

# **Fiscal Year 2007 Program Performance Plan**

**U.S. Department of Education  
February 6, 2006**



# Contents

Introduction.....	1
-------------------	---

## Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement

APEB: American Printing House for the Blind.....	5
CRA: Training and Advisory Services .....	10
ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers .....	12
ESEA: Advanced Credentialing.....	17
ESEA: Advanced Placement.....	18
ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity.....	21
ESEA: Charter Schools Grants .....	23
ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities.....	26
ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development.....	28
ESEA: Early Reading First .....	30
ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians.....	32
ESEA: English Language Acquisition .....	34
ESEA: Foreign Language Assistance .....	40
ESEA: Impact Aid Basic Support Payments .....	41
ESEA: Impact Aid Construction.....	42
ESEA: Impact Aid Payments for Children with Disabilities .....	44
ESEA: Impact Aid Payments for Federal Property.....	45
ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants .....	46
ESEA: Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies.....	49
ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries .....	51
ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance.....	53
ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships .....	55
ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program .....	58
ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program .....	64
ESEA: Reading First State Grants .....	66
ESEA: Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution .....	69
ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television.....	70
ESEA: Rural Education .....	72
ESEA: Special Programs for Indian Children .....	74
ESEA: State Assessments .....	77
ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs .....	81
ESEA: Striving Readers .....	84
ESEA: Teaching American History.....	86
ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies.....	87
ESEA: Transition To Teaching .....	89
ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers .....	91
ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice .....	93

## Goal 2 (continued)

ESRA: Comprehensive Centers.....	95
ESRA: National Assessment.....	97
HEA: High School Equivalency Program .....	98
IDEA: Special Education Grants for Infants and Families.....	100
IDEA: Special Education Grants to States .....	104
IDEA: Special Education Personnel Preparation .....	111
IDEA: Special Education Preschool Grants .....	114
MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths.....	117

## Goal 3: Develop Safe and Drug-Free Schools

ESEA: Character Education.....	121
ESEA: Mentoring Program .....	122
ESEA: Physical Education Program.....	124
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Other National Programs.....	126

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

ESEA: Indian Education - National Activities .....	131
ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination .....	132
ESRA: Research in Special Education.....	136
RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research.....	138

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

AEFLA: Adult Basic and Literacy State Grants .....	145
AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities .....	150
AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy .....	151
ATA: Assistive Technology Programs.....	153
EDA: Gallaudet University.....	157
EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf.....	163
HEA: AID Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions .....	166
HEA: AID Minority Science and Engineering Improvement .....	170
HEA: AID Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions .....	172
HEA: AID Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities.....	175
HEA: AID Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions.....	178
HEA: AID Strengthening Institutions .....	180
HEA: AID Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities.....	184
HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents in School .....	187
HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program .....	190
HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.....	192

## Goal 5 (continued)

HEA: Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) .....	194
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Domestic Programs .....	198
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Institute for International Public Policy .....	211
HEA: Javits Fellowships .....	213
HEA: SFA Federal Direct Student Loans .....	215
HEA: SFA Federal Family Education Loan Program & Liquidating .....	216
HEA: SFA Federal Pell Grants .....	217
HEA: SFA Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants .....	219
HEA: SFA Federal Work-Study .....	220
HEA: Student Aid Administration.....	221
HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers .....	223
HEA: TRIO McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement .....	224
HEA: TRIO Student Support Services .....	226
HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults.....	229
MECEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Overseas Programs .....	231
RA: Client Assistance State Grants.....	237
RA: Independent Living Centers .....	239
RA: Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals .....	242
RA: Independent Living State Grants.....	244
RA: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights .....	246
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs.....	247
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Grants for Indians .....	249
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants .....	251
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training.....	256
USC: Howard University.....	260
VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions .....	262

## Goal 6: Establish Management Excellence

DEOA: Office for Civil Rights.....	265
DEOA: Office of Inspector General .....	267

## Ongoing Plans Without FY 2007 Measures

ESRA: Statistics .....	271
------------------------	-----



# 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 *FY 2007 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 *FY 2007 Performance Plan*. The *FY 2007 Performance Plan* is located on our Web site at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2007plan/index.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**

**HEA = Higher Education Act**

**HKNCNA = Helen Keller National Center Act**

**IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**MECEA = Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act**

**MVHAA = McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act**

**RA = Rehabilitation Act**

**SFA = Student Financial Assistance Programs**

**USC = United States Code**

**VTEA = Vocational and Technical Education Act**





# **Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement**



# APEB: American Printing House for the Blind - FY 2007

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

---

**Objective 1 of 2:** *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 1.1 of 2:** 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.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 4:</b> The percentage of trustees who agree that the American Printing House's educational materials are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.		
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	100	98
2006		98
2007		98

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 4:</b> The percentage of advisory committee members who agree that the American Printing House's educational materials are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	100	100
2000	100	100
2001	100	100
2002	100	100

<b>2003</b>	100	100
<b>2004</b>	100	100
<b>2005</b>	100	100
<b>2006</b>		100
<b>2007</b>		100

**Measure 1.1.3 of 4:** The percentage of consumers who agree that the American Printing House's educational materials are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.

<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>	96	95
<b>2006</b>		96
<b>2007</b>		96

**Measure 1.1.4 of 4:** The percentage of teachers who agree that the American Printing House's educational materials are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.

<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>	99	96
<b>2006</b>		97
<b>2007</b>		97

**Source:** Surveys of Ex Officio Trustees; APH Advisory Committees; other consumers; and teachers of students who are visually impaired.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** 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 is distributed to all 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 makes it easily available for response by individuals who are not on a specific mailing list, but who were encouraged to respond through invitations on list serves and in various newsletters and announcements. The Web-based format also provides accessibility to visually impaired individuals who require alternate media.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** Student performance and participation: The percentage of American Printing House ex officio trustees who report that the performance of students and their participation in their educational programs improves as a result of the availability of educational materials provided through the act will be maintained.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of trustees who agree that the performance of students and their participation in educational programs improves as a result of the availability of educational materials provided by the American Printing House.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
1998	98	
1999	98	98
2000	97	99
2001	97	99
2002	100	99
2003	99.50	99
2004	100	99
2005	99.50	99
2006		99
2007		99

<b>Measure 1.2.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of teachers who agree that the performance of students and their participation in educational programs improves as a result of the availability of educational materials provided by the American Printing House.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2002	93	
2003	95	95
2004	98.50	95
2005	98.50	95
2006		96
2007		96

**Source:** Survey of Ex Officio Trustees and Survey of Teachers.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Objective 2 of 2:** *Improve the quality of APHB research and product usefulness.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 3:** High Quality Research: Conduct high quality research.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of APHB research judged to be of high quality.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Expert panel review.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 2.2 of 3:** Relevance and Utility: Increase the relevance and usefulness of new APHB products.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of new APHB products judged to be of high relevance and utility for the target audience.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Expert panel review

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 2.3 of 3:** New Products: Maintain an appropriate balance between production of new APH and ongoing products.

<b>Measure 2.3.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of new APH product sales that are new APH product sales.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2001</b>	10.70	
<b>2002</b>	11.80	
<b>2003</b>	6.50	
<b>2004</b>	18.30	

APEB: American Printing House for the Blind

<b>2005</b>	15.40	
<b>2006</b>		15
<b>2007</b>		15

**Source:** APH Annual Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Explanation:** This is a new measure for 2006. The calculation is the number of new APH product sales divided by the total product sales.

# CRA: Training and Advisory Services - FY 2007

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

**Indicator 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.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices in eliminating, reducing, or preventing harassment, conflict, and school violence.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		999
2007		999

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices ensuring that students of different races, national origins, and genders have equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Equity Assistance Center Annual Performance Reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2007

**Data Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data were to provide baseline data, however these data were never collected. Therefore FY 2006 data will establish the baseline. The FY 2007 performance target is the baseline plus 1%.



**Indicator 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 practices.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 3:</b> (a) 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.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

<b>Measure 1.2.2 of 3:</b> (b) The percentage of customers who report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high quality.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2007</b>		999

<b>Measure 1.2.3 of 3:</b> (c) The percentage of Equity Center grant funds carried over in each year of the project.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Equity Assistance Center Annual Performance Reports; Customer Satisfaction Survey Measure b&c: Equity Assistance Center, Customer Satisfaction Survey.

**Next Data Available:** August 2007

**Explanation:** Measure (a) FY 2005 data were to provide baseline data, however these data were never collected. Therefore FY 2006 will establish baseline. The FY 2007 performance target is the baseline plus 1%. Measure (b) FY 2006 will be used to establish the baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 1 percent. Measure (c) This is a new efficiency measure. The FY 2006 data will be used to establish the baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 1 percent.

# ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers - FY 2007

**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 1 of 3:** *Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 4:** Achievement: The percentage of regular program participants whose mathematics/English grades improved from fall to spring.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of regular program participants whose mathematics/English grades improved from fall to spring.													
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets						
	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle High School Math	Middle High School English	Overall Math	Overall English	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle High School Math	Middle High School English	Overall Math	Overall English	
2000	43	45	36	37	39	41							
2001	43	46	37	39	40	43	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
2002	41	44	37	39	39	42	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
2003	43	45	36	37	40	42	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
2004	43	47	38	41	41	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
2005							45	45	45	45	45	45	45
2006							46	46	46	46	46	46	46
2007							47	47	47	47	47	47	47
2008							47.50	47.50	47.50	47.50	47.50	47.50	47.50
2009							48	48	48	48	48	48	48
2010							48.50	48.50	48.50	48.50	48.50	48.50	48.50

**Source:** 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Report/PPICS.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2007

Data supplied by grantees.

**Indicator 1.2 of 4: Achievement:** The percentage of regular 21st Century Community Learning Centers program participants whose achievement test scores improve from below proficient to proficient or above in reading and mathematics on state assessments.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in reading on state assessments.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

<b>Measure 1.2.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of middle/high school 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in mathematics on state assessments.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Profile and Performance Information Collection System.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2007

Data supplied by grantees.

**Explanation:** This is a new measure in 2006. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is baseline plus 1 percent.

**Indicator 1.3 of 4:** The percentage of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Elementary	Middle or High School Math	Overall	Elementary	Middle or High School Math	Overall
2004	66.71	70	68.75			
2005				70	70	70
2006				70	70	70
2007				70	70	70

**Source:** 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Report/PPICS.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2007

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

**Explanation:** In 2006 this was considered a new measure because this program is now administered by states rather than being a federal discretionary program. As a result a different data collection instrument is being used. The FY 2004 data were used to establish the baseline.

**Indicator 1.4 of 4:** Behavior: Students participating in the program will show improvement through measures such as attendance, classroom performance, and decreased disciplinary action or other adverse behaviors.

<b>Measure 1.4.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of students with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall
2004	61.20	65	64.08			
2006				67	67	67
2007				70	70	70

**Source:** 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Report/PPICS.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2007

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

**Explanation:** In 2006 this was considered a new measure because this program is now administered by states rather than being a federal discretionary program. As a result a different data collection instrument is being used. The FY 2004 data were used to establish the baseline.

**Objective 2 of 3:** 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.

**Indicator 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>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of 21st Century Centers reporting emphasis in at least one core academic area.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	97	85
2001	96	85

<b>2002</b>	94.80	85
<b>2003</b>	96.10	85
<b>2004</b>	97.75	85
<b>2005</b>		100
<b>2006</b>		100
<b>2007</b>		100

**Source:** 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2007  
Data supplied by grantees.

**Improvements:** Data collection for Web-based system will be upgraded periodically.

**Indicator 2.2 of 2:** Other enrichment activities: More than 85 percent of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and physical education.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in technology.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2000</b>	70	85
<b>2001</b>	79	85
<b>2002</b>	80.60	85
<b>2003</b>	81.30	85
<b>2004</b>	65.60	85
<b>2005</b>		85
<b>2006</b>		85
<b>2007</b>		85

<b>Measure 2.2.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in other areas.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2000</b>	97	85
<b>2001</b>	95	85
<b>2002</b>	96	85
<b>2003</b>	95.90	85
<b>2004</b>	92.57	85
<b>2005</b>		100
<b>2006</b>		100

2007		100
------	--	-----

**Source:** 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2007  
Data supplied by grantees.

**Improvements:** Data collection for Web-based system will be upgraded periodically.

**Objective 3 of 3:** *Improve the operational efficiency of the program.*

**Indicator 3.1 of 2:** Program Efficiency: An increase in the percentage of SEAs that submit complete and accurate data on program performance measures in a timely manner.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 1:</b> An increase in the percentage of SEAs that submit complete and accurate data on program performance measures in a timely manner.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Monthly GAPS drawdown reports

**Next Data Available:** April 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish baseline. The FY 2007 target is baseline plus 1 percent.

**Indicator 3.2 of 2:** Program Efficiency: A decrease in the time it takes SEAs to draw funds down to reimburse grantees.

<b>Measure 3.2.1 of 1:</b> A decrease in the time it takes SEAs to draw funds down to reimburse grantees.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Monthly GAPS drawdown reports

**Next Data Available:** April 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish baseline. The FY 2007 target is baseline plus 1 percent.

# ESEA: Advanced Credentialing - FY 2007

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 1 of 1:** *To increase the number of National Board-certified teachers.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** The number of teachers awarded National Board certification will increase annually.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The cumulative number of National Board teachers certified.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2002</b>	23,936	
<b>2003</b>	32,142	
<b>2004</b>	40,200	35,000
<b>2005</b>	47,503	40,000
<b>2006</b>		45,000
<b>2007</b>		50,000

**Source:** NBPTS Web site, grantee annual performance report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

Upon release of the number of NBCTS, the name of each individual and his/her certification area are available on the NBPTS Web site.

**Explanation:** The target has been set at an increase of 5,000 National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTS) each year. Currently, legislative and policy action creating incentives and recognition for National Board certification has been enacted in all 50 states and in approximately 544 local school districts, including the District of Columbia. These incentives have helped increase the number of applicants for National Board Certification (NBC). These incentives include fee support, salary supplements, and license portability. The National Board continues to focus its efforts on recruitment, including its Targeted High Needs Initiative that works to recruit teachers in districts that have had little or no previous participation in NBC. With these efforts, along with the Candidate Subsidy program that supports up to one half of the candidate fee, the expectation is that the target will continue to be met. Data on the number of National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTS) is provided initially in a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) press release announcing those teachers who have received National Board certification.

# ESEA: Advanced Placement - FY 2007

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 5:** Students served: The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income public school students nationally.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income public school students nationally.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
1999	87,149	
2000	92,083	
2001	105,138	
2002	132,459	
2003	157,334	
2004	187,691	
2006		209,411
2007		230,352

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Advanced Placement Grantee Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** July 2006

**Explanation:** This is a new measure that was changed to focus on public school students only. The previous measure reported on public and non-public school students. The new measure now aligns with the population served by the program. Past data is included for historical purposes. Subsequent targets are based on the previous year's target plus 10 percent.

**Indicator 1.2 of 5:** Students served: The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by minority (Hispanic, Black, Native American) public school students nationally.



<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by minority (Hispanic, Black, Native American) public school students nationally.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	267,608	
<b>2005</b>	315,203	
<b>2006</b>		336,000
<b>2007</b>		376,000
<b>2008</b>		421,000
<b>2009</b>		472,000
<b>2010</b>		528,000

**Source:** The College Board/Educational Testing Service (ETS): Freeze File Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** July 2006

**Explanation:** The Freeze File Report is a mid-year data file of Advanced Placement exams taken in May of that year and provides basic student demographic characteristics.

**Indicator 1.3 of 5:** Students served: The number and percent of Advanced Placement tests passed (tests receiving scores of 3-5) by low-income public school students nationally.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> The number and percent of Advanced Placement tests passed (tests receiving scores of 3-5) by low-income public school students nationally.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	Percent passed	Number passed	Percent passed	Number passed
<b>2005</b>	37.50	79,800		
<b>2006</b>			38.50	90,009
<b>2007</b>			32.35	99,000

**Source:** The College Board/Educational Testing Service (ETS): Freeze File Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** July 2006

**Explanation:** The Freeze File Report is a mid-year data file of Advanced Placement exams taken in May of that year and provides basic student demographic characteristics. College Board considers a test "mastered" if it received a score of 3, 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5.

**Indicator 1.4 of 5:** Students served: The number of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate tests taken in public high schools served by API grants, divided by the total number of juniors and seniors enrolled at those schools.

<b>Measure 1.4.1 of 1:</b> The number of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate tests taken.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Advanced Placement Grantee Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Explanation:** The calculation is the number of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate tests taken in public high schools served by API grants, divided by the total number of juniors and seniors enrolled at those schools. This is a new measure in 2006. The FY 2005 data will be used as the baseline. The FY 2006 and FY 2007 targets are the baseline plus 1 percent.

**Indicator 1.5 of 5:** Students served: Cost per passage of an Advanced Placement test by a low-income public school student (amount provided for AP Test fees divided by the total number of tests passed by low-income students.)

<b>Measure 1.5.1 of 1:</b> Cost per passage of advanced placement test by a low income public school student.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** The College Board/Educational Testing Service (ETS): Freeze File Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** July 2006

**Explanation:** This is a new measure in 2006. The FY 2006 data will be used as the baseline. The target for FY 2007 is baseline plus 1 percent. The Freeze File Report is a mid-year data file of Advanced Placement exams taken in May of that year and provides basic student demographic characteristics and scores. The calculation is the cost per passage of an Advanced Placement test by a low-income public school student (amount provided for AP Test fees divided by the total number of tests passed by low-income students.)

# ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.356A - Alaska Native Educational Programs

**Program Goal: To help meet the unique educational needs of Alaska Natives and to support the development of supplemental educational programs to benefit Alaska Natives.**

---

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** The percentage of participants benefiting from the Alaska Native Education program will increase.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 3:</b> The percentage of students participating in the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science or reading.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2004		999
2005	44	999
2006		49
2007		54

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 3:</b> The percentage of Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs who improve on measures of school readiness.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2004		999
2005	76.40	999
2006		80
2007		85

<b>Measure 1.1.3 of 3:</b> The dropout rate of Alaska Native and American Indian middle and high school students.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2004		999
2005	2.20	999
2006		2
2007		1.80

Source: Grantee performance report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** July 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 target was to establish the baseline but data was unusable. Therefore the FY 2005 target was to establish the baseline.

# ESEA: Charter Schools Grants - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.282 - Charter Schools

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

**Objective 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.

**Indicator 1.1 of 4:** State legislation: The number of states that have charter school legislation.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of states with charter school legislation (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico).		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
1997	27	
1998	31	
1999	38	
2000	38	40
2001	39	42
2002	40	42
2003	41	43
2004	41	44
2005	41	44
2006	41	44
2007		44

**Source:** State educational agencies (SEA); state legislatures.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** The definition of charter school and of authorizing agency varies across state charter school legislation.

**Indicator 1.2 of 4:** Charter operations: The number of charter schools in operation around the nation.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The number of charter schools in operation.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
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	3,344	3,300
2006	3,625	3,600
2007		3,900

**Source:** Center for Education Reform Annual Survey: state education agencies (SEAs).

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2007

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.  
and data from the Center for Education Reform.

**Limitations:** 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.

**Indicator 1.3 of 4:** Student Achievement: The percentage of charter school students who are achieving at or above proficient on state assessments in mathematics and reading.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of students in charter schools who are achieving at or above proficient on state assessments in mathematics.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	Fourth Grade	Eighth Grade	Fourth Grade	Eighth Grade
2006			999	999
2007			999	999

<b>Measure 1.3.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of charter school students who are achieving at or above proficient on state assessments in reading.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>

	Fourth Grade	Eighth Grade	Fourth Grade	Eighth Grade
<b>2006</b>			999	999
<b>2007</b>			999	999

**Source:** ED Facts

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 targets are to establish baselines. The FY 2007 targets are baseline plus 1 percentage point.

**Indicator 1.4 of 4:** Efficiency measure: The cost efficiency of the Charter School Program and the State Charter School Facilities Incentive Grant Program.

<b>Measure 1.4.1 of 2:</b> (a) The federal cost per student in a "successful" charter school (defined as a school in operation for three or more years).		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

<b>Measure 1.4.2 of 2:</b> (b) The ratio of funds leveraged by states for charter facilities to funds awarded by the Department under the State Charter School Facilities Incentive Grant Program.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	1.82	
<b>2005</b>	2.52	
<b>2006</b>		2.70
<b>2007</b>		3.10

**Source:** Charter Schools Grantee Performance Report

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Explanation:** Explanation: (a) The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is to maintain the FY 2006 actual level. (b) FY 2004 data were used to establish the baseline. The leveraging ratio is the total funds available (the federal grant and the state match) divided by the federal grant for a specific year.

# ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities - FY 2007

**CFDA Number:** 84.354A - Charter Schools Facilities Program

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

---

**Objective 1 of 2:** Increase funds available for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Leveraged funds: The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, construction, or renovation of charter school facilities (in millions).		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	66	
2004	74	100
2005		100
2006		100
2007		120

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Charter School Facilities Grantee Performance Report.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Limitations:** 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.

**Explanation:** 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 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.

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



**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** The number of charter schools served.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of charter schools served through this program.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	20	
<b>2004</b>	32	20
<b>2005</b>		20
<b>2006</b>		25
<b>2007</b>		40

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Charter School Facilities Grantee Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

# ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development - FY 2007

**CFDA Number:** 84.349A - Early Childhood Educator Professional Development

**Program Goal: To enhance the school readiness of young children, particularly disadvantaged young children.**

---

**Objective 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.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Apply research-based approaches to early childhood pedagogy and child development and learning, including establishing literacy-rich classrooms: Average Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO) score will improve.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The ECEPD teacher's average ELLCO score after intervention.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	20	999
2005		20
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** ECEPD Annual Performance Report and final, grantee submissions.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the first 3-year grants. The FY 2007 target is to maintain the baseline. FY 2004 and 2005 data are the last group of 2-year grantees.

**Objective 2 of 2:** *Children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate early language and literacy*

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Demonstrated improved readiness for school: Demonstrated improved readiness for school: Children will demonstrate improved readiness for school in the areas of early language and literacy.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of children who demonstrate improved readiness for school in the areas of early language and literacy.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Early Language	Literacy	Early Language	Literacy

<b>2004</b>	43	999	999
<b>2005</b>		43	999
<b>2006</b>		999	999
<b>2007</b>		999	999

**Source:** Annual and final performance reports grantee submission.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2004 and 2005 data are from the last 2-year grantees. The baseline for early language was established with a sample of FY 2004 2-year grantee data. FY 2004 target for literacy was to establish a baseline for the 2-year grantees. Since data were not collected, the FY 2005 target is to establish baseline for 2-year grantees. FY 2006 is the beginning of the first 3-year cohort. Early language skills will be measured using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - III (PPVT-III); literacy skills will be measured using the PALS Pre-K, Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask. The FY 2006 targets are to establish baselines for the first group of 3-year grantees. The FY 2007 targets are to maintain the baseline for 3-year grantees.

# ESEA: Early Reading First - FY 2007

**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 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 1.1 of 3:** Language: The percentage of children who achieve significant gains in the development of receptive language.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of preschool-aged children participating in Early Reading First (ERF) programs who achieve significant gains on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
	Receptive	Receptive
<b>2004</b>	56	999
<b>2005</b>		57
<b>2006</b>		59
<b>2007</b>		59

**Source:** Early Reading First Program Performance Reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** Early Reading First grantees will be encouraged to use the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask.

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. 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. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition (PPVT) nationally normed tests which has been validated internally and correlated with other measures of cognitive development.

**Indicator 1.2 of 3:** 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>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The number of letters ERF children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	15	999
<b>2005</b>		16
<b>2006</b>		17
<b>2007</b>		18

**Source:** Early Reading First Program Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** Not all Early Reading First grantees use the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask to measure alphabet knowledge. Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask.

**Improvements:** Early Reading First grantees will be encouraged to use the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask as the measure of alphabet knowledge.

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. The PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask is a measure of alphabet knowledge that will be administered to ERF preschool children with scores reported in the ERF Performance Report. It has been demonstrated to have a strong positive correlation with the Woodcock-Johnson Letter-Word Identification test.

**Indicator 1.3 of 3:** Language: The percent of children who achieve significant gains in the development of receptive language.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> The percent of 4-year old children participation in ERF programs who achieve significant learning gains on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Early Reading First Program Performance Reports

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2007

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for this new measure. The FY 2007 target is baseline plus 1 percent. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition (PPVT) is a nationally normed test which has been validated internally and correlated with other measures of cognitive development.

# ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians - FY 2007

**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 Program  
 84.362A - Native Hawaiian Education

**Program Goal: To support innovative projects to provide supplemental services that address the educational needs of Native Hawaiian children and adults.**

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** The percentage of participants who will benefit from the Native Hawaiian Education program will increase.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 3:</b> The percentage of teachers involved with professional development activities that address the unique education needs of program participants.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>		999
<b>2005</b>	89.30	999
<b>2006</b>		91
<b>2007</b>		92.82

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 3:</b> The percentage of Native Hawaiian children participating in early education programs who improve on measures of school readiness and literacy.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>		999
<b>2005</b>	63	999
<b>2006</b>		68
<b>2007</b>		73

<b>Measure 1.1.3 of 3:</b> The percentage of students participating in the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science, or reading.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>		999
<b>2005</b>	82	999

ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians

<b>2006</b>		83.64
<b>2007</b>		85.31

**Source:** Grantee performance report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline, but these data were unusable. Therefore, the FY 2005 target was to establish a baseline.

# ESEA: English Language Acquisition - FY 2007

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.195N - ELA National Activities  
84.365A - English Language Acquisition Formula Grant Program

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

---

**Objective 1 of 3:** English Language Acquisition State Grants.

**Indicator 1.1 of 7:** The percentage of states that have demonstrated the alignment of English language proficiency (ELP) assessments with ELP standards.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of states that have demonstrated the alignment of English language proficiency (ELP) assessments with ELP standards.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	31	
<b>2005</b>		10
<b>2006</b>		50
<b>2007</b>		75
<b>2008</b>		100

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report; EDEN when available.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2007

**Explanation:** All 52 states are providing information regarding aligned English language proficiency assessments for the first time under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). States are counted as having demonstrated progress in alignment if they explained how their current English Language Proficiency assessment is being aligned with ELP standards.

**Indicator 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.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of states that have demonstrated their English language proficiency standards are linked to academic content standards in English language arts or reading.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	85	
<b>2005</b>		10



<b>2006</b>		90
<b>2007</b>		100

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report; EDEN when available.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2007

**Explanation:** For the first time under NCLB, all 52 states are to provide evidence of linking ELP standards to academic content standards in reading/language arts. States are counted as having demonstrated linking if they described how linking was accomplished.

**Indicator 1.3 of 7:** The percentage of states that have met state targets for Title III annual measurable achievement objectives.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of states that have met state targets for Title III annual measurable achievement objectives.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999
<b>2008</b>		999
<b>2009</b>		999
<b>2010</b>		999

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report; Biennial evaluation report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2007

**Limitations:** Average annual percentage increases vary depending on the LEP population in the state and available resources in serving these students and exercising allowable Departmental flexibilities for this subgroup.

**Explanation:** This is a long-term measure. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is baseline plus 10 percent. The FY 2008 target is baseline plus 20 percent. The FY 2009 target is baseline plus 40 percent. The FY 2010 target is baseline plus 70 percent.

