

**Archived Information**

**FY 2004  
PROGRAM PERFORMANCE  
PLAN**

**(Revised After Appropriations)**

**U.S. Department of Education**



# Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Introduction.....	1
Key to Program Legislation Acronyms .....	1

<b>Program Legislation and Name</b>	<b>Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan</b>	<b>Page</b>
20 USC: American Printing House for the Blind (Revised)	20 USC: American Printing House for the Blind	3
AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities (Revised)	AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities	5
AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy (Revised)	AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy	7
ATA: Assistive Technology (Revised)	ATA: Assistive Technology	9
CRA: Training and Advisory Services (Revised)	CRA: Training and Advisory Services	11
DEOA: Office for Civil Rights	Office for Civil Rights	13
DEOA/HEA: Payments for Services to Guaranty Agencies	Student Financial Assistance Policy	15
	Student Financial Assistance Programs	20
DEOA/HEA: Student Aid Administration	Student Financial Assistance Policy	15
	Student Financial Assistance Programs	20
EDA: Gallaudet University (Revised)	Gallaudet University	22
EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf (Revised)	National Technical Institute for the Deaf	27
ERDDI: Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers (Revised)	ERDDI: Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers	30
ERDDI: Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia (Revised)	ERDDI: Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia	32
ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers	21st Century Community Learning Centers	35
ESEA: Advanced Credentialing (Revised)	ESEA: Advanced Credentialing	39
ESEA: Advanced Placement	Advanced Placement Incentives Program	40
ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity (Revised)	ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity	41
ESEA: Character Education	Character Education	42
ESEA: Charter Schools Grants	Public Charter Schools Program	43
ESEA: Close-Up Fellowships (Revised)	ESEA: Close-Up Fellowships	45
ESEA: Community Technology Centers (Revised)	ESEA: Community Technology Centers	46

ESEA: Comprehensive School Reform (Revised)	ESEA: Comprehensive School Reform	47
ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities (Revised)	ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities	49
ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development (Revised)	Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Program	51
ESEA: Early Reading First (Revised)	Early Reading First	53
ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians (Revised)	ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians	55
ESEA: Educational Technology State Grants	Enhancing Education Through Technology Program	57
ESEA: Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education (Revised)	ESEA: Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education	59
ESEA English Language Acquisition State Grants – English Language Acquisition	OELA Language Acquisition State Grants (Title III)	61
ESEA English Language Acquisition State Grants – National Programs	OELA National Activities - Professional Development	63
ESEA English Language Acquisition State Grants – Continuation Grants	OELA Education Instructional Services Program	64
ESEA: Even Start (Revised)	Even Start Family Literacy Program	66
ESEA: Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners (Revised)	ESEA: Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners	69
ESEA: Impact Aid--Basic Support Payments	Impact Aid	71
ESEA: Impact Aid--Construction	Impact Aid	71
ESEA: Impact Aid--Payments for Children with Disabilities	Impact Aid	71
ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Revised)	Improving Teacher Quality State Grants	73
ESEA: Indian Education Special Programs for Indian Children	Indian Education	75
ESEA: Indian Education--Grants to Local Educational Agencies	Indian Education	75
ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries	Improving Literacy Through School Librarie	78
ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance	Magnet Schools Assistance Program	79
ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships (Revised)	ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships	80
ESEA: Migrant Education	Migrant Education	82
ESEA: National Writing Project (Revised)	ESEA: National Writing Project	86
ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent	Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected or Delinquent (N or D)	87
ESEA: Parental Assistance Information Centers (Revised)	ESEA: Parental Assistance Information Centers	89
ESEA: Reading Is Fundamental/ Inexpensive Book Distribution	Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution	92
ESEA: Ready to Teach (Revised)	ESEA: Ready to Teach	93

ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television	Ready-to-Learn Television	94
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities-Federal Activities and Evaluation	Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program--State Grants Program and National Programs	95
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities-Mentoring Program	Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program--State Grants Program and National Programs	95
ESEA: School Leadership (Revised)	ESEA: School Leadership	96
ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities (Revised)	ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities	97
ESEA: Star Schools Program (Revised)	ESEA: Star Schools Program	99
ESEA: State Assessments (Revised)	State Assessments	101
ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs	ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs	103
ESEA: Teaching of Traditional American History	Teaching of Traditional American History	104
ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies	Title I Grants for Schools--ESEA	105
ESEA: Transition to Teaching	Transition To Teaching	108
ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers	Troops To Teachers	110
ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice	Voluntary Public School Choice Program	111
ESRA: Regional Educational Laboratories (Revised)	ESRA: Regional Educational Laboratories	114
ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination	Research, Development and Dissemination	116
ESRA: Statistics	National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Statistics and Assessment	112
HEA: Aid for Institutional Development--Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions	Institutional Development, Title III & Title V	122
HEA: Aid for Institutional Development--Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities	Institutional Development, Title III & Title V	122
HEA: Aid for Institutional Development--Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions	Institutional Development, Title III & Title V	122
HEA: Aid for Institutional Development--Strengthening Institutions Part A	Institutional Development, Title III & Title V	122
HEA: Byrd Honors Scholarships	Byrd Honors Scholarships Program	124
HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents In School	HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents In School	125
HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program (Revised)	HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program	127
HEA: Federal Direct Student Loan Administration	Student Financial Assistance Policy	15
	Student Financial Assistance Programs	20
HEA: Federal Direct Student Loan Subsidies	Student Financial Assistance Policy	15
	Student Financial Assistance Programs	20

HEA: Federal Family Education Loan Subsidies	Student Financial Assistance Policy	15
	Student Financial Assistance Programs	20
HEA: Federal Family Education Loans liquidating account outlays	Student Financial Assistance Policy	15
	Student Financial Assistance Programs	20
HEA: Federal Pell Grants	Student Financial Assistance Policy	15
	Student Financial Assistance Programs	20
HEA: Federal Perkins Loans	Student Financial Assistance Policy	15
	Student Financial Assistance Programs	20
HEA: Federal student loan reserve fund outlays	Student Financial Assistance Policy	15
	Student Financial Assistance Programs	20
HEA: Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants	Student Financial Assistance Policy	15
	Student Financial Assistance Programs	20
HEA: Federal Work-Study	Student Financial Assistance Policy	15
	Student Financial Assistance Programs	20
HEA: Federal TRIO programs	TRIO Programs	129
HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers (Revised)	HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers	132
HEA: TRIO Talent Search (Revised)	HEA: TRIO Talent Search	133
HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education	134
HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP)	Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP)	136
HEA: Graduate Assistance In Areas of National Need (GAANN)	Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN)	139
HEA: High School Equivalency Program (Revised)	HEA: High School Equivalency Program	141
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies-- Domestic Programs	International Education and Foreign Language Studies Program	142
HEA: Javits Fellowships (Revised)	HEA: Javits Fellowships	146
HEA: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders (Revised)	HEA: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders	147
HEA: Teacher Quality Enhancement	Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants	148
HEA: Underground Railroad Program (Revised)	HEA: Underground Railroad Program	149

HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults (Revised)	Helen Keller National Center (HKNC) for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults	150
Howard University--General Support	Howard University	152
Howard University-Hospital	Howard University	152
IDEA: Grants for Infants and Families (Revised)	IDEA Part C -- Infants and Toddlers With Disabilities	158
IDEA: Grants to States	IDEA Part B -- Grants to States and Preschool Grants Program	161
IDEA: Parent Information Centers	IDEA Part D -- National Activities	166
IDEA: Personnel Preparation	IDEA Part D -- National Activities	166
IDEA: Preschool Grants	IDEA Part B -- Grants to States and Preschool Grants Program	161
IDEA: Research and Innovation	IDEA Part D -- National Activities	166
IDEA: State Improvement	IDEA Part D -- National Activities	166
IDEA: Technical Assistance and Dissemination	IDEA Part D -- National Activities	166
IDEA: Technology and Media Services	IDEA Part D -- National Activities	166
MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youth	MVHAA Education for Homeless Children and Youths	172
RA: Client Assistance State Grants (Revised)	Client Assistance Program (CAP)	174
RA: Demonstration and Training Programs	Demonstration and Training Programs	176
RA: Independent Living--Centers	Independent Living Services Program	179
RA: Independent Living--Services for Older Blind Individuals	Independent Living Services Program	179
RA: Independent Living--State Grants	Independent Living Services Program	179
RA: Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers (Revised)	RA: Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers	182
RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (Revised)	National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)	183
RA: Projects with Industry (Revised)	RA: Projects with Industry	188
RA: Protection and Advocacy (Revised)	Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights	191
RA: Training	Training Program	198
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Recreational Programs (Revised)	RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Recreational Programs	195
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants-Grants for Indians	State Vocational Rehabilitation Services	197
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants-Grants to States (Revised)	State Vocational Rehabilitation Services	197
VTEA: Occupational and Employment Information (Revised)	VTEA: Occupational and Employment Information	196
VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions (Revised)	VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions	201
VTEA: Vocational Education National Programs (Revised)	VTEA: Vocational Education National Programs	203
VTEA: Vocational Education State Grants (Revised)	Vocational Education State Grants and Tech-Prep Education State Grants	206







# INTRODUCTION

The strategic goals and objectives set forth in the Department of Education's *FY 2002-2007 Strategic Plan* form an overarching context of broad outcomes that we believe should characterize American education. We believe that if we are successful, as a whole, we will see increases in the related measures—measures that are in most cases for all children, whether or not they are individually served by our programs. We believe that our success as an agency can be measured in the results of better education for *all*.

However, this kind of information does not always provide us with the tools necessary to determine the success of each of our programs or the relationship between program-specific funding and results. For that, we need measures that are more specific to the provisions of each particular program and to the audience it serves. This, too, is part of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). Thus, in addition to the measures specified in our *FY 2002-2007 Strategic Plan*, we have established measures and targets for all of our major programs and many of our smaller programs. In some cases, we have set measures for a particular program individually. In other cases, we have grouped similar programs and set measures for that cluster of programs.

The Department of Education's *FY 2004 Annual Plan* includes both Department-level measures and program performance plans and is located on our Web site at <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/annualplan2004/>. This document is a compilation of the program performance plans.

## Key to Legislation:

20 USC = Title 20, United States Code  
AEFLA = Adult Education and Family Literacy Act  
ATA = Assistive Technology 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  
IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act  
MVHAA = McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act  
RA = Rehabilitation Act  
VTEA = Vocational and Technical Education Act  
WIA = Workforce Investment Act

*Revisions to the Department of Education's FY2004 Annual Plan were made by December 31, 2003, as required by OMB Circular A-11. In March 2004 the Department published additional program plans to reflect programs funded in the FY 2004 Appropriation that were not recommended in the FY 2004 President's Budget request. In this updated compilation, plans that were not in the original publication are marked "Revised" in the table of contents.*



## 20 USC: American Printing House for the Blind - 2004

**Goal 8: Pre-college-level blind students will receive appropriate educational materials which result in improved educational outcomes**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: APPROPRIATE, TIMELY, HIGH-QUALITY EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS ARE PROVIDED TO PRE-COLLEGE-LEVEL BLIND STUDENTS TO ALLOW THEM TO BENEFIT MORE FULLY FROM THEIR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 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.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Trustees-Percentage that agree</i>			<p><b>Status:</b> Target exceeded</p> <p><b>Progress:</b> In FY 2002, 99 percent of ex officio trustees, 100 percent of Advisory Committee members, 96 percent of consumers agreed that the educational materials provided through the Act were appropriate, timely and high quality. In addition, in FY 2002, teachers were surveyed to establish a benchmark regarding their satisfaction with the educational products provided through the Act. Of those surveyed, 96 percent agreed that the educational materials were appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Survey of Ex Officio Trustees; Input from Research and Publications Advisory Committees; Consumer surveys, and Teacher surveys.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by the American Printing House for the Blind. No formal verification procedure applied.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> A new Teacher survey was conducted in FY 2002 which provides further satisfaction with APH educational materials.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	95			
1999	96	95		
2000	96.50	96		
2001	97	96		
2002	99	96		
2003	98.75	96		
2004		96		
<i>Advisory Committees-Percentage that agree</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	100	100		
2000	100	100		
2001	100	100		
2002	100	100		
2003	100	100		
2004		100		
<i>Consumers-Percentage that agree</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	90			

<b>2000</b>	100	95
<b>2001</b>	97	95
<b>2002</b>	96	95
<b>2003</b>	100	95
<b>2004</b>		95

*Teachers - Percentage that agree*

<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2002</b>	96	
<b>2003</b>	97	96
<b>2004</b>		96

**Indicator 8.1.2 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.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Trustees-Percentage that agree</i>			<p><b>Status: Target exceeded</b></p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> In FY 2002, 100 percent of the ex officio trustees reported that student performance and participation in their educational programs improved as a result of the availability of educational materials provided through the Act. An initial survey of teachers indicated that 93 percent agreed that student performance and participation in their educational programs improved as a result of the availability of educational materials provided through the Act.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Survey of Ex Officio Trustees: Survey of Teachers.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by the American Printing House for the Blind. No formal verification procedure applied.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The survey of Teachers will be refined and expanded in 2003.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>1998</b>	98			
<b>1999</b>	98	98		
<b>2000</b>	97	99		
<b>2001</b>	97	99		
<b>2002</b>	100	99		
<b>2003</b>	99.50	99		
<b>2004</b>		99		
<i>Teachers--Percentage that agree</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2002</b>	93			
<b>2003</b>	95	95		
<b>2004</b>		95		

# AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities - 2004

## Goal 8: National Programs (Adult Education and Literacy Act) (new-2002) - 2002

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: The National Reporting System (NRS), that supports performance-based reporting, will be fully implemented in all states to consistently provide high quality learner assessment data.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of States yielding high quality learner assessment data.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> Approximately 50% of states currently have assessment policies that yield quality data.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Performance reporting is largely on learner assessment data. The NRS requires greater validity and reliability of this data. OVAE policies are requiring continuous improvement of state level assessment data. States are at various levels of expertise and capacity to collect high quality assessment data.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State Annual Performance Reports - Data and Narrative</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Program monitoring and data review and analysis by ED and Data Quality Certification Process. Data will be verified by electronic checks, expert staff analysis, and by requiring confirmation and attestation of data by state directors. State data is also checked independently by ED/OVAE during on-site monitoring and state audit reviews.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Total data quality and full systems development is dependent on investments of staff and resources by states to adopt and adapt the models developed and promoted by ED/OVAE; and supported by the technical assistance and expertise provided by ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2002</b>	50			
<b>2003</b>		75		
<b>2004</b>		95		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: By 2004, provide online curriculum, virtual learning resources and professional development to support the use of technology-based instruction in adult education through 9 demonstration labs and field sites, and 1 clearinghouse.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Labs, Field Sites, Clearinghouse</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> Labs, including a "hands-on" demonstration lab in Washington, DC, are being established, together with nation-wide, program-based field sites. In each site, learners and educators will use and participate in the development of IT-based models for learning, instruction and professional development.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> While the adult education field has made considerable progress in meeting the variety of skill needs of US adults, less than seven percent of eligible adults are served annually. New instructional strategies and mechanisms are needed to provide greater access to programs and services. By 2003, the 9 labs and field sites will be fully operational. In 2004, the clearinghouse will be operational.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Quarterly progress reports and annual reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Quarterly.</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Electronic monitoring, on-site monitoring; production of materials; professional development offerings/participation.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Actual Performance	Performance Target		
<b>2002</b>	3	999		
<b>2003</b>	9	9		
<b>2004</b>		1		

# AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy - 2004

**Goal 8: To provide the literacy field and related fields with the knowledge, resources, infrastructure, and leadership necessary to improve the quality of basic skills instruction and the literacy achievement of children, youth and adults**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Translate findings from scientifically based or the most rigorous research available into useful information and products for practitioners**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Research to Practice: Translate findings from scientifically based or the most rigorous research available into useful information and products for practitioners.**

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
<p><i>Percentage of recipients who say they will use the product and/or information to improve instructional practice and/or service delivery within six months.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2004</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">40</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		%	%	<b>2004</b>		999	<b>2005</b>		40	<p><b>Explanation:</b> These measures are all new. NIFL expects to use FY2004 data as a baseline</p>	<p><b>Source 1: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Other.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Aspen Systems/EDPubs..  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 12/11/2003.</p> <p><b>Source 2: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Other.  <b>Sponsor:</b> The National Institute for Literacy..  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 12/11/2003.</p> <p><b>Source 3: Non-NCES Survey/Research</b>  <b>Collecting Agency:</b> National Institute for Literacy.  <b>Survey/Research Report Title:</b> Training/Technical Assistance Evaluations.  <b>References:</b> .</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b>            Re: Source #2: The National Institute for Literacy will create a "dialogue" box on the NIFL website that asks visitors if they are willing to answer a few questions. If so, they will be asked whether they plan to use the online publications to improve instructional practice and/or service delivery within the next six months.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets												
	%	%												
<b>2004</b>		999												
<b>2005</b>		40												



		<p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Not everyone who reads or downloads NIFL publications will agree to respond to the questions.</p>
--	--	--

# ATA: Assistive Technology - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.224 - Assistive Technology

**Goal 8: To increase availability of, funding for, access to, and provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Through systemic activity, improve access to an availability of assistive technology (AT) for individuals with disabilities who require assistive technology**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Barrier reduction: Annually, grantees activities will result in legislative and policy changes that reduce barriers.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of grantees responsible for legislative and policy change resulting in barrier reduction</i>				<b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	95			
1998	95			
1999	88	95		
2000	50	95		
2001	78	95		
2002	63	95		
2003		95		
2004		95		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Through protection and advocacy, increase access to and funding of assistive technology devices and services for persons with disabilities.**

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Outcome-oriented measure of loans: The number of loans to individuals with disabilities per \$1 million in Federal investment and state matching funds**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of loans to individuals with disabilities per \$1 million Federal investment and State matching funds</i>				<b>Progress:</b> The Title III Alternative Financing Program was funded for the first time in FY 2000 to increase access to assistive technology for individuals with disabilities. Of the \$7.6 million of government funds available in the first year, grantees made 247 loans to individuals with disabilities for a rate of 33 loans per \$1 million in Federal investment and	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual web-based reporting system.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2004  <b>Limitations:</b> The data on the # of loans approved and closed during the performance period of October
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Fed dollars in million	State dollars in million	# of loans per 1million dollars invested		

	invested		invested	
<b>2000</b>	3.80	3.80	247	33
<b>2001</b>	13.60	4.60	594	33
<b>2003</b>	35.30			
<b>2004</b>	33			

state matching funds. The total amount loaned out was \$2.3 million. Of the \$18.2 million of new government funds available in FY 2001, grantees made 594 loans to individuals with disabilities for a rate of 33 loans per \$1 million in Federal investment and state matching funds. The total amount loaned in the second year was \$5.8 million.

**Explanation:** Comparing the data from FY 2000 and FY 2001 is difficult because this is a fairly new program and the number of years of participation differs among grantees. In FY 2000 6 states were funded. In FY 2001, 10 new states received grants and 4 states were refunded from year one for a total of 14 awards. Actual performance for FY 2001 also included loans made by two states that only received one award in FY 2000 but made loans over both years. Since there were no new awards in FY 2002, it will be easier to compare data from FY 2001 and FY 2002 because the amount of Federal investment and state matching funds, will remain the same. NIDRR is establishing a target of 33 for FY 2004 and FY 2005. Further analysis of trends and performance outcomes is required to establish baseline data. A revision of the target may be required for use in future years. It is important to point out that the AFP program allows for other, non-loan financing mechanisms. NIDRR will further evaluate the AFP to identify factors that have a potentially adverse effect on the program activities and program performance outcomes. NIDRR will use the results of this evaluation to develop strategies to improve outcomes.

1, 2000 to September 30, 2001 differ between the first annual report (229 loans) and the second annual report (247). This discrepancy suggests that grantees submitted additional data after the first annual report was published. The data collection tool for the AFP needs to be evaluated and then modified to improve the reliability of the data used to calculate the total number of loans reported for the AFP for a given performance period. At the present time, there are two reporting systems for the AFP. At the end of the AFP grant year, grantees submit loan program data in a Web-based program data collection system using the Annual Loan Program Data Form. Grantees also submit loan program data on a regular basis in a Web-based applicant data collection system that includes the initial applicant survey, the follow-up survey for an approved loan and the follow-up survey for a denied loan. For 2001, the total number of approved loans reported by states was 537 in the program data collection system and 594 in the applicant reporting system. Further evaluation of the data systems is necessary.

**Improvements:** NIDRR will work with the technical assistance grantee for the AFP to improve the reliability of the data used to measure the performance of the AFP by (1) evaluating the two data collection systems, (2) identifying the cause(s) for the differences in the total number of loans reported in the two data collection systems, and (3) modifying the data collection system to address the problems that were identified.

# CRA: Training and Advisory Services - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.004D - Training and Advisory Services

**Goal 8: To support access and equity in public schools and help school districts solve equity problems in education related to race, gender, and national origin.**

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Breadth of services: The number of services provided by the EACs will increase each year.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Web site visits</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> In 2001, EACs improved their performance in all areas except "conference/seminar/other training events." Program budget constraints prohibited increases in this area. 2001-2002 EAC activities were interrupted by the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), January 2002. NCLB re-directed EAC activity and focused Centers' work on the requirements of the legislation. The shifting nature of requested technical assistance is reflected in what appears to be a reduction of services in some areas. New areas of TA include: increased access to English language literacy for ELL students in addition to bilingual education advocacy; disaggregated data; high-quality teacher professional development; and parent group assistance.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Equity Assistance Centers (EACs) reported an unduplicated count of events, such that each event is only counted once.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Equity Assistance Center Project Performance Reports, 2000.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Monthly.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2001</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2002</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2000	1,266,975			
2001	2,931,386			
2002	3,993,390	3,078,000		
2003		3,108,780		
2004		3,139,868		
<i>Published materials and products</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2000	139			
2001	233			
2002	114	245		
2003		247		
2004		250		
<i>Conference/seminar/other training events</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2000	919			
2001	887			
2002	829	931		
2003		940		

<b>2004</b>		949
-------------	--	-----

*On-site consultations*

<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2000</b>	732	
<b>2001</b>	897	
<b>2002</b>	1,000	942
<b>2003</b>		951
<b>2004</b>		961

*Mailings or individual requests for information*

<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2000</b>	1,038	
<b>2001</b>	1,326	
<b>2002</b>	1,045	1,392
<b>2003</b>		1,406
<b>2004</b>		1,420

*Consultations by telephone or e-mail*

<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2000</b>	2,292	
<b>2001</b>	3,161	
<b>2002</b>	3,709	3,319
<b>2003</b>		3,352
<b>2004</b>		3,386

# Office for Civil Rights - 2004

**Goal 8: To ensure equal access to education and promote educational excellence throughout the nation through the vigorous enforcement of civil rights.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: To eliminate discriminatory educational practices within schools.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Technical Assistance to Recipients: Percentage of OCR directed activities and resource materials designed to assist recipients in identifying and addressing their obligations under federal civil rights laws.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of OCR materials that assist recipients in identifying and addressing federal civil rights obligations.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Until the electronic Case Management System becomes fully operational in FY 2003, OCR components will collect data manually. Data are collected during the fiscal year (from October 1 to September 30) and are reported in January of the following year.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		50		
2004		50		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Technical Assistance to Parents: Percentage of OCR directed activities and resource materials designed to assist parents in understanding recipients' federal civil rights obligations.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of OCR materials that assist parents in understanding recipients' federal civil rights obligations.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Until the electronic Case Management System becomes fully operational in FY 2003, OCR components will collect data manually. Data are collected during the fiscal year (from October 1 to September 30) and are reported in January of the following year.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		20		
2004		20		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: To obtain results by the efficient management of civil rights compliance activities.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Resolution of Complaints: Percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days of receipt.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Case Information System. Once the Case Management System is fully operational, all data will come from the CMS.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> This data is currently available in OCR's electronic Case Information System. The same data will continue to be available electronically when OCR implements the Case Management System (CMS). The CMS will increase the validity of the data by linking it to specific case files.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
1997	80		
1998	81		
1999	80	80	
2000	78	80	
2001	84	80	
2002	89	80	
2003		80	
2004		80	

# Student Financial Assistance Policy - 2004

**Goal 8: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants, loans, and work-study in an efficient, financially sound and customer-responsive manner.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Ensure that low- and middle-income students will have the same access to postsecondary education that high-income students do.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Percentage of unmet need: The percentage of unmet need considering all sources of financial aid, especially for low-income students.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of Unmet Need for Undergraduates</i>						<b>Source: Other</b> <b>Other:</b> Record/File. <b>Sponsor:</b> National Postsecondary Student Aid Study.  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  <b>Limitations:</b> NPSAS data are collected only every four years.	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets				
1995	23						
1996	23						
1997	22						
1998	21.20						
1999	20.80						
2000	21.20						
2003			19.20				
2004			19.20				
<i>Percentage of Unmet Need for Low Income Undergraduates.</i>							
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets			
	Dependent	Independent With Kids	Independent Without Kids	Dependent	Independent With Kids	Independent Without Kids	
1996	46.30	54.70	52.50				
1997	44.50	51.60	49				
1998	42.90	51.10	49				
1999	41.80	50.20	48.50				
2000	43.10	60.60	46.20				
2003				41.10	58.60	44.20	
2004				41.10	58.60	44.20	



**Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: College enrollment rates: Postsecondary education enrollment rates for all students, and the enrollment gap between low- and high-income high school graduates.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality			
<i>The percentage of high school graduates ages 16-24 enrolling immediately in college - Total</i>							<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2003  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Small subgroup sample sizes for low-income students lead to large yearly fluctuations in enrollment rates. Three-year weighted averages are used to smooth out these fluctuations.</p>			
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets							
1994	61.90									
1995	61.90									
1996	65									
1997	67									
1998	65.60									
1999	62.90									
2000	63.30									
2001	61.70									
2003			65							
2004			67							
<i>The Percentage of high school graduates ages 16-24 enrolling immediately in college by income.</i>										
Year	Actual Performance							Performance Targets		
	Low	High	Difference					Low	High	Difference
1994	44	78.40	34.40							
1995	41.20	83.40	42.20							
1996	41.50	78	36.50							
1997	47.10	82	34.90							
1998	50.60	77.30	26.70							
1999	50.90	76	25.10							
2000	48.50	77.10	28.60							
2001	47.80	79.80	32							
2003								50	80	30
2004				52	81	29				

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Targeting of Pell Grants: Pell Grant funds will continue to be targeted to those students with the greatest financial need: at least 75 percent of Pell Grant funds will go to students below 150 percent of poverty level.**

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

**Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Federal debt burden: The median Federal debt burden (yearly scheduled payments as a percentage of annual income) of borrowers in their first full year of prepayment will be less than 10 percent.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The median federal debt burden of students in their first full year of repayment.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> As a general rule, it is believed that an educational debt burden of 10 percent or greater will negatively affect a borrower's ability to repay his or her student loan and to obtain other credit such as a home mortgage. We expect the 2001 and 2002 median debt burden rate to remain well below 10 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS) and Internal Revenue Service (IRS) records.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2000 - 2001  <b>Data Available:</b> August 2003  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> To overcome limitations with the data from the Social Security Administration (SSA) that were previously used, we switched to IRS data on household income for 1998 and future years. The IRS data may slightly understate debt burden for married borrowers where both individuals have student loans.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	7.10			
1999	6.48			
2000	6.38			
2003		9.90		
2004		9.90		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Ensure that more students will persist in postsecondary education and attain degrees and certificates.**

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Completion rate: Completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in 4-year and less-than-4-year programs; and the gap in completion rates between minority and non-minority students.**

Targets and Performance Data								Assessment of Progress				Sources and Data Quality																																																																																																																																																																																																																																													
<p><i>The percentage of full-time degree seeking students completing a 4-year degree within 150% of the normal time required.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Year</th> <th colspan="6">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="2">Performance Targets</th> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2"></th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Black</th> <th>White</th> <th>Hispanic</th> <th>Difference between Black and White</th> <th>Difference between White and Hispanic</th> <th>Total</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>52.50</td> <td>35.50</td> <td>55.50</td> <td>39.10</td> <td>20</td> <td>16.40</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>52.60</td> <td>34.50</td> <td>55.80</td> <td>39.10</td> <td>21.30</td> <td>16.70</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>53</td> <td>35.80</td> <td>56</td> <td>40.90</td> <td>20.20</td> <td>15.10</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>52.40</td> <td>35.70</td> <td>55.40</td> <td>41.50</td> <td>19.70</td> <td>13.90</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>54</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>55</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>								Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets								Total	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference between Black and White	Difference between White and Hispanic	Total		1997	52.50	35.50	55.50	39.10	20	16.40									1998	52.60	34.50	55.80	39.10	21.30	16.70									1999	53	35.80	56	40.90	20.20	15.10									2000	52.40	35.70	55.40	41.50	19.70	13.90									2003							54								2004							55								<p><i>The percentage of full-time degree seeking students completing a less than 4-year program within 150% of the normal time required.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Year</th> <th colspan="6">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="2">Performance Targets</th> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2"></th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total</th> <th>Black</th> <th>White</th> <th>Hispanic</th> <th>Difference between Black and White</th> <th>Difference between White and Hispanic</th> <th>Total</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>30.90</td> <td>22.80</td> <td>32.60</td> <td>26.20</td> <td>9.80</td> <td>6.40</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>32.20</td> <td>25.10</td> <td>33.80</td> <td>29.90</td> <td>8.70</td> <td>3.90</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>34.40</td> <td>29.50</td> <td>35.30</td> <td>32.50</td> <td>5.80</td> <td>2.80</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>32.70</td> <td>26.50</td> <td>34</td> <td>30.10</td> <td>7.50</td> <td>3.90</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>34</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>35</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>								Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets								Total	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference between Black and White	Difference between White and Hispanic	Total		1997	30.90	22.80	32.60	26.20	9.80	6.40									1998	32.20	25.10	33.80	29.90	8.70	3.90									1999	34.40	29.50	35.30	32.50	5.80	2.80									2000	32.70	26.50	34	30.10	7.50	3.90									2003							34								2004							35								<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Graduation Rate Survey (GRS)</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 - 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Postsecondary institutions are not required to report graduation rates until 2002. However, data were voluntarily submitted by institutions representing 87 percent of 4-year students and 77 percent of 2-year students. Investigating whether a proxy for graduation rates for student aid recipients can be obtained from administrative records.</p>							
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
	Total	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference between Black and White	Difference between White and Hispanic	Total																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
1997	52.50	35.50	55.50	39.10	20	16.40																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
1998	52.60	34.50	55.80	39.10	21.30	16.70																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
1999	53	35.80	56	40.90	20.20	15.10																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
2000	52.40	35.70	55.40	41.50	19.70	13.90																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
2003							54																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
2004							55																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
	Total	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference between Black and White	Difference between White and Hispanic	Total																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
1997	30.90	22.80	32.60	26.20	9.80	6.40																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
1998	32.20	25.10	33.80	29.90	8.70	3.90																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
1999	34.40	29.50	35.30	32.50	5.80	2.80																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
2000	32.70	26.50	34	30.10	7.50	3.90																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
2003							34																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
2004							35																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Ensure that taxpayers will have a positive return on investment in the federal student financial assistance programs.**

**Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Return on investment: The benefits of the student aid programs, in terms of increased tax revenues, will continue to exceed their costs.**

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Return on Investment</i>							<p><b>Explanation:</b> The column titles are defined as follows. Low: A pessimistic set of assumptions leading to a low-end estimate of the return on investment. Best: The set of assumptions that we believe best captures the return on investment. High: An optimistic set of assumptions leading to a high-end estimate of the return on investment. The estimated return on investment is calculated in the following manner: 1) The discounted present value of tax revenue and welfare benefits is calculated for different educational attainment levels. 2) Under the “best” scenario, 90 percent of the revenue differential calculated in step 1 is assumed to be caused by obtaining more education.</p>	<p><b>Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research</b></p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> March Current Population Survey (CPS) and Beginning Post Secondary (BPS) study with imputations from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) and High School and Beyond (HS&amp;B). Behavioral assumptions were derived, where feasible, from meta-analyses conducted by Leslie and Brinkman in their 1988 book, <i>The Economic Value of Higher Education</i>.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2003  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> A number of assumptions and imputations are required to estimate the return on investment. By providing high and low estimates, one can assess the sensitivity of the results to the assumptions used. Prior year data has been updated from previous reports to reflect more complete information.</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets				
	Low	Best	High	Low	Best	High		
<b>1996</b>	1.30	2.90	6.70					
<b>1997</b>	1.30	2.80	6.50					
<b>1998</b>	1.30	2.90	6.70					
<b>1999</b>	1.40	3.10	7.10					
<b>2000</b>	1.50	3.30	7.70					
<b>2001</b>	1.60	3.40	8					
<b>2003</b>				1.60	3.40	8		
<b>2004</b>				1.60	3.40	8		

# Student Financial Assistance Programs - 2004

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

## Goal 8: Student Financial Assistance Programs Internal Goal

### Objective 8.1 of 1: Student Financial Assistance Programs Internal Objective 8

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Reduce or Maintain FSA Business Process Unit Cost			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>Unit Cost of Application Processing</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> By the end of this fiscal year we will develop baseline unit cost measures for the business processes referenced. Since the baselines are unknown as of this writing (3/10/03), FSA can only commit to maintaining the 2003 baselines in FY 2004. However, once the baselines are known later this year, FSA will develop more precise 2004 targets.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> FSA Activity-Based Cost Model will be used to collect data. The model is currently under construction with a target date of May, 2003.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2003  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost		
<b>2003</b>		9,999		
<i>Unit Cost of Origination and Disbursement</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost		
<b>2003</b>		9,999		
<i>Unit Cost of Direct Loan Repayment</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost		
<b>2003</b>		9,999		
<i>Unit Cost of Direct Loan Consolidation</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost		
<b>2003</b>		9,999		

<i>Unit Cost of Default Collections</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost
<b>2003</b>		9,999

# Gallaudet University - 2004

**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

**Goal 8: To challenge students who are deaf, graduate students who are deaf, and graduate students who are hearing, to achieve their academic goals and obtain productive employment, provide leadership in setting the national standard for best practices in education of the deaf and hard of hearing, and establish a sustainable resource base.**

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

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

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>University Enrollment</i>							<p><b>Progress:</b> In fiscal year 2004, the total undergraduate enrollment did not change significantly from last year and remains fairly near the target. Both the graduate student and professional studies enrollment totals appear significantly lower than last year's figures. (See reason in explanation section). The Model Secondary School did not reach its target, however, it maintained at nearly the same level reported in fiscal year 2003. The Kendall School enrollment exceeded its target.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Gallaudet has changed its system for counting Graduate and Professional Studies students this fiscal year in order to present a more accurate enrollment picture. The University realized that the prior system of calculating enrollment in these areas presented a danger of double counting the same student. Under the new counting method, if a degree-seeking student or a graduate special student is also enrolled in a professional studies course, that student will be counted only once. The new counting method has an impact on both the graduate and professional studies enrollment numbers. The University will continue to implement the</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Collegiate Office of Enrollment Services, and Clerc Center student database, FY 2004 enrollment as of October 2003, summarized in Gallaudet's FY 2003 annual report, submitted in 2004.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center. No formal verification procedure applied.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Gallaudet has implemented a new method for calculating its Graduate and Professional Studies enrollment numbers in order to present a more accurate enrollment picture.</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets				
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional Studies	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional Studies		
<b>1998</b>	1,339	714	92					
<b>1999</b>	1,300	628	70	1,250	700	70		
<b>2000</b>	1,318	541	86	1,250	700	70		
<b>2001</b>	1,321	625	93	1,250	700	70		
<b>2002</b>	1,243	517	92	1,250	700	70		
<b>2003</b>	1,243	617	154	1,250	700	70		
<b>2004</b>	1,236	506	70	1,250	700	70		
<b>2005</b>				1,250	650	70		
<i>Clerc Center Enrollment</i>								
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>	541		700					
<b>2001</b>	205	148	225	140				

<b>2002</b>	188	148	225	140	new method so that future reports will be comparable. It should also be noted that there was an increase of degree-seeking graduate students this year of 405 compared to last year's figure of 377. Gallaudet has established minimum enrollment targets based on longstanding enrollment targets and historical trends recognizing that actual figures vary from year to year.
<b>2003</b>	190	152	225	140	
<b>2004</b>	186	145	225	140	
<b>2005</b>			225	140	

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Student retention rate: Increase the undergraduate retention rate and increase or maintain the graduate student retention rate.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Universtiy Student Retention Rates - %</i>					<p><b>Progress:</b> In fiscal year 2003, the Undergraduate retention rate fell short of its target, while the Graduate student retention rate met its target</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> While the overall Undergraduate retention rate has not changed significantly, the fall to fall persistence for freshmen and transfer students has been increasing by 1 percent each year for the past 5 years. With the continuous improvement of academic support services, it is projected that this 1-2 percent increase will continue and will result in a more visible impact in the next few years. Gallaudet is committed to increased focus on retention of students at all levels and particular attention to the success of first year students.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Collegiate Office of the Register records, summarized in the FY 2003 annual report, submitted in 2004.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.            Data supplied by Gallaudet University.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	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	84		
<b>2003</b>	71	86	79	86		
<b>2004</b>			79	86		
<b>2005</b>			79	86		

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Student graduation rates: By 2008, the Undergraduate graduation rate will reach 48 percent; the Graduate student and Model Secondary School student graduation rates will be increased or maintained.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>University Students' Graduation Rates - %</i>					<p><b>Progress:</b> In fiscal year 2003, the Undergraduate graduation rate fell short of its target but remained steady with last year's rate. The Graduate student graduation rate met its target. The Model Secondary School graduation rate declined from the previous year and fell short its target (see explanation section).</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Collegiate Office of the Registrar and the Clerc Center Office of Exemplary Programs and Research records, summarized in FY 2003 annual report, submitted in 2004.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	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		



2002	42	82	44	81
2003	42	82	45	82
2004			45	82
2005			46	83
2006			47	
2007			47	
2008			48	

Clerc Center - Model Secondary School graduation rate - %		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	93	
1999	88	94
2000	98	94
2001	90	94
2002	80	94
2003	71	94
2004		94
2005		94

**Explanation:** The Undergraduate graduation rates are calculated as the number of graduates in one year over the number of entering students six years previously. Consistent with other universities, Gallaudet students are taking longer to complete baccalaureate studies. Gallaudet continues to institute new strategies to improve its Undergraduate graduation rate. In fiscal year 2003, 71 percent of the Model School seniors completed all graduation requirements by the end of their senior year. However, as of this report, an additional 21 percent have deferred graduation until 2004 in order to complete graduation requirements and IEP goals. An additional 2 percent are pending graduation upon completion of required coursework. Therefore, the total projected graduation rate for the fiscal year 2003 senior class is expected to be 94 percent.

Verification.  
Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center.

**Limitations:** The Clerc Center (MSSD) graduation rates reported here give an incomplete picture of the graduation status of seniors from fiscal year 2001 onward. There is a need to reconceptualize how performance is assessed to make this indicator a more valid reflection of actual graduation rates. Graduation from MSSD is more than completion of required course work. Graduation signals that students have successfully met their IEP goals, so that graduation becomes an IEP decision. Students may graduate at the end of their senior year, or they may make the decision, as part of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) process, to change their graduation so they may continue to pursue their IEP goals, or they may elect to take the fifth year option. Clerc Center personnel are currently in the process of redefining graduation outcomes and indicators at MSSD to reflect progress through school and changes in graduation requirements and program options. The Clerc Center will work with the Department in an effort to propose a revised indicator(s) and performance measure(s) to better show MSSD graduation rates.

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

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Use of the Demonstration Schools' expertise: Other programs and/or institutions adopting innovative curricula and other products, or modifying their strategies as a result of Model and Kendall's leadership, will be maintained or increased.</b>		
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

<i>Numbers of Programs adopting Model/Kendall Innovative strategies/curricula</i>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	41	
1999	52	41
2000	62	41
2001	39	41
2002	56	41
2003	54	41
2004		50
2005		55

**Progress:** The Clerc Center exceeded its target in fiscal year 2003.

**Explanation:** In fiscal year 2003, 54 programs adopted the Clerc Center's curricula and other products, or modified their strategies as a result of MSSD and KDES leadership. The cumulative number of programs utilizing MSSD/KDES expertise since 1998 is 304 programs. Again, it should be noted that 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 to participate in training and implementation activities.

**Additional Source Information:** Records of the Clerc Center Office of Training and Professional Development, summarized in the FY 2003 Annual Report, submitted in January 2004.

**Frequency:** Annually.  
**Collection Period:** 2004  
**Data Available:** October 2004  
**Validated By:** No Formal Verification.  
 Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center.

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

<b>Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the University: Gallaudet's Bachelor graduates will either find employment commensurate with their training and education or attend advanced education or training programs during their first year after graduation.</b>					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Graduates employed or in advanced education or training during first year after graduation - %</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Students Employed	Advanced Education or Training	Students Employed	Advanced Education or Training	
1998	95				
1999	98		95		
2000	97		95		
2001	90	38	77	38	
2002	89	49	78	39	
2003	79	40	79	40	
2004			80	40	
2005			81	41	

**Progress:** In fiscal year 2003, the targets of students who were either employed or in advanced education or training programs were met.

**Explanation:** Gallaudet has broken out this indicator to provide the percentages in each category of students, those actually employed and those students who were in advanced education or training programs. In the past, these two categories were combined. Please note that the percents total more than 100 percent because some respondents were employed and undertook a program of advanced education or training in the same year. Advanced education and training includes students enrolled in a Master's or Ph D program, a vocational or technical

**Additional Source Information:** University study on the status of graduates' employment and advanced studies, February, 2002

**Frequency:** Annually.  
**Collection Period:** 2004  
**Data Available:** October 2004  
**Validated By:** No Formal Verification.  
 Data supplied by Gallaudet University.

program, or another type of program, e.g., law school or medical school.

**Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the Model Secondary School: A high percentage of the Model Secondary School graduates will either find jobs commensurate with their training or will attend postsecondary programs.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Model Secondary School graduates in jobs or postsecondary programs during first year after graduation (%)</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> The fiscal year 2003 rate exceeds the target.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> The fiscal year 2003 rate exceeds the target by 2 percent. This includes fiscal year 2003 MSSD graduates who were engaged in productive activities, including postsecondary education, work, or Vocational Rehabilitation evaluation or training 4 months after June graduation. An additional 15 percent of graduates reported that they were actively involved in looking for work. Key strategies to address this indicator, implemented in fiscal year 2001, have maintained the impact seen in fiscal year 2002 and 2003.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Clerc Center Exemplary Programs and Research.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by Gallaudet University.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	74			
2001	72	80		
2002	90	80		
2003	82	80		
2004		80		
2005		81		

# National Technical Institute for the Deaf - 2004

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

**Goal 8: To provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate programs and professional studies with state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, undertake a program of applied research; share NTID expertise and expand outside sources of revenue**

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Enrollment: Maintain a minimum student body of undergraduates, graduates, and educational interpreters as established by NTID.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of students</i>							<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office records, FY 2004 as of October 2003.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2003            Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification applied.</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets			
	Undergraduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.	Undergraduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.	
1995	1,035	59	10				
1996	1,038	59	27				
1997	1,069	72	32				
1998	1,085	84	36				
1999	1,135	93	50	1,080	100	50	
2000	1,084	77	59	1,080	100	50	
2001	1,089	75	55	1,080	100	50	
2002	1,125	53	60	1,080	100	75	
2003	1,093	65	73	1,080	100	75	
2004	1,064	92	114	1,080	100	75	
2005				1,080	100	90	
<p><b>Progress:</b> NTID did not achieve its enrollment targets in the Undergraduate program or in the Educational Interpreter program. However, it well exceeded its target in the Graduate/Masters in Special Education program.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> NTID's goal is to maintain a student body of 1,080 undergraduates, 100 Education Interpreters, and 75 Graduate/Master's in Special Education in fiscal year 2004. This goal focuses on the total enrollment as year-to-year shifts in specific programs may result in the individual targets either being exceeded or not met. There are also human and physical resource limitations to the number of students NTID can serve. The Undergraduate Program and Educational Interpreter program enrollments are below target primarily due to more rigorous entrance requirements. More aggressive recruitment efforts have paid off in the Educational Interpreter Program and NTID expects the same results next year with Undergraduate programs.</p>							

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

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Graduation rate: Graduation rate: By 2008, the overall student graduation rate will be 60 percent.**

