug-Testing Programs grant competition. The competition provides discretionary grants to LEAs, community-based organizations, or other public and private entities to support implementation of drug testing of students, consistent with the parameters established by the U.S. Supreme Court or for students and their families that voluntarily agree to participate in the student drug testing program.

This measure is directly related to the National Drug Control Strategy's goal related to preventing drug use before it starts. Student drug testing has been prominently

featured in recent annual versions of the strategy as a recommended drug prevention intervention.

FY 2007 Performance Results. Data for the FY 2003 cohort will be submitted as part of final reports for these grants. The grantees are currently operating under no-cost extensions; final reports were due at the end of 2007, and aggregate data will be available in March 2008.

We have completed a preliminary review of data submitted by the FY 2005 cohort for this measure and have identified significant concerns about the quality and comparability of the data. Grant sites have reported on prevalence rates for a variety of illegal drugs and have not always provided data from the same items/elements across project years one and two. Based on these and other concerns, we will be obtaining assistance from the U.S. Department of Education's Data Quality Initiative contractor to create and disseminate detailed data collection and reporting guidance for the program, as well as standards that we will use to determine what constitutes valid data for this measure. After that project is complete in 2008, we will aggregate data based on these standards and report it.

FY 2008 Performance Targets. We established targets for percentage of grantees experiencing a 5 percent reduction in past-year illegal drug use after reviewing the first two years of data for the FY 2003 cohort of grant sites. Consistent with research that suggests that changes in student behavior related to student drug testing may not be realized immediately, we assumed that we could look for an increased number of grantees to experience positive change and, using our professional judgment, set that target at 50 percent of grantees. When we have received data for three project years from a single cohort of sites, we'll revisit targets for future cohorts. We may also need to consider revising targets for future cohorts based on full results from the FY 2005 cohort because the FY 2003 cohort is very small (only 8 sites) and may not be typical of other cohorts.

Methodology Data are collected by grantees using student surveys. Data are provided as part of the grantees' annual performance reports. Grantees do not use the same survey items to collect data for this measure but, rather, self-select survey items (often from surveys already administered) in order to provide this data. Survey items may relate to different substances, but must collect information concerning annual use in order to be included in the data reported for this measure.

Authorized representatives for the grant site sign the annual performance report and, in doing so, certify that to the best of the signer's knowledge and belief, all data in the performance report are true and correct and that the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relies on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and does not conduct further reviews.

The levels of anticipated decrease in substance abuse are consistent with those included in the National Drug Control Strategy – five percent per year. Targets were established following the report of baseline data for grant sites from the FY 2003 cohort. When we have received data for three project years from a single cohort of sites, we'll revisit targets for future years in other cohorts.

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants

Measure 4: 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 (Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grants)

Table 4

FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Target	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target
29	None	25	None	27	Pending	None

The measure. This measure is one of three measures directly related to reducing student drug or alcohol use for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) State Grants. This formula grant program provides funds to the States, based on school-aged population and the State's relative share of Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I concentration grant funds, to support drug and violence prevention programs. The measure directly relates to the National Drug Control Strategy Goal of preventing youth drug use by focusing on the extent to which illegal drugs are available on school property.

FY 2007 Performance Results. FY 2007 data will be available in September 2008. We established targets for this measure by reviewing trends in this measure over time and identifying a target that reflects continuing achievable reductions.

FY 2008 Performance Targets. There are no targets for this program in FY 2008 because data are collected only in the odd-numbered years.

Methodology. Data for this measure are collected from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12 as part of the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Data are collected in odd years and reported in the following even years. No data are collected for even years and, as a result, no targets have been established for even years.

Detailed information about the methodology used to sample and report data for the YRBSS is available at the CDC website at: <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/ss5505a1.htm>. We rely on the assertions provided about methodology presented by CDC in using this data to report on performance of SDFSC State Grants.

Measure 5: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who used marijuana one or more times during the past 30 days. (SDFSC State Grants)

Table 5

FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Target	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target
22	None	20	None	19	Pending	None

The measure. This measure is one of three measures directly related to reducing student drug and alcohol use for SDFSC State Grants. This formula grant program provides funds to the States, based on school-aged population and the State’s relative share of Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I concentration grant funds, to support drug and violence prevention programs. The measure is directly related to the National Drug Control Strategy Goal of preventing youth drug use by focusing on the extent of current use by high school aged-youth of the most prevalent illegal drug.

FY 2007 Performance Results. FY 2007 data will be available in September 2008.

FY 2008 Performance Targets. There are no targets for this program in FY 2008 because data are collected only in the odd-numbered years.