**Indicator 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.

<b>Measure 1.4.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of states that have met state targets for making progress in English for LEP students who have received Title III services.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999

<b>2007</b>		999
<b>2008</b>		999
<b>2009</b>		999
<b>2010</b>		999

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report; Biennial Evaluation Report; and EDEN, when available.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is the baseline plus 10 percent. The FY 2008 target is the baseline plus 20 percent. The FY 2009 target is the baseline plus 40 percent. The FY 2010 target is the baseline plus 70 percent.

**Indicator 1.5 of 7:** The number of states that have met state targets for attainment in learning English.

<b>Measure 1.5.1 of 1:</b> The number of states that met the state target for attainment of English language proficiency.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>	26	
<b>2006</b>		29
<b>2007</b>		31
<b>2008</b>		44
<b>2009</b>		47
<b>2010</b>		49

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** May 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 data were used to establish the baseline.

**Indicator 1.6 of 7:** The amount of time it takes states that have participated in a Title III on-site monitoring review to resolve Title III compliance issues identified during the review.

<b>Measure 1.6.1 of 1:</b> The amount of time it takes states that have participated in a Title III on-site monitoring review to resolve Title III compliance issues identified during the review.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		24
<b>2007</b>		18

<b>2008</b>		16
<b>2009</b>		12
<b>2010</b>		9

**Source:** On-site monitoring reports, state responses to monitor findings.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** May 2007

**Limitations:** Response time will vary from state to state depending on the compliance issue to be addressed and how well the state manages internal resources and communication. Those compliance issues that require action from the state school board or state legislature, such as English language proficiency standards and assessment approval, will require a longer period of time to resolve due to state schedules. Those compliance issues that are handled at the school district level (e.g. parental notification) may be addressed in a much shorter time frame.

**Explanation:** This was a new efficiency measure for FY 2006. The FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. Targets will demonstrate a decrease in the time required for resolution of on-site monitoring findings for Title III compliance issues. For FY 2006, 50 percent of states will resolve compliance issues within 24 months; for FY 2007, 60 percent of states will resolve compliance issues within 18 months; for FY 2008, 70 percent of states will resolve compliance issues within 16 months; for FY 2009, 80 percent of states will resolve compliance issues within 12 months; for FY 2010, 90 percent of states will resolve compliance issues within 9 months.

**Indicator 1.7 of 7:** Reported amount of time it takes states to make Title III subgrants to subgrantees.

<b>Measure 1.7.1 of 1:</b> Reported amount of time it takes states to make Title III subgrants to subgrantees.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999
<b>2008</b>		999
<b>2009</b>		999

**Source:** On-site monitoring reports; state responses to monitoring reports; desk monitoring results.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** May 2007

**Limitations:** States distribute funds to subgrantees according to a set schedule (depending on the state application process) or on a reimbursable basis (districts provide states either a monthly, quarterly, or annual report for reimbursement). Information regarding the award of subgrant is collected through program office desk monitoring and an on-site monitoring process.

**Explanation:** This is a new efficiency measure for FY 2006. The 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. Targets will demonstrate a decrease in the amount of time required for the states to allocate federal funds to subgrantees. The target for FY 2006 is a 10 percent decrease from the baseline. The target for FY 2007 is a 15 percent decrease from the baseline. The target for FY 2008 is a 20 percent decrease from the baseline. The target for FY 2009 is a 25 percent decrease from the baseline. This indicator addresses the Department's emphasis on risk mitigation, timely and effective use and drawdown of federal funds for their intended purpose.

**Objective 2 of 3: Improve the quality of teachers of LEP students.**

**Indicator 2.1 of 2:** The percentage of preservice teachers served by the Title III Professional Development Program who are placed in an instructional setting serving LEP students within one year of graduation.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of preservice teachers served by the Title III Professional Development Program who are placed in an instructional setting serving LEP students within one year of graduation.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>	93	999
<b>2006</b>		94
<b>2007</b>		95

**Source:** Grantee Annual Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2007

**Limitations:** Data are self reported by grantees.

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target was to establish the baseline.

**Indicator 2.2 of 2:** The percentage of National Professional Development program graduates who meet No Child Left Behind Highly Qualified Teacher requirements.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of National Professional Development program graduates who are highly qualified teachers.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>	95	999
<b>2006</b>		96
<b>2007</b>		97

**Source:** Grantee Annual Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2007

**Limitations:** Data are self reported by grantees.

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target was to establish the baseline.

**Objective 3 of 3: Improve English proficiency and academic achievement of students served by the**

*Native American and Alaska Native Children in School Program.*

**Indicator 3.1 of 2:** English proficiency: The percentage of limited English proficient (LEP) students in the program who make gains in English.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of limited English proficient (LEP) students in the Native American and Alaska Native program who make gains in English.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>	60	999
<b>2006</b>		66
<b>2007</b>		72

**Source:** Grantee Annual Performance Reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

**Limitations:** Data are self-reported by grantees. Operational definitions of Limited English Proficient students vary.

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target was to establish the baseline.

**Indicator 3.2 of 2:** Core Academic Subjects: The percentage of limited English proficient (LEP) students in the program who make gains in core academic subjects.

<b>Measure 3.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of limited English proficient (LEP) students in the Native American/Alaska Native program who make gains in core academic subjects.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>	15	999
<b>2006</b>		16.50
<b>2007</b>		18

**Source:** Annual Performance Reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

**Limitations:** Data is self-reported by grantees. Operational definitions of LEP students vary.

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 data were used to establish the baseline.

# ESEA: Foreign Language Assistance - FY 2007

**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 1 of 1:** *To Improve the foreign language proficiency of students served by the FLAP program.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Increased student achievement: The percentage of projects that report improvements in proficiency in a foreign language for three-quarters of school participants.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of projects reporting improvements.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	65	
<b>2005</b>	80	50
<b>2006</b>		75
<b>2007</b>		75
<b>2008</b>		75

**Source:** Grantee Annual Performance Reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** There are no statutory reporting requirements. Grantee performance reports indicate a multitude of various assessment measurements used to determine and plot student growth in language ability.

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 data were used to establish a baseline. Grantees are local educational agencies (LEAs) that receive funding for three years. Each grantee establishes its own annual performance targets for improved foreign language proficiency. Data on improved foreign language proficiency come from the annual report received at the end of the second year of the grant. Not all funded projects provide instruction, some focus on developmental activities such as teacher training and, therefore, would not collect data on improvements in foreign language proficiency. Others may not collect data in the first year of the grant.

# ESEA: Impact Aid Basic Support Payments - FY 2007

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 1 of 2: Make payments in a timely manner.**

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Timeliness of payments: The percentage of eligible applicants who receive initial Basic Support payments within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of eligible applicants who receive initial Impact Aid Basic Support payments within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>	94	
<b>2006</b>		90
<b>2007</b>		90

**Source:** Data extracted from the Impact Aid system.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

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

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Overpayment forgiveness requests: The number of requests to forgive overpayments of Basic Support payments.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of requests to forgive overpayments of Impact Aid Basic Support payments.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>	2	
<b>2006</b>		10
<b>2007</b>		10

**Source:** Data extracted from Impact Aid system.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

# ESEA: Impact Aid Construction - FY 2007

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 3:** Construction: The percentage of schools in LEAs receiving Impact Aid Construction funds that report that the overall condition of their school buildings is adequate.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of LEAs reporting that the overall condition of their school buildings is adequate.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2000</b>		70
<b>2001</b>	44	70
<b>2002</b>	43	70
<b>2003</b>	47	70
<b>2004</b>	54	70
<b>2005</b>	52	70
<b>2006</b>		58
<b>2007</b>		61

**Source:** Data collected from LEA application for Impact Aid Section 8003 payments.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Limitations:** 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.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 + 2007 targets were adjusted based on past actual performance.

**Indicator 1.2 of 3:** Construction: Make 90% of Section 8007(a) formula grant awards in the second quarter of the fiscal year.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> Improve the schedule of payments by 30 days each year until 90% of payments are made by April 30th
---



Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999
2008		999
2009		999

**Source:** Lea application for Impact Aid.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Explanation:** This new efficiency measure is intended to track programmatic efficiency by reducing the amount of time it takes to process the formula construction grant payments under Section 8007(a) of the Impact Aid Program. The target for FY 2006 is 7/31/2006; the target for FY 2007 is 6/30/2007; the target for FY 2008 is 5/31/2008; the target for FY 2009 is 4/30/2009.

**Indicator 1.3 of 3: Construction:** The average number of days elapsed between the initial Impact Aid discretionary construction award and the LEAs' awarding of contracts is less than 150 days.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> The average number of days elapsed between the initial Impact Aid discretionary construction award and the LEAs' awarding of contracts.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		250
2007		250

**Source:** GAPS system data will be used to determine timeliness for this indicator.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Explanation:** This is a new efficiency measure for FY 2006.

# ESEA: Impact Aid Payments for Children with Disabilities - FY 2007

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 1 of 2: Make payments in a timely manner.**

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Timeliness of payments: The percentage of eligible applicants who receive initial Children with Disabilities payments within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of eligible applicants who receive initial Impact Aid Children with Disabilities payments within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
<b>2005</b>	94	
<b>2006</b>		90
<b>2007</b>		90

**Source:** Data extracted from the Impact Aid system.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

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

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Overpayment forgiveness requests: The number of requests to forgive overpayments of Children with Disabilities payments.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of requests to forgive overpayments of Impact Aid Children with Disabilities payments.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
<b>2005</b>	2	
<b>2006</b>		10
<b>2007</b>		10

**Source:** Data extracted from the Impact Aid system.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

# ESEA: Impact Aid Payments for Federal Property - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.041 - Impact Aid

**Program Goal: To assist local school districts that have lost a portion of their local tax base because of federal ownership of property.**

---

**Objective 1 of 1:** *Manage Section 8002 Payments for Federal Property to disburse funds accurately and efficiently under the statutory formula.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 2:** Program Management: Review and verify validity of estimated assessed value of Federal property in each Section 8002 applicant LEA at least every three years.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of eligible Section 8002 applicants reviewed during the year.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		33

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** Timeliness of payments: Make initial Section 8002 payments to eligible school districts by the end of the second quarter.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of initial payments to eligible LEAs that are made by the end of the second quarter.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		75
2007		67

**Source:** Data extracted from the Impact Aid system.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

**Data Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

# ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants - FY 2007

**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 1 of 2:** *Show an annual increase in the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 4:** Highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools: The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of core academic classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	74	
2004	81	
2005		90
2006		95
2007		100

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2003 data was to establish the baseline. FY 2003 actual performance was estimated from the Consolidated State Performance Report, submitted in September 2003.

**Indicator 1.2 of 4:** Highly qualified teachers in low-poverty schools: Percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in low-poverty schools.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	89	

<b>2005</b>		90
<b>2006</b>		95
<b>2007</b>		100

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2004 data were used to establish the baseline. FY 2004 data were estimated from Consolidated State Performance Report submitted in September 2004.

**Indicator 1.3 of 4:** Highly qualified teachers in elementary schools: Percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of core academic classes in elementary schools taught by highly qualified teachers .		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	85	999
<b>2004</b>	89	89
<b>2005</b>		90
<b>2006</b>		95
<b>2007</b>		100

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2003 data was used to establish the baseline. FY 2003 data were estimated from Consolidated State Performance Report submitted in September 2003.

**Indicator 1.4 of 4:** Highly qualified teachers in secondary schools: Percentage of core academic classes in secondary schools taught by highly qualified teachers.

<b>Measure 1.4.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of core academic classes in secondary schools taught by highly qualified teachers.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	80	999
<b>2004</b>	84	85
<b>2005</b>		85

<b>2006</b>		92
<b>2007</b>		100

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2003 data was used to establish the baseline. FY 2003 data were estimated from Consolidated State Performance Report submitted in September 2003.

**Objective 2 of 2:** *Improve the operational efficiency of the program*

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Program Efficiency: A decrease in the number of days it takes the Department of Education to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring visits.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> Average number of days between monitoring visit and report sent to state.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Program office records.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is baseline minus 1 percent.

# ESEA: Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies - FY 2007

**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 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 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.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 4:</b> The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade four who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	63	
2002	51	60
2003	47	62
2005		53
2007		60

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 4:</b> The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade eight who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	61	
2003	57	66
2005		63
2007		65

<b>Measure 1.1.3 of 4:</b> The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade four who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	40	

<b>2002</b>		64
<b>2003</b>	64	66
<b>2005</b>		66
<b>2007</b>		70

<b>Measure 1.1.4 of 4:</b> The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade eight who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2000</b>	47	
<b>2002</b>		62
<b>2003</b>	52	64
<b>2005</b>		54
<b>2007</b>		60

**Source:** National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2000, 2003.

**Frequency:** Biennially.

**Next Data Available:** February 2008

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

**Limitations:** The small sample (for the subpopulation 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.

**Explanation:** NCES oversampled American Indian and Alaska Native students in the 2005 NAEP assessments in reading and mathematics to increase the reliability of the data.



# ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries - FY 2007

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** School/District/State Reading Assessments: The percentage of schools/districts served by Improving Literacy Through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of schools/districts served by Improving Literacy Through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>		999
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Improving Literacy Through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; program evaluation by Department of Education.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2006

**Explanation:** The first program year for grantees receiving funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries is 2003-2004. The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. However, FY 2004 data were unusable for reporting. Therefore the FY 2005 target is to establish the baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1 percent. The FY 2007 target is the baseline plus 2 percent.

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

**Indicator 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 nonparticipating schools.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The difference in rate of increase between participating schools and nonparticipating schools
--

<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	25	999
<b>2005</b>		27
<b>2006</b>		29
<b>2007</b>		31

**Source:** Improving Literacy Through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; program evaluation of 2005 by Department of Education.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2006

**Explanation:** The first program year for grantees receiving funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries is 2003-2004. The FY 2004 target was to establish the baseline.

# ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.165A - Magnet Schools Assistance

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

**Objective 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 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.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of magnet schools whose student applicant pool reduces, prevents, or eliminates minority group isolation.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
<b>2005</b>			999	
<b>2006</b>			999	
<b>2007</b>			999	
<b>2008</b>				999

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Magnet Schools Grantee Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** Data are self reported by grantees.

**Explanation:** The Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) grants are three-year grants. New cohorts of grantees were established in SY 2004-05 (cohort 1) and a second cohort will be established in SY 2007-08 (cohort 2). The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 1, and the FY 2008 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 2. The FY 2006 target for cohort 1 is the baseline plus 1 percentage point. The FY 2007 target for cohort 1 is the previous year's actual level plus 1 percentage point.

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

**Indicator 2.1 of 2:** The percentage of magnet schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed the state's adequate progress standard.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed the state's adequate yearly progress standard.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
<b>2005</b>			999	
<b>2006</b>			999	
<b>2007</b>			999	
<b>2008</b>				999

**Source:** State test results required by NCLB.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006  
State educational agencies

**Limitations:** Data are frequently late in being released.

**Explanation:** 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 establish a baseline for cohort 1. The target for FY 2008 is to establish a baseline for cohort 2. The FY 2006 target for cohort 1 is the baseline plus 1 percentage point. The FY 2007 target for cohort 1 is the FY 2006 actual level plus 1 percentage point.

**Indicator 2.2 of 2:** The percentage of magnet schools that meet or exceed the state's adequate yearly progress standard.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of magnet schools that meet or exceed the state's adequate yearly progress standard.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
<b>2005</b>			999	
<b>2006</b>			999	
<b>2007</b>			999	
<b>2008</b>				999

**Source:** State test results required by NCLB

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006  
State educational agencies.

**Limitations:** Data are frequently late in being released.

**Explanation:** 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 establish a baseline for cohort 1. The FY 2006 target is the baseline plus 1 percentage point and the FY 2007 target is the previous year's actual level plus 1 percentage point. The FY 2008 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 2.

# ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships - FY 2007

**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 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 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.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of K-5 teachers in MSP schools, who significantly increase their knowledge of mathematics and science.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Project Annual Reports

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. The FY 2004 data were not usable, therefore FY 2005 data will be used as baseline. The FY 2006 target is baseline plus 20 percent. The FY 2007 target is baseline plus 21 percent.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** Highly qualified teachers in MSP schools: The percentage of mathematics and science middle and high school teachers who are not highly qualified upon beginning participation in the program who become highly qualified upon completion of the program.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of highly qualified middle school (grades six through eight) teachers.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999

<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

<b>Measure 1.2.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of highly qualified high school (grades nine through twelve) teachers.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>		999
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Program Evaluation. Individual annual reports from Partnership projects.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. The FY 2004 data were not usable, therefore FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is baseline plus 20 percent. The FY 2007 target is baseline plus 21 percent.

**Objective 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 2.1 of 2:** Student achievement in MSP classrooms: The percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced on state mathematics assessments.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of students in MSP classrooms scoring at proficient or advanced in mathematics on state assessments.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>		999
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Program Annual reports

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. The FY 2004 data were not useable. Therefore FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 and FY 2007 performance targets are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 2.2 of 2:** Student achievement in MSP schools: The percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced on state science assessments.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of students in MSP classrooms at proficient or advanced levels in science on state assessments.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Program annual reports

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The FY 2006 and FY 2007 performance targets are to maintain the baseline.

# ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program - FY 2007

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 1 of 2: 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 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 proficient on state assessments in reading.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of states meeting an annually set performance target in reading at the elementary level for migrant students.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	States meeting target	States that reported results	States meeting target	States that reported results
1997	4	15		
1998	7	18		
1999	2	19		
2000	5	26		
2001	6	23		
2002	8	29	8	27
2003	15	43	10	32
2004			14	36
2005			16	38
2006			18	40
2007			20	45

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

**Limitations:** Information that directly measures the impact of the Title I, Migrant Education Program is not



available. However, each state has its own assessment to measure and determine student proficiency. Student achievement across the states cannot be compared directly, but the results for migrant students can be tracked over time, providing the state proficiency levels and assessments' content remain consistent and the disaggregation of assessment data by subgroup is accurate.

**Improvements:** It is expected that this measure will have greater validity and reliability over time as state assessment systems stabilize, include all migrant students in testing, and properly disaggregate and report results.

**Explanation:** The annually set state target for 2002 through 2007 is 50 percent or more of migrant students at the proficient or advanced level. Once 80 percent of all states have met the performance target of 50 percent of migrant students at or above the proficient level, the performance target will be raised in increments of 5 percent.

**Indicator 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 proficient on state assessments in reading.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The number of states meeting an annually set performance target in reading for middle school migrant students.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	States meeting target	States that reported results	States meeting target	States that reported results
<b>1997</b>	3	15		
<b>1998</b>	6	18		
<b>1999</b>	4	18		
<b>2000</b>	2	23		
<b>2001</b>	7	21		
<b>2002</b>	6	27	9	25
<b>2003</b>	9	45	11	29
<b>2004</b>			15	32
<b>2005</b>			17	34
<b>2006</b>			19	36
<b>2007</b>			21	45

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

**Limitations:** Information that directly measures the impact of the Title I, Migrant Education Program is not available. However, each state has its own assessment to measure and determine student proficiency. Student achievement across the states cannot be compared directly, but the results for migrant students can be tracked over time, providing the state proficiency levels and assessments' content remain consistent and the disaggregation of assessment data by subgroup is accurate.

**Improvements:** It is expected that this measure will have greater validity and reliability over time as state assessment systems stabilize, include all migrant students in testing, and properly disaggregate and report results.

**Explanation:** The annually set state target for 2002 through 2007 is 50 percent or more of migrant students at the proficient or advanced level. Once 80 percent of all states have met the performance target of 50 percent of migrant students at or above the proficient level, the performance target will be raised in increments of 5 percent.

**Indicator 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 proficient on state assessments in mathematics.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> The number of states meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics for elementary school migrant students.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	States meeting target	States that reported results	States meeting target	States that reported results
<b>1997</b>	5	15		
<b>1998</b>	9	18		
<b>1999</b>	6	19		
<b>2000</b>	7	25		
<b>2001</b>	10	23		
<b>2002</b>	6	29	12	27
<b>2003</b>	21	44	14	32
<b>2004</b>			18	36
<b>2005</b>			20	38
<b>2006</b>			22	40
<b>2007</b>			24	45

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

**Limitations:** Information that directly measures the impact of the Title I, Migrant Education Program is not available. However, each state has its own assessment to measure and determine student proficiency. Student achievement across the states cannot be compared directly, but the results for migrant students can be tracked over time, providing the state proficiency levels and assessments' content remain consistent and the disaggregation of assessment data by subgroup is accurate.

**Improvements:** It is expected that this measure will have greater validity and reliability over time as state assessment systems stabilize, include all migrant students in testing, and properly disaggregate and report results.

**Explanation:** The annually set state target for 2002 through 2007 is 50 percent or more of migrant students at

the proficient or advanced level. Once 80 percent of all states have met the performance target of 50 percent of migrant students at or above the proficient level, the performance target will be raised in increments of 5 percent.

**Indicator 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 proficient on state assessments in mathematics.

<b>Measure 1.4.1 of 1:</b> The number of states meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics for middle school migrant students.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	States meeting target	States that reported results	States meeting target	States that reported results
<b>1997</b>	3	15		
<b>1998</b>	7	18		
<b>1999</b>	4	18		
<b>2000</b>	2	22		
<b>2001</b>	4	20		
<b>2002</b>	4	27	6	24
<b>2003</b>	8	45	8	28
<b>2004</b>			12	32
<b>2005</b>			14	34
<b>2006</b>			16	36
<b>2007</b>			18	45

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

**Limitations:** Information that directly measures the impact of the Title I, Migrant Education Program is not available. However, each state has its own assessment to measure and determine student proficiency. Student achievement across the states cannot be compared directly, but the results for migrant students can be tracked over time, providing the state proficiency levels and assessments' content remain consistent and the disaggregation of assessment data by subgroup is accurate.

**Improvements:** It is expected that this measure will have greater validity and reliability over time as state assessment systems stabilize, include all migrant students in testing, and properly disaggregate and report results.

**Explanation:** The annually set state target for 2002 through 2007 is 50 percent or more of migrant students at the proficient or advanced level. Once 80 percent of all States have met the performance target of 50 percent of migrant students at or above the proficient level, the performance target will be raised in increments of 5 percent.

**Indicator 1.5 of 6:** Reducing dropout rate: More states have a decreasing percentage of migrant students who drop out from secondary school (grades 7 - 12).

<b>Measure 1.5.1 of 1:</b> The number of states meeting an annually set performance target for dropout rate for migrant students.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	States meeting targets	States that reported results	States meeting targets	States that reported results
<b>2004</b>			999	999
<b>2005</b>			999	999
<b>2006</b>			999	999
<b>2007</b>			999	999

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2008

**Limitations:** There are several limitations in collecting and using student dropout data. First, a number of states do not have data collection and reporting systems in place to accurately calculate and disaggregate student dropout rates for each of the required subgroups. Second, for those states reporting dropout data, there remain significant variations in the the definition and calculation of a dropout rate (e.g., rates based on the number of enrolled students who dropout in the 12th grade of high school versus the number of students who were enrolled in the 9th grade of high school and dropped out of school in either the 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade).

**Improvements:** The Department is working with the states to improve and standardize the definition and calculation of student dropout rates.

**Explanation:** For the number of states that meet the 50 percent threshold, the annually set state target for 2004 through 2007 is 50 percent or more of migrant students. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline for the number of states that meet the 50 percent threshold. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 2%. The target for FY 2007 is baseline plus 3%.

**Indicator 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.

<b>Measure 1.6.1 of 1:</b> The number of states meeting an annually set performance target for high school graduation of migrant students.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	States meeting targets	States that reported results	States meeting targets	States that reported results
<b>2004</b>			999	999
<b>2005</b>			999	999
<b>2006</b>			999	999

2007		999	999
------	--	-----	-----

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2008

**Limitations:** There are several limitations in collecting and using graduation rate data. First, a number of states do not have data collection and reporting systems in place to accurately calculate and disaggregate student graduation rates for each of the required subgroups. Second, for those states reporting graduation rate data, there remain significant variations in the the definition and calculation of a graduation rate (e.g., rates based on the number of enrolled students in the 12th grade who graduate from high school versus the number of students who were enrolled in the ninth grade of high school and graduated from high school four years later).

**Improvements:** The Department is working with the states to improve and standardize the definition and calculation of graduation rates.

**Explanation:** For the number of states that meet the 50 percent threshold, the annually set state target for 2004 through 2007 is 50 percent or more of migrant students who graduate. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline for the number of states that meet the 50 percent threshold. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 2%. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 3%.

**Objective 2 of 2:** *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 2.1 of 1:** Efficiency measure: The percentage of consolidated student records available to states.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of consolidated student records meeting an annually set performance target.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2007		50
2008		75
2009		100

**Source:** Contractor Evaluation Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** June 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 data will be used to establish the baseline. This is a new measure of program efficiency. A consolidated student record contains information on the student, state student identification number, student's name, gender, date of birth, and grade level.

# ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program - FY 2007

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 3:** Progress and achievement: The percentage of neglected or delinquent students obtaining a secondary school diploma, or its recognized equivalent, will increase.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of neglected or delinquent students obtaining a diploma or diploma equivalent.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	8	999
2004		8.40
2005		8.80
2006		8.80
2007		8.80

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** June 2006

**Limitations:** Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.

**Explanation:** The FY 2003 target was to establish a baseline. No data were collected in 2004. For FY 2006, the measure was slightly modified by deleting the phase "obtain employment".

**Indicator 1.2 of 3:** High school course credits: The percentage of high school course credits earned by neglected or delinquent students will increase.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of neglected or delinquent students earning high school course credits.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program

<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** OESE State Consolidated Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** June 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 1.3 of 3:** 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>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of neglected or delinquent students who improve academic skills as measured on approved and validated measures.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** June 2006

**Limitations:** Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target was to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline. The FY 2007 target is to maintain the baseline.

# ESEA: Reading First State Grants - FY 2007

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 1 of 1:** *To increase the percentage of students that learn to read proficiently by the end of third grade.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 3:** Reading achievement in Reading First schools: Increased percentages of grade one through three students will read at grade level or above in schools participating in Reading First programs, as measured by meeting or exceeding the proficient level in reading on Reading First outcomes of fluency.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 3:</b> The percentage of grade 1 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency in reading on Reading First outcome measures of fluency.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
	Grade 1	Grade 1
<b>2004</b>	43	
<b>2006</b>		45
<b>2007</b>		46

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 3:</b> The percentage of grade 3 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency in reading on Reading First outcome measures of fluency.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	36	
<b>2006</b>		38
<b>2007</b>		39

<b>Measure 1.1.3 of 3:</b> The percentage of grade 2 students in Reading First schools that meet or exceed proficiency in reading on Reading First outcome measures of fluency.										
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>					<b>Performance Targets</b>				
	Economically Disadvantaged	African American	Hispanic	Students with Disabilities		Economically Disadvantaged	African American	Hispanic	Students with Disabilities	
<b>2004</b>	33	27	34	30	17					
<b>2006</b>						35	29	36	32	19



2007		36	30	37	33	20
------	--	----	----	----	----	----

**Source:** Contractor Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** February 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 data were used to establish the baseline.

**Indicator 1.2 of 3:** Reading achievement in Reading First schools: Number of States showing an increase in the percentage of grade one through three students who read at grade level or above in schools participating in Reading First programs, as measured by meeting or exceeding proficiency in reading on Reading First outcomes of comprehension.