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Student graduation rates - %</i>							<p><b>Progress:</b> In fiscal year 2003, the graduation rates for all three categories equaled or exceeded their targets.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> In fiscal year 2003, the graduation rate for students in the sub-baccalaureate programs decreased to 52 percent while the rate for students in the baccalaureate programs increased to 68 percent resulting in an overall graduation rate of 56 percent for all deaf students. The Institute's goal is to maintain or increase the rate for students in sub-baccalaureate programs at or above 52 percent in FY 2004 and increase the rate for students in baccalaureate programs.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office Records.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets					
	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate			
1997	50	50	51						
1998	51	50	57						
1999	53	50	61						
2000	53	50	63	53	51	61			
2001	54	50	64	53	51	61			
2002	57	54	66	53	52	61			
2003	56	52	68	53	52	61			
2004				57	52	69			
2005				57	52	69			
2006				58	53	70			
2007				59	53	71			
2008				60	54	72			

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

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Student retention rates-%</i>							<p><b>Progress:</b> In fiscal year 2003, the overall performance of 76 percent exceeded its target by 2 percentage points.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> The sub-baccalaureate rate of 70 percent was 4 percentage points below the goal, but 2 percentage points above the average of the last three years. This pattern of improvement makes NTID confident that current and new retention strategies will help achieve the target of 74 percent in 2004. Baccalaureate retention rate decreased to 86</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NTID Registrar office records</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by NTID. No formal verification procedure applied.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets					
	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate			
1997	76	85	84						
1998	74	73	81						
1999	74	69	84						
2000	74	69	85	74	73	84			
2001	74	68	86	74	74	84			
2002	77	72	87	74	74	84			

2003	76	70	86	74	74	84	percent, but once again surpassed the target of 84 percent, and is only slightly below the rate for hearing freshmen entering the Rochester Institute of Technology (88 percent).
2004				74	74	84	
2005				75	74	86	

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

**Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Placement rate: Maintain a high percentage of graduates placed in the workforce.**

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

# ERDDI: Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.283A - Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers Program

## Goal 8: To improve student achievement in low performing schools under the No Child Left Behind Act

Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide high-quality comprehensive technical assistance to states, territories, tribes, school districts, and schools that help students reach high academic standards.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Improved Reading for Students: Schools that receive and implement research-based reading strategies provided by CCs will show improved reading scores.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Average reading score for all CC served schools</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Fy 2004 will provide the baseline for this data (the code for setting a baseline is 999); performance targets beyond 2004 will increase 5% from the baseline annually.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Comprehensive Center performance reports will identify schools assisted and data collected. State Report Cards will validate the Annual Yearly Progress by districts and their schools.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Average reading score	Average reading score		
2004		999		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Improve AYP Status: Schools in need of improvement that receive corrective action interventions by district staff who had direct assistance from Comprehensive Centers will have improved Annual Yearly Progress status.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Districts that reported CC served schools improved APY status</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> 2004 data is baseline.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Comprehensive Center program performance reports will identify assisted districts and related</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

		schools AYP status. <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
--	--	--



# ERDDI: Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.319 - Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia

## Goal 8: To improve mathematics and science education through technical assistance and dissemination

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Provide high-quality technical assistance, including planning assistance, training, facilitation of collaboration and networking, and other technical assistance.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Technical Assistance: At least 80 percent of participants in Consortia technical assistance activities will report that information or assistance from the Consortia added value to their work.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Training improved instructional practice</i>			<p><b>Status:</b> Target exceeded</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> For all years that data are reported, the Actual Performance data are shown as the percent of respondents who found training and collaboration with the Consortia to be moderately or extensively useful. In 2003, clients who were surveyed were those who received intensive services (i.e. 12 or more hours of training and technical assistance). Additionally; the Consortia has been collecting data on the impact of their services on student achievement. Data show positive student achievement at sites that received intensive assistance.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consortia/Clearinghouse Network Evaluation report. The primary sources for this report are the Consortia and Clearinghouse Descriptive Data System (CCDDS) and participant surveys.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Common definitions and common data collection procedures are established across each Consortium. Statistical standards are applied. Data are subjected to Cross-Consortia's Eisenhower Network Evaluation Committee internal review and validation procedures.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> 2003 data have not been subjected to external audit.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	91			
1999	96	75		
2000		80		
2001	93.50	80		
2002	90	80		
2003	91	80		
2004		80		
<i>Training improved student engagement and performance</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	89			
1999	94	75		
2000		80		
2001	90.80	80		
2002	89	80		
2003	87	80		
2004		80		

<i>Collaboration strengthened relationships and access to resources</i>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	88	
1999	93	75
2000		80
2001	87.60	80
2003	95	80
2004		80

  

<i>Collaboration leveraged resources and efforts for greater impact</i>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	80	
1999	87	75
2000		80
2001	81.30	80
2003	97	80
2004		80

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia Internal Objective 2**

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Dissemination: The total number of Consortia contacts with customers, by print or by electronic media (“hits” on Web sites plus other electronic communications), will increase by 10 percent annually, and a majority of the recipients will report that the information contributed to improving their work.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Print</i>			<b>Status: Target exceeded</b>  <b>Explanation:</b> With the increasing costs of print dissemination, the Consortia expanded their electronic dissemination efforts resulting in a jump in electronic media contacts. Beginning in 2001, data were collected using newer, more accurate, widely accepted techniques for representing the number of contacts that customers had with Web-based information. Shown for 2001 is the baseline of page views, not Web hits.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consortia/Clearinghouse Network Evaluation report. The primary sources for this report are the Consortia and Clearinghouse Descriptive Data System (CCDDS) and participant surveys..  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	306,557			
1998	340,185			
1999	125,212	337,212		
2000	129,901	306,167		
2001	196,780	275,551		
2002	233,267	247,996		

<b>2003</b>	290,749	223,196
<b>2004</b>		223,196

<i>Electronic Media</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>1997</b>	1,354,167	
<b>1998</b>	1,465,259	
<b>1999</b>	3,328,846	1,489,583
<b>2000</b>	3,684,883	1,638,541
<b>2001</b>	2,820,197	1,802,395
<b>2002</b>		1,982,634
<b>2003</b>	6,922,349	2,180,898
<b>2004</b>		2,180,898

<i>Usefulness</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>1998</b>	70	
<b>1999</b>	77	
<b>2000</b>		51
<b>2001</b>	93	51
<b>2002</b>		51
<b>2003</b>	76	51
<b>2004</b>		51

Verification.  
Common definitions and common data collection procedures established across each Consortium. Statistical standards are applied. Data are subjected to Cross-Consortia's Eisenhower Network Evaluation Committee internal review and validation procedures.

**Improvements:** Improved information technology has enabled more accurate assessment of the number of Web-based customer contacts.

# 21st Century Community Learning Centers - 2004

CFDA Number: [84.287](#) - Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers

**Goal 8: To enable public elementary and secondary schools to plan, implement, or expand extended learning opportunities for the benefit of the educational, health, social service, cultural, and recreational needs of their communities.**

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Achievement: Students regularly participating in the program will show improvement in achievement through measures such as test scores, grades, and/or teacher reports.**

Targets and Performance Data												Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of regular program participants whose Math/English grades improved from fall to spring.</i>													
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets						<b>Additional Source Information:</b> 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees.
	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle or High School Math	Middle or High School English	Overall Math	Overall English	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle or High School Math	Middle or 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	
2002	41.10	44.20	37.20	39.40	39.40	42.30	45	45	45	45	45	45	
2003							45	45	45	45	45	45	
2004							45	45	45	45	45	45	
<i>Percentage of regular program participants whose achievement test scores improved from below grade level to at or above grade level.</i>													
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets						
	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle or High School Math	Middle or High School English	Overall Math	Overall English	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle or High School Math	Middle or High School English	Overall Math	Overall English	
2000	5.80	5.10	3.90	3.90	4.80	4.50							
2001	5	4.10	8.10	5.50	6.60	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
2002	3.70	4	2	3.90	3.70	4.10	6	6	6	6	6	6	

2003							6	6	6	6	6	6
2004							6	6	6	6	6	6
<i>Percentage of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.</i>												
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets					
	Elementary		Middle or High School Math		Overall		Elementary		Middle or High School Math		Overall	
2000	76		64		69							
2001	74		71		73		75		75		75	
2002	76.30		73.60		75.50		75		75		75	
2003							75		75		75	
2004							75		75		75	

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Behavior: Students participating in the program will show improvement through measures such as school attendance, classroom performance, and decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors.**

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Percentage of students with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior</i>							<p><b>Explanation:</b> According to teacher reports in 2002, 76 percent of the students who regularly participated in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs showed behavioral improvements (up from 74% in 2001).</p>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.            Data supplied by grantees.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Teacher reports are subjective and thus subject to variation over time and across sites.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets								
	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall						
2000	62	57	59	70	70	70						
2001	73	75	74	75	75	75						
2002	76	76.90	76.30	75	75	75						
2003				75	75	75						
2004				75	75	75						

**Objective 8.2 of 2: 21st Century Community Learning Centers will show improvement through measures such as school attendance, classroom performance and decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors**

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Core educational services: Percent of centers that offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of 21st Century Centers reporting emphasis in at least one core academic area.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data collection for web-based system will be upgraded periodically.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	97	85		
2001	96	85		
2002	94.80	85		
2003		85		
2004		85		

**Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Enrichment and support activities: Percentage of centers that offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in technology</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The vast majority of the centers (96%) offer enrichment and support services with a significant proportion (81 percent) offering computer- or technology-related activities. This is up from 79% in 2001.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> 2003</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data collection for web-based system will be upgraded periodically.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	70	85		
2001	79	85		
2002	80.60	85		
2003		85		
2004		85		
<i>Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in other areas.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	97	85		
2001	95	85		
2002	96	85		
2003		85		
2004		85		

# ESEA: Advanced Credentialing - 2004

**CFDA Number:** 84.925 - Advanced Certification or Advanced Credentialing

**Goal 8: Support teachers seeking advanced certification through high quality professional teacher enhancement programs designed to improve teaching and learning.**

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

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The number of teachers awarded National Board Certification will increase annually.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Cumulative number of teachers certified.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> The actual number of National Board Certified Teachers is currently available for 2002. Data for each year normally will be available by the end of November. The target has been set at an increase of 5,000 NBCTs each year. Currently, 49 states and approximately 490 localities offer some kind of incentive for teachers to apply for National Board Certification; these incentives have helped to increase the number of applicants for National Board Certification. (These incentives include fee support, salary supplements, and license portability.) However, budget shortfalls in the states are having an impact on the incentives offered and thus the number of candidates.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Board reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2003</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	23,936	22,000		
2003		30,000		
2004		35,000		



# Advanced Placement Incentives Program - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.330C - Advanced Placement Incentives Program

## Goal 8: To increase the numbers of low-income high school students prepared to pursue higher education

Objective 8.1 of 1: Encourage a greater number of low-income students to participate in the AP program.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of AP tests taken by low-income students.</i>				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Educational Testing Service  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 - 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	92,570	83,300		
2000	102,474	102,000		
2001	112,891	112,200		
2002	140,572	124,180		
2003		154,629		
2004		170,092		

# ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.356A -

**Goal 8: To assist Alaska Native population to achieve to challenging standards through supporting supplemental programs that meet their unique educational needs.**

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Student achievement: Percentage of participants benefiting from the Alaska Native Education program will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>As appropriate an increased percentage of students participating in the program will meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science or reading.</i>			<p><b>Status: Target not met</b></p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2004 data will provide the baseline (the code for setting baseline is 999). Performance target are set for baseline plus 5%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Additional Source Information: Grantee performance report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> July 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2004		999		
2005		5		
2006		5		
<i>[Empty]As appropriate Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs will improve on measures of school readiness.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2004		999		
2005		5		
2006		5		
<i>As appropriate Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs will improve on measures of school readiness.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2004		999		
2005		5		
2006		5		

# Character Education - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.215 - Fund for the Improvement of Education

## Goal 8: To help promote the development of strong character among the Nation's students

Objective 8.1 of 1: Support the development and implementation of high-quality character education programs

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Partnership in Character Education Program grantees will demonstrate substantial progress toward achieving the results-based goals and objectives established in their applications.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of grantees meeting their measurable goals and objectives.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Requirements for measuring progress toward goals and objectives will be incorporated into applications for Character Education Program direct grants.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Review of program files.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2004</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		75		
2004		80		
2005		85		

# Public Charter Schools Program - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.282 - Charter Schools

## Goal 8: To support the creation of a large number of high-quality charter schools and to evaluate their effects.

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

### Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: State legislation: The number of states that have charter school legislation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of states with charter school legislation (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico)</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Several States will be considering legislation this year.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> State Educational Agencies (SEA); state legislatures. <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.  <b>Limitations:</b> There is variation in the definition of state charter school legislation.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1995	12			
1996	19			
1997	27			
1998	31			
1999	38			
2000	38	40		
2001	39	42		
2002		42		
2003		43		
2004		44		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Charter operations: The number of charter schools in operation around the Nation.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of charter schools in operation</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> There has been a positive trend toward meeting this objective. The number of charter schools in operation has dramatically increased from 100 in 1994 to 2,431 in 2002.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> SEAs; State legislatures.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2003  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.  <b>Limitations:</b> Differences in the definition of charter schools (i.e., some states count multiple sites as single charters, while others count them as multiple charters) cause variability in the counts SEAs. There is sometimes disagreement about numbers of charter schools in operation among the agencies that do the counting.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1995	100			
1996	255			
1997	428			
1998	790			
1999	1,100			
2000	1,700	2,060		
2001	2,110	2,667		
2002	2,431	3,000		
2003		3,000		
2004		3,000		

# ESEA: Close-Up Fellowships - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.927A - Close-Up Fellowship Program

**Goal 8: To improve participants' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding the three branches of government.**

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

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Amount of funding (in dollars)</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The \$1,137,975 figure represents funds raised by the foundation and allocated for teachers and economically disadvantaged students.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual audit and grantee's analysis of Internal financial documents, 2001.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies. Data from audited program records.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	865,000			
2000		906,000		
2001	1,047,340	955,000		
2002	1,137,975	960,000		
2004		970,000		

# ESEA: Community Technology Centers - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.341 - Community Technology Centers

**Goal 8: To provide disadvantaged residents of economically distressed urban and rural communities with increased access to information technology and related training.**

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Greater Access: Increasing numbers of disadvantaged students in high schools within distressed areas will have access to services that help them to improve their academic performance.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of students served</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Initial grants have been awarded in September 2003. Baseline data will be gathered in 2004.	<b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Grantees provide adult education:: Increasing numbers of grantees will provide adult education..**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of grantees providing adult education.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Initial grants were awarded in September of 2003. Baseline will be gathered in 2004.	<b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b>  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

# ESEA: Comprehensive School Reform - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.332B - Comprehensive School Reform Quality Initiatives

## Goal 8: To enable low-performing students to improve their achievement to meet challenging standards

Objective 8.1 of 2: Student achievement in core subjects generally will show marked improvement in comprehensive school reform demonstration (CSR) program schools

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: State assessments: By 2014 all students in schools that have received CSR funding will meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality			
<i>Reading</i>							<b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004  <b>Limitations:</b> The data for this indicator were self-reported by State Educational Agencies.			
Year	Actual Performance							Performance Targets		
	Elementary	Middle	High					Elementary	Middle	High
2000	67	56	72							
2001	75	77	64							
2002								78	80	67
2003								81	83	70
2004								84	87	73
<i>Mathematics</i>										
Year	Actual Performance									
	Elementary	Middle	High	Elementary	Middle	High				
2000	62	74	61							
2001	74	74	74							
2002				77	77	77				
2003				80	80	80				
2004				83	83	83				