Methodology. Data for this measure are collected from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12 as part of the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Data are collected in odd years and reported in the following even years. No data are collected for even years and, as a result, no targets have been established for even years.

Detailed information about the methodology used to sample and report data for the YRBSS is available at the CDC website at:
<http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/ss5505a1.htm>. We rely on the assertions provided about the methodology presented by CDC in using this data to report on performance of SDFSC State Grants.

Measure 6: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who had five or more drinks of alcohol in a row one or more times during the past 30 days. (SDFSC State Grants)

Table 6

FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Target	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target
28	None	26	None	26	Pending	None

The measure. This measure is one of three measures related to reducing student drug or alcohol use for SDFSC Grants. This formula grant program provides funds to the States, based on school-aged population and the State's relative share of Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I concentration grant funds, to support drug and violence prevention programs. The measure is directly related to the National Drug Control Strategy Goal of preventing youth drug use by focusing on the prevalence of binge drinking by high school aged-students. While alcohol is not explicitly an emphasis of the National Drug Control Strategy, illegal use of alcohol can be associated with use of other illegal drugs.

FY 2007 Performance Results. FY 2007 data will be available in September 2008.

FY 2008 Performance Targets. There are no targets for this program in FY 2008 because data are collected only in the odd-numbered years.

Methodology. Data for this measure are collected from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12 as part of the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Data are collected in odd years and reported in the following even years. No data are collected for even years and as a result no targets have been established for even years.

Detailed information about the methodology used to sample and report data for the YRBSS is available at the CDC website at: <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/ss5505a1.htm>. We rely on the assertions provided about the methodology presented by CDC in using this data to report on performance of SDFSC State Grants.

Measure 7: The percentage of drug and violence prevention programs/practices supported with SDFSC State Grant funds that are research based. (SDFSC State Grants)

Table 7

FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Target	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target
None	None	7.8	None	None	None	11.7

The measure. This measure examines the extent to which programs and practices supported with SDFSC State Grant funds are based on research. The measure supports attainment of National Drug Control Strategy goals by focusing on the quality of programs supported with SDFSC State Grants funds and the likelihood that the programs will reduce or prevent youth drug use.

FY 2007 Performance Results. No target is established for this measure in FY 2007; data are collected every three years.

FY 2008 Performance Targets. A target of 11.7 percent has been established for FY 2008. We considered the challenges involved in encouraging the adoption of research-based programs and, using our professional judgment, we established a target for a 50 percent increase over the baseline in the prevalence of research-based programs implemented in schools. Although the target appears modest, it requires change in a very significant number of schools and districts in order to be achieved.

The next data collection is scheduled to collect information about programs implemented during the current (2007-2008) school year, so our remaining ability to influence performance on this measure for the next target is limited. However, we have established this issue as one of our strategic priorities for the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools 2008 organizational assessment. As part of that effort, SDFSC State Grant program staff have developed a plan to emphasize adoption and implementation of research-based programs. Strategies include requesting State protocols/standards for approving applications and providing waivers, focusing phone monitoring contacts on this issue, examining protocols to identify compliance issues and technical assistance needs, and identifying and disseminating best practices in this area based on protocols and monitoring activities.

Methodology. Baseline data for this measure were collected from a nationally representative sample of schools under a contract supported by ED. As a first step, the contractor developed a large list of research-based programs and then screened those programs to identify programs that were relevant to the SDFSC State Grants program; had at least two empirical studies completed that met stringent methodological standards; had implementation materials available; used at least two independent samples in program evaluations; and demonstrated an adequate level of program effectiveness.

The contractor collected data for the measure using surveys of national probability samples of public elementary and secondary schools and the school districts with which they were associated. The surveys – conducted using both mail and web-based approaches – gathered information on prevention programs operating during the 2004-2005 school year. Survey information was collected between fall 2005 and spring 2006.

The sample design included 2,500 districts, and nearly 6,000 schools that were sampled from the 2,500 districts. The contractor used the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) national sample frame. The NAEP sample frame is derived from the 2003-2004 National Center for Education Statistics Common Core of Data (CCD) Public Elementary and Secondary School Universe and Agency files. Using the NAEP sample frame allowed the contractor to take advantage of edits already made to the CCD files (for example eliminating administrative school districts from the sample frame).

Survey instruments used included 89 prevention programs; respondents were also able to write in any programs omitted from those listed. The contractor received responses from 91 percent of the districts included in the sample and 86 percent of schools. The study conducted by the contractor to obtain data for this measure has some limitations that are the result of both the research synthesis and survey data collections. Despite significant efforts to be comprehensive, it is possible that the literature searches used may not have identified some published studies on prevention programs, and as a result, the number of research-based program may be understated.