**Measure 1.2.1 of 3:** The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of grade 1 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency on Reading First measures of reading comprehension.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	2	
2006		5
2007		8

**Measure 1.2.2 of 3:** The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of grade 3 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency on Reading First measures of reading comprehension.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	7	
2006		12
2007		17

**Measure 1.2.3 of 3:** The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of grade 2 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency on Reading First measures of reading comprehension.

Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets				
	Economically Disadvantaged	African American	Hispanic	Students with Disabilities		Economically Disadvantaged	African American	Hispanic	Students with Disabilities	
2004	4	5	5	5	2					
2006						7	10	10	10	5
2007						10	15	15	15	8

**Source:** 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 one, two, and three.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** February 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 data were used to establish the baseline. For 2004 only 2 States had 2 years of grade 1 comprehension data needed to show an increase. For grade 1, both States did show an increase in students at proficiency. Only 10 States had 2 years of grade 3 comprehension data needed to show an increase. For grade 3, 7 out of 10 States show an increase in students at proficiency. Only 4 States had 2 years of grade 2 comprehension data for Economically Disadvantaged Students needed to show an increase. Only 5 States had 2 years of grade 2 comprehension data for English Language Learners, African American Students and Hispanic Students needed to show an increase. All States that had data available in the above categories show an increase in students at proficiency. Only 3 States had 2 years of grade 2 Comprehension data for Students with disabilities needed to show an increase. Of those 3 States, only 2 show an increase.

**Indicator 1.3 of 3:** Reading achievement in Reading First Schools: Increased percentages of third grade students who will read at grade level or above in schools participating in Reading First programs, as measured by meeting or exceeding the proficient level in reading on state assessments in reading.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of grade 3 students who score at or above proficient on state assessments in reading.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	9	
<b>2006</b>		15
<b>2007</b>		21

**Source:** 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 one, two, and three.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** February 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 data were used to establish the baseline. For 2004 only 22 States had 2 years of proficiency data available for Grade 3. By 2006 it is anticipated that all states will be using Grade 3 Assessment Data.

# ESEA: Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution - FY 2007

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

---

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Reading is Fundamental (RIF) will provide books and scientifically based reading services to low-income children at risk of educational failure due to delays in reading.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of low-income children who receive books and reading services through the Reading is Fundamental Program.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	3,713,541	999
2004	3,704,383	3,899,218
2005	3,626,846	4,089,895
2006		3,759,960
2007		3,769,244

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Inexpensive Book Distribution/Reading Is Fundamental Grantee Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2007

**Explanation:** The program has had an across the board decrease in funding of .15 percent since the original baseline target was established in FY 2003. In addition, the costs of books have substantially increased. Thus, the grantee can only start a small number of new programs. As a result, this decreases the possibility that the grantee can continue to raise the percentage of students served since there will be too few new programs to substantially impact the book distribution.

# ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television - FY 2007

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 school children.**

**Objective 1 of 2:** *Develop, produce, and distribute high-quality televised educational programming for preschool and early elementary school children.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** The percentage of RTL children's television programming 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>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of Ready To Learn children's television programming deemed to be of high quality.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Researcher and expert panel review.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2007

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Explanation:** In FY 2006, all RTL grantees will be in year one of new multi-year awards. The FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline. The target for 2007 is the baseline plus 5 percent.

**Objective 2 of 2:** *Develop and implement high-quality targeted outreach strategies (including Ready To Learn products and services).*

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** The percentage of Ready To Learn (RTL) targeted outreach 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>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of Ready To Learn targeted outreach products and services deemed to be of high quality.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

2007		999
------	--	-----

**Source:** Researcher and expert panel review.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2007

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Explanation:** In FY 2006, all Ready To Learn grantees will be in year one of new multi-year awards. The FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 5 percent.

# ESEA: Rural Education - FY 2007

**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 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.

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Adequate yearly progress: Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of SRSA participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress after three years.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report, State Report Card, Evaluation Survey, NCES and ED FACTS.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is the baseline plus 1 percent; the FY 2007 target is the baseline plus 2 percent.

**Objective 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 2.1 of 1:** Adequate yearly progress: Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of RLIS participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress after three years.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999

<b>2007</b>	999
-------------	-----

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report, State Report Card, Evaluation Survey, NCES and ED FACTS.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

**Data Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is baseline plus 1 percent. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 2 percent.

**Objective 3 of 3:** *Eligible rural school districts will use the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.*

**Indicator 3.1 of 1:** Use of the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority will remain high, if not increase.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of eligible school districts utilizing the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	61	999
<b>2004</b>	59	71
<b>2005</b>		65
<b>2006</b>		65
<b>2007</b>		65

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report, grantee submissions.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

**Explanation:** Only districts eligible for the Small Rural Schools Achievement (SRSA) Program are eligible to utilize the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.

# ESEA: Special Programs for Indian Children - FY 2007

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

**Program Goal: To improve the educational opportunities and achievement of preschool, elementary, and secondary school Indian children by developing, testing, and demonstrating effective services and programs.**

**Objective 1 of 2:** *Discretionary programs will focus on improving educational opportunities and services for American Indian and Alaska Native children and adults.*

**Indicator 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 Alaskan Native.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 3:</b> The percentage of program participants who become principals/vice principals/school administrators of schools with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		20
2007		20

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 3:</b> The percentage of program participants who become teachers in schools with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		23
2007		23

<b>Measure 1.1.3 of 3:</b> The percentage of program participants who receive full state licensure.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		75
2007		75

**Source:** Office of Indian Education Project Performance Reports: Schools and Staffing Survey; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools

**Frequency:** Biennially.

**Next Data Available:** June 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

**Limitations:** 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.

**Improvements:** Monitor the number of American Indian and Alaska Native students through LEAs' reporting on program effectiveness in their Annual Performance Report.

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

**Indicator 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>Measure 2.1.1 of 3:</b> The percentage of 3- to 4-year-old American Indian and Alaska Native children achieving educationally significant gains on a measure of language and communication development based on curriculum benchmarks.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		46
2006		46
2007		46

<b>Measure 2.1.2 of 3:</b> The percentage of 3- to 4-year-old American Indian and Alaska Native children achieving educationally significant gains on prescribed measure of cognitive skills and conceptual knowledge, including mathematics, science and early reading based on curriculum benchmarks.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		46
2006		46
2007		46

<b>Measure 2.1.3 of 3:</b> The percentage of 3- to 4-year-old American Indian and Alaska Native children achieving educationally significant gains on prescribed measure of social development that facilitates self-regulation of attention, behavior and emotion based on curriculum benchmarks.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		46
2006		46
2007		46

**Source:** Office of Indian Education Project Performance Reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Limitations:** Substantial variation will exist in curriculum benchmarks and assessments.

**Indicator 2.2 of 2:** Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native high school graduates will increase competency and skills in challenging subject matters, including mathematics and science, to enable successful transition to postsecondary education.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of high school American Indian and Alaska Native students successfully completing (as defined by a passing grade) challenging core courses. Core subjects include English, mathematics, science and social studies.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		46
2006		46
2007		46

<b>Measure 2.2.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students participating in the program that have college assessment scores (ACT, SAT, PSAT) as high or higher than the district average.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		46
2006		46
2007		46

**Source:** Project Performance Reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Limitations:** Substantial variation may exist in methods used to assess student performance.

**Explanation:** Core subjects include English, mathematics, science, and social studies.

# ESEA: State Assessments - FY 2007

**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 1 of 1:** *By SY 2005-2006, 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 (three through five, six through eight and high school) in science, all on which are aligned with their content specific academic content standards.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 6:** Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades three through eight and in high schools in reading/language arts that align with the state's academic content standards.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of states (including DC and PR) that have reading/language arts assessments in grades three through eight and high school.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	0	999
<b>2005</b>	0	18
<b>2006</b>		52
<b>2007</b>		52

**Source:** Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** September 2006

**Explanation:** Each state has developed a schedule by which its reading/language arts assessments for grades 3-8 and high school will be developed and field tested, and submitted to the Department for review and approval, prior to implementation. The Department developed the Standards and Assessment External Review process to review and approve the state assessments and conducted its first peer review in early 2005. States are required to have their reading/language arts assessments in place by SY 2005-06. The 2006 performance target of 52 reflects the compliance of the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

**Indicator 1.2 of 6:** Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades three through eight and in high schools in mathematics that align with the state's academic content standards.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The number of states (including DC and PR) that have mathematics assessments in grades three through eight and high school.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	0	999
<b>2005</b>	0	18
<b>2006</b>		52
<b>2007</b>		52

**Source:** Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** September 2006

**Explanation:** Each state has developed a schedule by which its mathematics assessments for grades 3-8 and high school will be developed and field tested, and submitted to the Department for review and approval, prior to implementation. The Department developed the Standards and Assessment External Peer Review process to review and approve the state assessments and conducted its first peer review in early 2005. States are required to have their mathematics assessments in place by SY 2005-06. The 2006 performance target of 52 reflects the compliance of the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

**Indicator 1.3 of 6:** 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 (three through five, six through eight and high school) in science that align with the state's academic content standards.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> The number of states (including DC and PR) that have science assessments in each grade span (grades three through five, six through eight and high school).		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	0	999
<b>2005</b>	0	18
<b>2006</b>		15
<b>2007</b>		25
<b>2008</b>		52

**Source:** Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** September 2006

**Explanation:** Each state has developed a schedule by which its science assessments in each grade spans (3-5, 6-8, and high school) will be developed and field tested, and submitted to the Department for review and approval, prior to implementation. The Department developed the Standards and Assessment External Review process to review and approve the state assessments. No state submitted their science assessments for review in 2004 or 2005. States are required to have their science assessments in place by SY 2007-08. The 2008 performance target of 52 reflects the compliance of the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

**Indicator 1.4 of 6:** Field testing reading: States' field testing assessments in reading/language arts.

<b>Measure 1.4.1 of 1:</b> The number of states that have completed field testing of the required assessments in reading/language arts.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	16	
<b>2004</b>	20	
<b>2005</b>	47	30
<b>2006</b>		52
<b>2007</b>		52
<b>2008</b>		52

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Reports and state Web sites

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** September 2006

**Explanation:** Field testing is a prerequisite for implementation of new assessments.

**Indicator 1.5 of 6:** Field testing mathematics: States' field testing assessments in mathematics.

<b>Measure 1.5.1 of 1:</b> The number of states that have completed field testing of the required assessments in mathematics.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	16	
<b>2004</b>	20	
<b>2005</b>	47	30
<b>2006</b>		52
<b>2007</b>		52
<b>2008</b>		52

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Reports and state Web sites

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** September 2006

**Explanation:** Field testing is a prerequisite for implementation of new assessments.

**Indicator 1.6 of 6:** Field Testing Science: States field testing assessments in science

<b>Measure 1.6.1 of 1:</b> The number of states that have completed field testing of the required assessments in science.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	18	
<b>2004</b>	19	
<b>2005</b>	24	
<b>2006</b>		20
<b>2007</b>		52
<b>2008</b>		52

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Reports and State Web Sites.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** September 2006

**Explanation:** Field testing is a prerequisite for implementation of new assessments.

# ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs - FY 2007

**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 1 of 2:** *To encourage states to use flexibility authorities in ways that will increase student achievement.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 3:** 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 (AYP) than those that use funds for all other activities. Strategic priorities include (1) those that support student achievement, 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.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of LEAs meeting AYP.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	Of districts targeting Title V funds, the percent achieving AYP	Of districts not targeting Title V funds, the percent achieving AYP	Of districts targeting Title V funds, the percent achieving AYP	Of districts not targeting Title V funds, the percent achieving AYP
<b>2003</b>	65	55	65	55
<b>2004</b>			68	58
<b>2005</b>			69	59
<b>2006</b>			70	60
<b>2007</b>			71	61

**Source:** State Report Cards; Title V Monitoring; Consolidated State Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2007

**Indicator 1.2 of 3:** Improved student achievement: The percentage of combined funds that districts use for the four strategic priorities. The four strategic priorities are: (1) support student achievement, enhance reading and math; (2) improve the quality of teachers; (3) ensure that schools are safe and drug free; and (4) promote access for all students.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of combined funds that districts use for the four strategic priorities
--

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report; Title V Program monitoring

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline. The performance target for FY 2007 is baseline plus 2%.

**Indicator 1.3 of 3:** Improved student achievement: The percentage of LEAs that complete a credible needs assessment.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of LEAs that complete a credible needs assessment.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Program monitoring; Site visits

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline. The performance target for FY 2007 is baseline plus 2%.

**Objective 2 of 2:** *Improve the operational efficiency of the program*

**Indicator 2.1 of 2:** Program Efficiency: A decrease in the number of days it takes the Department of Education to send a monitoring report to states after monitoring visits (both on-site and virtual).

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The number of days it takes the Department of Education to send a monitoring report to states after monitoring visits (both on-site and virtual).		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** State Report Cards: Title V monitoring

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006



**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline. The FY 2007 target is the baseline plus 1 percent.

**Indicator 2.2 of 2:** Program Efficiency: A decrease in the number of days it takes states to respond satisfactorily to findings in their monitoring reports.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> The number of days it takes states to respond satisfactorily to findings in their monitoring reports.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** State Report Cards: Title V monitoring

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline. The FY 2007 target is the baseline plus 1 percent.

# ESEA: Striving Readers - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.371A - Striving Readers

**Program Goal: To enhance the overall level of reading achievement in middle and high schools through intensive literacy interventions for struggling readers and improvements in literacy instruction across curriculum; and to help build a strong scientific research base around specific strategies that improve adolescent literacy skills.**

---

**Objective 1 of 1:** *Raise the reading achievement levels of middle and high school-aged students in Title I eligible schools with significant numbers of students reading below grade level.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 2:** Reading achievement of students participating in an intensive intervention: Increased percentage of adolescent students reading significantly below grade level who demonstrate a gain in their reading achievement at a minimum of one grade level or its equivalent after participating in an intensive intervention over an academic year.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of adolescent students reading significantly below grade level who demonstrate a gain in their reading achievement at a minimum of one grade level or its equivalent after participating in an intensive intervention over an academic year.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2007		999

**Source:** Grantee Annual Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2008

**Explanation:** The FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline. Striving Readers provides services only in grades 6-12.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** Reading achievement in schools participating in Striving Readers: Increased percentage of schools participating in the Striving Readers program whose students score at or above proficient on the state's reading/language arts assessment.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of schools participating in the Striving Readers program whose students score at or above proficient on the state's reading/language arts assessment.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2007		999

**Source:** Grantee Annual Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2008

**Explanation:** The FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline. Striving Readers projects support services only in grades 6-12.

# ESEA: Teaching American History - FY 2007

**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 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 1.1 of 1:** Students in experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational effectiveness in the Teaching of Traditional 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.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 2:</b> (a) The percentage of students in studies of educational effectiveness who demonstrate higher achievement than those in control or comparison groups.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>		999
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 2:</b> (b) The percentage of school districts that demonstrate higher educational achievement for students in TAH classrooms than those in control or comparison groups.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Teaching American History Grantee Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** July 2006

**Explanation:** (a) The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1 percent. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the FY 2005 target. The FY 2007 target is the FY 2006 target plus 1 percentage point. (b) The FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1 percentage point. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the FY 2005 target. The FY 2007 target is the FY 2006 target plus 1 percentage point.

# ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies - FY 2007

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

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

---

**Objective 1 of 2:** *The performance of low-income students will increase substantially in reading and mathematics.*

**Indicator 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 proficient or advanced performance levels will increase annually.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> 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.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	25	
2005		25
2006		25
2007		26

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** September 2006

**Explanation:** SY 2002-03 was the first year for which states were required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report. Actual performance data for FY 2005 will be obtained by comparing SY 2004-05 data to 2003-04 data.

**Indicator 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>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> 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.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

<b>2004</b>	31	
<b>2005</b>		25
<b>2006</b>		25
<b>2007</b>		26

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report; EDEN

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** September 2006

**Explanation:** SY 2002-03 was the first year for which states were required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report. Actual performance data for FY 2005 will be obtained by comparing SY 2004-05 data to SY 2003-04 data.

**Objective 2 of 2: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Status**

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Making AYP: The number of states that report an increase in schools making AYP.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of schools making AYP.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>		10
<b>2006</b>		20
<b>2007</b>		21

**Source:** Consolidated State Performance Report; EDEN

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** September 2006

**Explanation:** School year 2002-2003 was the first year for which states were required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report. Actual performance data for FY 2005 will be obtained by comparing SY 2004-2005 data to SY 2003-2004 data.

# ESEA: Transition To Teaching - FY 2007

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** The percentage of new, highly qualified Transition to Teaching teachers who teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for at least three years.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 3:</b> a) The percentage of all Transition to Teaching (TTT) participants who become teachers of record (TOR) in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	2002 Grant	2004 Grant	2002 Grant	2004 Grant
2003	27			
2004	41		60	
2005	45	18	70	
2006			55	40
2007			75	45
2008				55
2009				75

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 3:</b> (b) The percentage of Transition to Teaching (TTT) participants receiving certification/licensure within three years.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	2002 Grant	2004 Grant	2002 Grant	2004 Grant
2005	18	10		
2006			40	15
2007			65	25
2008				40
2009				65

<b>Measure 1.1.3 of 3:</b> (c) The percentage of Transition to Teaching (TTT) teachers of record who teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for at least three years.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	2002 Grant	2004 Grant	2002 Grant	2004 Grant
<b>2006</b>			999	
<b>2007</b>			999	
<b>2008</b>				999
<b>2009</b>				999

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Transition to Teaching Grantee Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2007

While not a formal measure of validation, the 2004 grantees will also be responsible for providing a three year interim evaluation demonstrating progress over the first three years of the grant. As in 2005 with the 2002 grantees, this interim evaluation may provide a validation of the actual annual performance data for the 2004 grantees.

**Limitations:** In 2005, the Transition to Teaching Program piloted a uniform reporting system that improved data consistency but which required outside contractors to manage. In 2006 the program began to use the Department's standard performance reporting form. This form has been piloted with 2002 grantees for a different purpose. While the new form is an improvement over the previous year's performance reporting form that relied entirely on narrative formats, the new form requires very specific directions to ensure reporting consistency across grantees.

**Improvements:** The use of the on-line uniform reporting system, created by AIR, provided agreed-upon definitions of key terms and should improve consistency across grantees as a result.

**Explanation:** (a) FY 2003 data established baselines. Language clarified to "teacher of record," now standardized language for TTT, meaning participant has primary instructional responsibility. Calculation is the cumulative number of teachers of record in high-need schools/LEAs over cumulative number of TTT participants. (b) The previous measure was refined in FY 2006 by adding a 3-year timeframe to reflect expectation of expedited processes. Calculation is the cumulative number receiving certification within 3 years over cumulative number of participants. Denominator changed from teachers to participants as more meaningful indicator of performance. FY 2005 data for the 2002 cohort established the baselines. (c) For 2002 cohort FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. Calculation will be the number of TORs in FY 2006 who began in 2003 over total number of TORs who began in 2003. FY 2007 target is baseline plus 1percent. For 2004 cohort, FY 2008 target is to establish the baseline. Calculation will be the number of TORs in FY 2008 who began in 2005 over total number of TORs who began in 2005. FY 2009 target is baseline plus 1percent.



# ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.815 - Troops to Teachers

**Program Goal: To increase the number of Troops participants who become teachers of record in high-need LEAs.**

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Recruit and retain highly qualified teachers in high-need LEAs.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 3:</b> (a) The percentage of troops participants who become teachers of record in high-need LEAs..		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	71	
<b>2004</b>	76	
<b>2005</b>		75
<b>2006</b>		75
<b>2007</b>		75
<b>2008</b>		75

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 3:</b> (b) The percentage of participants who become mathematics, science or special education teachers.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	44	
<b>2004</b>	45	
<b>2005</b>		47
<b>2006</b>		49
<b>2007</b>		50

<b>Measure 1.1.3 of 3:</b> (c) The percentage of troops participants who remain in teaching for three or more years after placement in a teaching position in a high-need LEA.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>		80
<b>2006</b>		80

2007		80
------	--	----

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Troops to Teachers Grantee Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

**Explanation:** "Participants" are those receiving financial support from the Troops-to-Teachers program, either stipend or bonus. Both participants and recruits receive funding from the program and the words are used interchangeably. "Eligible school district " is a high-need LEA as defined by program regulations. "Teachers of record" are those Troops participants hired by an eligible school district, and all Troops teachers are highly qualified. Measure (a): the calculation is the total number of highly qualified Troops teachers since Jan. 2002 divided by the total number of Troops participants since Jan. 2002. Measure (b): the total number of math or science or special education Troops teachers since Jan. 2002 divided by the total number of Troops participants since Jan. 2002. Measure (b) includes special education teachers in order to track priority subject areas in the NCLB statute. For FY 2006, measure (c) will report on Troops participants who began teaching in the 2003-04 school year; for 2007 those who began teaching in 2004-05; for 2008 those who began teaching in 2005-06. The FY 2005 data were not collected. The goal is to maintain the same percentage of retention over the years.

# ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice - FY 2007

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** The number and percentage of families who exercise public school choices will increase annually.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 2:</b> (a) The number of students who have the option of attending participating VPSC schools selected by their parents.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	755,387	
<b>2005</b>	862,396	849,864
<b>2006</b>		846,523
<b>2007</b>		843,384

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 2:</b> (b) The percentage of students participating at each VPSC site who exercise school choice by changing schools.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	1	
<b>2005</b>	1.90	
<b>2006</b>		2
<b>2007</b>		2.50

**Source:** Voluntary Public School Choice Grantee Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2007

**Explanation:** (a) The measure is the total number of all students eligible to apply for transfers. In some instances, grantees may not have slots available for all students applying for a transfer. The performance target is the estimated number of participating students when projects are fully implemented, excluding Florida for which no estimate was possible. (b) The calculation is the total number of students who changed schools divided by the total number of eligible students for the VPSC program across the 13 grantees. This approach is consistent with the national evaluation of this program. This measure replaces a previous similar measure that was based on an average of averages across sites. Trend data shown in the table reflect a re-calculation under the new definition. "School" refers to a day or residential school, as well as schools within a school, off-campus learning and "alternative" programs. "Exercising choice" refers to students who moved from their assigned

ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice

school to a school of their choice. The targets reflect anticipated full implementation but may decrease over time because of predicted declining enrollments in some grantee sites.

# ESRA: Comprehensive Centers - FY 2007

**Program Goal: To improve student achievement in low-performing schools under the No Child Left Behind Act.**

**Objective 1 of 2:** *Improve the quality of technical assistance.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 2:** High quality: The percentage of products and services that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified stakeholders.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of products and services that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified stakeholders.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999
<b>2008</b>		999
<b>2009</b>		999
<b>2010</b>		999

**Source:** Reviews by independent review panel.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2007

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Source information will be based upon report of independent review panel.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline. This is a long-term measure with the following targets: 2007 baseline plus 1 percent, 2008 baseline plus 2 percent, 2009 baseline plus 3 percent, 2010 baseline plus 4 percent.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** High relevance: The percentage of products and services that are deemed to be of high relevance by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational practice by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999
<b>2008</b>		999

<b>2009</b>		999
<b>2010</b>		999

**Source:** Reviews by independent review panel.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2007

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Source information will be based upon report of independent review panel.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline. This is a long-term measure with the following targets: 2007 baseline plus 1 percent, 2008 baseline plus 2 percent, 2009 baseline plus 3 percent, 2010 baseline plus 4 percent.

**Objective 2 of 2:** *Technical assistance products and services will be used to improve results for children in the target areas.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Use: The percentage of all products and services (such as professional development, problem solving, and networking) that are deemed to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice by target audiences.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of all products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice by target audiences.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999
<b>2008</b>		999
<b>2009</b>		999
<b>2010</b>		999

**Source:** Source information will be based upon a survey of target audiences.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2007

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline. This is a long-term measure with the following targets: 2007 baseline plus 1 percent, 2008 baseline plus 2 percent, 2009 baseline plus 3 percent, 2010 baseline plus 4 percent.

# ESRA: National Assessment - FY 2007

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 1 of 1:** *Timeliness of National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data for reading and mathematics assessment in support of No Child Left Behind.*

**Indicator 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.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of months from the end of NAEP reading and mathematics assessments data collection to the initial public release of results.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	8	6
<b>2005</b>	6	6
<b>2007</b>		6

**Frequency:** Biennially.

**Next Data Available:** October 2007

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

# HEA: High School Equivalency Program - FY 2007

**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 1 of 2:** *An increasing percentage of HEP participants will receive their General Educational Development (GED) diploma.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** The percentage of High School Equivalency Program (HEP) participants receiving a GED.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of HEP participants receiving a GED.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	70	
1998	66	
1999	72	
2000	73	
2001	58	
2002	53	
2003	63	60
2004		60
2005		65
2006		66
2007		67
2010		70

**Source:** HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Limitations:** OME is working with grantees to provide detailed information within the annual performance reports.

**Explanation:** This is a long term measure. The denominator for this measure is the number of HEP participants who receive the GED divided by the number of HEP participants served.



**Objective 2 of 2:** *An increasing percentage of HEP participants in the GED will enter postsecondary education programs, career positions, or the military.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Post-GED placement: The percentage of HEP participants who earn the GED and enter postsecondary education programs, career positions, or the military will continue to be high, if not increase.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of HEP participants who earn the GED and enter postsecondary education programs, career positions, or the military.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is the baseline plus 2 percent.

# IDEA: Special Education Grants for Infants and Families - FY 2007

**CFDA Number:** 84.181 - Special Education Grants for Infants and Families with Disabilities

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

---

**Objective 1 of 2:** *The functional development of infants and toddlers will be enhanced by early intervention services.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 2:** FUNCTIONAL ABILITIES: The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in the Part C program who demonstrate positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and demonstrate appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in Part C who demonstrate positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and demonstrate appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2007		999

**Source:** Part C Annual Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** February 2008  
OSEP is currently determining a data collection methodology for this measure.

**Explanation:** Program entry and exit data for infants and toddlers included in this measure will be collected. The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** FAMILY CAPACITY: The percentage of families participating in Part C that report that early intervention services have helped them (1) know their rights; (2) effectively communicate their children's needs; and (3) help their children develop and learn.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of families participating in Part C that report that early intervention services have helped them (1) know their rights; (2) effectively communicate their children's needs; and (3) help their children develop and learn.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	72	
2001	73	

<b>2002</b>		80
<b>2003</b>		80
<b>2004</b>		80
<b>2005</b>		80
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Part C Annual Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** February 2007

OSEP is currently determining a data collection methodology for this indicator.

**Explanation:** FY 1998 data established the baseline. Data for 1998 and 2001 were obtained from the IDEA National Early Intervention Study (NEILS). No data will be collected FY 2002-2006. The FY 2007 target is to establish a new baseline using state reported data.

**Objective 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 2.1 of 3:** Infants served: The number of states that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under age one through Part C.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of states that serve at least one percent of infants in the general population under age one through Part C.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2002</b>	21	
<b>2003</b>	23	
<b>2004</b>	23	37
<b>2005</b>	24	27
<b>2006</b>		27
<b>2007</b>		27

**Source:** State-reported data under IDEA Section 618 and U.S. census data.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Explanation:** The 1 percent threshold in this indicator is based on the prevalence rates of 5 conditions: 0.4 percent, severe mental retardation; 0.2 percent, hearing impairment; 0.1 percent, visual impairment; 0.2 percent, physical conditions (spina bifida, cerebral palsy, etc.); and 0.1 percent, autism.