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

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



Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of principals in Title I schools reporting that they are implementing a research-based school reform model</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Increasing numbers of Title I schools are implementing research-based school reform models to improve curriculum and instruction. The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program is meeting its purpose of increasing awareness of and support for comprehensive school reform among states, districts and schools, and acts as a catalyst for how Title I funds can be used in schoolwide programs to support the adoption of research-based comprehensive school reform programs</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999(baseline)/2000.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  Data collected by Westat, Inc., and validated by internal procedures.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are taken from a nationally representative sample of Title I schools; no data are available on all Title I schools. Because data are based on self-reports, it is difficult to judge the extent to which reform programs are comprehensive and research-based. An examination of school documents on a subsample of Title I schools will allow some indication of the quality of comprehensive school reform efforts in Title I schools in general.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	31			
2000	46			
2001		55		
2002		60		
2003		70		
2004		72		

# ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.354A - Charter Schools Facilities Program

## Goal 8: Increase the number of charter school facilities acquired, constructed or renovated.

### Objective 8.1 of 1: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program Internal Objective 1

#### Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Leveraged funds:: The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, construction, or renovation of charter school facilities.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Baseline data will be collected in 2003 and reported in 2004. The 2004 &amp; 2005 target for this measure is baseline plus 1%. * Definition: Leverage: The number of dollars 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 towards 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.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> These multi-year grants received all the funding at the beginning of the first project period. As no reports are required for continuation funding, grantees were given a full year of performance before reporting data. First reports are due December 2003.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		1		
2005		1		

#### Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Number of school facilities acquired, constructed, or renovated using program funds.: Number of school facilities acquired, constructed, or renovated using program funds.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of charter schools served through this indicator.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Baseline data will be collected in 2003 and reported in 2004. The 2004 and 2005 target for this measure is baseline plus</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 -</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		

<b>2004</b>		1	1%.	<b>Data Available:</b> January 2004
<b>2005</b>		1		

# Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Program - 2004

## Goal 8: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Program Internal Goal

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Apply research based approaches to early childhood pedagogy and child development and learning, including establishing literacy rich classrooms: Average ELLCO score will improve.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>ECEPD teachers' scores on ELLCO will improve.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> Teacher performance documentation; documented use of the Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO). The target for FY 2005 is baseline +1%</p>	<p><b>Source: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Other.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Documentation of application of research based approaches, as recorded by mentors or supervisors working with participating educators (i.e., logs or reports); pre and post evaluation of educator lesson plans; results of the ELLCO.  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 12/31/2005.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> May 2004</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Not all ECEPD grantees use the ELLCO literacy Environment Checklist. Data collected only represent the sample grantees who use the checklist.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		1		

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

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Demonstrated improved readiness for school: At the end of the last preschool year, children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy, and numeracy skills.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Improved readiness for school in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy, and numeracy skills.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> Documented use of Get It Got It Go, the Developmental Indicators for the</p>	<p><b>Source: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Record/File.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Results of Get It Got It Go, DIAL 3 and PPVT III</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		

	Social/Cognitive Emotional	Social/Cognitive Emotional	Assessment of Learning (DIAL-3) and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-III). The target for FY 2005 is baseline +1%.	<b>Date Sponsored:</b> 12/31/2005. <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> May 2004  <b>Improvements:</b> Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the PPVT and the Individual Growth Development Indicators available from Get It Got It Go. Not all ECEPD grantees use the PPVT or the Individual Growth and Development Indicators.
<b>2004</b>		999		
<b>2005</b>		1		
<b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Demonstrated skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction: One year following instruction from a teacher who participated in an Early Childhood Educator Professional Development program, children will demonstrate that they have the skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction at the end of the kindergarten year.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Children will demonstrate they they have the skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction at the end of the kindergarten year.</i>			<b>Progress:</b> Documented use of the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS).	<b>Source:</b> Other <b>Other:</b> Other. <b>Sponsor:</b> Results of DIBELS. <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 12/31/2005.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		

# Early Reading First - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.359 - Early Reading First

**Goal 8: To support local efforts to enhance the early language, literacy, and prereading development of preschool age children through strategies and professional development based on scientifically based reading research.**

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Language: The percent of children who demonstrate age appropriate development of receptive language.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>The percent of 4 year old children participating in ERF who achieve age-appropriate benchmarks on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004		999	2005		1	<p><b>Progress:</b> Data from FY 2004 will provide the baseline. (The code for setting the baseline is 999.) The target for FY 2005 is baseline +1%.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> The first full program year for Early Reading First grantees is 2003-2004. Early Reading First preschool children will take a Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III pre-test and a post-test after the year of Early Reading First intervention. Post-test scores of ERF preschool children will be compared to the national norms provided by the test publisher.</p>	<p><b>Source: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Other.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Early Reading First Annual Performance Report..  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 12/31/2003.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition (PPVT) is a nationally normed tests which has been validated internally and correlated with other measures of cognitive development.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the PPVT. NOT all Early Reading First grantees use the PPVT to measure cognitive development..</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
2004		999											
2005		1											

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Early Reading: Alphabet Knowledge: The score ERF children attain on the Letter Naming Task..**

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

The number of letters ERF children can identify measured by the Letter Naming Task.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		1

**Progress:** Data from SY 2004 will provide the baseline. (The code for setting baseline is 999.) The target for FY 2005 is baseline +1%.

**Explanation:** FY 2003-2004 is the first program year for Early Reading First grantees. The first Early Reading First Performance Report will be due December 2004. The Letter Naming Task is a measure of alphabet knowledge that will be administered to ERF preschool children with scores reported in the ERF Performance Report.

**Source:** Other

**Other:** Record/File.

**Sponsor:** The Early Reading First Performance Report.

**Date Sponsored:** 12/31/2003.

**Additional Source Information:**

The PALS Pre-K tests the mastery of early developing reading skills. The Early Reading First Performance Report is submitted to the Department by ERF grantees as an annual performance report.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Collection Period:** 2004 - 2005

**Data Available:** March 2005

**Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

On Site Monitoring by ED. The Letter Naming Task is a measure that has been normed using a national sample from the Head Start population. It has been demonstrated to have a strong positive correlation with the Woodcock-Johnson Letter-Word Identification test.

**Limitations:** Not all Early Reading First grantees use the Letter Naming Task to measure alphabet knowledge. Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the Letter Naming Task.

**Improvements:** Early Reading First grantees will be encouraged to use the Letter Naming Task as the measure of alphabet knowledge.

# ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians - 2004

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

## Goal 8: Native Hawaiian Education Program Internal Goal

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Percentage of participants who will benefit from the Native Hawaiian Education program will increase**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
<p><i>As appropriate the percentage of teachers involved with professional development activities that address the unique education needs of program participants will increase.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004		999	2005		5	2006		5	<p><b>Status: Unable to judge</b></p> <p><b>Progress:</b> Baseline will be established in FY 2004. 999 is used to set the baseline. The 2005 Target is baseline plus 5 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee performance report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> July 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets														
2004		999														
2005		5														
2006		5														
<p><i>An increased percentage of Native Hawaiian children who participate in the early education program provided by Alu Like, Inc. will improve on measures of school readiness and literacy.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004		999	2005		5	2006		5		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets														
2004		999														
2005		5														
2006		5														
<p><i>As appropriate an increased percentage of student participating in the program will meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science or reading.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004		999	2005		5	2006		5		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets														
2004		999														
2005		5														
2006		5														



<b>2004</b>		999		
<b>2005</b>		5		
<b>2006</b>		5		

# Enhancing Education Through Technology Program - 2004

CFDA Number: [84.318](#) - Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Grants

## Goal 8: To facilitate the comprehensive and integrated use of educational technology into instruction and curricula to improve teaching and student achievement.

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Curriculum Integration: The percentage of schools receiving substantial EETT funds that have effectively and fully integrated technology, as identified by States.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of schools receiving substantial EETT funds that have integrated technology.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Fy 2004 data will provide the baseline (the code for setting a baseline is 999); performance targets beyond 2004 will be set from the baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA) Common Data Elements Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

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

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Internet access in high poverty schools: Internet access in high-poverty school classrooms will be comparable to that in other schools.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of classrooms with internet access.</i>					<b>Explanation:</b> The number of high-poverty schools with Internet access continues to rise. As high-poverty schools increasingly obtain access to the Internet, it is likely that their classroom connections will subsequently increase.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCES Survey: Internet Access in U.S. Public Schools and Classrooms.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004  <b>Limitations:</b> Poverty measures are based on data on free and reduced-price lunches, which may underestimate school poverty levels, particularly for older students and immigrant students.
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Low-poverty schools	High-poverty schools	Low-poverty schools	High-poverty schools		
1999	73	38				
2000	82	60	100	100		
2001	90	79	100	100		
2002			100	100		
2003			100	100		
2004			100	100		

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

<b>Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Professional Development: In districts that receive substantial funding from the State Grants program, the percentage of teachers that meet their state technology standards will increase.</b>		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress
Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Percentage of teachers that meet state technology standards</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>		999
		<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2004 data will provide the baseline (the code for setting a baseline is 999); the performance target is baseline plus.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA) Common Data Elements Report</p>

# ESEA: Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education - 2004

**Goal 8: To improve the teaching and learning of all students through the provisions of high-quality instructional materials and information about effective programs, and through the expansion of a cadre of highly accomplished teachers.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide access to high quality instructional materials and information about exemplary programs in mathematics and science education for elementary and secondary schools.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Utility: At least 80 percent of customers who use clearinghouse products will report that the products meet their needs in terms of being easy to access, up to date, and valuable to their work.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of customers who report that products are:</i>							<p><b>Explanation:</b> The Clearinghouse has placed increasing emphasis on customer satisfaction. The respondents in the performance table represent those sample members who remembered the clearinghouse materials well enough to respond.</p> <p><b>Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research</b>  <b>Collecting Agency:</b> Eisenhower Clearinghouse.  <b>Survey/Research Report Title:</b> Clearinghouse Data System.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consortia/clearinghouse Network Evaluation Report 2002. Primary sources for this report are the Consortia and Clearinghouse Descriptive Data System and participants' surveys.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Statistical standards are applied. Data are subjected to Cross-Consortia's Eisenhower Network Evaluation Committee internal review and validation procedures.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Consortia and Clearinghouse Descriptive Data System and data for 2001 and 2002 have not been subjected to external audit</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets			
	Easy to access	Up to date	Value to work	Easy to access	Up to date	Value to work	
<b>2000</b>	90	95.50	93.40	72	72	72	
<b>2001</b>	97	97	97	76	76	76	
<b>2002</b>	98	97	98	78	78	78	
<b>2003</b>				80	80	80	
<b>2004</b>				80	80	80	

--	--	--

# OELA Language Acquisition State Grants (Title III) - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.365 - English Language Acquisition Grants

## Goal 8: To help limited English proficient students learn English and reach high academic standards

Objective 8.1 of 1: Improve English proficiency and academic achievement of students served by Title III.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: The percentage of states that have aligned English language proficiency standards and assessments in place.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report  <b>Data Available:</b> May 2004
<i>Percentage of states that have developed English language proficiency standards</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2004		100		
<i>The percentage of states that have selected and administered English language proficiency assessments</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2004		100		
<i>The percentage of states that have conducted studies and/or implemented procedures to assess the alignment of English language proficiency standards and assessments</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2004		100		
<i>The percentage of states that have conducted studies and/or implemented procedures to ensure that English language proficiency standards are linked to academic content standards in English language arts and reading</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2004		80		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: The percentage of students who attain English language proficiency.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Of limited English-proficient students who have received Title III services for three academic years, the percentage who have attained English language proficiency</i>			<b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> May 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2006		70	

# OELA National Activities - Professional Development - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.195N - ELA National Activities

## Goal 8: Improve the academic achievement of LEP students

Objective 8.1 of 1: Improve the quality of teachers of LEP students.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Percentage of grantees that report program improvement related to K-12 state standards, scientifically-based research practices, or development of subject area competence.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of grantees that report program improvement related to K-12 state standards, scientifically-based research practices, or development of subject area competence</i>				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2003
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		25		
2004		50		
2005		75		
Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Percentage of grantees that report effectiveness of graduates/completers in the instructional setting.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of grantees that report effectiveness of graduates/completers in the instructional setting</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> A baseline will be set in 2006.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2003
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2006		999		
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Of preservice teachers the rate of placement of graduates in an instructional setting serving LEP students, within one year of graduation.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Of preservice teachers the rate of placement of graduates in an instructional setting serving LEP students, within one year of graduation</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> A baseline will be set in 2007.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2003
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2007		999		



# OELA Education Instructional Services Program - 2004

## Goal 8: To help limited-English proficient (LEP) students reach high academic standards.

Objective 8.1 of 1: IMPROVE ENGLISH PROFICIENCY AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS SERVED BY TITLE VII OF THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: English proficiency: Students in the program will annually demonstrate continuous and educationally significant progress on oral or written English proficiency measures.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of projects in which three-quarters of student groups made gains in English proficiency</i>					<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data analyzed reported percentages of projects, not percentages of students. The program has funded at least five consecutive annual cohorts of student participants, each of which is funded for five years. Cohorts provide comparisons of oral and written performance of approximately the same project groups over time. For example, Cohort 1 is the group of Comprehensive School Programs initially funded in 1995. The cohort's first biennial report was submitted in 1998, covering outcome data of the first two years of operation (1995-1997). Subsequent data for Cohort 1 were reported in 2000 detailing student outcomes during its third and fourth years, and in 2002 covering its final program year. Cohort 2, therefore, is the group initially funded in 1996; Cohort 3 began in 1997, and so on. Program-defined cohorts provide the best comparisons, but have limitations. They are the only source of trend data on program impact. However, student groups are moving targets; the composition of the student groups changes between reports due to mobility and reclassification (mainstreaming). Cohort data are aggregated in the tables to show overall improvement of program performance in a concise form.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Contracted synthesis of local project data.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Operational definitions of LEP students vary; the amount of missing data varies greatly across projects and cohorts of projects. Prior year data has been updated from previous reports to reflect more complete information.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Oral	Written	Oral	Written		
1998	90	81				
1999	82	74	92	85		
2000	75	89	93	88		
2001	75	89	94	91		
2002			94	91		
2003			95	90		
2004			95	90		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Other academic achievement: Students in the program will annually demonstrate continuous and educationally significant progress on appropriate academic achievement of language arts, reading, and math.**

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of projects in which three-quarters of student groups made gains in academic achievement in language arts, reading and math.</i>								<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual contracted synthesis of biennial reports. Data analyses are fully reported. Planned improvements for addressing the limitations of source data and the limitations in data comparisons include uniform program monitoring and assessment guidance for all Title III projects (see "Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance on the Title III State Formula Grant Program, Standards, Assessment, and Accountability, Feb., 2003).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets				
	Language Arts	Reading	Math	Language Arts	Reading	Math		
1998	69	66	70					
1999	44	53	58	65	65	66		
2000	63	73	67	67	67	68		
2001	83	67	60	70	70	70		
2002				70	70	70		
2003				70	70	70		
2004				70	70	70		

# Even Start Family Literacy Program - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.314 - Even Start\_Statewide Family Literacy Program

**Goal 8: To help break the cycle of poverty and illiteracy by improving the educational opportunities of the nation's low-income families through a unified family literacy program that integrates early childhood education, adult literacy and adult basic education, and parenting education.**

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Adult literacy and mathematics achievement and English language acquisition: Percentage of adults who achieve significant learning gains on measures of literacy and mathematics and Limited English proficient (LEP) adults who achieve significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality			
<i>Percentage of Even Start Adults showing significant learning gains on measures of literacy and mathematics and Even Start LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> The baseline for this measure will be set with the 2003 data. The 2004 target is baseline +1%.</p>			<p><b>Source: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Other.  <b>Sponsor:</b> NCLP State Consolidated Performance Report (CPR).  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 12/31/2003.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b>                      Performance Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> May 2004</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Currently, the CPRs and PBDMI do not provide data in format to report on performance for this indicator. Data for 2003 is dependent upon the format of the revised CPR and additions to the PBDMI.</p>			
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets							
	Reading	Math	English Language Acquisition					Reading	Math	English Language Acquisition
<b>2003</b>								999	999	999
<b>2004</b>								1	1	1
<b>2005</b>				1	1	1				
<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Adult educational attainment: Percentage of Even Start school age parents who earn a high school diploma and the percentage of non-school age parents who earn a high school diploma or a general equivalency diploma.</b>				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality			
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality			

*Percentage of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal or GED attainment goal that earn a high school diploma or equivalent.*

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	School Age Adults HS Diploma	Non-School Age Adults HS Diploma/GED	School Age Adults HS Diploma	Non-School Age Adults HS Diploma/GED
2003			999	999
2004			1	1

**Explanation:** Baseline for this measure will be set with the 2003 data. The 2004 target is baseline +1%.

**Source: Other**  
**Other:** Other.  
**Sponsor:** NCLB State Consolidated Performance Report (CPR)..  
**Date Sponsored:** 12/31/2003.