Some other study limitations pertain to the quality of data collected via the surveys. Recall problems and responses from less knowledgeable respondents in some schools and districts (particularly among schools and districts that provided information late in the collection period) may have affected the quality of data. Schools may have also over-reported the prevention programs operating in their schools because respondents confused the specific named program in the survey with other similarly named but different programs.

Data for this measure will be collected every three years. A second data point for this measure will be collected in 2008-2009; information will reflect 2007-2008 school year practices.

Measure 8: The percentage of drug and violence prevention curriculum programs that are implemented with fidelity. (SDFSC State Grants)

Table 8

FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Target	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target
None	None	44.3	None	None	None	50.9

The measure. This measure examines the extent to which research-based curriculum programs supported with SDFSC State Grant funds are implemented with fidelity. The measure supports attainment of National Drug Control Strategy goals by focusing on the quality of implementation of the research-based programs and practices supported with SDFSC State Grants funds, and the corresponding likelihood that the programs will reduce or prevent youth drug use.

FY 2007 Performance Results. No targets were established for this measure for FY 2007 since the data are collected every three years.

FY 2008 Performance Targets. We established a target of 50.9 percent for FY 2008. We considered the challenges involved in encouraging the adoption of research-based programs and, using our professional judgment, we established a target for a 15 percent increase over the baseline data in the percentage of drug prevention programs that are implemented with fidelity. Although the target appears modest, it means change in a very significant number of schools and districts in order to be achieved.

Methodology. Baseline data for this measure were collected from a nationally representative sample of schools under a contract supported by ED. Data were collected in the fall of 2006, and reflected information about programs and practices implemented during the 2004-2005 school year. The contractor developed a list of research-based programs and compared information about programs and practices being implemented with SDFSC State Grants funds with the list of research-based program and practices. (See discussion for Measure 7)

The contractor then followed up with a subset of respondents to examine the extent to which research-based programs and practices were implemented in a manner consistent with implementation keys for individual programs (as determined by program developers). The contractor focused its review on the 10 programs (from the list of 21 research-based programs) that were implemented most frequently by respondents to the initial phase of the study.

The contractor mailed copies of questionnaires to principals and program implementers to each school that reported operating at least one research-based program in the response to the earlier survey. The response rate for the questionnaire supplied to program implementers was 78 percent; the response rate for questionnaires completed by principals was 70 percent.

The study developed program-specific measures of quality implementation for each of the research-based programs identified by the study. The standards were based on program developer's specifications for individual programs. Aspects of implementation considered included issues such as frequency of student participation; number of lessons delivered; and topics covered. Based on applying these quality standards to data supplied on the two questionnaires, the contractor identified the percentage of research-based programs that were implemented according to the standards identified by the program developer (which the study refers to as being implemented with "fidelity").

This aspect of the study has some limitations related to the application of the program-specific standards for assessing the quality of program implementation and from the additional survey data questionnaires. Valid measurement of quality of implementation required that a program developer's program specifications be applied to implementer reports on that specific program. In some cases, responses raised questions about whether respondents were reporting on the correct program. Study staff worked to confirm that implementers were reporting on the correct program; in cases where the implementer reported on the wrong program, that report was considered invalid and not included in the final data. If responses suggested that the program implementer reported on the wrong program and confirmation could not be made, those cases were also excluded from analyses.

Similar problems occurred for programs that had multiple components or different versions that are implemented for different ages or grade levels. Study staff reviewed

program materials for different components or versions and worked to identify the program standards most closely related to the various components or versions. If a meaningful standard for a component or measure could be developed, the case was included in the analyses; if not, the program was omitted.

Limitations related to data quality from questionnaires also exist. Because a substantial number of cases were ineligible for inclusion in the study analyses for the reasons described above, the number of valid cases was reduced, leading in turn to decreased precision in estimates and larger than expected standard errors and confidence intervals. Similar recall problems caused by the gap between program implementation and data collection (as discussed for the previous measure) may have also impacted data quality. Finally, the quality of reports varied by the extent to which respondents were in a position to observe actual implementation and intentionally bias reports. Program implementers may have difficulty in providing objective information about programs they are responsible for establishing. However, previous research using similar measures suggests that this ‘social desirability’ bias is likely to be low.

Data for this measure will be collected every three years. A second data point for this measure will be collected in 2008-2009; information will reflect 2007-2008 school year practices.

Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse

Measure 9: The percentage of grantees whose target students show a measurable decrease in binge drinking (Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse Program – FY 2004 and FY 2005 cohorts)

Table 9

Cohort	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Target	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target
2004	n/a	n/a	n/a	50	70	pending	n/a
2005	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	none	65.2%	75

The measure. This measure examines a key outcome for the Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse (GRAA) program – reduction in binge drinking for the target population. While the National Drug Control Strategy is focused most intensively on preventing the use of controlled substances, the strategy does address the role of alcohol as a drug of choice for teenagers. Data do suggest that early use of alcohol is more likely to result in heavy later use of alcohol.

FY 2007 Performance Results. Actual performance data for FY 2007 for the FY 2004 cohort will be contained in final reports for these grant projects. Grants are currently operating in no-cost extensions; generally, final reports will be due at the end of 2008 for this cohort. Data will be aggregated and available in March 2009.

No FY 2007 target exists for the FY 2005 cohort for this measure since the first two performance reports were necessary in order to establish baseline data for this cohort.

FY 2008 Performance Targets. We have established a performance target of 75 percent for FY 2008 for this measure for the FY 2005 cohort. We elected to adjust the target for this measure to reflect the fact that a significantly greater number of grantees posted decreases in binge drinking at baseline. The target of 75 percent reflects an increase over the year three target for the prior (FY 2004) cohort, but a smaller increase between baseline and year three because of the performance of the FY 2005 cohort of grantees at baseline.

Methodology. Data for this measure are collected by grantees and reported as part of annual performance reports. If data for this measure are not available at the time that performance reports are submitted, staff follow up with sites to attempt to obtain data for the measure. Grantees that fail to provide data are not included in the tabulation of data for the measures. Also, grantees that did not provide data for two consecutive project years (so that we could determine if a decrease in binge drinking had occurred) are not included in data report for the measure. Authorized representatives for the grant site sign the annual performance report and, in doing so, certify that to the best of the signer's knowledge and belief, all data in the performance report are true and correct and that the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relies on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and does not conduct further reviews.

ED does not mandate data collection protocols or instruments for grantees. Grantees select a survey item that reflects the concept of binge drinking, and collect and report data about that survey item as part of their performance reports. As a result, data are not comparable across grant sites, but individual grant sites are required to use the same survey items across performance periods.

Applicants are not required to furnish baseline data as part of their applications. Data supplied after year one are considered baseline data for the projects. Projects require two years of data in order to determine if a decrease in binge drinking among target students has occurred.

Measure 10: 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 (Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse – FY 2004 and FY 2005 cohorts)

Table 10

Cohort	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Target	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target
2004	n/a	n/a	n/a	55.6	76	pending	n/a
2005	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	none	70.1	80

The measure. This measure examines a key outcome for the Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse (GRAA) program – perception of health risk for alcohol abuse among target students. While the National Drug Control Strategy is focused most intensively on preventing the use of controlled substances, the Strategy does address the role of alcohol use as a drug of choice for teenagers. Data do suggest that changes in perceptions about risks to health resulting from alcohol use are positively correlated with reductions in alcohol use.

FY 2007 Performance Results. Actual performance data for FY 2007 for the FY 2004 cohort will be contained in final reports for these grant projects. Grants are currently operating in no-cost extensions; generally, final reports will be due at the end of 2008 for this cohort. Data will be aggregated and available in March 2009.

No FY 2007 target exists for the FY 2005 cohort for this measure since the first two performance reports were necessary in order to establish baseline data for this cohort.

FY 2008 Performance Targets. We have established a performance target of 80 percent for FY 2008 for this measure for the FY 2005 cohort. We elected to adjust the target for this measure to reflect the fact that a significantly greater number of grantees posted decreases in binge drinking at baseline than was the case for the FY 2004 cohort. The target of 80 percent reflects an increase over the year three target for the prior (FY 2004) cohort, but a smaller increase between baseline and year three because of the performance of the FY 2005 cohort of grantees at baseline.

Methodology. Data for this measure are collected by grantees and reported as part of annual performance reports. If data for this measure are not available at the time that performance reports are submitted, staff follow up with sites to attempt to obtain data for the measure. Grantees that fail to provide data are not included in the tabulation of data for the measures. Also, grantees that did not provide data for two consecutive project years (so that we could determine if an increase in the percentage of students that believe that alcohol abuse is harmful to their health had occurred) are not included in data report for the measure. Authorized representatives for the grant site sign the annual performance report and, in doing so, certify that to the best of the signers' knowledge and belief, all data in the performance report are true and correct and that the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relies on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and does not conduct further reviews.