**Indicator 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.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> 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.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2002</b>	25	
<b>2003</b>	27	20
<b>2004</b>	28	40
<b>2005</b>	30	31
<b>2006</b>		31
<b>2007</b>		32

**Source:** State-reported data under IDEA Section 618 and U.S. census data.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Explanation:** FY 2002 data were used to establish a baseline.

**Indicator 2.3 of 3:** Service settings: The percentage of children receiving early intervention services in home or in programs designed for typically developing children.

<b>Measure 2.3.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of children receiving early intervention services in home or in programs designed for typically developing children.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>1997</b>	58	
<b>1998</b>	63	
<b>1999</b>	67	
<b>2000</b>	73	67
<b>2001</b>	76	69
<b>2002</b>	82	71
<b>2003</b>	83	78
<b>2004</b>	85	79
<b>2005</b>		83
<b>2006</b>		85
<b>2007</b>		86

IDEA: Special Education Grants for Infants and Families

<b>2008</b>		87
<b>2009</b>		88
<b>2010</b>		89

**Source:** State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Explanation:** This is a long-term measure.

# IDEA: Special Education Grants to States - FY 2007

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 postsecondary education and/or competitive employment and independent living by assisting state and local educational agencies and families.**

*Objective 1 of 4: All children with disabilities will meet challenging standards as determined by national and state assessments with accommodations as appropriate.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 3: PERFORMANCE ON NAEP:** The percentage of children with disabilities that meet or exceed Basic levels in reading and mathematics on the NAEP.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic in reading on the NAEP.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2000	22	
2002	29	24
2003	29	25
2005	33	35
2007		35
2009		37
2011		39

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic in mathematics on the NAEP.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2000	20	
2003	29	23
2005	31	32
2007		33
2009		35
2011		37

Source: NCES (NAEP).

**Frequency:** Biennially.

**Next Data Available:** November 2007

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

**Limitations:** Results of the NAEP scores for students with disabilities from this sample cannot be generalized to the total population of such students.

**Explanation:** Targets for 2000-03 have been adjusted to be consistent with the Department's Strategic Plan 2002-2007.

**Indicator 1.2 of 3: EXCLUSION FROM NAEP:** The percentage of students excluded from NAEP due to their disability.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities included in the NAEP reading sample who are excluded from the NAEP.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
1998	41	
2002	39	
2003	33	
2005	35	
2007		33
2009		31
2011		29

<b>Measure 1.2.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities included in NAEP mathematics sample who are excluded from the NAEP.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2000	32	
2003	22	
2005	24	
2007		23
2009		21
2011		19

**Source:** NCES

**Frequency:** Biennially.

**Next Data Available:** November 2007

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

**Explanation:** This measure was changed in 2006 to better focus on the percentage of children with disabilities

who are excluded from NAEP testing. Previous years' data were recalculated accordingly.

**Indicator 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.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 2:</b> 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.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	24	
2005		25
2006		25
2007		26

<b>Measure 1.3.2 of 2:</b> 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.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	26	
2005		25
2006		25
2007		26

**Source:** OESE Consolidated State Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Explanation:** This measure parallels a measure for the Title I Grants to Local Education Agencies program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

**Objective 2 of 4:** *Secondary school students will complete high school prepared for postsecondary education and/or competitive employment.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 3: GRADUATION RATE:** The percentage of students with disabilities who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of students with disabilities with IEPs who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	43	



1998	45	
1999	47	
2000	46	
2001	48	
2002	51	
2003	52	
2004	54	
2005		54
2006		56
2007		57
2008		58
2009		59
2010		60

**Source:** State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Explanation:** The graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students aged 14 and older with disabilities who graduated with a regular diploma by the total number of students with disabilities in the same age group who graduate with a regular diploma, receive a certificate of completion, reach the maximum age for services, die, drop out, or move (not known to have continued)). This includes calculations for 57 entities (50 states. DC. Puerto Rico. Guam. American Samoa. Virgin Islands. N. Marianas and BIA)

**Indicator 2.2 of 3: DROPOUT RATE:** The percentage of students with disabilities who drop out of school.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of students with disabilities who drop out of school.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
1997	46	
1998	44	
1999	42	
2000	42	
2001	41	
2002	38	
2003	34	
2004	31	

<b>2005</b>		34
<b>2006</b>		29
<b>2007</b>		28
<b>2008</b>		27
<b>2009</b>		26
<b>2010</b>		25

**Source:** State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Explanation:** The dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students aged 14 and older with disabilities who dropped out or moved (not known to have continued in education) by the total number of students with disabilities in the same age group who graduate with a regular diploma, receive a certificate of completion, reach the maximum age for services, die, drop out, or move (not known to have continued). This includes calculations for 57 entities (50 states, DC, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, N. Marianas and BIA).

**Indicator 2.3 of 3: POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL AND EMPLOYMENT:** The percentage of youth with disabilities who are no longer in secondary school and who are either competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

<b>Measure 2.3.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of youth with disabilities who are no longer in secondary school and who are either competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	59	
<b>2005</b>		59.50
<b>2006</b>		60
<b>2007</b>		60.50

**Source:** National Longitudinal Transition Study 2 (NLTS2).

**Date Sponsored:** 09/30/2002.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** September 2006

**Objective 3 of 4:** All children with disabilities will receive a free appropriate public education.

**Indicator 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 to 21 fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of states with at least 90 percent of special education teachers fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
1997	36	
1998	37	
1999	36	41
2000	36	42
2001	37	42
2002	33	42
2003	30	37
2004	36	37
2005		39
2006		40
2007		41

**Source:** State-reported data under IDEA section 618.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** Data reflect grades 1-12, not teachers teaching children aged 6-21. State 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).

**Explanation:** There is a clustering of states around the 90 percent threshold in this indicator, which may result in unpredictable changes from year to year.

**Indicator 3.2 of 3: HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS UNDER IDEA:** The percentage of special education teachers who teach core academic subjects that are highly qualified, consistent with IDEA.

<b>Measure 3.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of special education teachers who teach core academic subjects that are highly qualified, consistent with IDEA.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2005		999

**Source:** State reported data

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** September 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target was to establish a baseline.

**Indicator 3.3 of 3: SERVICES OUTSIDE THE REGULAR CLASSROOM:** The percentage of children aged 6 to 21 served outside of the regular classroom 60 percent or more of the day because of their disability.

<b>Measure 3.3.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of children served outside of the regular classroom 60 percent or more of the day due to their disability (as a percentage of the school population).		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2001</b>	2.85	
<b>2002</b>	2.81	
<b>2003</b>	2.77	
<b>2004</b>	2.67	
<b>2005</b>		2.69
<b>2006</b>		2.65
<b>2007</b>		2.64

**Source:** State-reported data under IDEA section 618 and NCES data.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Explanation:** Data for FY 2001 were used to establish a baseline.

**Objective 4 of 4: Improve the administration of IDEA.**

**Indicator 4.1 of 1: ISSUANCE OF LETTERS:** The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and OSEP's response.

<b>Measure 4.1.1 of 1:</b> The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and OSEP's response.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	123	
<b>2005</b>	107	
<b>2006</b>		113
<b>2007</b>		103

**Source:** OSEP office records.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 data established the baseline.

# IDEA: Special Education Personnel Preparation - FY 2007

**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 qualified to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

---

**Objective 1 of 3:** *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.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 2: EVIDENCE-BASED CURRICULUM:** The percentage of projects incorporating evidence-based curriculum.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of Personnel Preparation projects incorporating evidence-based curriculum.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999

**Source:** Researcher/expert panel review of a sample of program curricula.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2: KNOWLEDGEABLE AND SKILLED SCHOLARS:** The percentage of scholars who are knowledgeable and skilled in evidence-based practices.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of IDEA funded scholars who are knowledgeable and skilled in evidence-based practices.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999

**Source:** Sample of scholars.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

**Objective 2 of 3:** *Increase the supply of teachers and service providers who are highly qualified for and serve in positions for which they are trained.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 4: SCHOLARS EXITING PROGRAM:** The percentage of scholars who exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of IDEA funded scholars who exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005	0.95	999
2006		0.99
2007		0.99

**Source:** IDEA - Part D- Personnel Preparation Annual Data Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2005

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target was to establish a baseline.

**Indicator 2.2 of 4: EMPLOYED UPON COMPLETION:** The percentage of degree/certification program recipients employed upon program completion who are working in the area(s) in which they were trained.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of IDEA funded degree/certification program recipients employed upon program completion who are working in the area(s) in which they were trained.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	79	
2005	68	82
2006		71
2007		85
2008		86
2009		88
2010		89

**Source:** IDEA- Part D - Personnel Preparation Annual Data Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Explanation:** No FY 2004 data were collected.

**Indicator 2.3 of 4: EMPLOYED AND FULLY QUALIFIED UNDER IDEA:** The percentage of degree/certification recipients employed upon program completion who are working in the area(s) in which they were trained and who are fully qualified under IDEA.

<b>Measure 2.3.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of IDEA funded degree/certification recipients employed upon program completion who are working in the area(s) for which they were trained and who are fully qualified under IDEA.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

<b>2006</b>		999
-------------	--	-----

**Source:** IDEA- Part D - Personnel Preparation Annual Data Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

**Indicator 2.4 of 4: EMPLOYED FOR THREE OR MORE YEARS:** The percentage of degree/ certification recipients who maintain employment for three or more years in the area(s) in which they were trained and who are fully qualified under IDEA.

<b>Measure 2.4.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of IDEA funded degree/certification recipients who maintain employment for three or more years in the area(s) in which they were trained and who are fully qualified under IDEA.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2008</b>		999

**Source:** Sample of scholars in the field - post completion.

**Frequency:** Other.

**Next Data Available:** October 2008

**Explanation:** This is a new measure. The FY 2008 target is to establish a baseline. Baseline data will reflect scholars who have taught for a minimum of three years beyond program completion in the areas for which they were trained. Therefore these data will not be reported until FY 2008.

**Objective 3 of 3:** *The Personnel Preparation Program will ensure an adequate supply of personnel who are fully qualified under IDEA to serve infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. (Long-term objective. Target areas: assessment, literacy, behavior, instructional strategies, early intervention, and inclusive practices)*

**Indicator 3.1 of 1: QUALIFIED LOW INCIDENCE PERSONNEL:** The percentage of low incidence positions that are filled by personnel who are fully qualified under IDEA.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of low incidence positions that are filled by personnel who are fully qualified under IDEA.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** IDEA - Part D - Personnel Preparation Annual Data Report

**Explanation:** This is a new measure for 2007. The FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline.

# IDEA: Special Education Preschool Grants - FY 2007

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 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 1.1 of 3: SERVICE SETTING:** The percentage of children receiving special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of children receiving special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
1999	41	
2000	40	
2001	39	
2002	40	39
2003	38	40
2004	37	40
2005	36	41
2006		40
2007		40

**Source:** State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Limitations:** The Department 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.

**Indicator 1.2 of 3: CERTIFIED 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.



<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The number of states with at least 90 percent of special education teachers of children aged three to five who are fully certified in the area in which they are teaching.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
1997	35	
1998	37	
1999	34	40
2000	36	41
2001	35	40
2002	34	40
2003	32	36
2004	34	36
2005		37
2006		37
2007		38

**Source:** State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Limitations:** States maintain data by grades taught, not by ages of students taught. Therefore, these data are for teachers teaching prekindergarten and kindergarten.

**Improvements:** 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.

**Explanation:** There is a clustering of states around the 90 percent threshold in this measure, which may result in unpredictable changes from year to year.

**Indicator 1.3 of 3: FUNCTIONAL ABILITIES:** The percentage of children with disabilities aged three through five participating in the Preschool Grants program who demonstrate positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and use appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of children with disabilities aged three through five participating in the Preschool Grants program who demonstrate positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and use appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** State-reported data under the Annual Performance Reports and IDEA section 618.

**Frequency:** Other.

**Next Data Available:** October 2007

**Explanation:** This measure 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. The FY 2007 target is to maintain the baseline.

# MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths - FY 2007

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 2:** State assessment participation: Percentage of homeless students that participate annually in the state assessments in reading and mathematics will increase.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of homeless children and youth, grades three through eight, included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics as reported by LEA subgrantees.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
2004	16	15		
2005	50	49	17	16
2006			53	52
2007			60	60

**Source:** McKineey - Vento Homeless Assistance Act (MVHAA) Annual Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

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.

**Explanation:** FY 2002 data established the baseline from a one-time data collection. However, the 2002 results could not be disaggregated by subject matter. Data was not collected in 2003. The data to be collected from states are from LEAs that have subgrantees and are capable of reporting such data. However, approximately 10 percent of all school districts receive subgrant funds.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** State assessment achievement: The percentage of homeless students meeting or exceeding state's proficiency level or standard in reading and mathematics.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of homeless students, grades three through eight, meeting or exceeding state proficiency standards in reading/language arts and mathematics.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths

	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
<b>2002</b>	30	24		
<b>2004</b>	36	36		
<b>2005</b>	42	41	34	26
<b>2006</b>			43	43
<b>2007</b>			50	50

**Source:** MVHAA Annual Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2002 data established the baseline from a one-time data collection. Data were not collected in 2003. 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. However, nationally only 10% of LEAs receive subgrants.

# **Goal 3: Develop Safe and Drug-Free Schools**



# ESEA: Character Education - FY 2007

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.215S - Partnerships in Character Education Program  
84.215V - Partnerships in Character Education

**Program Goal: To help promote the development of strong character among the nation's students.**

**Objective 1 of 1:** Support the development and implementation of high-quality character education programs.

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Partnerships in Character Education: Partnership in Character Education Program grantees will demonstrate improved student outcomes through valid, rigorous evaluations.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The proportion of Partnerships in Character Education projects demonstrating improved student outcomes through valid, rigorous evaluations.						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
<b>2006</b>				999		
<b>2007</b>				999		
<b>2008</b>					999	

**Source:** Review of biennial evaluation reports included in program files.

**Frequency:** Biennially.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** While all grantees are required to conduct evaluations, only those responding to the competitive preference for rigorous evaluations are actually conducting valid, rigorous evaluations. Thus, only a subset of Character Education grantees are actually reflected in the data collected under this measure. Evaluation results will be available after two years and at the completion of the each project.

**Explanation:** A subset of grantees evaluate their projects using either experimental or quasi-experimental designs. Evaluation reports will not be available annually. For each cohort, no target will be established for years in which evaluation reports are not due. The FY 2006 target is to set a baseline for the 2004 cohort, the FY 2007 target is to set a baseline for the 2005 cohort, and the FY 2008 target is to set the baseline for the 2006 cohort. Future year targets will be established as baseline data become available. Because of different grant cohorts, information will be available each year for one or more cohorts, but data related to each cohort are collected biennially.

# ESEA: Mentoring Program - FY 2007

**CFDA Number:** 84.184B - 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 1 of 1:** Provide grants to community-based organizations and local school districts to support mentoring programs for high-risk youth.

**Indicator 1.1 of 3:** Sustained mentoring matches: Proportion of student-mentor matches that are sustained for over one year.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of student-mentor matches that are sustained by the grantees for a period of 12 months.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2006			999	
2007				999

**Source:** Annual Grantee Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Explanation:** No target is established for a cohort in the first year after award because grant sites will need to have operated for a minimum of 12 months in order to produce any student-mentor matches that meet the criteria established for this measure. The FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline for the 2004 cohort, and the FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline for the 2005 cohort.

**Indicator 1.2 of 3:** Improved academic achievement: The proportion of mentored students demonstrating improved academic competencies.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of mentored students who demonstrate improvement in core academic subjects as measured by grade point average after 12 months.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2006			aaa	



<b>2007</b>		999
-------------	--	-----

**Source:** Annual Grantee Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** No target is established for a cohort in the first year after award because grant sites will need to have operated for a minimum of 12 months to report data that meet the criteria for this measure. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort, and the FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.

**Indicator 1.3 of 3:** Unexcused absences: Proportion of mentored students with unexcused absences.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of mentored students who have unexcused absences from school.						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
<b>2005</b>	39.40					
<b>2006</b>				27.60	999	
<b>2007</b>				23.60	999	

**Source:** Annual Grantee Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** It is important to note that of 146 grantees who submitted performance reports in 2005, only 31 (21.2%) of them provided aggregable data that is responsive to the established performance measure. The remaining 115 grantees either provided no data, no aggregable data, or data that did not respond to the established performance measure.

**Explanation:** Of the 1358 mentored students from grantees reporting data on this measure, 535 had at least one unexcused absence. The FY 2005 data established a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is based on a 30% decrease in the second year, and the FY 2007 target is based on a 40% decrease by the third year. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort. The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline for the 2006 cohort.

# ESEA: Physical Education Program - FY 2007

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

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

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Meeting state physical education standards: Program evaluations will demonstrate program activities are helping grantees meet state standards for physical education.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of students served by the grant who make progress toward meeting state standards for physical education.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005	73.80			999		
2006				999		
2007				90	999	

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of students served by the grant actively participating in physical education activities.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005	69.90			999		
2006				999		
2007				90	999	

**Source:** Random sampling of annual grantee performance reports (see note on sampling methods in Explanation section).

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** Of the 78 grant performance reports sampled, only 25 (32%) for the first measure and 24 (31%) for the second measure contained aggregable (raw) data for this measure. Due to the large number of grants in this cohort, grantee performance reports were randomly sampled for this data collection. The slate of funded programs was rank-ordered by year one funding amount. The list was then numbered 1-2. All 'ones' were

sampled. No replacements were made for sampled reports containing invalid or un-aggregable data.

**Explanation:** Among 35,043 the students served (by the sampled grantees which provided aggregable data), 25,857 (73.8%) made progress toward meeting state standards for physical education. 42,179 (69.9%) out of 60,363 students actively participated in physical education activities. The FY 2005 target was to establish the baseline for the 2004 cohort, the FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline for the 2005 cohort, and the FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline for the 2006 cohort.

# ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Other National Programs - FY 2007

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.184D - Student Drug Testing  
84.184L - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Safe Schools/Healthy Students Program

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Safe Schools/Healthy Students: Extent to which grantees demonstrate substantial progress in improving student behaviors and school environments.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 3:</b> The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that experience a decrease in the number of violent incidents at schools during the three-year grant period.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005				999		
2006					999	
2007				90		999

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 3:</b> The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that experience a decrease in substance abuse during the three-year grant period.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005				999		
2006					999	
2007				90		999

<b>Measure 1.1.3 of 3:</b> The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that improve school attendance during the three-year grant period.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005						
2006						
2007						

	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
<b>2005</b>				999		
<b>2006</b>					999	
<b>2007</b>				90		999

**Source:** Annual Grantee Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target was to establish baseline data for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort. The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline for the 2006 cohort.

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

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Student drug testing: Proportion of grantees that experience an annual reduction in the incidence of drug use by students in the target population.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a five percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-month drug use by students in the target population.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort
<b>2005</b>			999	
<b>2006</b>			999	
<b>2007</b>			999	999

<b>Measure 2.1.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a five percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-year drug use by students in the target population.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort
<b>2005</b>			999	
<b>2006</b>			999	
<b>2007</b>			999	999

**Source:** Annual Grantee Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** Due to grantee delays in obtaining IRB approvals, baseline data were reported one year late for this program. Because the nature of the performance measure requires two years of data, the first data for this measure will be available in FY 2006.

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target was to establish a baseline for the 2003 cohort; however data were not collect. Therefore, the FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2003 cohort. The FY 2007 target for the 2003 cohort is the baseline plus 25%. The FY 2007 target for the 2005 cohort is to establish a baseline.

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





# ESEA: Indian Education - National Activities - FY 2007

**Program Goal: To prepare and train Indians to serve as teachers and school administrators.**

**Objective 1 of 1:** *Indian Education National Activities focus on research, evaluation, collection, dissemination and analyses of the educational status, needs and effective approaches for the education of American Indian and Alaska Native children and adults.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 2:** The number of annual hits on the NCES American Indian and Alaska Native Web based data tool and the OIE Web sites.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of annual hits on the NCES Web based data tool and the OIE Web site.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** New NCES Web site.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** A Web based program will automatically count the hits on the Web site. The FY 2006 target was to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is baseline plus 1 percent.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** Increasing the representation of American Indian and Alaska Natives who are surveyed by high quality national educational studies.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of high quality national educational studies that oversample and report statistically reliable data on American Indian and Alaska Natives.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** NCES

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is the baseline plus 1 percent.

# ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.305 - Education Research

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

---

**Objective 1 of 2:** *Raise the quality of research funded or conducted by the Department.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 2:** The percentage of new research proposals funded by Institute of Education Sciences that receive an average score of excellent or higher from an independent review panel of qualified scientists.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> 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.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	88	
2004	97	
2005	100	100
2006		100
2007		100

**Source:** Expert

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** September 2006

**Limitations:** Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the peer review panel. Inclusion of senior scientists who are leading researchers in their fields ensures the quality of the data.

**Explanation:** the measure is calculated as the average review panel score for newly funded IES research proposals.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the Department's National Center of Education Research that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	32	32

<b>2002</b>	100	75
<b>2003</b>	97	75
<b>2004</b>	90	75
<b>2005</b>		75
<b>2006</b>		75
<b>2007</b>		75

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Limitations:** Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the proposal reviewers. Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as having two IES researchers independently evaluate a subset of proposals (with minimum inter-rater agreement of 90 percent), minimizes threats to the validity and reliability of data.

**Explanation:** IES researchers evaluate all research and evaluation proposals newly funded by IES. The 75 percent target for 2002-2006 recognizes that some high-quality research addressing causal questions will not be able to employ randomized experimental designs. 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 procedures will be used, the proposal is recorded as not using a randomized experimental design.

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

**Indicator 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>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of new research projects funded by the Department's National Center of Education Research that are deemed to be of high relevance as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.		
<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	50
<b>2005</b>		65
<b>2006</b>		75

2007	75
------	----

**Source:** External panel of qualified practitioners.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Limitations:** Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel. Inclusion of experienced practitioners and administrators in education and special education assures the quality of the data.

**Explanation:** The target of 75 percent for 2006 + 2007 recognizes that some important research may not seem immediately relevant but will make important contributions over the long term.

**Indicator 2.2 of 3:** The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse Web site.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse Web site.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	1,522,922	1,000,000
2004	4,249,668	2,000,000
2005	5,706,257	4,500,000
2006		5,000,000
2007		5,500,000

**Source:** What Works Clearinghouse. Web Site.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** A Web-based program automatically counts the hits on this Web site.

**Indicator 2.3 of 3:** The percentage of WWC Web site users surveyed randomly who responded to the statement, "Evidence provided on the WWC Web site is useful in making decisions about education programs and practices" by checking "agree" or "strongly agree."

<b>Measure 2.3.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of WWC Web site users surveyed randomly who responded to the statement, "Evidence provided on the WWC Web site is useful in making decisions about education programs and practices" by checking "agree" or "strongly agree."		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005	68	30
2006		31
2007		70

**Source:** What works clearing house website away.

ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

# ESRA: Research in Special Education - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.324 - Research in Special Education

## Program Goal: Transform Education into an evidence-based field.

---

**Objective 1 of 2:** Raise the quality of research funded or conducted by the Department.

**Indicator 1.1 of 2:** The percentage of new research proposals funded by the Institute of Education Sciences that receive an average score of excellent or higher from an independent review panel of qualified scientists.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of new research proposals funded by the Department's National Center for Special Education Research that receive an average score of excellent or higher from an independent review panel of qualified scientists.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Expert panel review.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Limitations:** Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the peer review panel. Inclusion of senior scientists who are leading researchers in their fields ensures the quality of the data.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is the baseline plus 10 percent.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> Of new research and evaluation projects (group evaluations) funded by the Department's National Center for Special Education Research that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** IES researchers evaluate all research and evaluation proposals newly funded 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.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Limitations:** Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the proposal reviewers. Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as having two IES researchers independently evaluate a subset of proposals (with minimum inter-rater agreement of 90 percent), minimizes threats to the validity and reliability of data.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is baseline plus 10 percent. In addition, the 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 procedures will be used, the proposal is recorded as not using a randomized experimental design.

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

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** The percentage of new research projects funded by IES that are deemed to be of high relevance to the needs of children with disabilities as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of new research projects funded by the Department's National Center for Special Education Research that are deemed to be of high relevance by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Expert panel review.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Limitations:** Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel. Inclusion of experienced practitioners and administrators in education and special education assures the quality of the data.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is the baseline plus 10 percent.

# RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research - FY 2007

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

**Program Goal: To conduct high-quality research and related activities that lead to high-quality products.**

---

**Objective 1 of 4:** *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 decisionmaking, change practice, and improve the lives of individuals with disabilities.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 2:** The percentage of awarded NIDRR projects will be multisite, collaborative controlled studies of interventions and programs.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of NIDRR projects that conduct multisite, collaborative controlled trials.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		999
2007		999
2015		10

**Source:** Contractor Performance Report, 1820-0642 Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR, RTI

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Limitations:** This measure applies only to RERCs, RRTC's, Model Systems grants, and DRRPs.

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target was to establish a baseline; however, the recompetition was postponed. Therefore the FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline. The FY 2007 target is baseline plus 2 percentage points. This is an output-oriented capacity building measure.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** Percentage of NIDRR-supported fellows, post-doctoral trainees, and doctoral students who publish results of NIDRR-sponsored research in refereed journals.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of NIDRR-supported fellows, postdoctoral trainees, and doctoral students who publish results of NIDRR-sponsored research in refereed journals.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets



	Fellows	Post-Doc Trainees	Doctoral Students	Fellows	Post-Doc Trainees	Doctoral Students
<b>2005</b>				999	999	999
<b>2006</b>				999	999	999
<b>2007</b>				999	999	999

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utilization Projects).

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** July 2006

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.

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target is to establish the baseline; the FY 2006 target is baseline plus 1 percent; the FY 2007 target is baseline plus 10 percent. Data for this measure are collected for a calendar year, rather than fiscal year. The peer-reviewed status of publications is established using an accepted standard, such as the International Scientific Index (ISI). This is an output-oriented capacity building measure.

**Objective 2 of 4:** Advance knowledge through research and related activities: Generate scientific-based knowledge, technologies, and applications to inform policy, change practice, and improve outcomes.

**Indicator 2.1 of 4:** The number of accomplishments (e.g., new or improved tools, methods, discoveries, standards, interventions, programs, or devices) developed or tested with NIDRR funding that have been judged by expert panels to be of high quality and to advance the field.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of accomplishments (new or improved tools, methods, discoveries, standards, interventions, programs, or devices) developed and/or tested with NIDRR funding that have been judged by expert panels to be of high quality and to advance the field.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2015</b>		999

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utilization Projects).

**Frequency:** Other.

**Next Data Available:** July 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline at the completion of the first three-year cycle of assessments, in which a judgmentally selected sample of grantee nominated "discoveries" will be reviewed. Approximately 1/3 of NIDRR's grants will be reviewed annually as part of the new portfolio assessment process. This is an outcome-oriented research and development measure. The FY 2015 target is the baseline plus at least 20 percent.