**Additional Source Information:** Second and Third National Even Start Evaluation: Universe Study (1996-2000).

**Frequency:** Annually.  
**Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003  
**Data Available:** May 2004

**Limitations:** Currently, the CPRs and PBDMI do not provide data in a format to report on performance for this indicator. Data for 2003 is dependent upon the format of the revised CPR and additions to the PBDMI. Definitions of high school diploma and GED may vary across programs.

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Children's language development and reading readiness: Percentage of Even Start children that are entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development and reading readiness.**

Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality																									
<p><i>Percentage of Even Start children that are entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development and reading readiness.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Year</th> <th colspan="2">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="2">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Language Development</th> <th>Reading Readiness</th> <th>Language Development</th> <th>Reading Readiness</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		Language Development	Reading Readiness	Language Development	Reading Readiness	2003			999	999	2004			1	1	2005			1	1	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Baseline for this measure will be set with the 2003 data. The 2004 target is baseline +1%.</p>		<p><b>Source: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Other.  <b>Sponsor:</b> NCLB State Consolidated Performance Report (CPR)..  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 12/31/2003.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> May 2004</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Currently the CPRs and PBDMI do not provide data in a format to report on performance for</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets																										
	Language Development	Reading Readiness	Language Development	Reading Readiness																									
2003			999	999																									
2004			1	1																									
2005			1	1																									

		this indicator. Data for 2003 is dependent upon the format of the revised CPR and additions to the PBDMI.
--	--	---

# ESEA: Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.215Y -

**Goal 8: To develop innovative culturally based educational programs, cultural exchanges and internships and apprentice programs to assist Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and children and families of Massachusetts linked by history and tradition, to learn about their shared culture and tradition.**

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

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number/ percentage of partnership exchanges.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> 2003 Performance Target = Baseline, 2004 Performance Target = Baseline + 10%, 2005 Performance Target = Baseline + 7%</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Reports (Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners)</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2003</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data is self-reported by grantee.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		10		
<i>Number of new partner capabilities.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		10		
<i>Number/ percent of individual participants involved in educational and cultural enrichment activities (including online participants).</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		10		
<i>Number/ percentage of schools, community groups, and family programs involved in educational and cultural enrichment activities.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		

<b>2004</b>		10		
<i>Number/ percent of participants in a culturally based youth internship program involving career awareness, leadership and job skills development.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2003</b>		99		
<b>2004</b>		10		

# Impact Aid - 2004

CFDA Numbers: 84.040 - Impact Aid\_Facilities Maintenance  
84.041 - Impact Aid

## Goal 8: To provide appropriate financial assistance for federally connected children who present a genuine burden to their school districts

### Objective 8.1 of 3: Make payments in a timely manner

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Timeliness of payments: The percent of eligible applicants who receive initial Basic Support and Children With Disabilities payments within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.

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



**Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the quality of public school facilities used to educate federally connected children.**

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

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Make accurate payments**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of requests to forgive overpayments of Basic Support Payments</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program office files.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	5	10		
2000	2	10		
2001	10	10		
2002	4	10		
2003		10		
2004		10		
2005		10		

# Improving Teacher Quality State Grants - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.367 - Improving Teacher Quality State Grants

**Goal 8: To improve teacher and principal quality and increase the number of highly qualified teachers in the classroom and highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools.**

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

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in Title I schools: Percentage of highly qualified teachers in Title I schools				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of highly qualified teachers in Title I elementary schools.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data is the baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI)	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
2003	80			999
2004				85
2006				100
<i>Percentage of highly qualified teachers in Title I middle and high schools.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
2003	75			999
2004				81
2006				100
Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in all schools: Percentage of highly qualified teachers in all elementary schools and in all middle and high schools.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of highly qualified teachers in all elementary schools.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 is the baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI)	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
2003	85			999
2004				89
2006				100
<i>Percentage of highly qualified teachers in all middle and high schools.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
2003	80			999

<b>2004</b>		85		
<b>2006</b>		100		

# Indian Education - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.299A - Indian Education Special Programs for Indian Children

**Goal 8: To help American Indian and Alaska Native children achieve to the same challenging standards expected of all students by supporting access to programs that meet their unique educational and culturally related academic need.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: American Indian and Alaska Native students served by LEAs receiving Indian Education Formula Grants will progress at rates similar to those for all students in achievement to standards, promotion, and graduation.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Student achievement: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will meet or exceed the performance standards established by national assessments.**

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																																				
<p><i>Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 4 who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 35%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1994</td> <td style="text-align: center;">48</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1998</td> <td style="text-align: center;">47</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2000</td> <td style="text-align: center;">43</td> <td style="text-align: center;">58</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2002</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">60</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2004</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">62</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 8 who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 35%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1994</td> <td style="text-align: center;">63</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1998</td> <td style="text-align: center;">61</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2000</td> <td style="text-align: center;">53</td> <td style="text-align: center;">62</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2001</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">64</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2004</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">66</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1994	48		1998	47		2000	43	58	2002		60	2004		62	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1994	63		1998	61		2000	53	62	2001		64	2004		66	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The schedule for testing is being revised to correspond with the No Child Left Behind Act's requirements. Assessments in reading and math for grades four and eight will be administered in all states every other year. Assessment results for 2002 will be available Spring 2003.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2000, 2002, 2003; Schools and Staffing Survey, 1997.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> June 2003  <b>Validated By:</b> NCES.                      Data validated by National Center for Education Statistics review procedures and National Center for Education Statistics statistical standards.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The small sample (for the sub-population of American Indian and Alaska Native students) means there is a high degree of standard error surrounding the estimates and limits data collection and possibilities for comparison to other populations. These estimates will vary greatly until a larger population is surveyed.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																				
1994	48																																					
1998	47																																					
2000	43	58																																				
2002		60																																				
2004		62																																				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																				
1994	63																																					
1998	61																																					
2000	53	62																																				
2001		64																																				
2004		66																																				

<i>Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 4 who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>1996</b>	52	
<b>2002</b>		64
<b>2004</b>		66

<i>Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 8 who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>1996</b>	52	
<b>2000</b>	42	60
<b>2002</b>		62
<b>2004</b>		64

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will meet or exceed the performance standards established by states.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in schools who meet proficient and advanced performance levels in reading and math</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The 1994 Elementary and Secondary School Act requires, by 2000-01, disaggregation of achievement data submitted by states to reflect American Indian and Alaska Native proficiency levels on state assessments.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Reports  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Verified by Department attestation process and Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.  <b>Limitations:</b> Substantial variation across states in their definitions of proficient student performance.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2004</b>		35		

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Student promotion and graduation: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will graduate at rates comparable to all students.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<i>Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Natives 20 to 24 years old who are high school graduates</i> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>70</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td></td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>82</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1998	70		2000		75	2001		80	2004		82	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Projects are targeting services to reduce dropouts and increase the graduation rates of American Indian and Alaska Native students. Increased promotion and graduation completion are expected.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCES Transcript Data, 2000-01.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p>Census data validated by the Census Bureau review procedures and Census standards; OIE Annual Performance Report data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedures applied; National Center for Educational Statistics Transcript data. Validated by the National Center for Educational Statistics review procedures and National Center for Educational Statistics statistical standards.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Participation in Census surveys varies by regions and location, resulting in undercount of population.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
1998	70																		
2000		75																	
2001		80																	
2004		82																	

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

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Increasing percentages of the teacher and principal workforces serving American Indian and Alaska Native students will themselves be American Indian and Alaska Native.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																								
<i>Percentage of principals and teachers in public schools with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students</i> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Year</th> <th colspan="2">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="2">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Principals</th> <th>Teachers</th> <th>Principals</th> <th>Teachers</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1994</td> <td>13</td> <td>15</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>18</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>20</td> <td>22</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		Principals	Teachers	Principals	Teachers	1994	13	15			2001			18	20	2004			20	22	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Projects to train teachers were funded in FY 1999 for the first time since FY 1994. Because the projects are just beginning, some of the targeted number of participants will take part in these programs, and the number will increase.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Schools and Staffing Survey, 1999; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools (1998-99 and 2000-01).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> June 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> NCES.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Sample size is small, and it is costly to add supplemental samples to data collection programs. National sample results in an under-representation in sample count.  <b>Improvements:</b> Monitor the number of American Indian and Alaska Native students through LEA's reporting on program effectiveness in their Annual Performance Report.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets																											
	Principals	Teachers	Principals	Teachers																										
1994	13	15																												
2001			18	20																										
2004			20	22																										

# Improving Literacy Through School Libraries - 2004

CFDA Number: [84.364](#) - Literacy through School Libraries

## Goal 8: To improve literacy skills and academic achievement of students by providing students with increased access to up-to-date school library materials and resources.

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of schools/districts served by Improving Literacy through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The first program year for grantees receiving funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries is 2003-2004. Data collected for this school year will provide the baseline. (The code for setting a baseline is 999.)	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Improving Literacy through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; Program Evaluation of 2005 by Department of Education.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Difference in rate of increase between participating schools and non-participating schools.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The first program year for grantees receiving funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries is 2003-2004. Data collected for this school year will provide the baseline. (The code for setting a baseline is 999.)	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Improving Literacy through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; Program Evaluation of 2005 by Department of Education.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

# Magnet Schools Assistance Program - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.165 - Magnet Schools Assistance

## Goal 8: To assist in the desegregation of schools served by local educational agencies.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Federally funded magnet programs eliminate, reduce, or prevent the incidence and the degree of minority student isolation in targeted schools.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Magnet schools will eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation according to their individual objectives by successfully attracting and enrolling students whose demographic composition is consistent with and furthers a school's specific objective for the reduction, prevention or elimination of minority group isolation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of Magnet schools that have met their objectives to reduce, prevent, or eliminate minority group isolation.</i>				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> MSAP Performance Reports  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Data Available:</b> June 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.  <b>Limitations:</b> Data are self reported.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		50		
2004		55		
2005		60		
2006		65		
2007		70		



# ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.366A - Mathematics and Science Partnership program

**Goal 8: To improve the quality of mathematics and science teachers and increase both the number of highly qualified math and science teachers and the achievement of students participating in Mathematics and Science Partnerships programs**

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

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in MSP schools: the number or percentage of elementary certified teachers who significantly increase their knowledge of mathematics and science.</b>											
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="padding: 2px;"><i>Percentage of K-5 teachers who significantly increase knowledge of mathematics and science.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>Year</b></td> <td style="width: 45%; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>Actual Performance</b></td> <td style="width: 40%; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>Performance Targets</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>2004</b></td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">999</td> </tr> </table>			<i>Percentage of K-5 teachers who significantly increase knowledge of mathematics and science.</i>			<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	<b>2004</b>		999
<i>Percentage of K-5 teachers who significantly increase knowledge of mathematics and science.</i>											
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>									
<b>2004</b>		999									
<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to set a baseline. (The code for setting a baseline is 999.) The target for FY 2005 is baseline +1.</p>											
<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Report; MSP Project Performance Reports</p>											

<b>Indicator 8.1.2 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>											
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="padding: 2px;"><i>Percentage of highly qualified middle school (Grades 6-8) teachers.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>Year</b></td> <td style="width: 45%; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>Actual Performance</b></td> <td style="width: 40%; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>Performance Targets</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>2004</b></td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">999</td> </tr> </table>			<i>Percentage of highly qualified middle school (Grades 6-8) teachers.</i>			<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	<b>2004</b>		999
<i>Percentage of highly qualified middle school (Grades 6-8) teachers.</i>											
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>									
<b>2004</b>		999									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="padding: 2px;"><i>Percentage of highly qualified high school (Grades 9-12) teachers.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>Year</b></td> <td style="width: 45%; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>Actual Performance</b></td> <td style="width: 40%; text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>Performance Targets</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;"><b>2004</b></td> <td style="padding: 2px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">999</td> </tr> </table>			<i>Percentage of highly qualified high school (Grades 9-12) teachers.</i>			<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	<b>2004</b>		999
<i>Percentage of highly qualified high school (Grades 9-12) teachers.</i>											
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>									
<b>2004</b>		999									
<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to set a baseline. (The code for setting a baseline is 999.) The target for FY 2005 is baseline +1.</p>											
<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Report; MSP Project Performance Reports</p>											

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

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Student achievement in MSP schools: the percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced on State mathematics assessments.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced in mathematics.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data from SY 2003-2004 will set the baseline. The target for FY 2005 is baseline +1.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report; PBDMI</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

# Migrant Education - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.011 - Migrant Education\_State Grant Program

**Goal 8: To assist all migrant students in meeting challenging academic standards and achieving graduation from high school (or a GED program) with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.**