ED does not mandate data collection protocols or instruments for grantees. Grantees select a survey item that reflects the concept of binge drinking, and collect and report data about that survey item as part of performance reports. As a result, data are not comparable across grant sites, but individual grant sites are required to use the same survey items across performance periods.

Applicants are not required to furnish baseline data as part of their applications. Data supplied after year one are considered baseline data for the projects. Projects require two years of data in order to determine if a decrease in binge drinking among target students has occurred.

Measure 11: The percentage of grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who disapprove of alcohol abuse (Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse – FY 2004 and FY 2005 Cohorts)

Table 11

Cohort	FY 2003 Actual	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Target	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target
2004	n/a	n/a	n/a	66.7	87	pending	n/a
2005	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	none	71.2	87

The measure. This measure examines a key outcome for the Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse (GRAA) program – perception of health risk for alcohol abuse among target students. While the National Drug Control Strategy is focused most intensively on the preventing the use of controlled substances, the Strategy does address the role of alcohol use as a drug of choice for teenagers. Data do suggest that increases in the percentage of target students who believe that alcohol abuse is not socially acceptable are associated with declines in consumption of alcohol.

FY 2007 Performance Results. Actual performance data for FY 2007 for the FY 2004 cohort will be contained in final reports for these grant projects. Grants are currently operating in no-cost extensions; generally. Final reports will be due at the end of 2008 for this cohort. Data will be aggregated and available in March 2009.

No FY 2007 target exists for the FY 2005 cohort for this measure since the first two performance reports were necessary in order to establish baseline data for this cohort.

FY 2008 Performance Targets. We have established a performance target of 87 percent for FY 2008 for this measure for the FY 2005 cohort. We retained the target from the FY 2004 cohort for this measure since it is an aggressive target (requiring that nearly all grantees achieve improvement for this measure), and the baseline differences between cohorts were smaller than in the other two measures for this program.

Methodology. Data for this measure are collected by grantees and reported as part of annual performance reports. If data for this measure are not available at the time that

performance reports are submitted, staff follow up with sites to attempt to obtain data for the measure. Grantees that fail to provide data are not included in the tabulation of data for the measures. Also, grantees that did not provide data for two consecutive project years (so that we could determine if an increase in the percentage of students that disapprove of alcohol abuse had occurred) are not included in data report for the measure. Authorized representatives for the grant site sign the annual performance report, and in doing so, certify that to the best of the signer's knowledge and belief, all data in the performance report are true and correct and that the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relies on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and does not conduct further reviews.

ED does not mandate data collection protocols or instruments for grantees. Grantees select a survey item that reflects the concept of binge drinking, and collect and report data about that survey item as part of performance reports. As a result, data are not comparable across grant sites, but individual grant sites are required to use the same survey items across performance periods.

Applicants are not required to furnish baseline data as part of their applications. Data supplied after year one are considered baseline data for the projects. Projects require two years of data in order to determine if a decrease in binge drinking among target students has occurred.

Assertions

Performance Reporting System

The Department of Education has a system in place to capture performance information accurately and that system was properly applied to generate the performance data in this report. In instances in which data are supplied by grantees as part of required periodic performance reports, the data that are supplied are accurately reflected in this report.

Data related to the drug control programs included in this Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2007 are recorded in the Department of Education's software for recording performance data and are an integral part of our budget and management processes.

Methodology for Establishing Performance Targets

The methodology described in the Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2007 to establish performance targets for the current year is reasonable given past performance and available resources.

Performance Measures for Significant Drug Control Activities

The Department of Education has established at least one acceptable performance measure for each Drug Control Decision Unit identified in its Detailed Accounting of Fiscal Year 2007 Drug Control Funds.

Criteria for Assertions

Data

No workload or participant data support the assertions provided in this report. Sources of quantitative data used in the report are well documented. These data are the most recently available and are identified by the year in which the data was collected.

Other Estimation Methods

No estimation methods other than professional judgment were used to make the required assertions. When professional judgment was used, the objectivity and strength of those judgments were explained and documented. Professional judgment was used to establish targets for programs until data from at least one grant cohort were available to provide additional information needed to set more accurate targets. We routinely re-evaluate targets set using professional judgment as additional information about actual performance on measures becomes available.

Reporting Systems

Reporting systems that support the above assertions are current, reliable, and an integral part of the Department of Education's budget and management processes. Data collected and reported for the measures discussed in this report are stored in the Department of Education's Visual Performance System (VPS). The VPS includes appropriate disclosures about data quality issues associated with measures. Data from the VPS are used in developing annual budget requests and justifications, and in preparing reports required under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993.