**Indicator 2.2 of 4:** 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.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of NIDRR-funded grant applications that receive an average peer review score of 85 or higher.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2002</b>	82	
<b>2003</b>	96	
<b>2004</b>	89	
<b>2005</b>	99	
<b>2006</b>		85
<b>2007</b>		90

**Source:** GAPS; Grant review documentation

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** For FY 2006 the measure was reworded, and its prior year data were recalculated using a new methodology. This is an activity-oriented research and development measure.

**Indicator 2.3 of 4:** Average number of publications per award based on NIDRR-funded research and development activities in refereed journals.

<b>Measure 2.3.1 of 1:</b> The number of publications per award published in refereed journals.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2002</b>	2.91	
<b>2003</b>	3.38	8
<b>2004</b>	2.71	5
<b>2005</b>		5
<b>2006</b>		2
<b>2007</b>		2

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utilization Projects).

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** An accepted standard, such as the International Scientific Index (ISI) will be used to determine peer-reviewed status. Data for publications will be collected over a calendar year, instead of fiscal year. Actual performance for prior years 2002 and 2003 was recalculated in FY 2005 to correct for duplications of

publications within the same award. This is an output-oriented research and development measure.

**Indicator 2.4 of 4:** Percentage of new grants that include studies funded by NIDRR that assess the effectiveness of interventions, programs, and devices using rigorous and appropriate methods.

<b>Measure 2.4.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of new grants that assess the effectiveness of interventions, programs, and devices using rigorous and appropriate methods.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2002</b>	65	
<b>2003</b>	59	
<b>2004</b>	59	
<b>2005</b>	49	
<b>2006</b>		65
<b>2007</b>		65

**Source:** GAPS and review of grant applications.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** Beginning in FY 2006, preliminary data reported for 2002-2005 based on staff reviews of grants abstracts will be updated with external expert assessments to ensure "effectiveness studies" using "rigorous and appropriate methods." For FY 2005, 77 newly-funded grants contained at least 1 "effectiveness study." This is an output-oriented research and development measure.

**Objective 3 of 4:** 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.

**Indicator 3.1 of 1:** Number of new or improved assistive and universally-designed technologies, products, and devices developed and/or validated by grantees that are transferred to industry for potential commercialization.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of new or improved assistive and universally designed technologies, products, and devices transferred to industry for potential commercialization.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Contractor Performance Report, Annual Project Performance Reports for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC, Model Systems, DBTACs, DRRPs, and FIPs.),

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** July 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target is to establish the baseline. The FY 2006 target is baseline plus 1 percent; the FY 2007 target is to maintain the 2006 target. Data will be collected over a calendar year, rather than fiscal year. This is an outcome-oriented knowledge translation measure.

**Objective 4 of 4:** Enhance efficiency of NIDRR grant award process.

**Indicator 4.1 of 1:** Notification: Notification of applicants.

<b>Measure 4.1.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of NIDRR competitions announced by Oct 1.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2003	21	
2004	23	
2005	8	
2006		25
2007		50

<b>Measure 4.1.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of NIDRR grant awards issued within 6 months of the competition closing date.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2003	70	
2004	83	
2005	57	
2006		90
2007		90

**Source:** GAPS and Federal Register Notice.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

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



# AEFLA: Adult Basic and Literacy State Grants - FY 2007

**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 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 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.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The 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.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Percentage of adults	Percentage of adults
1997	40	
1999	44	
2000	26	40
2001	36	40
2002	37	40
2003	38	41
2004	38	42
2005		42
2006		39
2007		41

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** 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.

**Improvements:** OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

**Explanation:** As of 2000 data represent the percentage 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.

**Indicator 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.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> 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.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
1997	28	
1998	28	
1999	49	
2000	20	40
2001	31	40
2002	34	42
2003	36	44
2004	36	45
2005		45
2006		38
2007		40

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines.

**Improvements:** OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

**Explanation:** As of 2000 data reflect the 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.



**Indicator 1.3 of 5:** Secondary completion: The 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>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
	Percent of adults	Percent of adults
<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>	45	42
<b>2005</b>		46
<b>2006</b>		46
<b>2007</b>		46

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** As a third-tier recipient of this data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines.

**Improvements:** OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

**Explanation:** As of FY 2000 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.

**Indicator 1.4 of 5:** Transition to postsecondary education or training: The 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>Measure 1.4.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults	Number of adults	Percentage of adults
1997	178,520			
1998	158,167			
1999	148,803			
2000	161,650		300,000	
2001		25		
2002		30		25
2003		30		26
2004		30		27
2005				30
2006				33
2007				34

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines.

**Improvements:** OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

**Explanation:** As of 2001 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.

**Indicator 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.

<b>Measure 1.5.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults	Number of adults	Percentage of adults
1997	240,206			

AEFLA: Adult Basic and Literacy State Grants

<b>1998</b>	294,755	
<b>1999</b>	409,062	
<b>2000</b>	454,318	425,000
<b>2001</b>		36
<b>2002</b>		39
<b>2003</b>		37
<b>2004</b>		36
<b>2005</b>		40
<b>2006</b>		40
<b>2007</b>		42

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Limitations:** As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines.

**Improvements:** OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

**Explanation:** As of 2001 data reflect the percentage of adult learners with an employment goal who, upon exit from an adult education program, obtain a job.

# AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities - FY 2007

**CFDA Number:** 84.191 - Adult Education National Leadership Activities

**Program Goal: To support research, evaluation, information dissemination and other activities to help states improve adult education, and literacy programs.**

---

**Objective 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 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.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of states yielding high-quality learner assessment data.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	50	
2003	65	75
2004	75	95
2005		96
2006		100
2007		100

**Source:** Adult Education State Annual Performance Reports

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2007

**Data Validated By:** 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 checked independently by ED/OVAE during onsite monitoring and state audit reviews.

**Limitations:** 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. States are supported by the technical assistance and expertise provided by ED.

# AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.257 - National Institute for Literacy

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

**Objective 1 of 2:** *Recipients state that information based on scientific research (or the most rigorous research available) provided by NIFL prepares them to improve instruction.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Technical assistance: The percentage of persons who receive NIFL technical assistance.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 2:</b> (a)The percentage of recipients who receive information through NIFL technical assistance who report they are likely to implement instructional practices grounded in scientifically based research (or the most rigorous research available).		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 2:</b> (b)The percentage of individuals who receive NIFL technical assistance who can demonstrate that they implemented instructional practices grounded in scientifically based research within six months of receiving the technical assistance.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Participant evaluation of technical assistance (LINCS and Bridges)

**Frequency:** Other.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Limitations:** Not everyone who receives technical assistance will complete an evaluation.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the first year of these measures. The FY2007 target is baseline plus one percent.

**Objective 2 of 2:** *NIFL effectively disseminates high-quality information to improve instructional practice and/or service delivery.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Dissemination: The percentage of projects that are deemed to be of high quality.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of products that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent panel of qualified scientists.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Panel of experts to review a sample of products available on the NIFL Web site. (5 most requested)

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for this new measure. The FY2007 is baseline plus one percent.

# ATA: Assistive Technology Programs - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.224 - Assistive Technology

**Program Goal: To increase access to and acquisition of assistive technology for individuals with disabilities**

**Objective 1 of 2:** *To increase acquisition of assistive technology for individuals with disabilities.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 3:** AT Acquisition for Education: Targeted individuals and entities as defined by the AT Act obtain devices and services in the domains of education, employment, and community living despite systemic and cost barriers.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who obtained AT for education purposes through state financing activities or reutilization programs who would not have obtained the device or service.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Data collection system being developed.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target was to establish a baseline. However, the data collection system was not yet developed. Therefore, the FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. Statewide AT Programs can conduct either device demonstration programs or device loan programs (or both) to assist individuals to learn about what AT is right for them. Statewide AT Programs will collect data from individuals using these programs to determine whether the services helped overcome the identified barriers.

**Indicator 1.2 of 3:** AT Acquisition in Employment: Targeted individuals and entities as defined by the AT Act obtain devices and services in the domains of education, employment, and community living despite systemic and cost barriers.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who obtained AT for employment purposes through state financing activities or reutilization programs who would not have obtained the device or service.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Data collection system being developed.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target was to establish a baseline. However, the data collection system was not yet developed. Therefore, the FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline. Statewide AT Programs can conduct either device demonstration programs or device loan programs (or both) to assist individuals to learn about what AT is right for them. Statewide AT Programs will collect data from individuals using these programs to determine whether the services helped overcome the identified barriers.

**Indicator 1.3 of 3:** AT Acquisition in Community Living: Targeted individuals and entities as defined by the AT Act obtain devices and services in the domains of education, employment, and community living despite systemic and cost barriers.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who obtained AT for community living through state financing activities or reutilization programs who would not have obtained the device or service.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Data collection system being developed.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 was to establish a baseline. However, the data collection system was not yet developed. Therefore, the FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline. Statewide AT Programs can conduct either device demonstration programs or device loan programs (or both) to assist individuals to learn about what AT is right for them. Statewide AT Programs will collect data from individuals using these programs to determine whether the services helped overcome the identified barriers.

**Objective 2 of 2:** *To increase access to assistive technology for individuals with disabilities.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 4:** AT Access for Education: Targeted individuals and entities as defined by the AT Act have increased access to AT in the domains of education, employment, community living, and telecommunications IT because of exposure that enables them to make informed decisions.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who accessed device demonstration and/or loan programs and made a decision about an AT device or service for educational purposes as a result of the assistance they received.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Data collection system being developed.



**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target was to establish a baseline. However, the data collection system was not yet developed. Therefore, the FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline. Statewide AT Programs can conduct either device demonstration programs or device loan programs (or both) to assist individuals to learn about what AT is right for them. Statewide AT Programs will collect data from individuals using these programs to determine whether the services helped overcome the identified barriers.

**Indicator 2.2 of 4:** AT Access for Employment: Targeted individuals and entities as defined by the AT Act have increased access to AT in the domains of education, employment, community living, and telecommunications IT because of exposure that enables them to make informed decisions.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who accessed device demonstration and/or loan programs and made a decision about an AT device or service for employment purposes.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Data collection system being developed.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target was to establish a baseline. However, the data collection system was not yet developed. Therefore, the FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline. Statewide AT Programs can conduct either device demonstration programs or device loan programs (or both) to assist individuals to learn about what AT is right for them. Statewide AT Programs will collect data from individuals using these programs to determine whether the services helped overcome the identified barriers.

**Indicator 2.3 of 4:** AT Access for Community Living: Targeted individuals and entities as defined by the AT Act have increased access to AT in the domains of education, employment, community living, and telecommunications IT because of exposure that enables them to make informed decisions.

<b>Measure 2.3.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who accessed device demonstration and/or loan programs and made a decision about an AT device or service for community living.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Data collection system being developed.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target was to establish a baseline. However, the data collection system was not yet developed. Therefore, the FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline. Statewide AT Programs can conduct either device demonstration programs or device loan programs (or both) to assist individuals to learn about what AT is right for them. Statewide AT Programs will collect data from individuals using these programs to

determine whether the services helped overcome identified barriers.

**Indicator 2.4 of 4:** AT Access for Telecommunications/IT: Targeted individuals and entities as defined by the AT Act have increased access to AT in the domains of education, employment, community living, and telecommunications IT because of exposure that enables them to make informed decisions.

<b>Measure 2.4.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who accessed device demonstration and/or loan programs and made a decision about an AT device or service that meets an IT/telecommunications need as a result of the assistance they received.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Data collection system being developed.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target was to establish a baseline. However, the data collection system was not yet developed. Therefore, the FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline. Statewide AT Programs can conduct either device demonstration programs or device loan programs (or both) to assist individuals to learn about what AT is right for them. Statewide AT Programs will collect data from individuals using these programs to determine whether the services helped overcome identified barriers.

# EDA: Gallaudet University - FY 2007

**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 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 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.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: University enrollment in Gallaudet's programs and schools.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional Studies	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional Studies
1998	1,339	714	92			
1999	1,300	628	70	1,250	700	70
2000	1,318	541	86	1,250	700	70
2001	1,321	625	93	1,250	700	70
2002	1,243	517	92	1,250	700	70
2003	1,243	617	154	1,250	700	70
2004	1,236	506	70	1,250	700	70
2005	1,207	451	176	1,250	650	70
2006	1,274	466	173	1,250	650	175
2007				1,250	650	175

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: Enrollment in Gallaudet's Clerc Center .		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

	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
<b>2006</b>	226	141	225	140
<b>2007</b>			225	140

**Source:** Collegiate Office of Enrollment Services, and Clerc Center student database, FY 2006 enrollment as of October 2005, summarized in Gallaudet's FY 2005 annual report, submitted in 2006.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** Gallaudet has established minimum enrollment targets based on long-standing enrollment targets and historical trends, recognizing that actual figures vary from year to year. A degree-seeking student who is dually-enrolled in Professional Studies course is only counted under 1 of the categories.

**Indicator 1.2 of 3:** Student persistence rate: Increase the undergraduate persistence rate and increase or maintain the graduate student persistence rate.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> Persistence rates of university students served by Gallaudet.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Graduate
<b>1998</b>	72			
<b>1999</b>	73		75	
<b>2000</b>	72	78	76	80
<b>2001</b>	71	82	76	82
<b>2002</b>	73	98	76	
<b>2003</b>	71	86	79	
<b>2004</b>	73	89	79	86
<b>2005</b>	76	93	79	86
<b>2006</b>			79	86

<b>2007</b>		79	86
<b>2008</b>		80	88
<b>2009</b>		80	88
<b>2010</b>		80	88

**Source:** Collegiate Office of the Register records, summarized in the FY 2005 annual report, submitted in 2006.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** For FY 2006, this measure changed from retention rates to persistence rates. This measure was designated as a long-term measure in FY 2006.

**Indicator 1.3 of 3:** Student graduation rates: The undergraduate graduation rate will reach 48 percent; the graduate student and Model Secondary School student graduation rates will be increased or maintained.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 2:</b> Graduation rates of university students served by Gallaudet.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Graduate
<b>1998</b>	41			
<b>1999</b>	42		41	
<b>2000</b>	41	82	42	80
<b>2001</b>	41	82	43	80
<b>2002</b>	42	82	44	
<b>2003</b>	42	82	45	
<b>2004</b>	42	84	45	82
<b>2005</b>	42	86	46	83
<b>2006</b>			47	83
<b>2007</b>			47	83
<b>2008</b>			48	83
<b>2009</b>			48	83
<b>2010</b>			48	83

<b>Measure 1.3.2 of 2:</b> Model Secondary School graduation rate of Clerc Center students.						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	1st Year Seniors	2nd Year Seniors	Annual Graduation Rate	1st Year Seniors	2nd Year Seniors	Annual Graduation Rate

<b>1998</b>			93	
<b>1999</b>			88	94
<b>2000</b>			98	94
<b>2001</b>			90	94
<b>2002</b>	76	14	80	94
<b>2003</b>	68	21	71	94
<b>2004</b>	58	29	87	94
<b>2005</b>	71			94
<b>2006</b>				90
<b>2007</b>				90

**Source:** Collegiate Office of the Registrar and the Clerc Center Office of Exemplary Programs and Research records, summarized in FY 2005 annual report, submitted in 2006.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** The undergraduate graduation rates are calculated as the number of graduates in one year over the number of entering students six years previously. 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 Individualized Education Program (IEP) decision. Students may graduate at the end of their senior year, or they may make the decision, as part of the IEP process, to return to MSSD for a fifth year to pursue their IEP goals. As of FY 2005, the graduate rate was disaggregated to show those who graduate after four years and those who exercise a 5th-year option. The FY 2005 data only reports those who graduated after their senior year. The second year seniors (5th-year option) for FY 2005 will be reported after June 2006; the Annual Graduation rate will be calculated at that time.

**Objective 2 of 3:** *Gallaudet works in partnership with others to develop and disseminate educational programs and materials for deaf and hard-of-hearing students.*

**Indicator 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>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of programs adopting Model/Kendall innovative strategies/curricula.		
<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>	56	55
<b>2006</b>		55
<b>2007</b>		55

**Source:** Records of the Clerc Center Office of Training and Professional Development, summarized in the FY 2004 Annual Report, submitted in January 2005.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** 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.

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

**Indicator 3.1 of 2:** Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the university: Gallaudet's bachelor's graduates either find employment commensurate with their training and education or attend advanced education or training programs during their first year after graduation.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of Gallaudet University graduates who are employed or are in advanced education or training during their first year after graduation.						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	Students Employed	Students in Advanced Education or Training	Not Engaged in Either Activity	Students Employed	Students in Advanced Education or Training	Not Engaged in Either Activity
<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>	69	36		81	41	
<b>2006</b>				82	41	999
<b>2007</b>				82	42	999

**Source:** University study on the status of graduates' employment and advanced studies, February, 2005.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** In FY 2006, this measure was disaggregated by adding a new category "Not Engaged in Either Activity" to capture the percentage of graduates who are NOT employed or in advanced education or training during their first year after graduation. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the new category. The FY 2007 target for the new category is to maintain the baseline. Students employed include both full and part-time employment. Advanced education or 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.

**Indicator 3.2 of 2:** Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the Model Secondary School: A high percentage of the Model Secondary School graduates either find jobs commensurate with their training or attend postsecondary programs.

<b>Measure 3.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of Model Secondary School graduates who are in jobs or postsecondary programs during their first year after graduation.						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	Students Employed	Studented in Advanced Education or Training	Not Engaged in Either Activity	Students Employed	Studented in Advanced Education or Training	Not Engaged in Either Activity
<b>2007</b>				999	999	999

**Source:** The follow-up survey is conducted by the Cerc Center Office of Exemplary Programs and Research, approximately one year following June graduation.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** In FY 2007 this measure was changed to reflect the status of graduates one year following graduation, rather than the previous measure of a 4-month follow-up. The FY 2007 target is to establish the baselines for the three categories: "students employed," "students in advanced education or training," and "not engaged in either activity."



# EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf - FY 2007

**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 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 1.1 of 1:** Enrollment: Maintain a minimum student body of undergraduates, graduates, and educational interpreters as established by NTID.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of students enrolled in NTID.						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	Undergraduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.	Undergraduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.
<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
<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
<b>2006</b>	1,013	116	127	1,080	100	120
<b>2007</b>				1,080	100	120

**Source:** National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office records, FY 2006 as of October 2005.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Objective 2 of 3:** Maximize the number of students successfully completing a program of study.

**Indicator 2.1 of 2:** Graduation rate: Increase the baccalaureate and sub-baccalaureate rates.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> NTID baccalaureate and sub-baccalaureate graduation rates.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate
<b>1997</b>	50	51		
<b>1998</b>	50	57		
<b>1999</b>	50	61		
<b>2000</b>	50	63	51	61
<b>2001</b>	50	64	51	61
<b>2002</b>	54	66	52	61
<b>2003</b>	52	68	52	61
<b>2004</b>	51	68	52	69
<b>2005</b>	48	69	52	69
<b>2006</b>			53	70
<b>2007</b>			53	71
<b>2008</b>			54	72
<b>2009</b>			54	72
<b>2010</b>			54	72

**Source:** NTID Registrar Office records

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Indicator 2.2 of 2:** Student retention rate: Maintain the first year baccalaureate and sub-baccalaureate retention rates.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of first-year NTID baccalaureate and sub-baccalaureate retention rates.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate
<b>1997</b>	85	84		

<b>1998</b>	73	81		
<b>1999</b>	69	84		
<b>2000</b>	69	85	73	84
<b>2001</b>	68	86	74	84
<b>2002</b>	72	87	74	84
<b>2003</b>	70	86	74	84
<b>2004</b>	70	86	74	84
<b>2005</b>	70	85	74	86
<b>2006</b>			74	86
<b>2007</b>			74	86
<b>2008</b>			74	87
<b>2009</b>			74	87
<b>2010</b>			74	87

**Source:** NTID registrar office records.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October

**Explanation:** In FY 2006, this measure became a long-term measure.

**Objective 3 of 3: Post-school outcomes**

**Indicator 3.1 of 1:** Post-school outcome: Maintain a high percentage of NTID graduates in advanced education or training and in the workforce.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 1:</b> The post-school rate of NTID graduates in advanced education or training and in the workforce during their first year after graduation.						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	Students Employed	Students in Advanced Education or Training	Not Engaged in Either Activity	Students Employed	Students in Advanced Education or Training	Not Engaged in Either Activity
<b>2007</b>				999	999	999

**Source:** National Technical Institute for the Deaf placement records for FY 2006.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2007 target is to establish baselines for the three categories: "students employed," "students in advanced education or training," and "not engaged in either activity". This is a new measure.

# HEA: AID Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions - FY 2007

**CFDA Number:** 84.031S - Title V Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program

**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 1 of 4:** Increase enrollment at Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs).

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Student enrollment: Full-time degree-seeking undergraduate enrollment at HSIs

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of full-time degree-seeking undergraduates enrolling at HSIs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	734,212	
2003	773,859	
2004	825,492	
2005	845,045	
2009		813,326

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.  
**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.  
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Fall enrollment data will be monitored annually to measure progress in meeting the long-term target, which is projected to be met in 2009. Target is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2002-03 -- which was 5.1%. Therefore, the HSI program actual enrollment of 773,859 in FY 2003 was extended to FY 2009 to generate the target value of 813,326.

**Objective 2 of 4:** Increase the persistence rate for students enrolled at HSIs.

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Persistence rate: First year persistence rate of students attending HSIs

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of full-time undergraduate students who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same HSI institution.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	66.50	
<b>2005</b>	66	
<b>2006</b>		67
<b>2007</b>		68
<b>2008</b>		68
<b>2009</b>		68
<b>2010</b>		68
<b>2011</b>		68

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 data established the baseline. Data value for 2004 had previously been erroneously assigned to 2003. Institutions report a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for the HSI program is calculated as a median. Target is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2003-04 -- which was 1.12%. Therefore, the HSI program actual persistence rate of 66.5% in FY 2004 was multiplied by 1.0112 to generate the long-term target (for 2009) of 68%. Annual increases are estimated to be 0.2% each year through 2009 and 0.1% beginning in 2010.

**Objective 3 of 4:** Increase the graduation rate for students enrolled at HSIs.

**Indicator 3.1 of 1:** Graduation rate: The graduation rate of students enrolled at HSIs will increase.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of students enrolled at four-year HSIs graduating within six years of enrollment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	35	
<b>2004</b>	36	
<b>2006</b>		34
<b>2007</b>		35
<b>2008</b>		35

<b>2009</b>		35
<b>2010</b>		35
<b>2011</b>		35

**Measure 3.1.2 of 2:** The percentage of students enrolled at two-year HSIs who graduate within three years of enrollment.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	21	
<b>2004</b>	22	
<b>2006</b>		36
<b>2007</b>		36
<b>2008</b>		36
<b>2009</b>		36
<b>2010</b>		36
<b>2011</b>		36

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** The FY 2003 data established the baseline. Data for FY 2003 were recalculated and is now more accurate than that previously reported. Target for four-year graduation rate is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2002-03 -- which was 3.54%. Therefore, the HSI program actual four-year graduation rate of 35% in FY 2003 was multiplied by 1.0354 to generate the long-term target (for 2009) of 35%. Annual increases are estimated to be 0.6% through 2009 and 0.3% beginning in 2010. For the two-year graduation rate projections, program experience was used to estimate targets. An increase of 0.5% was used to generate annual targets each year through 2009 and an increase of 0.3% was used beginning in 2010.

**Objective 4 of 4:** *Improve the efficiency of service delivery to HSI students.*

**Indicator 4.1 of 1:** Efficiency measure: Cost per successful program outcome.

**Measure 4.1.1 of 1:** Federal cost for undergraduate and graduate degrees at institutions in the Developing HSIs program.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	1,058	

2004	1,030	
------	-------	--

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** This measure is calculated as appropriation for the Developing HSIs program divided by the number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded. The \$1,058 actual value per successful outcome for 2003 reflects an appropriation of \$92.396 million divided by 87,326 graduates. The \$1,030 actual value for 2004 reflects an appropriation of \$93.993 million divided by 91,216 graduates.

# HEA: AID Minority Science and Engineering Improvement - FY 2007

**CFDA Number:** 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 1 of 3:** *To increase enrollment of minority undergraduates in the fields of engineering or physical and biological sciences at minority-serving institutions over the long term.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** The percentage change in the number of full-time, degree-seeking minority undergraduate students at grantee institutions enrolled in the fields of engineering or physical or biological sciences, compared to the average minority enrollment in the same fields in the three-year period immediately prior to the beginning of the current grant.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage change in the number of full-time, degree-seeking minority undergraduate students at grantee institutions enrolled in the fields of engineering or physical or biological sciences, compared to the average minority enrollment in the same fields in the three-year period immediately prior to the beginning of the current grant.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** February 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Fall enrollment data will be reported annually to measure progress in meeting a long-term target, for 2009. OPE anticipates providing data for SY 2002-03 and SY 2003-04 in February 2006. The FY 2006 and 2007 targets are to maintain the baseline and to set the long-term target value for 2009. The Department is exploring additional data sources beyond the biennial IPEDS field study data.

**Objective 2 of 3:** *To increase the persistence rate for minority students in the fields of engineering or biological and physical sciences at minority-serving institutions.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Persistence rate: The first-year persistence rate of minority students in the fields of engineering or biological and physical sciences at minority-serving institutions.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of full-time undergraduate minority students who were in their first year of
--



postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution in the fields of engineering or physical and biological sciences.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** Contractor Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The FY 2006 and 2007 targets are to maintain the baseline.

**Objective 3 of 3:** *To increase the graduation rate for students in the fields of engineering, or physical and biological sciences, at minority-serving institutions.*

**Indicator 3.1 of 1:** Graduation rate: The graduation rate of minority students in engineering or physical and biological sciences at minority-serving institutions.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of minority students enrolled at four-year minority-serving institutions, in the fields of engineering or physical or biological sciences, who graduate within six years of enrollment.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

<b>Measure 3.1.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of minority students enrolled at two-year minority-serving institutions, in the fields of engineering or physical or biological sciences, who graduate within three years of enrollment.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** February 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The FY 2006 and 2007 targets are to maintain the baseline.

# HEA: AID Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.031N - Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions

**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 1 of 4:** *Maintain or increase enrollments at Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian serving Institutions over the long term.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Student enrollment: Full-time degree-seeking undergraduate enrollment at Alaska Native and Native-Hawaiian Serving institutions (AN/NH) will increase.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of full-time degree-seeking undergraduates enrolling at AN/NH institutions.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	13,638	
<b>2004</b>	13,739	
<b>2005</b>	13,717	
<b>2009</b>		13,700

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Fall enrollment data will be monitored annually to measure progress toward the long-term target, which is projected to be met in 2009. (Actual data for 2004 had previously been erroneously reported for 2003.)

**Objective 2 of 4:** *Maintain or increase the persistence rate for students at Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian serving Institutions.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Persistence rate: The first-year persistence rate of full-time, first-time undergraduate students at AN/NH institutions.

<p><b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of full-time undergraduate students who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same Alaskan</p>
---

Native/Native Hawaiian institution.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	45.50	
2005	61.50	
2006		46
2007		46
2008		46
2009		46
2010		46
2011		46

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Persistence data first became available from IPEDS in 2003-04. Institutions report a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for the AN/NH institutions is calculated as a median. The measure for 2003-04 is only based on data for two institutions. (Actual 2004 data was erroneously reported for 2003).