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

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

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Number of States meeting performance target in Reading--Elementary</i>							<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 - 2002</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> June 2003</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The States reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from one year to the next. States are also re-designing assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same States or measure from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children have been included in the assessment systems.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			<p><b>Explanation:</b> 2002 data are not yet available.</p>		
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results			Percent of students at or above proficient
1996	4	10	50					
1997	4	15	50					
1998	7	18	50					
1999	2	19	50					
2000	5	26	50					
2001	6	23	50					
2002				8	27			50
2003				10	32		50	
2004				14	36	50		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 6: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the middle school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in reading.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality			
<i>Number of States meeting performance target in Reading--Middle</i>							<p><b>Explanation:</b> 2002 data are not yet available.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 - 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2003</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The States reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from one year to the next. States are also re-designing assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same States or measure from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children have been included in the assessment systems.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 - 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2003</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The States reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from one year to the next. States are also re-designing assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same States or measure from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children have been included in the assessment systems.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets						
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient				
1996	2	10	50							
1997	3	15	50							
1998	6	18	50							
1999	4	18	50							
2000	2	23	50							
2001	7	21	50							
2002				9	25	50				
2003				11	29	50				
2004				15	32	50				

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 6: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the elementary school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in mathematics.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality			
<i>Number of States meeting performance target in Math--Elementary</i>							<p><b>Explanation:</b> 2002 data are not yet available.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 - 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2003</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The States reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from one year to the next. States are also re-designing assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same States or measure from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children have been included in the assessment systems.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 - 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2003</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The States reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from one year to the next. States are also re-designing assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same States or measure from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children have been included in the assessment systems.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets						
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient				
1996	4	10	50							
1997	5	15	50							
1998	9	18	50							
1999	6	19	50							
2000	7	25	50							
2001	10	23	50							
2002				12	27	50				

<b>2003</b>				14	32	50
<b>2004</b>				18	36	50

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

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

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of States meeting performance target in Math--Middle</i>							<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 - 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2003</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The States reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from one year to the next. States are also re-designing assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same States or measure from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children have been included in the assessment systems.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets			
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	
<b>1996</b>	3	10	50				
<b>1997</b>	3	15	50				
<b>1998</b>	7	18	50				
<b>1999</b>	4	18	50				
<b>2000</b>	2	22	50				
<b>2001</b>	4	20	50				
<b>2002</b>				6	24	50	
<b>2003</b>				8	28	50	
<b>2004</b>				12	32	50	

**Indicator 8.1.5 of 6: Reducing Dropout Rate: In an increasing number of states, a decreasing percentage of migrant students will dropout from secondary school (grades 7 - 12).**

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Numbers of States Meeting Performance Target (of States reporting) -- Dropout Rate</i>							<p><b>Explanation:</b> [Note: This indicator is new. 2004 data will set baseline. As the data are not yet available, "999" is the code for baseline data that will be forthcoming.]</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report (proposed).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data on the number of high school migrant dropouts is not available currently.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> An element of the forthcoming Consolidated State Performance Report will collect information on the number and percent of migrant students who drop out of school between the grades 7 through 12 annually.</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets				
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students who drop out of school	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students who drop out of school		
<b>2004</b>				999	999	999		

**Indicator 8.1.6 of 6: Achieving High School Graduation: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will graduate from high school.**

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Numbers of States Meeting Performance Target (of States reporting) -- High School Graduation</i>							<p><b>Explanation:</b> [Note: This indicator is new. 2004 data will set baseline. As the data are not yet available, "999" is the code for baseline data that will be forthcoming.]</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Report (proposed).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data on the number of migrant who graduate from high school is not available currently.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> An element of the forthcoming Consolidated State Performance Report will collect information on the number and percent of migrant students who graduate from high school annually.</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets				
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students who graduate from high school	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students who graduate from high school		
<b>2004</b>				999	999	999		

# ESEA: National Writing Project - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.928 - National Writing Project (OII)

## Goal 8: To improve the quality of student writing and learning.

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To support and promote the establishment of teacher training programs designed to improve the writing skills of students and teachers. NWP sites will develop methods to assess student writing.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Students taught by NWP teachers will show improved student writing skills.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of students of NWP trained teachers who achieve effectiveness in major areas of writing competence such as persuasive and rhetorical and those students who demonstrate clear control of the writing conventions of usage, mechanics, and spelling will increase.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> Data will be available annually by 2004. Progress will be reported each June. 2004 data will be used as baseline data and succeeding years will be used to measure progress.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Sites will determine assessment instruments to be used (possible examples are Academy for Educational Development-derived tests and the NAEP Test of Writing) in cooperation with the NWP Research Division.</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> June 2004</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

# Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) - 2004

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

**Goal 8: To ensure that neglected and delinquent children and youth will have the opportunity to meet the challenging state standards needed to further their education and become productive members of society.**

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

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Progress and achievement: The percent of neglected or delinquent students obtaining a secondary school diploma, or its recognized equivalent, or obtaining employment will increase.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percent of N or D students obtaining diploma, diploma equivalent, or employment</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> This is a new measure. Data collected for 2004 will provide the baseline; targets will be set based on the baseline data.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>				999
<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: High school course credits: The number of high school course credits earned by neglected or delinquent students will increase.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Average number of high school course credits earned by N or D students.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> This is a new measure. Data collected for 2004 will provide the baseline; targets will be set based on the baseline data.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Study of State Agency Activities under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>				999
<b>Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Academic skills: Neglected or delinquent students shall have the same opportunities to learn as students served in regular classrooms. The academic skills of neglected or delinquent students served will increase, closing this gap.</b>				



Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of N or D students that improve academic skills as measured on approved and validated measures.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> This is a new measure. Data collected for 2004 will provide the baseline; targets will be set based on the baseline data.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Study of State Agency Activities under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
<b>Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Transition plan: The percent of students who have a high quality transition plan will increase.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of N or D students with transition plan.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> This is a new measure. Data collected for 2004 will provide the baseline; targets will be set based on the baseline data.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Study of State Agency Activities under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

# ESEA: Parental Assistance Information Centers - 2004

CFDA            84.310 - Parental Assistance Centers  
 Numbers:      84.310A - .

## Goal 8: To increase information and options for parents.

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

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Increasing numbers of parents of children attending schools that are not making adequate yearly progress, who participate in PIRC activities, will receive information on their State Accountability systems, rights and opportunities for supplemental services and public school choice options.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> This will be a new indicator based on a program priority. There is insufficient information available to pre-determine a reasonable baseline number for the first year. Consequently, actual data collected for the first year will serve as the baseline and growth based on that number will be used to establish the performance targets for succeeding years. In 2004, the number of parents of children attending schools that are not making adequate yearly progress reported to have received the information they need to understand their State Accountability systems and the options available to them under section 1116 of the ESEA will establish the baseline for performance targets in succeeding years.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Performance reporting requirements for the PIRC program are being revised to incorporate the collection of information needed to respond to this indicator.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report</b>  <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b> Parent Information Resource Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Performance Reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

# Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution - 2004

## Goal 8: To motivate low income children to read.

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of low-income children who receive books and reading services through the Reading is Fundamental Program.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> 2003 establishes the baseline year. The target for 2004 is baseline plus 5 percent. The target for 2005 is the baseline plus 10 percent. The target for 2006 is the baseline plus 15 percent.	<b>Frequency:</b> Annually.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		

# ESEA: Ready to Teach - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.286 - Ready to Change

**Goal 8: To improve student achievement by developing high quality, standards-based digital professional development to teachers and by developing high quality, standards-based digital classroom content.**

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

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Students participating in Ready to Teach will demonstrate enhanced academic achievement.									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>Students who participate in Ready To Teach programs and demonstrate enhanced academic achievement.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 5px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2004</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>2004</b>		999	<p><b>Progress:</b> The 2005 performance target is 5% over the 2004 baseline target. Steady progress is anticipated.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> The following data may be collected: test scores, participation in more rigorous course-taking, or any other established measure of achievement. Materials developed under Ready To Teach are intended for distribution beyond the project period, although the support resources needed to maximize the resources may not be available without continued funding. During the Ready To Teach pilot phase in 2003, more than 7000 educators were impacted by Ready To Teach. As this program approaches national dissemination, it is expected that this number will increase substantially in coming years and thereby will impact the enhanced academic achievement of an increasing number of students.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Outside contractors' evaluation reports and projects' annual performance reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004                      Validated by outside contractors for evaluation and by Department staff.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Due to limited resources for evaluation, sample sizes are appropriate for the level of funding and the scope of these projects. Because of shifting demographics, some students may not remain in the assigned school district, but every effort will be made to track these students.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
<b>2004</b>		999							

# Ready-to-Learn Television - 2004

CFDA Number: [84.295](#) - Ready-To-Learn Television

## Goal 8: The Ready-to-Learn Television Program will enhance the learning strategies of preschool and elementary children.

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: High-quality programming and materials produced by Ready to Learn (RTL) programs will increase and provide accountability measures to yield a positive increase in readiness to learn in preschool and elementary children.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of preschool children demonstrating expressive vocabulary skills and emergent literacy skills as a result of viewing literacy based Ready to Learn television shows.</i>					<p><b>Explanation:</b> 60 percent of funds go for TV programming and the majority of the remainder to 144 Ready to Learn stations with coordinators who conduct workshops. Parents and Child Educators read one children's book to children each day. Baseline year is 2003. For the first measure, subsequent year targets will reflect a 5 percent increase over the preceding year. For the second measure, subsequent year targets will reflect a 10 percent increase over the preceding year.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Mathematica, first year research contractor.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2003</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Between the Lions	Sesame Street	Between the Lions	Sesame Street		
2003			999	999		
<i>Percentage increase in the utilization of RTL skills among parents and child educators who attend workshops.</i>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Parents or Child Educators			Parents or Child Educators		
2003				999		

# Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program--State Grants Program and National Programs - 2004

CFDA Numbers: [84.184](#) - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities\_National Programs  
[84.186](#) - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities\_State Grants

**Goal 8: To help ensure that all schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high quality drug and violence prevention programs.**

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the percentage of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities grantees that achieve results-based goals.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of grantees meeting their measurable goals and objectives.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Requirements for measuring progress toward goals and objectives have been incorporated into all applications for National Programs direct grants.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Review of program files.  <b>Frequency:</b> Other. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	84	75		
2002		85		
2003		85		
2004		85		
2005		85		
<b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grantees will demonstrate substantial progress toward achieving their results-based goals and objectives that they establish for their programs.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of grantees meeting their measurable goals and objectives.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Requirements for measuring progress toward goals and objectives have been incorporated into all applications for Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grants.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Review of program files.  <b>Frequency:</b> Other. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		75		
2004		80		
2005		85		



# ESEA: School Leadership - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.363A - School Leadership Program

**Goal 8: To increase the number of qualified assistant principals and principals serving in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.**

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

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>Percentage of all new recruits who enroll and complete training programs to become assistant principals or principals in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2004</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>2004</b>		999	<p><b>Progress:</b> For measures (a), (b) and (c): Data will be analyzed in October 2004 for reports that will be available in November.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> School Leadership Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> November 2004</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Each grantee uses its own method of recording and reporting data and inconsistencies exist.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
<b>2004</b>		999						
<p><i>The percentage of new assistant principals or principals receiving full certification/licensure will increase.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2004</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>2004</b>		999		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
<b>2004</b>		999						
<p><i>The percentage of fully certified/licensed assistant principals and principals who apply for positions in high-need schools in high-need LEAs will increase.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2004</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>2004</b>		999		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
<b>2004</b>		999						

# ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.215L - FIE/Smaller Learning Communities

**Goal 8: To assist high schools to create smaller learning communities that can prepare all students to achieve to challenging standards and succeed in college and careers.**

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

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

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants who graduate from high school based on 9th grade enrollment.</i>						<b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b>  <b>Contractor:</b> Contractor Performance Report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.		
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
<b>2001</b>	59.20							
<b>2003</b>			60.20					
<b>2004</b>			63					

<b>Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Postsecondary Transition: Increasing percentages of students in high schools receiving Small Learning Community grants plan to attend a 2- or 4-year college.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants planning to attend a 2 -or 4 year college.</i>							<b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b>  <b>Contractor:</b> Contractor Performance Report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>						
<b>2001</b>	69.90							
<b>2003</b>		70.90						
<b>2004</b>		74						

# ESEA: Star Schools Program - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.203 - Star Schools

## Goal 8: To improve student learning and teaching through the use of distance learning technologies.

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: The percentage of students participating in Star Schools courses and modules who demonstrate improved achievement in reading, math, or science.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of students demonstrating improved achievement in reading, math, or science.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> This was a new indicator in 2003. Insufficient data was reported in 2003 to establish baseline.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Therefore, baseline will be set on 2004 data; 2005 target is 5% over the 2004 baseline.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004                      Based on program review of the data reported by the grantee(s). ]</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data is difficult to aggregate because the grantees use various forms of measures to determine improved achievement.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The indicator has been modified to measure student achievement data rather than numbers of courses and modules offered.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	69.30	999		
2004		999		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Challenging content: Challenging content aligned with standards at all academic levels (including high school credit, advanced placement, adult education, and Graduate Equivalency Diploma courses) through distance education.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of full credit courses or modules offering challenging content that is aligned with standards.</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> FY 2003 annual performance and evaluation reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2003                      Based on program review of the data reported by the grantee(s). The</p>	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1994	30			
1997	81			
1998	105			

<b>1999</b>	126	
<b>2000</b>	921	
<b>2001</b>	387	
<b>2002</b>	1,502	1,000
<b>2003</b>	1,338	1,600
<b>2004</b>		1,700

program evaluation liaison and the program officers' review includes: examining the procedures that grantees use to align the standards with all academic levels; reviewing the sources of standards, strategies and procedures utilized for alignment; and verifying the evidence provided for alignment.

**Limitations:** Data are self-reported by the projects. Evidence of alignment with standards has been particularly difficult to assess in previous years.

**Improvements:** Planned validation improvements on evidence of course alignment with standards include verifying whether projects utilize content experts to review and validate the extent to which: a) content is challenging, or b) standards are appropriate for the content delivered. In addition, the indicator has been modified as follows: a) expand data collection to include elementary and secondary courses and modules offered, and b) focus specifically on projects offering reading, math, or science courses or modules.

# State Assessments - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.368 - Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments

## Goal 8: To support states in the development of state assessments.

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

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of states (including DC &amp; PR) that have reading/language arts assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> 2004 is the baseline year.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Title I review processes (Standards & Assessments external peer review process)  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2004
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		18		
2006		52		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Annual assessments: All states, DC & Puerto Rico, will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades 3 through 8 and in high schools in mathematics that align with the state's academic content standards.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>All states, DC &amp; Puerto Rico, will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades 3 through 8 and in high schools in mathematics that align with the state's academic content standards.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The performance target for this measure is set at 52 for FY 2008. States are not required to have science assessments in grades 3-8 and high school until 2007-2008. This performance measure reflects a long term goal based on requirements set up in NCLB.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Application FY 2002 and NCLB Consolidated State Report; Peer Review, Title I review processes
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		18		
2006		25		
2007		52		
2008		52		

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Annual assessments: All states, DC & Puerto Rico, will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (grades 3-5,6-8, & high school) in science that align with the state's academic content standards.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<p><i>All states, DC &amp; Puerto Rico, will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (grades 3-5, 6-8, &amp; high school) in science that align with the state's academic content standards.</i></p>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		18		
2006		21		
2007		25		
2008		52		

# ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.298 - Innovative Education Program Strategies

## Goal 8: To support state and local programs that are a continuing source of innovation and educational improvement.

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

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of LEAs targeting Title V funds to strategic activities.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> School Year 2002-2003 data will be used to set the baseline. The number 999 is the code for baseline data. Performance targets for FY 2004 will be the baseline data plus 5%.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> State Report Cards; Title V Monitoring; Consolidated State Performance Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> November 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2003</b>		999		
<b>2004</b>		999		
<i>The percentage of LEAs meeting AYP</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	LEAs that target Title V funds      LEAs that do not target Title V funds	LEAs that target Title V funds      LEAs that do not target Title V funds		
<b>2003</b>		999      999		
<b>2004</b>		999      999		



# Teaching of Traditional American History - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.215X - Teaching of Traditional American History

## Goal 8: To improve student achievement by providing high-quality professional development to elementary and secondary level teachers of American history.