**Objective 3 of 4:** *Maintain or increase the graduation rate at Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian serving Institutions.*

**Indicator 3.1 of 1:** Graduation rate: The graduation rate of undergraduates at AN/NH institutions.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of undergraduate students at four-year AN/NH institutions who graduate within six years of enrollment.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	27	
2004	28	
2006		27
2007		27
2008		27
2009		27
2010		27
2011		27

<b>Measure 3.1.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of students enrolled at two-year AN/NH institutions who graduate within three years of enrollment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	16	
<b>2004</b>	14	
<b>2006</b>		16
<b>2007</b>		16
<b>2008</b>		16
<b>2009</b>		16
<b>2010</b>		16
<b>2011</b>		16

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Objective 4 of 4:** *Maintain or improve the efficiency of service delivery to AN/NH students.*

**Indicator 4.1 of 1:** Efficiency measure: Cost per successful program outcome

<b>Measure 4.1.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost for undergraduate degree at AN/NH institutions.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	1,940	
<b>2004</b>	2,532	

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** This measure is calculated as appropriation for the Strengthening AN/NH Institutions program divided by the number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded. The \$1,940 value for the efficiency measure for 2003 reflects an appropriation of \$8,180,479 divided by 4,216 graduates. The \$2,532 value for 2004 reflects an appropriation of \$10,935,100 divided by 4,318 graduates.

# HEA: AID Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities - FY 2007

**CFDA Number:** 84.031B - Strengthening HBCUs and Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions

**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 1 of 4:** *Increase enrollments at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs).*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Student enrollment: Full-time degree-seeking undergraduate enrollment at HBCUs will increase.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of full-time degree-seeking undergraduates enrolling at HBCUs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	188,259	
2003	206,332	
2004	221,254	
2005	223,933	
2009		231,443

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Fall enrollment data will be monitored annually to measure progress in meeting the long-term target, which is projected to be met in 2009. Target is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2002-03 -- which was 12.1%. Therefore, the HBCU program actual enrollment of 206,332 in FY 2003 was multiplied by 1.121 to generate the long-term target of 231,443.

**Objective 2 of 4:** *Increase the persistence rate for students enrolled at HBCUs.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Persistence rate: First-year persistence rate of students attending HBCUs will increase.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of full-time undergraduate students who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same HBCU institution.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2004	64	
2005	65	
2006		65
2007		66
2008		66
2009		66
2010		67
2011		67

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Institutions report a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for the HBCU program is calculated as a median. Target is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2002-03 -- which was 3.6%. Therefore, the HBCU program actual persistence rate of 64% in FY 2004 was multiplied by 1.0363 to generate the long-term target (for 2009) of 66%. Annual increases are estimated to be 0.6% each year through 2009 and 0.3% beginning in 2010. (Data value for 2004 had previously been erroneously assigned to 2003).

**Objective 3 of 4:** Increase the graduation rate for students enrolled at HBCUs.

**Indicator 3.1 of 1:** Graduation rate: The graduation rate of students enrolled at HBCUs will increase.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of students enrolled at four-year HBCUs graduating within six years of enrollment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2003	39	
2004	39	
2006		37
2007		37
2008		37
2009		37

**HEA: AID Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities**

<b>2010</b>		37
<b>2011</b>		37

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** The target for four-year graduation rate is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for a school year. Annual increases are estimated to be 0.25% through 2009 and 0.1% beginning in 2010. (The 2003 actual value has been modified to reflect a correction in the percentage of students enrolled at four-year HBCUs who graduate within six years of enrollment).

**Objective 4 of 4: Improve the efficiency of institutional services delivery to HBCU students.**

**Indicator 4.1 of 1:** Efficiency measure: Cost per successful program outcome.

<b>Measure 4.1.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost of HBCU undergraduate and graduate degree.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	8,631	
<b>2004</b>	8,982	

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** The 2003 actual value of \$8,631 reflects an appropriation of \$214.01 million divided by 24,796 graduates. The 2004 actual value of \$8,982 reflects an appropriation of \$222.8 million divided by 24,804 graduates. The numbers of graduates for 2003 and 2004 were computed from a sample of HBCU institutions. Data for the full set of institutions yielded a larger number of graduates for both years: 37,858 in 2003, with an efficiency measure of \$5,653; and 38,873 in 2004, with an efficiency measure of \$5,731.

# HEA: AID Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions - FY 2007

**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 1 of 3:** Increase enrollment at historically Black graduate institutions (HBGIs).

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Graduate student enrollment: The number of full-time graduate students enrolled at HBGIs will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of full-time graduate students enrolled at HBGIs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	12,648	
2003	13,328	
2004	14,832	
2005	14,687	
2009		14,148

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Actual data and targets were calculated using IPEDS fall enrollment data for all graduate students. Data for only full-time graduate and first professional students result in the following lower values: FY 2002, 8,671; FY 2003, 9,860; FY 2004, 10,164; FY 2005, 10,470. Fall enrollment data are monitored annually to measure progress toward meeting the long-term target in 2009. The target was derived by applying an estimated annual rate of increase, based on program experience, to the period between FY 2003 and FY 2009. Annual increases are estimated to be 1.0% through 2009 and 0.5% beginning in 2010.

**Objective 2 of 3:** Increase the number of graduate degrees awarded at HBGIs.

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Graduate awards: The number of Ph.D.s, first professional, and Master's degrees awarded at HBGIs.



<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of Ph.D., first professional, and Master's degrees awarded at HBGIs.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	4,055	
<b>2004</b>	4,219	
<b>2006</b>		4,178
<b>2007</b>		4,220
<b>2008</b>		4,262
<b>2009</b>		4,305
<b>2010</b>		4,327
<b>2011</b>		4,349

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** The FY 2003 data established the baseline. Program experience indicates that an annual increase of 1.0% is an ambitious goal. Targets are derived by applying an estimated annual increase rate of 1.0% through 2009 and an increase rate of 0.5% beginning in 2010.

**Objective 3 of 3:** *Improve the efficiency of institutional service delivery to HBGI students.*

**Indicator 3.1 of 1:** Efficiency measure: Cost per successful program outcome.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost per HBGI graduate.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	13,173	
<b>2004</b>	12,586	

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** The measure is calculated as the appropriation for the Strengthening HBGIs program divided by the number of graduate degrees awarded. The 2004 actual value reflects an appropriation of \$53.1 million divided by 4,219 degrees.

# HEA: AID Strengthening Institutions - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.031A - Strengthening Institutions Program--Development Grants, Planning Grants

**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 1 of 4:** Increase enrollments of Strengthening Institutions Program (SIP) institutions.

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Student enrollment: Full-time degree-seeking undergraduate enrollment at SIP Institutions will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of full-time degree-seeking undergraduates enrolling at SIP institutions.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	176,304	
2003	200,345	
2004	214,022	
2005	220,764	
2009		253,500

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Fall enrollment data will be monitored annually to measure progress in meeting the long-term target, which is projected to be met in 2009. Target is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2002-03 (about 25%) -- which results in a long-term target of 253,500.

**Objective 2 of 4:** Increase the persistence rate for students enrolled at SIP Institutions.

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Persistence rate: First year persistence rate of students attending SIP Institutions will increase.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of full-time undergraduate students who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same SIP institution.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	66	
<b>2005</b>	63	
<b>2006</b>		68
<b>2007</b>		68
<b>2008</b>		68
<b>2009</b>		68
<b>2010</b>		68
<b>2011</b>		68

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Institutions report a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for the SIP program is calculated as a median. The target is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual values for school year 2002-03 -- which was 1.67%. Therefore, the SIP program actual persistence rate of 66% in FY 2004 was multiplied by 1.0167 to generate the long-term target (for 2009) of 68%. Annual increases are estimated to be 0.3% each year through 2009 and 0.2% beginning in 2010. (Data value for 2004 had previously been erroneously assigned to 2003).

**Objective 3 of 4:** Increase the graduation rate for students enrolled at SIP Institutions.

**Indicator 3.1 of 1:** Graduation rate: The graduation rate of students enrolled at SIP Institutions will increase.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of students enrolled at four-year SIPs graduating within six years of enrollment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	45	
<b>2004</b>	47	
<b>2006</b>		47
<b>2007</b>		47
<b>2008</b>		48
<b>2009</b>		48

<b>2010</b>		48
<b>2011</b>		48

<b>Measure 3.1.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of students enrolled at two-year SIPs who graduate within three years of enrollment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	25	
<b>2004</b>	26	
<b>2006</b>		25
<b>2007</b>		26
<b>2008</b>		26
<b>2009</b>		26
<b>2010</b>		26
<b>2011</b>		26

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Target for four-year graduation rate is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual values for school year 2002-03 -- which was 6.33%. Therefore, the SIP program actual four-year graduation rate of 45% in FY 2003 was multiplied by 1.0633 to generate the long-term target (for 2009) of 48%. Annual increases are estimated to be 1% through 2009 and 0.5% beginning in 2010. For the two-year graduation rate projections, program experience was used to estimate targets. An increase of 0.5% was used to generate annual targets each year through 2009 and an increase of 0.3% was used beginning in 2010.

**Objective 4 of 4:** *Improve the efficiency of service delivery to SIP students.*

**Indicator 4.1 of 1:** Efficiency measure: Cost per successful program outcome.

<b>Measure 4.1.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost for undergraduate and graduate degree at SIP institutions.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	3,975	
<b>2004</b>	3,678	

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** This measure is calculated as the appropriation for the Strengthening Institutions program divided by the number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded. The \$3,975 cost/successful outcome for 2002-2003 reflects an appropriation of \$81.467 million divided by 20,495 graduates. The \$3,678 cost/successful outcome for 2003-04 reflects an appropriation of \$80.986 million divided by 22,021 graduates.

# HEA: AID Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities - FY 2007

**CFDA Number:** 84.031T - Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities

**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 1 of 4:** *Maintain or increase enrollments of Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities institutions (TCCUs).*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Student enrollment: Full-time degree-seeking undergraduate enrollment at TCCUs will increase.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of full-time degree-seeking undergraduates enrolling at TCCUs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	7,625	
2004	9,456	
2005	9,736	
2009		10,000

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Fall enrollment data will be monitored annually to measure progress in meeting the long-term target, which is projected to be met in 2009.

**Objective 2 of 4:** *Maintain or increase the persistence rate for students enrolled at TCCUs.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Persistence rate: First year persistence rate of students attending TCCUs will increase.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of full-time undergraduate students who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same TCCU institution.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

<b>2004</b>	41	
<b>2005</b>	48	
<b>2006</b>		41
<b>2007</b>		41
<b>2008</b>		41
<b>2009</b>		41
<b>2010</b>		41
<b>2011</b>		41

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Institutions report a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for TCCUs is calculate as a median.

**Objective 3 of 4:** *Maintain or increase the graduation rate for students enrolled at TCCUs.*

**Indicator 3.1 of 1:** Graduation rate: The graduation rate of students enrolled at TCCUs will increase.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of students enrolled at four-year TCCUs graduating within six years of enrollment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	23	
<b>2004</b>	32	
<b>2006</b>		32
<b>2007</b>		32
<b>2008</b>		32
<b>2009</b>		32
<b>2010</b>		32
<b>2011</b>		32

<b>Measure 3.1.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of students enrolled at two-year TCCUs who graduate within three years of enrollment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	40	

<b>2004</b>	34	
<b>2006</b>		29
<b>2007</b>		29
<b>2008</b>		29
<b>2009</b>		29
<b>2010</b>		29
<b>2011</b>		29

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Graduation rate data first became available from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) for FY 2003. 4-year data for 2003-04 (which had been erroneously placed in FY 2003) was used to establish the baseline. 2-year data were recomputed. This data replaces previously reported data that was not as accurate.

**Objective 4 of 4:** *Maintain or improve the efficiency of service delivery to TCCU students.*

**Indicator 4.1 of 1:** Efficiency measure: Cost per successful program outcome.

<b>Measure 4.1.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost per successful undergraduate enrollment at TCCU institutions.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	14,353	
<b>2004</b>	12,386	

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**References:** .

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** The calculation is the appropriation for the Strengthening TCCU program divided by the number of undergraduate enrollments. The \$12,386 cost for the 2003-04 value reflects an appropriation of \$23.3 million divided by 1,880 graduates. A majority of the funds appropriated for this program are used for construction.



# HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents in School - FY 2007

**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 provision of campus-based child care services.**

---

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 3:** Persistence rate: The percentage of program participants who persist in postsecondary education.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of CCAMPIS program participants receiving child care services who remain in postsecondary education at the end of the academic year.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	18 month report	36 month report	18 month report	36 month report
<b>2002</b>		79		
<b>2003</b>	64			
<b>2004</b>	66	74	64.50	79.50
<b>2005</b>		67		80
<b>2007</b>			65	
<b>2008</b>			65.50	81
<b>2009</b>				81.50
<b>2010</b>			66	
<b>2011</b>				82

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, 18 and 36 months Performance Reports for the Child Care Access Parents in Schools Program.

**Frequency:** Other.

**Next Data Available:** July 2007

**Limitations:** Grantees attest to accuracy of data.

**Explanation:** These measures have been reformatted from prior year reports to display performance by year without regard to cohort. Data are collected, per program statute, from 18-month and 36-month performance reports. Although data from the 36-month reports are more meaningful for reporting on persistence, data are also presented and projected from 18-month reports. This enables regular annual reporting on program activity. The 67 percent persistence rate, from the 36-month performance reports, reported for 2004-05, is lower than

the 36-month persistence rate for 2003-04. The calendar for data collection with reports at 18 and 36 months means that data are not collected in FY 2006, as there were no new competitions in 2003 or 2004.

**Indicator 1.2 of 3:** Graduation rate: The percentage of program participants, not including those at four-year institutions, who complete their program of study.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The graduation rate of CCAMPIS program participants in postsecondary education other than four-year schools.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	18 month report	36 month report	18 month report	36 month report
<b>2002</b>		22		
<b>2003</b>	17			
<b>2004</b>	18	30	17.50	22.50
<b>2005</b>		24		23
<b>2007</b>			18	
<b>2008</b>			18.50	23.50
<b>2009</b>				24
<b>2010</b>			19	
<b>2011</b>				25

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, 18 and 36 months Performance Reports for the Child Care Access Parents in Schools Program.

**Frequency:** Other.

**Next Data Available:** July 2007

**Limitations:** Data are supplied by grantees with no formal verification procedure provided. Grantees attest to the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Data are collected, per program statute, from 18-month and 36-month performance reports. Although data from the 36-month reports are more meaningful for reporting on persistence, data are also presented and projected from 18-month reports. This enables regular annual reporting on program activity. The 24 percent graduation rate, from the 36-month performance reports, reported for 2004-05, is lower than the rate reported in 2003-04 (30 percent). The calendar for data collection with reports at 18 and 36 months means that data are not collected in FY 2006, as there were no new competitions in 2003 or 2004.

**Indicator 1.3 of 3:** Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful CCAMPIS outcome

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost per CCAMPIS student who persist in or graduate from an institute of higher education.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	1,097	

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, 18 and 36 months Performance Reports for the Child Care Access Parents in Schools Program.

**Frequency:** Other.

**Next Data Available:** February 2006

**Improvements:** Program is currently revising Annual Performance Report , which will generate more accurate counts of persistence and completion beginning in 2007.

**Explanation:** The calculation is the annual appropriation for CCAMPIS divided by the number of students receiving CCAMPIS services who persist in or graduate from an institute of higher education. The 2003 appropriation (\$16,194,050) divided by the number of CCAMPIS students persisting in and graduating from school during the 2003-04 school year (14,762) = \$1,097

# HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program - FY 2007

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 education.**

**Objective 1 of 2:** All CAMP students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** The percentage of CAMP participants completing their first academic year of study at a postsecondary institution.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of CAMP participants completing the first year of their academic or postsecondary program.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2001	82	
2002	80	
2004		83
2005		85
2006		86
2007		86

**Source:** HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2001 data were used to establish a baseline. Although no target was established for FY 2003, data will be collected.

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

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** CAMP students continue in Postsecondary: By 2010, 85 percent of CAMP participants who successfully complete their first year of college will continue in postsecondary education.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of CAMP students who, after completing first year, continue their postsecondary education.
--

<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2001</b>	78	
<b>2002</b>	75	
<b>2004</b>		79
<b>2005</b>		80
<b>2006</b>		81
<b>2007</b>		82
<b>2010</b>		85

**Source:** HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2001 data were used to establish the baseline. Although no target was established for FY 2003, data will be collected.

# HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education - FY 2007

**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 1 of 2:** *Promote reforms that improve the quality of teaching and learning and postsecondary institutions.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Replication of projects: The percentage of projects that are adopted in full or in part, or whose materials are used by other institutions.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of FIPSE grantees reporting project dissemination to others.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>1998</b>	92	
<b>1999</b>	100	
<b>2000</b>	83	100
<b>2001</b>	96	85
<b>2002</b>	95	95
<b>2003</b>	88	95
<b>2004</b>	88	95
<b>2005</b>	96	95
<b>2006</b>		90
<b>2007</b>		90

**Source:** Final Report Scorecard

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2007

**Explanation:** FIPSE has shifted to a new online data collection instrument that allows for more accurate calculation of the measure. As a result of the changes in data collection and the results of an external evaluation of this measure through PPSS, FIPSE has revised the target for this measure for years 2006-2007.

**Objective 2 of 2:** *The institutionalization of FIPSE programs.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Projects sustained: The percentage of projects with a high likelihood of sustainability beyond federal funding, based on the project officer's determination.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of FIPSE projects reporting institutionalization on their home campuses.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>1998</b>	93	
<b>1999</b>	96	
<b>2000</b>	94	100
<b>2001</b>	100	95
<b>2002</b>	96	95
<b>2003</b>	96	95
<b>2004</b>	90	95
<b>2005</b>	94	95
<b>2006</b>		91
<b>2007</b>		92

**Source:** Final Report Scorecard.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2007

**Explanation:** FIPSE's emphasis on institutional contributions to projects and development of long-term continuation plans are designed to embed projects within campus structures. FIPSE has changed the way that it collects data through a new on-line data collection and scoring system. Based on the results of an external evaluation by PPSS, FIPSE has reset its FY 2006 and 2007 targets downward. Assessment of projects is based on onsite visitation, evaluation of projects, and review of final reports sent within 90 days after the completion of projects.

# HEA: Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) - FY 2007

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 4:** Graduate school completion: The percentage of GAANN fellows who obtain a terminal degree in an area of national need will increase.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of GAANN fellows completing a terminal degree in the designated areas of national need.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	12	12
2002	28	12
2003	47	
2004	51	
2005		28
2006		45
2007		46
2008		47
2009		48
2010		49
2011		50

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, GAANN Final Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** June 2006

**Data Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies.

The National Science Foundation is responsible for accuracy of the Survey of Earned Doctorates. Program data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** The program office developed a database to collect this information. Performance data includes degree completion as well as fellows passing preliminary examinations. The 2002 year information contains



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

data from the 1997 cohort only. Successive years combine two cohorts: 2003 information contains data from the 1998 cohort, and from those fellows in the 2000 cohort that finished in 2003. No new grants are awarded each third year, so that there were no cohorts of new fellows in 1999 or 2002. Data for 2004 includes completers and people passing preliminary examinations from both the 2000 and 2001 cohorts. This is a long-term measure.

**Indicator 1.2 of 4:** Enrollment of underrepresented populations: Percentage of fellows from traditionally underrepresented groups by grantee cohort enrolled in a terminal degree program in the designated areas of national need will increase.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of fellows from traditionally underrepresented groups by grantee cohort enrolled in a terminal degree program in the designated areas of national need.										
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
1999	1	10	7	4	37					
2001	0	7	7	7	39					
2002	1	11	10	5	38					
2003	0	6	7	2	35	999	999	999	999	999
2004	1	9	7	9	41	0	6	7	2	35
2005						1	8	7	6	39
2006						1	11	10	5	39
2007						1	11	10	5	40
2008						1	11	10	5	40
2009						1	11	10	5	41
2010						1	11	10	5	41
2011						1	11	10	5	42

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, GAANN Final Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** June 2006

**Data Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies.

The National Science Foundation is responsible for accuracy of the Survey of Earned Doctorates. Program data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Limitations:** 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.

**Explanation:** The program office developed a database to collect this information. Performance data includes

degree completion as well as fellows passing preliminary examinations. The 2002 year information contains data from the 1997 cohort only. Successive years combine two cohorts: 2003 information contains data from the 1998 cohort, and from those fellows in the 2000 cohort that finished in 2003. No new grants are awarded each third year, so that there were no cohorts of new fellows in 1999 or 2002. Data for 2004 includes completers and people passing preliminary examinations from both the 2000 and 2001 cohorts. This is a long-term measure.

**Indicator 1.3 of 4:** Time for program completion: The median 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.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Median time to completion of doctorate for GAANN students</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2002	6.50	
2003	7.10	
2004	5.92	
2005		6.45
2006		7
2007		7
2008		7
2009		7
2010		7
2011		7

**Source:** NSF, Survey of Earned Doctorate

**Web Site:** <http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/ssed/start.htm>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** June 2006

**Data Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies.

The National Science Foundation is responsible for accuracy of the Survey of Earned Doctorates. Program data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** This is a long-term measure. Actual performance is compared to the National Research Council's Survey of Earned Doctorates in which the current median time to degree for comparable degrees ranges from 6.8 to 7 years. Contract for study of graduate fellowship programs has been awarded; the study is expected to be completed by September 2007. Study results are expected in November 2007.

**Indicator 1.4 of 4:** Efficiency measure: The cost per successful GAANN fellow.

<b>Measure 1.4.1 of 1: Federal cost of GAANN Ph.D.s and those who pass preliminary exams over the life of the grant.</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>

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

<b>2002</b>	92,557	
<b>2003</b>	127,514	
<b>2006</b>		127,500

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, GAANN Final Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** June 2006

Data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** This measure is derived by taking the total funding of the grant for years one, two, and three divided by the number of GAANN Ph.D.s and those that pass preliminary exams during that period. The program office has developed a database to collect this information. The 2002 information is based on the 1997 cohort. The 2003 information was based on the 1998 cohort and 2000 cohorts; information for 2004 was based on 2000 and 2001 cohorts. No new grants are awarded each third year, so that there were no cohorts of new fellows in 1999 or 2002.

# HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Domestic Programs - FY 2007

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.015 - National Resource Centers and Fellowships Program for Language and Area or Language and International Studies  
 84.016 - Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs  
 84.017 - International Research and Studies  
 84.153A - Business and International Education Program  
 84.220 - Centers for International Business Education  
 84.229A - Language Resource Centers  
 84.274A - 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 1 of 9:** *The National Resource Centers (NRC) Program provides grants to institutions of higher education or consortia of institutions of higher education to establish, strengthen, and operate comprehensive and undergraduate language and area/international studies centers.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 3:** Employment in field of study: The percentage of NRC Ph.D. graduates finding employment in higher education, government, and national security will increase.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of National Resource Center Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government, and national security.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	48.50	
2002	53.70	
2003	55	
2004	71.80	47
2005		47.50
2006		48
2007		48.50
2008		49
2009		49.50
2010		50
2011		50.50

**Source:** ELLIAS, National Resource Center Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting

system

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** Government employment reflects employment in federal government. Employment in national security is represented by military employment. This is a long-term measure.

**Indicator 1.2 of 3:** Expansion of critical languages: The percentage of critical languages taught, as reflected by the list of critical languages referenced in the Title VI program statute

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of critical languages taught, as reflected by the list of critical languages referenced in the Title VI program statute.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	56	
<b>2004</b>	56	
<b>2005</b>		74
<b>2006</b>		60
<b>2007</b>		63
<b>2008</b>		66
<b>2015</b>		80

**Source:** EELIAS,National Resource Center Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** The list of critical languages included in the Title VI statute comprises 171 languages. This is a long-term measure. It is the goal of the program to have 80% of these languages taught by 2015.

**Indicator 1.3 of 3:** Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost for NRC fellow finding employment in government, military or higher education.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	20,169	

**Source:** EELIAS,National Resource Center Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Explanation:** This measure is calculated as the appropriation for NRC divided by the number of NRC fellows finding employment in government, military, and higher education. The 2004 actual value reflects an appropriation of \$28.7 million divided by 1,423 employed fellows. 2004-05 and 2005-06 data will both be available in December 2006.

**Objective 2 of 9:** *The Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowship Program provides academic year and summer fellowships to institutions of higher education to assist graduate students in foreign language and either area or international studies.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 3:** Improved language competency: Average competency score of FLAS Fellowship recipients at the end of one full year of instruction will be at least one competency level higher than their average score at the beginning of the year.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The average competency score of FLAS Fellowship recipients at the end of one full year of instruction minus the average score at the beginning of the year.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	1.30	
<b>2004</b>	1.22	
<b>2005</b>	1.20	1.20
<b>2006</b>		1.20
<b>2007</b>		1.20
<b>2008</b>		1.20
<b>2009</b>		1.20
<b>2010</b>		1.20
<b>2011</b>		1.20

**Source:** ELLIAS, FLAS Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Explanation:** Overall change in the language competency self-assessment reflects a mix of different levels of improvement at all stages (beginner, intermediate, advanced) of the three modalities of language acquisition that the assessment measures (reading, writing, speaking). Beginning language students may be expected to make larger advances over a given time period (and therefore have larger change scores) than more advanced students. A target value of 1.20 for change over the year reflects an ambitious overall goal for the program.

**Indicator 2.2 of 3:** Employment in field of study: The percentage of FLAS Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government, and national security will increase.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of FLAS Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government, and national security.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	16	
2006		17
2007		18

**Source:** EELIAS,FLAS Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 data established the baseline. Government employment reflects employment in federal government. Employment in national security is represented by military employment.

**Indicator 2.3 of 3:** Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome

<b>Measure 2.3.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost per FLAS fellowship recipient to increase their average competency score by at least one point from pre-test to post-test.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	17,439	

**Source:** EELIAS,FLAS Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS reporting system.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 data established the baseline. The calculation is the annual appropriation for FLAS divided by the number of FLAS fellowship recipients increasing their average competency score by at least one point from pre- to post-test. The 2004 actual value reflects an appropriation of \$27.0 million divided by 1,546 successful fellows. 2004-05 data will be available in December 2006.

**Objective 3 of 9:** *Centers for International Business Education (CIBE) provide funding to schools of business for curriculum development, research, and training on issues of importance to United States trade and competitiveness.*

**Indicator 3.1 of 2:** Employment in field of study: Percentage of CIBE Masters and Ph.D. graduates who find employment in field will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 2:</b> Percentage of CIBE Masters graduates who find employment in business.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	0.1	

2006		94
2007		94

<b>Measure 3.1.2 of 2:</b> Percentage of CIBE Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education and government.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2004	77.90	
2006		77.90
2007		77.90

**Source:** EELIAS,CIBE Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 data established the baseline for these measures. The indicator for government employment among Ph.D. graduates corresponds to employment in federal government. 2004-05 data will be available in December 2006.

**Indicator 3.2 of 2:** Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome.

<b>Measure 3.2.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost of CIBE master's graduates who find employment in business and the number of CIBE Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education and government.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2004	3,695	

**Source:** EELIAS,CIBE Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**References:** .

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 data established the baseline. This measure is calculated as the appropriation for CIBE divided by the sum of the number of CIBE Master's graduates who find employment in business and the number of CIBE Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education and government. The 2004 actual value reflects an appropriation of \$11.1 million divided by 3695 employed graduates.

**Objective 4 of 9:** *The International Research and Studies (IRS) Program supports surveys, studies, and instructional materials development to improve and strengthen instruction in modern foreign languages, area studies, and other international fields to provide full understanding of the places in which the foreign languages are commonly used.*

**Indicator 4.1 of 3:** Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by



program grantees will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 4.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of all IRS projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS,IRS Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2004 data will be used to establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 4.2 of 3:** Outreach effectiveness: The percentage of IRS participant project-related activities that result in adoption or further dissemination will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 4.2.1 of 1:</b> The number of outreach activities that result in adoption or further dissemination within a year, divided by the total number of IRS participant project-related outreach activities during the current year.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS,IRS Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 4.3 of 3:** Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome

<b>Measure 4.3.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost per IRS project successfully completed.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

**Source:** EELIAS,IRS Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 data will be used to establish the baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline. This measure is calculated as the appropriation for IRS divided by the number of IRS projects successfully completed.

**Objective 5 of 9:** *Language Resource Centers (LRCs) provide grants for establishing, strengthening, and operating centers that serve as resources for improving the nation's capacity for teaching and learning foreign languages through teacher training, research, materials development, and dissemination projects.*

**Indicator 5.1 of 3:** Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 5.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of all LRC projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS,LRCs Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The targets for 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 5.2 of 3:** Outreach effectiveness: The percentage of LRC participant project-related activities that result in adoption or further dissemination will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 5.2.1 of 1:</b> Cost of LRC project that results in adoption or further dissemination within a year.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS,LRCs Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2007

**Explanation:** The calculation is the number of outreach activities that result in adoption or further dissemination within a year, divided by the total number of LRC participant project-related outreach activities during the

current year. The FY 2005 data will be used to establish the baseline. The FY 2006 and 2007 targets are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 5.3 of 3:** Efficiency measure: Cost per successful outcome

<b>Measure 5.3.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost for successful LRC projects.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** EELIAS,LRC's Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 data will establish the baseline. The FY 2006 and 2007 targets are to maintain the baseline. This measure is calculated as the appropriation for LRC divided by the number of LRC projects successfully completed.

**Objective 6 of 9:** *The Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language (UISFL) program provides funds to institutions of higher education, a combination of such institutions, or partnerships between nonprofit educational organizations and institutions of higher education to plan, develop, and carry out programs to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages.*

**Indicator 6.1 of 3:** Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 6.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of all UISFL projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** EELIAS,UISFL Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 6.2 of 3:** Institutionalization: The number of critical languages addressed by courses or programs developed by UISFL grantees will increase.

<b>Measure 6.2.1 of 1:</b> The number of critical languages for which language courses or language training programs, materials development or dissemination activities are developed using UISFL grant funds.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** EELIAS,UISFL Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to increase the baseline by one language per year.

**Indicator 6.3 of 3:** Efficiency measure: Cost per successful outcome

<b>Measure 6.3.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost of successful UISFL project.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** EELIAS,UISFL Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** This measure is calculated as the appropriation for UISFL divided by the number of projects successfully completed. FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Objective 7 of 9:** *The Business and International Education (BIE) Program provides funds to institutions of higher education that enter into an agreement with a trade association and/or business for two purposes: to improve the academic teaching of the business curriculum and to conduct outreach activities that expand the capacity of the business community to engage in international economic activities.*

**Indicator 7.1 of 3:** Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 7.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of all BIE projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS,BIE Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System  
**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 7.2 of 3:** Outreach effectiveness: The percentage of BIE participant project-related activities that result in adoption or further dissemination will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 7.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of BIE participant project-related activities that result in adoption or further dissemination.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIS,BIE Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System  
**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2007

**Explanation:** The calculation is the number of outreach activities that result in adoption or further dissemination within a year, divided by the total number of BIE participant project-related outreach activities during the current year. FY 2005 data will establish the baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 7.3 of 3:** Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome

<b>Measure 7.3.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost for successful BIE project.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS,BIE Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System  
**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** The calculation is the annual appropriation for the BIE program divided by the number of BIE projects successfully completed. FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Objective 8 of 9:** *The Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access (TICFIA) Program supports projects that will develop innovative techniques or programs using new electronic technologies to collect information from foreign sources. Grants are made to access, collect, organize, preserve, and widely disseminate information on world regions and countries other than the United States that address our nation's teaching and research needs in international education and foreign languages.*

**Indicator 8.1 of 3:** Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 8.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of all TICFIA projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** EELIAS, TICFIA Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 8.2 of 3:** Outreach effectiveness: The percentage of TICFIA participant project-related activities that result in adoption or further dissemination will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 8.2.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of TICFIA activities that are adopted or further disseminated.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** EELIAS, TICFIA Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2007

**Explanation:** The number of outreach activities that result in adoption or further dissemination within a year, divided by the number of TICFIA projects funded during the current year. FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The 2007 target is to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 8.3 of 3:** Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome

<b>Measure 8.3.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost per successful TICFIA project.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** EELIAS, TICFIA Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** The calculation is the annual appropriation for the TICFIA program divided by the number of TICFIA projects successfully completed. FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Objective 9 of 9:** *The American Overseas Research Centers (AORCs) provides grants to consortia United States institutions of higher education to establish or operate overseas research centers that promote postgraduate research, exchanges, and area studies.*

**Indicator 9.1 of 3:** Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 9.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of AORC projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** EELIAS, AORCs Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 9.2 of 3:** Customer (scholar) satisfaction: The level of visiting scholar satisfaction with AORC support and services will increase.

<b>Measure 9.2.1 of 1:</b> Ratings by visiting scholars on a customer satisfaction scale.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** EELIAS,AORC Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2007

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The FY 2006 and 2007 targets are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 9.3 of 3:** Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome

<b>Measure 9.3.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost per successful AORC projects.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** EELIAS,AORCs Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** The calculation is the annual appropriation for the AORCs divided by the number of visiting scholars served by the research centers. FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.



# HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Institute for International Public Policy

CFDA Number: 84.269 - Institute for International Public Policy

**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 1 of 2:** *Maintain a U.S. higher education system able to produce experts in less commonly taught languages and area studies who are capable of contributing to the needs of the U.S. Government, and national security.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Employment: The percentage of Institute for International Public Policy (IIPP) graduates who find employment in government service and national security will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of IIPP Master's degree graduates who find employment in federal government and military service.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS performance reporting system, EELIAS and IIPP Annual and Final Reports.

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Objective 2 of 2:** *Completion of Master's and other graduate degrees by program participants.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 2:** Degree completion: The number of Master's and other graduate degrees obtained by participants in the IIPP program will increase.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Number of Master's degrees obtained by IIPP program participants.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS performance reporting system, EELIAS and IIPP Annual and Final Performance Reports

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will be establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 2.2 of 2:** Efficiency measure: Cost per successful outcome.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost of Master's degree for IIPP participants.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** EELIAS, performance reporting system and the grant allocation amount divided by the numbers of Master's degrees completed by program participants.

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Data Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

**Explanation:** The calculation is the grant allocation amount divided by the numbers of Master's degrees completed by IIPP program participants. FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

# HEA: Javits Fellowships - FY 2007

**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 1 of 1:** *To enable students of superior ability in the arts, humanities, and social sciences to complete their terminal degree.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 3:** Graduate school completion: The percentage of Javits fellows who complete a terminal degree within seven years.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of Javits fellows who complete a doctorate degree within seven years.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
1998	30	
1999	26	
2003	31	29
2004	30	30
2005		31
2006		31
2007		32
2008		32
2009		33
2010		33
2011		34

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Performance Report for the Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Program.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** February 2006

Program data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** This is a long-term measure. The program office collects cohort-specific data on fellows' performance to assemble this information.

**Indicator 1.2 of 3:** Time to degree completion: Average time to degree completion for Javits fellows will be less than national values.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The average time to degree completion for Javits fellows.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2003	6.30	
2004	6.30	
2005		6.30
2006		6.30
2007		6.20
2008		6.20
2009		6.10
2010		6.10
2011		6

**Source:** Annual Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** February 2006

**Data Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies.

The National Science Foundation is responsible for accuracy of the Survey of Earned Doctorates. Program data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** This is a long-term measure.

**Indicator 1.3 of 3:** Efficiency Measure: Cost per terminal degree (MFA/PhD) awarded.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> The Federal cost per terminal degree (PhD/MFA) for the Javits Fellowship Program.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2003	109,873	
2004	110,000	

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Performance Report for the Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Program.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** February 2006

Program data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Efficiency data are determined by calculating the total dollars allocated to the cohorts divided by the total number of Javits Fellows receiving a terminal degree during this same time frame. Over time, the uses for this efficiency measure may include examining the cost per successful outcome for the Javits Program as compared with other comparable programs.

# HEA: SFA Federal Direct Student Loans - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 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 work-study in an efficient, financially sound and customer-responsive manner.**

---

**Objective 1 of 1:** *Ensure that persistence rates will increase for low- and middle-income students.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Student persistence.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Student persistence rate in postsecondary education for Direct Loan borrowers.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2007		999

**Source:** IPEDS

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** June 2008

**Explanation:** The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. Providing program-specific data for this program will become feasible when individual student enrollment information is collected. The collection of student data at the individual unit record level will provide the information needed to calculate retention and completion rates for the individual FSA programs. OPE management has been actively involved in the technical review panel for the IPEDS Student Unit Record Feasibility Study. The study is being conducted to review the feasibility of redesigning the IPEDS collection of student-related data to incorporate individual student unit records. Although it is premature to anticipate when, and if, unit record data will become available, 2008 would likely be the earliest possible date for reporting since field testing is anticipated in FY 2006 and implementation would probably not occur until FY 2007. Given that the unit record project study outcome is not yet known, OPE also is exploring the feasibility of obtaining program data on persistence and completion by drawing an alternative sample from the merged applicant/recipient file and conducting a survey of this group.

# HEA: SFA Federal Family Education Loan Program & Liquidating - FY 2007

**CFDA Number:** 84.032 - Federal Family Education Loans

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

---

**Objective 1 of 1:** *Ensure that persistence rates will increase for low- and middle-income students.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Student persistence.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Student persistence rate in postsecondary education for FFEL borrowers.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2007		999

**Source:** IPEDS

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** June 2008

**Explanation:** The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. Providing program-specific data for this program will become feasible when individual student enrollment information is collected. The collection of student data at the individual unit record level will provide the information needed to calculate retention and completion rates for the individual FSA programs. OPE management has been actively involved in the technical review panel for the IPEDS Student Unit Record Feasibility Study. The study is being conducted to review the feasibility of redesigning the IPEDS collection of student-related data to incorporate individual student unit records. Although it is premature to anticipate when, and if, unit record data will become available, 2008 would likely be the earliest possible date for reporting since field testing is anticipated in FY 2006 and implementation would probably not occur until FY 2007. Given that the unit record project study outcome is not yet known, OPE also is exploring the feasibility of obtaining program data on persistence and completion by drawing an alternative sample from the merged applicant/recipient file and conducting a survey of this group.

# HEA: SFA Federal Pell Grants - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.063 - Federal Pell Grant Program

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

---

**Objective 1 of 1:** *Ensure that low- and middle-income students will have the same access to postsecondary education that high-income students do.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** 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 the poverty line.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of Pell Grant funds going to students below 150 percent of the poverty line.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
1997	82	
1998	80	
1999	78	75
2000	78	75
2001	79	75
2002	78	75
2003	76	75
2004	76	75
2005		75
2006		75
2007		78
2008		79
2009		79
2010		80

**Source:** Pell Grant Applicant/Recipient File.

**Date Sponsored:** 03/30/2004.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** August 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Explanation:** 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. This is a long-term measure.



# HEA: SFA Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants - FY 2007

**CFDA Number:** 84.007 - Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants

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

*Objective 1 of 1: Ensure that persistence rates will increase for low- and middle-income students.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Student Persistence.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Student persistence rate for SEOG recipients.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2007		999

**Source:** IPEDS

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** June 2008

**Explanation:** The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. Providing program-specific data for this program will become feasible when individual student enrollment information is collected. The collection of student data at the individual unit record level will provide the information needed to calculate retention and completion rates for the individual FSA programs. OPE management has been actively involved in the technical review panel for the IPEDS Student Unit Record Feasibility Study. The study is being conducted to review the feasibility of redesigning the IPEDS collection of student-related data to incorporate individual student unit records. Although it is premature to anticipate when, and if, unit record data will become available, 2008 would likely be the earliest possible date for reporting since field testing is anticipated in FY 2006 and implementation would probably not occur until FY 2007. Given that the unit record project study outcome is not yet known, OPE also is exploring the feasibility of obtaining program data on persistence and completion by drawing an alternative sample from the merged applicant/recipient file and conducting a survey of this group.

# HEA: SFA Federal Work-Study - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.033 - Federal Work-Study Program

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

---

**Objective 1 of 1:** *Ensure that persistence rates will increase for low- and middle-income students.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Student persistence.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Student persistence rate for Federal Work Study participants.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2007		999

**Source:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** June 2008

**Explanation:** The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. Providing program-specific data for this program will become feasible when individual student enrollment information is collected. The collection of student data at the individual unit record level will provide the information needed to calculate retention and completion rates for the individual FSA programs. OPE management has been actively involved in the technical review panel for the IPEDS Student Unit Record Feasibility Study. The study is being conducted to review the feasibility of redesigning the IPEDS collection of student-related data to incorporate individual student unit records. Although it is premature to anticipate when, and if, unit record data will become available, 2008 would likely be the earliest possible date for reporting since field testing is anticipated in FY 2006 and implementation would probably not occur until FY 2007. Given that the unit record project study outcome is not yet known, OPE also is exploring the feasibility of obtaining program data on persistence and completion by drawing an alternative sample from the merged applicant/recipient file and conducting a survey of this group.

# HEA: Student Aid Administration - FY 2007

**Program Goal: To administer the student aid programs, including efforts to modernize student aid delivery and management systems, improve service to students and other student aid program participants, reduce the cost of student aid administration, and improve accountability and program integrity.**

---

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

### **Indicator 1.1 of 2: Reduce FSA Business Process Cost**

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 4: (a) Percent reduction of electronic FAFSA unit costs</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2006		999
2008		999
2010		999

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 4: (b) Percent reduction of origination and disbursement unit costs</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2006		999
2008		999
2010		999

<b>Measure 1.1.3 of 4: (c) Percent reduction of Direct Loan Servicing unit costs</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2006		999
2008		999
2010		999

<b>Measure 1.1.4 of 4: (d) Percent reduction of Collections unit costs</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2006		999
2008		999
2010		999

**Source:** FSA Activity-Based Cost Model (ABC)

**Frequency:** Biennially.

**Next Data Available:** January 2007

Numerous internal controls

**Explanation:** In FY 2004, FSA defined and validated its Activity-Based Costing (ABC) model to measure the success of its cost-reduction strategies. In FY 2005, FSA continued to enhance the ABC model to yield improved cost data and in FY 2006 will develop baseline reduction percentages. The FSA Activity-Based Costing Model was used to produce unit cost data for FY2003 and FY2004. FY2005 unit cost data will be finalized by the second quarter of FY2006. The FY 2006 target for measures a through d is to establish the baselines (BL). For measure (a), the FY 2008 target is BL minus 20%; 2010 target is BL minus 25%. For measure (b), the FY 2008 target is BL minus 10%; 2010 target is BL minus 15%. For measure (c), the FY 2008 target is BL minus 12%; 2010 target is BL minus 12%. For measure (d), the FY 2008 target is BL minus 14%; 2010 target is BL minus 14%.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** Eliminate improper payments

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Improper Payments PMA Scorecard Rating		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005	1	
2006		2
2010		3

**Source:** President's Management Agenda Scorecard.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** In the first quarter of FY 2005, OMB introduced a new President's Management Agenda (PMA) initiative, Eliminating Improper Payments, to support agency efforts to meet the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (IPIA) reporting requirements. This initiative makes it easier for agencies to track the progress of activities aimed at identifying, reporting on and reducing improper payments. At the same time, it provides for more comprehensive agency accountability to OMB through quarterly PMA scorecards. As such, Federal Student Aid is working closely with OMB and the Department to develop an action plan designed to (a) reduce the amount of improper payments in our programs, (b) lower the risk of improper payments in our programs and (c) improve the accuracy of our improper payment estimates. In FY 2005, FSA received red and the FY 2006 target is yellow and the FY 2010 target is green.

In the table: 1 = Red; 2 = Yellow; 3 = Green

# HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.066 - TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers

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

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of EOC participants enrolling in college.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers participants enrolling in college.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	57	
2001	66	
2002	66	
2003	57	
2004	57.40	57
2005		57.50
2006		58
2007		58.50
2008		59
2009		59.50
2010		60
2011		60.50

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Talent Search and Education Opportunity Centers Programs Annual Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

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.

**Explanation:** FY 2000 data established the baseline.

# HEA: TRIO McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement - FY 2007

**CFDA Number:** 84.217A - TRIO - McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement

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

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Graduate school enrollment and persistence: Percentages of McNair participants enrolling and persisting in graduate school.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentages of TRIO McNair participants enrolling and persisting in graduate school.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	Enrollment	Persistence	Enrollment	Persistence
<b>1999</b>	35	48		
<b>2000</b>	35	75	35	48
<b>2001</b>	40	66	35	48
<b>2002</b>	39	65	35	48
<b>2003</b>	36	78	36	75
<b>2004</b>	45.30	77.70	36	75
<b>2005</b>			36	70
<b>2006</b>			37	79
<b>2007</b>			37	79
<b>2008</b>			37.50	79.50
<b>2009</b>			37.50	79.50
<b>2010</b>			38	80
<b>2011</b>			38	80

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Performance Report for the Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement Program.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** December 2006

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.

**Explanation:** Enrollment refers to immediate enrollment in graduate school for B.A. recipients. Previously reported data for FY 2004 has been updated to be more accurate. This is a long-term measure.

# HEA: TRIO Student Support Services - FY 2007

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 4:** Postsecondary persistence: Percentage of Student Support Services participants persisting at the same institution will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of TRIO Student Support Services participants persisting at the same institution.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	67	
2000	67	67
2001	70	67
2002	72	67
2003	72	68
2004	73.10	68.50
2005		69
2006		72
2007		73
2008		73
2009		73.50
2010		73.50
2011		74

**Source:** Evaluation, Higher Education.

**Section:** [The National Evaluation of Upward Bound: Summary of First-year Impacts and Program Operations \(1997\)](#).

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

The annual performance report is based on self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

**Explanation:** Persistence is defined as the rate of freshman participants who continue to enroll at the grantee institution in the following academic year. Data from the national study of the Student Support Services



Program provided the baseline data (1999 actual performance). Subsequent data are from the Annual Performance Reports. Targets were recalculated in FY 2006, as the persistence rate has increased since the baseline year. Previously reported FY 2004 data has been recalculated to be more accurate.

**Indicator 1.2 of 4:** Postsecondary completion two- year schools: Percentage of Student Support Services freshmen completing an Associates degree at original institution or transferring to a four- year institution within three years will increase.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of Student Support Services participants completing an Associates degree at original institution or transferring to a four-year institution within three years.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2001</b>	23.10	
<b>2002</b>	26	
<b>2003</b>	27.70	
<b>2004</b>	25.60	
<b>2006</b>		27
<b>2007</b>		27.50
<b>2008</b>		27.50
<b>2009</b>		28
<b>2010</b>		28
<b>2011</b>		28.50

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Report for the Student Support Services (SSS) Program.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

The annual performance report is based on self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

**Explanation:** Previously reported FY 2004 has been recalculated to be more accurate.

**Indicator 1.3 of 4:** Postsecondary completion-four-year schools: Percentage of Student Support Services freshmen completing an Bachelors degree at original institution within six years will increase.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of Student Support Services freshmen completing an Bachelors degree at original institution within six-years.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	28.10	
<b>2006</b>		28
<b>2007</b>		29
<b>2008</b>		29

<b>2009</b>		29.50
<b>2010</b>		29.50
<b>2011</b>		30

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Report for the Student Support Services (SSS) Program.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

The annual performance report is comprised of self-reported data. However, a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

**Explanation:** 2003-04 is the first year for which graduation data for four-year schools were available from the annual performance reports. Previously reported FY 2004 data has been recalculated to be more accurate.

**Indicator 1.4 of 4:** Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome.

<b>Measure 1.4.1 of 1:</b> Cost of program completers, transfers to another institution or persists in the same school and gap between cost per successful outcome and cost per program participant.			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>
	Cost per successful outcome	Gap between cost per outcome and cost per output	Gap between cost per outcome and cost per output
<b>2003</b>	1,528	263	
<b>2004</b>	1,510	252	
<b>2007</b>			239

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Report for the Student Support Services (SSS) Program.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Improvements:** Actual allocations of the annual appropriation are now used instead of the overall appropriation.

**Explanation:** The efficiency measure is derived by dividing the annual appropriation by the number of students completing, transferring or persisting at the same institution during that specific school year. The 2007 target was established to reduce the gap by \$13 or 5 percent (viewed another way, there was a 20 percent difference between the 2004 cost per outcome and cost per output, which the 2007 target would reduce to 19 percent). As more trend data become available, additional data analysis are completed, and feedback is received from the TRIO community, the Department will work to ensure that efficiency measure data are informative and useful, and to ensure that efficiency measure targets are sufficiently ambitious yet reasonable.

# HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults - FY 2007

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 1 of 2: Individuals who are deaf-blind received the specialized services and training they need to become as independent and self-sufficient as possible.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Services to consumers at headquarters: The training program at Helen Keller National Center (HKNC) headquarters will increase the number of adult consumers who have achieved successful employment to 45 percent, less restrictive setting outcomes to 75 percent, and identified training goals to 90 percent.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of HKNC adult consumers who successfully achieve/maintain employment and independent living outcomes.								
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets			
	# Adult consumers	% Training goals met	% in Less Restrictive Settings	% Placed in Employment Settings	# Adult consumers	% Training goals met	% in Less Restrictive Settings	% Placed in Employment Settings
1999	75			45	85			38
2000	82			52	90			45
2001	87	92	71	38	90	86	59	45
2002	85	90	80	27			59	45
2003	100	88	70	42.50				
2004	98	90	69	46	95	88	70	45
2005	100	89	95	42	95	88	70	45
2006					95	88	72	45
2007					95	90	75	45
2008					95	90	75	45
2009					95	90	75	45
2010					95	90	75	45

**Source:** Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Limitations:** Data are based upon self-reported data from the grantee and are not independently verified. A follow-up survey was developed, but budgetary limitations prevented its implementation.

**Explanation:** For FY 2006, this measure was reworded to more accurately reflect the elements being measured. Final transition plans for each client will include the employment and living situations each client will be entering upon completion of training.

**Objective 2 of 2:** Increase the capacity of deaf-blind consumers to function more independently in the home community.

**Indicator 2.1 of 2:** Impact of professional training: State and local service providers will demonstrate improved knowledge and skills to meet the needs of HKNC consumers.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of service providers who demonstrate knowledge/skill acquisition six months after HKNC training.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** HKNC Annual Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 2.2 of 2:** Consumer outcomes: Improved vocational and independent living outcomes

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of consumers who successfully achieve/maintain employment or independent living outcomes.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Secure Employment	Retain Employment	Independent Living	Secure Employment	Retain Employment	Independent Living
2006				999	999	999
2007				999	999	999

**Source:** HKNC Annual Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2007

**Explanation:** This is a new measure under development. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is to maintain the baseline.

# MECEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Overseas Programs - FY 2007

**CFDA Numbers:** 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

**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 1 of 4:** *The Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad (DDRA) program, provides grants to colleges and universities to fund individual doctoral students to conduct research in other countries in modern foreign languages and area studies for periods of 6- to -12 months.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 3:** Improved language competency: The average language competency score of DDRA fellowship recipients at the end of their period of instruction will be higher than their average score at the beginning of the period.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The average language competency score of DDRA fellowship recipients at the end of their period of instruction minus their average score at the beginning of the period.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System.

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 1.2 of 3:** Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of all DDRA projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

2007		999
------	--	-----

**Source:** EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System.

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 1.3 of 3:** Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost per DDRA fellowship recipient to increase the average language competence by at least one level in any of the three components of the language proficiency assessment at the end of their period of instruction.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System.

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** The calculation is to the annual appropriation for DDRA divided by the number of DDRA recipients. FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Objective 2 of 4:** *The Fulbright-Hays Faculty Research Abroad (FRA) program provides grants to institutions of higher education to fund faculty to maintain and improve their area studies and language skills by conducting research abroad for periods of 3- to- 12 months.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 3:** Improved language competency: The average language competency of FRA recipients at the end of their period of instruction will be higher than their competency at the beginning of the period.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The average language competency score of FRA recipients at the end of their period of instruction minus their average language competency at the beginning of the period.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	0.38	
2006		0.38
2007		0.38

**Source:** EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System.

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 data were used to establish the baseline.

**Indicator 2.2 of 3:** Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of all FRA projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System.

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 2.3 of 3:** Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome.

<b>Measure 2.3.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost per FRA fellowship recipient to increase their average language competency by at least one level in any of the three components of the language proficiency assessment at the end of their period of instruction.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System.

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Explanation:** The calculation is the annual appropriation for FRA divided by the number of FRA recipients who increase their language competency by at least one level in any of the three components of the language proficiency assessment at the end of their period of instruction. FY2005 will be used to establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Objective 3 of 4:** *The Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad (GPA) Program provides grants to support overseas projects in training, research, and curriculum development in modern foreign languages and area studies by teachers, students, and faculty engaged in a common endeavor.*

**Indicator 3.1 of 3:** Improved language competency: The average language competency score of GPA recipients at the end of their period of instruction will be higher than their score at the beginning of the period.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 1:</b> The difference between the average language competency of GPA recipients at the end of their period of instruction and their average competency at the beginning of the period.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System.

**References:** .

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 3.2 of 3:** Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 3.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of all GPA projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System.

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 3.3 of 3:** Efficiency measure: Cost per successful outcome.

<b>Measure 3.3.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost per GPA fellowship recipient to increase their language proficiency by at least one level in any one of the three components of the language proficiency assessment at the end of their period of instruction.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999



**Source:** EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System.

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** November 2006

**Explanation:** The calculation is the annual appropriation for GPA divided by the number of GPA recipients who increase their language proficiency by at least one level in any one of the three components of the language proficiency assessment at the end of their period of instruction. FY 2005 data will be to establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

**Objective 4 of 4:** *The Fulbright-Hays Seminars Abroad (SA) program provides short-term study and travel seminars abroad for U.S. educators in the social sciences and humanities for the purpose of improving their understanding and knowledge of the peoples and cultures of other countries.*

**Indicator 4.1 of 3:** Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

<b>Measure 4.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of all SA projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System.

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline level.

**Indicator 4.2 of 3:** Outreach effectiveness: The number of curriculum units or lesson plans that show evidence of successful adoption by outside groups, faculty or teachers will increase.

<b>Measure 4.2.1 of 1:</b> The number of curriculum units, lesson plans or other materials that show evidence of successful adoption by outside educational groups, faculty, or teachers.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2007		999

**Source:** EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System.

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 4.3 of 3:** Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome.

<b>Measure 4.3.1 of 1:</b> Federal cost per SA project successfully completed.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

**References:** .

**Web Site:** <http://www.eelias.org>.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** The calculation is the annual appropriation for SA divided by the number of successfully completed SA projects. FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The targets for FY 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

# RA: Client Assistance State Grants - FY 2007

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 1 of 2:** *Resolve cases at lowest possible level.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Alternative dispute resolution (ADR): The percentage of cases resolved through the use of ADR will be maintained at a rate of 84 percent.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of cases resolved through ADR.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	84	
2002	85	
2003	82	
2004	82	84
2005		84
2006		84
2007		84
2008		84
2009		84
2010		84

**Source:** CAP performance report, RSA-227.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialists. Onsite reviews of individual programs are conducted when resources permit, and random sampling of onsite files is cross-checked with reported data for verification.

**Explanation:** Targets are established based on actual data from FY 2001 through 2004.

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

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Effects of systemic change: The percentage of Client Assist Programs (CAPs) that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will maintain a rate of 60 percent.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of Client Assist Programs (CAPs) that reported that their systemic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>1999</b>	43	
<b>2000</b>	44	44
<b>2001</b>	45	45
<b>2002</b>	54	46
<b>2003</b>	48	47
<b>2004</b>	57	49
<b>2005</b>		50
<b>2006</b>		54
<b>2007</b>		60
<b>2008</b>		60
<b>2009</b>		60
<b>2010</b>		60

**Source:** CAP performance report, RSA-227, narrative section.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialists. Onsite reviews of individual programs are conducted when resources permit, and random sampling of onsite files is cross-checked with reported data for verification.

**Explanation:** Performance percentage is based on the reporting of successful systemic change activity. FY 1999 data established the baseline.

# RA: Independent Living Centers - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.132 - Centers for Independent Living

**Program Goal: To promote and support a philosophy of independent living, including a philosophy of consumer control, peer support, self-help, self-determination, equal access, and individual and system advocacy, in order to maximize the leadership, empowerment, independence, and productivity of individuals with disabilities, and the integration and full inclusion of individuals with disabilities into the mainstream of American society.**

**Objective 1 of 3:** *Through the provision of IL services (including the four IL core services), increase the percentage of CIL consumers who report having access to services needed to improve their ability to live more independently and participate fully in their communities.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 2:** Increase the percentage of CIL consumers who report having access to previously unavailable transportation, health care, and assistive technology.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> As a result of direct services provided by a CIL (including referral to another service provider), the percentage of CIL consumers who report having access to previously unavailable transportation, appropriate accommodations to receive health care services, and/or assistive technology resulting in increased independence in at least one significant life area.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Transportation	Appropriate Accommodations for Health Care Services	Assistive Technology	Transportation	Appropriate Accommodations for Health Care Services	Assistive Technology
<b>2006</b>				999	999	999
<b>2007</b>				999	999	999

**Source:** RSA Annual Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2007

**Limitations:** Data are self-reported.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target is to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** Increase the percentage of CIL consumers moving out of institutions.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> Through the provision of IL services (including the four IL core services) the percentage of CIL consumers who move out of institutions into a community based setting
---

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Percentage of CIL consumer moving out of institutions	Percentage of CIL consumer moving out of institutions
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** RSA Annual (704 Part 1).

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** May 2007

**Limitations:** Data is self-reported by CILs.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline . The 2007 target is the baseline plus 1 percent.

**Objective 2 of 3:** Increase the percentage of community services available to persons with disabilities.

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Increase the percentage of community services available to persons with disabilities.

**Measure 2.1.1 of 1:** The percentage of CILs with CIL staff, board members and/or consumers creating/participating on community committees, in advocacy initiatives, in public information campaigns, and/or other community events designed to increase the accessibility to transportation, develop relationships with health care providers, increase the availability /access to assistive technology and/or increase the compliance with applicable laws/regulations governing the number of affordable accessible housing units within the community.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets			
	Appropriate Health Care      Assistive Transportation Accommodations Technology Housing	Appropriate Health Care	Assistive Technology	Accommodations	Housing
2006		999	999	999	999
2007		999	999	999	999

**Source:** RSA Annual Performance Report (704 Report).

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2007

**Limitations:** Data are self-reported.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for each category. The FY 2007 targets are to maintain the baselines.

**Objective 3 of 3:** Improve the efficiency and transparency of the Centers for Independent Living Program.

**Indicator 3.1 of 1:** Improve the efficiency and transparency of the Centers for Independent Living Program.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of months from due date to the release of CIL data to the public.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>	7	
<b>2005</b>		5
<b>2006</b>		5
<b>2007</b>		5

**Source:** Office records and files.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** July 2006

**Explanation:** FY 2004 data established the baseline.

# RA: Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals - FY 2007

**CFDA Number:** 84.177 - Rehabilitation Services Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who are Blind

**Program Goal: Support individuals with significant disabilities, including older individuals who are blind or severely visually impaired in the achievement of their independent living goals.**

---

**Objective 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 1.1 of 1:** Older blind individuals served by the program: 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.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> 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.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	AT	ADL	AT	ADL
<b>2005</b>			999	999
<b>2006</b>			999	999
<b>2007</b>			999	999

**Source:** Annual 7-OB reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** July 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is the baseline plus 1 percent. The FY 2007 target is baseline plus 2 percent.

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

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Make Title VII, Chapter 2 data available to the public.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of months from data due to the release of the data to the public
--



RA: Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		7
2006		5
2007		5

**Source:** Annual 7-OB Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** July 2006

**Explanation:** This was a new measure for 2005.

# RA: Independent Living State Grants - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.169 - Independent Living State Grants

**Program Goal: To promote and support a philosophy of independent living, including a philosophy of consumer control, peer support, self-help, self-determination, equal access, and individual and system advocacy, in order to maximize the leadership, empowerment, independence, and productivity of individuals with disabilities, and the integration and full inclusion of individuals with disabilities into the mainstream of American society.**

**Objective 1 of 2:** *Through the provision of services (either directly or through grants and/or contracts), increase the percentage of consumers receiving services funded through IL Title VII, Part B funds who report having access to services needed to improve their ability to live more independently and participate fully in their communities.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 2:** The percentage of Part B consumers who report having access to previously unavailable transportation, health care, and assistive technology provided by the DSU will increase.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of Part B consumers who report having access to (previously unavailable) transportation, appropriate accommodations to receive health care services, and/or assistive technology resulting in increased independence in at least one significant life area.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Transportation	Appropriate Accommodations for Health Care Services	Assistive Technology	Transportation	Appropriate Accommodations for Health Care Services	Assistive Technology
2006				999	999	999
2007				999	999	999

**Source:** Source: RSA Annual 704 Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2007

**Limitations:** Data are self-reported.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The 2007 target is to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** Increase the percentage of consumers reporting satisfaction with IL services.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of consumers receiving/who have received IL services reporting satisfaction with IL services received.
--

RA: Independent Living State Grants

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** State's consumer satisfaction survey (required by 34 CFR 364.38) collected every three years as an attachment to the State Plan for Independent Living.

**Frequency:** Other.

**Next Data Available:** March 2007

**Limitations:** Data are self-reported.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The 2007 target is to maintain the baseline.

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

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Make Title VII, Part B data available to the public.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of months from data due date to the release of IL-Part B data to the public.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	7	
2005		5
2006		5
2007		3

**Source:** Annual Part 1 704 Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** May 2006

**Limitations:** Data are self-reported.

**Explanation:** The FY 2004 data was used to establish the baseline.

# RA: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights - FY 2007

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

**Program Goal: To support the protection and advocacy system in each state to protect the legal and human rights of individuals with disabilities.**

---

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

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Policy changes: The percentage of PAIRs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts is maintained at a rate of 81 percent.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of PAIRs that reported that their systemic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	54	
2001	68	
2002	81	
2003	75	
2004	86	77
2005		79
2006		80
2007		81
2008		81
2009		81
2010		81

**Source:** Grantee Performance Report, Annual Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) Program Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialist. Onsite reviews of individual programs are conducted when resources permit, and random sampling of onsite files is cross-checked with reported data for verification.

# RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs - FY 2007

**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 1 of 1:** *Expand and improve the provision of rehabilitation services that lead to employment outcomes.*

**Indicator 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>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of individuals who were provided employment services through projects and who were placed into employment.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Percent of individuals placed into employment	Percent of individuals placed into employment
2001	14.20	
2002	27.86	
2003	38.62	
2004	35.97	
2005		24
2006		34
2007		34

**Source:** Web-based Annual Performance Reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Limitations:** The Web-based system that grantees use for reporting provides raw data but does not aggregate all the numbers needed, which has resulted in hand counting to obtain the information required.

**Explanation:** Actual performance data were re-calculated for FY 2001 through 2004 to include only projects with employment outcomes.

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** Improvement: The percentage of individuals referred to or from VR agencies will be maintained or increased as a result of interactions with, presentations to, and information provided to VR agencies.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of referrals to and from state VR agencies and projects.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	Referrals to VR from Projects	Referrals from VR to Projects	Referrals to VR from Projects	Referrals from VR to Projects
<b>2001</b>	17.50	35.64		
<b>2002</b>	17.47	37.34	10	58
<b>2003</b>	11.22	27.55	10	60
<b>2004</b>	9.22	31.44	10	62
<b>2005</b>			13	33
<b>2006</b>			13	33
<b>2007</b>			13	33

**Source:** Web-based Annual Performance Reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Limitations:** The Web-based system that grantees use for reporting provides raw data but does not aggregate all the numbers needed, which has resulted in hand counting to obtain the information required.

**Explanation:** FY 2001 data established the baseline. Actual performance data were re-calculated for FY 2001 through 2004 to include only projects with employment outcomes.

# RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Grants for Indians - FY 2007

**CFDA Number:** 84.250 - Rehabilitation Services American Indians with Disabilities

**Program Goal: Projects demonstrate effective fiscal management.**

---

**Objective 1 of 2:** *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 1.1 of 1:** The percentage of individuals who leave the program with employment outcomes: 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.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of individuals who leave the AIVRS program with employment outcomes.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	58	
1999	61	
2000	62	61
2001	65	62
2002	64	62
2003	66	64.10
2004	62	64.50
2005		65
2006		65
2007		65
2008		65
2009		65
2010		65

**Source:** Web-based Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Improvements:** Continued technical assistance will ensure that grantees are providing uniform data.

**Objective 2 of 2:** *Ensure that all AIVRS projects demonstrate effective fiscal management.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** The cost per employment outcome: The percentage of projects whose cost per employment outcome is within a specified range.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of AIVRS projects whose cost per employment outcomes is within a specified range.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** Web-Based Performance Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** January 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for this new efficiency measure. The 2007 target is to maintain the baseline. Cost per employment outcome is calculated by dividing the total federal grant funds by the number of individuals served by AIVRS with employment outcomes.



# RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.126A - Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants

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

**Objective 1 of 2:** *Ensure that individuals with disabilities who are served by the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) State Grants program achieve employment consistent with their particular strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, abilities, capabilities, interests and informed choice.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 3:** Employment outcomes: The percentage of (a) general and combined state VR agencies that assist at least 55.8 percent of individuals who receive services to achieve employment outcomes, and (b) state VR agencies for the blind that assist at least 68.9 percent of individuals who receive services to achieve employment outcomes will increase.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 2:</b> (a) The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies that assist at least 55.8 percent of individuals receiving services to achieve employment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2001	75	
2002	75	
2003	66	
2004	66	83
2005		75
2006		70
2007		70

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 2:</b> (b) The percentage of state VR agencies for the blind that assist at least 68.9 percent of individuals receiving services to achieve employment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2001	75	
2002	75	
2003	58	
2004	63	83
2005		75
2006		70
2007		70

**Source:** RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

**Limitations:** Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from grantees.

**Explanation:** 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.

**Indicator 1.2 of 3:** Competitive employment for individuals with significant disabilities: The percentage of (a) general and combined state VR agencies for which at least 80 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities, and (b) state VR agencies for the blind for which at least 90 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities will increase.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 2:</b> (a) The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies for which at least 80 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2002</b>	75	
<b>2003</b>	82	
<b>2004</b>	86	
<b>2006</b>		88
<b>2007</b>		89

<b>Measure 1.2.2 of 2:</b> (b) The percentage of state VR agencies for the blind for which at least 90 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2002</b>	88	
<b>2003</b>	88	
<b>2004</b>	100	
<b>2006</b>		96
<b>2007</b>		100

**Source:** RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

**Limitations:** Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees.

**Explanation:** This indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on indicator 1.4, in Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals achieving competitive employment who have significant disabilities. To pass the Section 106 indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 62.4 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 89 percent. For purposes of this measure, beginning with the FY 2006, RSA decided that the criteria were too low, and therefore increased the performance criteria to 80 percent for general and combined agencies, and 90 percent for agencies for the blind. FY 2002 and 2003 data were recalculated to reflect the new criteria that were developed in 2006.

**Indicator 1.3 of 3:** Competitive employment: By 2010 (a) 98 percent of general and combined state VR agencies will assist at least 85 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment, and (b) 79 percent of state VR agencies for the blind will assist at least 65 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment.

<b>Measure 1.3.1 of 2:</b> (a) The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies assisting at least 85 percent of individuals to achieve competitive employment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2002	88	
2003	93	
2004	95	67
2005		89
2006		96
2007		98
2008		98
2009		98
2010		98

<b>Measure 1.3.2 of 2:</b> (b) The percentage of state VR agencies for the blind assisting at least 65 percent of individuals to achieve competitive employment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2002	50	
2003	54	
2004	71	48
2005		54
2006		71
2007		75
2008		75

<b>2009</b>		79
<b>2010</b>		79

**Source:** RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluation Program Performance Data.

**Limitations:** Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from grantees.

**Explanation:** 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 the Section 106 indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 72.6 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 35.4 percent. For purposes of this measure, beginning with the FY 2004 plan, RSA decided that the criteria were too low, and therefore increased the rates to 85 percent for general and combined VR agencies, and 65 percent for agencies for the blind. For measure (a), the FY 2002 and 2003 data were incorrectly calculated and have been corrected.

**Objective 2 of 2:** *Ensure that state VR agencies demonstrate effective fiscal management.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 2:** Cost per employment outcome: The percentage of state VR agencies whose cost per employment outcome is within a specified range.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies whose cost per employment outcome is within a specified range.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2007</b>		999

<b>Measure 2.1.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of state VR agencies for the blind whose cost per employment outcome is within a specified range.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2007</b>		999

**Source:** RSA state agency data from the RSA-911 report and RSA final state agency allocation tables.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** April 2007

**Explanation:** During FY 2006, the Department will identify the specific performance range needed to meet these measures. These are new efficiency measures. Cost per employment outcome is calculated by dividing the total federal grant funds by the number of individuals achieving employment outcomes in the fiscal year. The FY 2007 target is to maintain the baseline.

**Indicator 2.2 of 2:** Consumer Service Expenditure Rate: The percentage of state VR agencies whose consumer service expenditure rate is at or above a specified level.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 2:</b> The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies whose consumer service expenditure rate is at or above a specified level.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

<b>Measure 2.2.2 of 2:</b> The percentage of state VR agencies for the blind whose consumer service expenditure rate is at or above a specified level.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

**Source:** State VR agency data from the RSA-2 Cost Report

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** July 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish the baselines for these new efficiency measures. During FY 2006 the Department will identify the specific performance level needed to meet these measures. Consumer service expenditure rate is calculated by dividing the state VR agency's total program expenditures by consumer service expenditures. The FY 2007 target is to maintain the baseline

# RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training - FY 2007

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.129 - Rehabilitation Long-Term Training  
 84.246 - Rehabilitation Short-Term Training  
 84.264 - Rehabilitation Training\_Continuing Education  
 84.275 - Rehabilitation Training\_General Training

**Program Goal: To provide the public vocational rehabilitation (VR) sector with well-trained staff and to maintain and upgrade the skills of current staff through continuing education.**

**Objective 1 of 3:** *To provide graduates who work within the vocational rehabilitation (VR) system to help individuals with disabilities achieve their goals.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 2:** Numbers trained: The number of students supported by RSA scholarships and the number of RSA scholars graduating will remain stable.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 2:</b> The number of scholars supported by RSA scholarships.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
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	2,378	2,050
2004	1,798	2,050
2005		2,100
2006		2,000
2007		2,000

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 2:</b> The number of RSA-supported scholars graduating.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
1997	800	
1998	817	
1999	832	729
2000	764	688

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training

<b>2001</b>	841	700
<b>2002</b>	817	700
<b>2003</b>	802	725
<b>2004</b>	598	725
<b>2005</b>		725
<b>2006</b>		725
<b>2007</b>		725

**Source:** Annual grantee reporting form.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** Percentage working: The percentage of graduates fulfilling their payback requirements through acceptable employment will increase annually.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of RSA-supported graduates fulfilling their payback requirements through acceptable employment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2000</b>	72	70
<b>2001</b>	71	71
<b>2002</b>	85	72
<b>2003</b>	82	72
<b>2004</b>	81	74
<b>2005</b>		73
<b>2006</b>		83
<b>2007</b>		83

**Source:** Annual grantee reporting form.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** Targets were increased for 2006 since data indicate a higher performance level.

**Objective 2 of 3:** *Maintain and upgrade the knowledge and skills of personnel currently employed in the public VR system.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Qualified personnel: The percentage of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their state's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standard will increase annually.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their state's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standards.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2000	69	
2001	71	70
2002	63	75
2003	67	77
2004	67	79
2005		70
2006		70
2007		70

**Source:** In-service annual grantee progress report.

**Frequency:** Other.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Explanation:** The FY 2002 actual data has been updated to reflect final reports. Performance is expected to decrease as staff turnover remains very high due to retirements and other attrition and there is an insufficient pool of qualified candidates to replenish the staff positions. Program funding levels decrease while tuitions increase, lessening ability of program to keep up with demand.

**Objective 3 of 3:** *To provide existing staff of the public vocational rehabilitation sector with continuing education to maintain and upgrade skills and knowledge.*

**Indicator 3.1 of 2:** Knowledge and skills development: Percentage of staff of the public vocational rehabilitation sector who report improvement of skills and knowledge necessary for high quality performance.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of participants who report an improvement in their knowledge and skills acquisition.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
2006		999

**Source:** Project annual report Evaluation Instrument.

**Date Sponsored:** 06/30/2006.

**Frequency:** Other.

**Next Data Available:** January 2007

**Limitations:** Evaluation instruments vary across projects.



**Improvements:** Plan to develop common data collection instrument during FY 2005-2006 for use in all future years.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The 2007 target will be set after baseline data have been collected.

**Indicator 3.2 of 2:** Project activities consistent with needs assessment: The percentage of continuing education activities that are consistent with regional needs assessment.

<b>Measure 3.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of VR training project activities consistent with annual needs assessment.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

**Source:** Trimester reports.

**Date Sponsored:** 06/30/2005.

**Frequency:** Other.

**Next Data Available:** November 2007

**Limitations:** Assessment comprehensiveness varies across projects.

**Explanation:** The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2007 target will be determined once baseline is established.

# USC: Howard University - FY 2007

**Program Goal: To assist Howard University with financial resources needed to carry out its educational mission.**

---

**Objective 1 of 3:** Increase student enrollment over the long term.

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Increased enrollment: Annual enrollment rate.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The number of full-time undergraduate students enrolling at Howard University.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	6,841	
<b>2009</b>		7,334

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Fall enrollment data will be monitored and reported annually to measure progress toward meeting the long-term target, which is projected to be met in 2009. Target is derived from project experience and applies an estimated 1.0% annual rate of increase to the period between FY 2003 and FY 2009.

**Objective 2 of 3:** Increase the retention of full-time undergraduate students.

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** Persistence rate: Year-to year persistence of full-time, first-time students.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of full-time undergraduate students who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	90	
<b>2006</b>		90
<b>2007</b>		90
<b>2008</b>		90
<b>2009</b>		90

<b>2010</b>		90
<b>2011</b>		90

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.  
**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.  
 Data supplied by the institution, which certifies the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** Institutions only report a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for the Howard University is calculated as a median. The persistence rate for Howard is high compared to other institutions, so that maintaining the present rate is viewed as an ambitious goal.

**Objective 3 of 3:** Increase the undergraduate graduation rate.

**Indicator 3.1 of 1:** Graduation rate: Graduation within six years of enrollment.

<b>Measure 3.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of students enrolled at Howard University who graduate within six years of enrollment.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2003</b>	68	
<b>2007</b>		69
<b>2008</b>		69
<b>2009</b>		70
<b>2010</b>		70
<b>2011</b>		70

**Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.  
**Web Site:** <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas>

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** March 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.  
 Data supplied by the institution, which certifies the accuracy of the data.

**Explanation:** The graduation rate for Howard is high compared to other institutions, so that maintaining (or slightly increasing) the present rate is viewed as an ambitious goal. Graduation data will be monitored and reported annually.

# VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions - FY 2007

**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 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 1.1 of 1:** Postsecondary outcomes: An increasing percentage of vocational education students in the TCPVIP will receive an A.A. degree or certificate.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of vocational students in the TCPVIP who earn an A.A. degree or certificate.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
	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>	49	52
<b>2006</b>		57
<b>2007</b>		60

**Source:** Program Performance Report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** June 2006

**Limitations:** Data are self-reported by the grantees using lists of graduates and enrollees.

**Explanation:** Calculations of completions are based on the number of students receiving degrees relative to all students available to graduate (i.e., students in their final semester).

# **Goal 6: Establish Management Excellence**



# DEOA: Office for Civil Rights - FY 2007

**Program Goal: To ensure equal access to education and promote educational excellence throughout the nation through the vigorous enforcement of civil rights.**

---

**Objective 1 of 2:** *To provide high-quality customer service throughout the case-resolution process.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Customer response: The percentage of customers satisfied with OCR's service based on a survey.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of respondents satisfied with OCR's customer service.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005	3.66	999
2006		3.66
2007		3.66

**Frequency:** Other.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006  
Electronic data recording ensures data integrity.

**Explanation:** The FY 2005 target was to establish a baseline. The value of 3.66 represents a mean customer satisfaction score out of a possible 5.00. The baseline data represent data from the last quarter of FY 2004 and the first three quarters of FY 2005.

**Objective 2 of 2:** *To obtain results by the efficient management of civil rights compliance activities.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 2:** Resolution of complaints: The percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days of receipt.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	80	
1998	81	
1999	80	80
2000	78	80
2001	84	80
2002	89	80

<b>2003</b>	91	80
<b>2004</b>	92	80
<b>2005</b>	92	80
<b>2006</b>		80
<b>2007</b>		80

**Source:** Data are collected in OCR's Case Management System throughout the fiscal year (October 1-September 30).

**Frequency:** Other.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Indicator 2.2 of 2:** Resolution of Complaints over 180: The percentage of pending complaint caseload over 180 days old.

<b>Measure 2.2.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of pending civil rights complaints that are over 180 days old.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		25
<b>2007</b>		25

**Source:** Data are collected in OCR's Case Management System throughout the fiscal year (October 1 - September 30)

**Frequency:** Other.

**Next Data Available:** October 2006

**Data Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Explanation:** This a new efficiency measure for 2006. The FY 2007 target will stay at 25% until baseline data are received. While OCR is able to resolve the majority of complaints in 80 days, some cases are so complex and/or sensitive that they cannot be resolved within that timeframe. OCR wants no more than 25% of its pending complaint caseload to be over 180 days.



# DEOA: Office of Inspector General - FY 2007

**Program Goal: To promote the efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity of the Department's programs and operations by conducting independent and objective audits, investigations, inspections, and other activities.**

**Objective 1 of 2:** *To improve the Department's programs and operations.*

**Indicator 1.1 of 2:** The percentage of significant recommendations accepted by the Department each year.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 1:</b> Percentage of significant recommendations accepted by the Department each year.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		70
<b>2007</b>		70

**Source:** OIG audit and inspection reports.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2007

**Limitations:** The measure includes only recommendations from audit and inspection reports. Recommendations from other OIG services, as quick response projects and advice and technical assistance, are not included in this measure.

**Explanation:** The FY 2007 target is to maintain the target for the previous year. Reports will be tracked principally in the OIG Audit Tracking System (ATS). There may be additional tracking information available from the department's Audit Accountability and Resolution System (ARTS).

**Indicator 1.2 of 2:** The percentage of written reports that meet OIG timeliness standards.

<b>Measure 1.2.1 of 1:</b> The percentage of written reports that meet OIG timeliness standards.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>	67	75
<b>2006</b>		75
<b>2007</b>		75

**Source:** Audit Services, Investigative Services, Evaluation, Inspection, and Management Services.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2007

**Explanation:** The FY 2007 target is to maintain the target from the previous year.

**Objective 2 of 2:** *To protect the integrity of the Department's programs and operations.*

**Indicator 2.1 of 1:** OIG monetary recoveries will exceed the OIG annual budget by an average of 100% over a five year period.

<b>Measure 2.1.1 of 1:</b> The calculation is the percentage by which the five-year rolling average of OIG monetary recoveries to exceeds the OIG annual budget.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>	120	125
<b>2006</b>		100
<b>2007</b>		100

**Source:** Semiannual report to Congress (Audit Tracking System, Investigative Case Tracking System, and the Department of Justice).

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Next Data Available:** October 2007  
The numbers are validated internally.

**Explanation:** The FY 2007 target is to maintain the target from the previous year. The OIG budget will be compared to the five-year average of: court and administratively assessed fines, penalties, restitutions, civil settlements/judgements, savings/recoveries, seized/forfeited property, sustained questioned costs, and sustained unsupported costs.

# **Ongoing Plans Without FY 2007 Measures**



# ESRA: Statistics - FY 2007

CFDA Number: 84.830 - Statistics

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

**Objective 1 of 1:** Provide timely, useful, and comprehensive data that are relevant to policy and educational improvement.

**Indicator 1.1 of 1:** Customer satisfaction: The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data are timely, relevant, and comprehensive.

<b>Measure 1.1.1 of 3:</b> The percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES publications.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility
1997	88	72	86			
1999	91	77	89	85	85	85
2001	90	74	90	90	90	90
2004	90	78	90	90	90	90
2006				90	90	90
2008				90	90	90

<b>Measure 1.1.2 of 3:</b> The percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES data files.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness
1997	82	52		
1999	87	67	85	85
2001	88	66	90	90
2004	88	78	90	90
2006			90	90
2008			90	90

<b>Measure 1.1.3 of 3:</b> The percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES services.				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness
<b>1997</b>		89		
<b>1999</b>	93	93	85	85
<b>2001</b>	83	88	90	90
<b>2004</b>	92	84	90	90
<b>2006</b>			90	90
<b>2008</b>			90	90

**Source:** NCES Customer Satisfaction Survey.

**Frequency:** Biennially.

**Next Data Available:** June 2006

**Data Validated By:** NCES.

Data will be validated by using NCES review procedures and by applying NCES statistical standards.

**Improvements:** The NCES Monitoring System will yield annual updates on the use and applications of NCES data. NCES views Web release of its reports as a source of increased efficiency and is committed to releasing at least 90 percent of its reports on the Web.

**Explanation:** NCES expects that each year, all user manuals for NCES public-use data files will be available on the Web, at least 50 percent of its public-use data files will be available on the Web, and 75 percent of nonassessment surveys will be administered either through the use of computerized interviews or directly over the Web. These efficiency steps will facilitate easier, quicker, and wider access to NCES products.