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

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Teachers in a nationally representative sample of TAH projects will report improvement of their knowledge and skills as a result of professional development activities.</b>					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of teachers in a nationally representative sample of TAH projects who report improvement of their knowledge and skills.</i>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>		<b>Explanation:</b> Baseline or interim data will be obtained in 2003. The 2004 target is 10 percent over the baseline.  <b>Additional Source Information:</b> SRI Evaluation survey and case study data and grantee evaluation data  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004
<b>2003</b>			999		

<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Students in randomized studies of educational effectiveness who are in classes taught by teachers in a TAH project will demonstrate higher achievement on course content measures and/or on statewide U.S. history assessments than students in control groups.</b>					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of students in randomized studies of educational effectiveness who demonstrate higher achievement than those in control groups.</i>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>		<b>Explanation:</b> Baseline will be established in 2003 for the first cohort (up to 10 studies). Interim data for the first cohort will be obtained in 2004 and the target will be baseline plus 10 percent for 2005. Final data on the first cohort will be obtained in 2005. Baseline data for the second cohort will be obtained in 2004. In 2005, interim data on the second cohort will be obtained and the target for 2006 will be baseline plus 10 percent. In 2006, final data for the second cohort will be obtained.  <b>Additional Source Information:</b> SRI Evaluation survey and case study data and grantee evaluation data.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004
	First Cohort	Second Cohort	First Cohort	Second Cohort	
<b>2003</b>			999		
<b>2004</b>				999	
<b>2005</b>			75		
<b>2006</b>				75	

# Title I Grants for Schools--ESEA - 2004

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

## Goal 8: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Performance of the lowest-achieving students and students in high poverty public schools will increase substantially in reading and mathematics.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of low-income 4th grade students scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels in reading on the NAEP.</i>					<b>Explanation:</b> The NAEP reading test is administered biennially and is on a 2003, 2005, 2007 schedule.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) 4th grade Reading Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> NCES.
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Percentage at or above proficient	Percentage at or above basic	Percentage at or above proficient	Percentage at or above basic		
<b>2000</b>	13	39				
<b>2002</b>			14	40		
<b>2003</b>			15	41		
<b>2005</b>			16	42		
<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Student performance on national assessments: The mathematics performance of low-income 8th grade students on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).</b>					<b>Explanation:</b> The NAEP mathematics for 8th grade students is administered biennially and is on a 2003, 2005, 2007 schedule.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> NAEP scores posted on NCES website.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> NCES.
Targets and Performance Data						
<i>Percentage of low-income 8th grade students scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels in mathematics on the NAEP.</i>						
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Percentage at or above proficient	Percentage at or above basic	Percentage at or above proficient	Percentage at or above basic		
<b>2000</b>	10	42				
<b>2003</b>			11	43		
<b>2005</b>			13	45		
<b>2007</b>			18	50		

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Student performance on state assessments: States with two years of assessment data and aligned content and performance standards will annually report an increase in the number of students in schools with at least 40 percent poverty who attain either proficient or advanced performance levels in reading on state assessments measures.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>States reporting increase in number of low-income students meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in reading on state assessments</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The long-range target for this indicator is that in five years (2009), 52 states will report an increase in the number of low income students who attain either proficient or advanced performance levels in reading on state assessments.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI)</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002		999		
2004		30		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: States and districts will implement standards-based accountability systems and provide effective support for school improvement efforts.**

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: Schools identified for improvement: The percentage of schools identified for improvement.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of schools identified for improvement.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003-2004 data will be the baseline; 2004-2005 data will show a 10% decrease in schools identified for improvement. The number of schools identified for improvement will continue to decline at a 10% rate each year. By 2013, no schools will be identified for improvement.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI)</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

**Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: Highly qualified staff: The number of teachers working in programs supported by Title I funds who are highly qualified, as defined in NCLB.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of highly qualified teachers working in Title I programs.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2002-2003 data will establish the baseline; subsequent years will show a 10 percent annual increase in highly qualified teachers working in programs supported by Title I funds. By the 2005-2006 school year, all teachers working in Title I supported programs will be highly qualified.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> States report highly qualified teacher information in the No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> 2004</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		

Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: State accountability plans: The number of states that fully implement their approved Accountability Plans as required in the ESEA.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of states with fully implemented Accountability Plan</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>Explanation:</b> Data collected in 2003 established the baseline; the FY 2004 target is baseline plus 10. In five years (2009), all states will have fully implemented their approved Accountability Plans.
2003		999	

# Transition To Teaching - 2004

CFDA Number: [84.350](#) - Transition to Teaching

**Goal 8: To increase the number of mid-career professionals, highly qualified paraprofessionals, and recent college graduates who are hired to teach in high need schools and to teach high need subjects.**

Objective 8.1 of 1: Objective 1

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Program participants will receive full teacher certification as a result of training and support provided by the program.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of program participants who receive full teacher certification as a result of training and support provided by the program.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The 2002 target was to set a baseline. Those baseline data are not yet available. The 2003 target is 5 percent over the baseline. The 2004 target is 5 percent over the 2003 target.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee Annual Performance Reports and Survey data.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2002				999
2006				75
Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Program participants will have teaching positions in high need schools in high need school districts.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of program participants who have teaching positions in high need schools and school districts.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The 2002 target was to set a baseline. Those baseline data are not yet available. The 2003 target is 5 percent over the baseline. The 2004 target is 5 percent over the 2003 target.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee Annual Performance Reports and Survey data.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2002				999
2006				85

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Program participants in Cohorts 1 and 2 will teach in high-need schools in high need school districts for three years or more.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of program participants in Cohorts 1 and 2 who teach in high-need schools in high need school districts for three years or more.</i>				<b>Explanation:</b> For Cohort 1, the target for 2002 was to set the baseline. The target for Cohort 1 is 5 percent over the baseline for 2003 and 5 percent over the 2003 target for 2004. For Cohort 2, the target for 2003 was to set the baseline. The target for Cohort 2 is 5 percent over the baseline for 2004 and over the 2004 target for 2005.		<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee Annual Performance Reports and survey data.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2			
<b>2002</b>			999				
<b>2003</b>				999			
<b>2006</b>			75	75			

# Troops To Teachers - 2004

**Goal 8: To increase the number of military personnel hired as public school teachers and the number who teach high need subjects through the Troops to Teachers Program.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To provide schools with highly qualified teachers who are former military personnel.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: The number of individuals who register for the Troops to Teachers Program as a result of outreach efforts in the U.S. and abroad.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The number of individuals who register for the Troops to Teachers Program as a result of outreach efforts in the U.S. and abroad.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> 2003 is the baseline year. The target for 2004 is baseline plus 33 percent. The target for 2005 is an additional 33 percent and the target for 2006 is 33 percent over that of 2005.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual performance reports submitted by the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES).  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003				999
Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: The number of participants earning teacher certification in the high needs areas of math, science, and special education.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The number of participants earning teacher certification in the high needs areas of math, science, and special education.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> 2003 is the baseline year. The target for 2004 is the baseline plus 25 percent. The target for 2005 is an additional 25 percent increase and for 2006, an additional 25 percent increase over 2005.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual performance reports submitted by the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES).  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003				999

# Voluntary Public School Choice Program - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.361 - Voluntary Public School Choice

## Goal 8: To assist States and local school districts in creating, expanding, and implementing a public school choice program.

**Objective 8.1 of 1: The Voluntary Public School Choice Program increases the number of students moving from low performing to higher performing schools.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The number of families who exercise public school choice will increase.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The number of students exercising their choice to transfer from low performing to higher performing schools.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> A baseline will be set in FY 2003. The FY 2004 target is 10 percent over the baseline. Choosing not to transfer is considered exercising the option.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> COSMOS Corporation, contractor secured through PPSS for the National Evaluation of the Voluntary Public School Choice Program.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
<b>2003</b>				999



# National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Statistics and Assessment - 2004

CFDA Numbers: 84.830 - Statistics  
84.902 - Assessments

## Goal 8: To collect, analyze, and disseminate information on the condition of education in the United States and to provide comparative international statistics.

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Provides timely, useful, and comprehensive data that are relevant to policy and educational improvement.**

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES publications</i>							<p><b>Explanation:</b> The next data collection for NCES on customer service will not render data until December 2003 and will not be released until 2004.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCES Customer Satisfaction Survey.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> NCES. Data will be validated by using NCES review procedures and by applying NCES statistical standards.</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets				
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility		
<b>1997</b>	88	72	86					
<b>1999</b>	91	77	89	85	85	85		
<b>2001</b>	90	74	90	90	90	90		
<b>2004</b>				90	90	90		
<i>Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES data files</i>								
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness				
<b>1997</b>	82	52						
<b>1999</b>	87	67	85	85				
<b>2001</b>	88	66	90	90				
<b>2004</b>			90	90				

<i>Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES services</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness
1997	89			
1999	93	93	85	85
2001	83	88	90	90
2004			90	90

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Timeliness of NAEP data for Reading and Mathematics Assessment in support of the President's No Child Left Behind initiative.**

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: The time from the end of data collection to initial public release of results in reading and mathematics assessments shall be reduced from 15 months to 6 months.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>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.</i>				<b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> NCES. Data will be validated by using NCES review procedures and by applying NCES statistical standards.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	15			
2005		6		

# ESRA: Regional Educational Laboratories - 2004

**Goal 8: Support evidence-based educational improvement through high-quality, relevant, useful applied research, development, technical assistance, and dissemination.**

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Quality of products and project designs: The percentage of new evidence-based products and project designs that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of new evidence-based products and project designs with average reviewer ratings for quality of "high and above" and "very high and above." If there is a large number of new evidence-based products and project designs, a random sample may be assessed.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Performance in FY 2004 will become the baseline for future targets.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Report of independent review panel  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Relevance of products and project designs: The percentage of new evidence-based products and project designs that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of new evidence-based products and project designs with average reviewer ratings for relevance of "high and above" and "very high and above." If there is a large number of new evidence-based products and project designs, a random sample may be assessed.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Performance in FY 2004 will become the baseline for future targets.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Report of independent review panel.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Usefulness of products and services: The percentage of all products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice by target audiences.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>On a field survey, the percentage of a random sample of all products and services with average audience ratings for usefulness of "high and above" and "very high and above."</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Performance in FY 2004 will become the baseline for future targets.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Field survey of target audiences. <b>Frequency:</b> Other. <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 Data collected biennially or triennially.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		



## Research, Development and Dissemination - 2004

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.305 - National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum, and Assessment  
 84.305G - Reading Comprehension Research Grant Program  
 84.305H - Cognition and Student Learning Research Grant Program  
 84.305J - Preschool Curriculum Evaluation Research Grant Program  
 84.305K - Mathematics Education Research Grant Program  
 84.305L - Social and Character Development Research Grant Program  
 84.305M - Teacher Quality Research Grant Program  
 84.305W - Interagency Education Research Initiative

### Goal 8: Transform education into an evidence-based field.

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: The percentage of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that are deemed to be of high-quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that are deemed to be of high-quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b>                      IES selects a random sample of newly funded research proposals from IES. These proposals are distributed to senior scientists in education for evaluation. Data will be collected annually. This evaluation is separate from the peer review panels used to evaluate applications submitted for research funding.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p>Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel. Inclusion of only eminent senior scientists who are distinguished professors in their institutions, editors of premier research journals, and leading researchers in education and special education assures the quality of the data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	50	50		
2003		65		
2004		80		
2005		95		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: The percentage of new research and evaluation publications by IES that are deemed to be of high-quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>The percentage of new research and evaluation publications by IES that are deemed to be of high-quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>100</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>95</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	100	50	2003		70	2004		95	2005		95		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b>                      IES selects a random sample of new research and evaluation publications from IES. Publications are distributed to senior scientists in the field for review. Data will be collected annually.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p>Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel. Inclusion of only eminent senior scientists who are distinguished professors in their institutions, editors of premier research journals, and leading researchers in education and special education assures the quality of the data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
2002	100	50																	
2003		70																	
2004		95																	
2005		95																	

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>32</td> <td>32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>100</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	32	32	2002	100	75	2003		75	2004		75	2005		75		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> IES researchers evaluate all newly funded research and evaluation proposals by IES to identify projects that address causal questions and of those projects, those that utilize randomized experimental designs to answer those questions. Data will be collected annually. The 75% target for 2002-2005 recognizes that some high quality research addressing causal questions will not be able to employ randomized experimental designs.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p>Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the proposal reviewers. Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as a check of inter-rater agreement in which the 2 IES researchers independently evaluate a subset of proposals (with minimum inter-rater agreement of 90%), minimizes threats to the validity and reliability of data. Presence of a causal question is defined as instances in which the investigation is designed to examine the effects of one variable on a second variable. A causal relation might be expressed as one variable influencing, affecting, or changing another variable. A randomized experimental design is defined as instances in which there is (a) an experimental (treatment) group and one or more comparison groups and (b) random assignment of either participants to treatment and comparison groups or groups (e.g., classrooms or schools) to treat 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.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																				
2001	32	32																				
2002	100	75																				
2003		75																				
2004		75																				
2005		75																				

**Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Of new research and evaluation publications funded by IES that address causal questions, the percentage of publications that employ randomized experimental designs.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>Of new research and evaluation publications funded by IES that address causal questions, the percentage of publications that employ randomized experimental designs.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>100</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	100	75	2003		75	2004		75	2005		75		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> IES researchers evaluate all newly funded research and evaluation publications by IES to identify projects that address causal questions and of those projects, those that utilize randomized experimental designs to answer those questions. Data will be collected annually. The 75% target recognizes that some high quality studies will not be able to employ randomized experimental designs.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p>Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the proposal reviewers. Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as a check of inter-rater agreement in which the 2 IES researchers independently evaluate a subset of proposals (with minimum inter-rater agreement of 90%), minimizes threats to the validity and reliability of data. Presence of a causal question is defined as instances in which the investigation is designed to examine the effects of one variable on a second variable. A causal relation might be expressed as one variable influencing, affecting, or changing another variable. A randomized experimental design is defined as instances in which there is (a) an experimental (treatment) group and one or more comparison groups and (b) random assignment of either participants to treatment and comparison groups or groups (e.g., classrooms or schools) to treat 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.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
2002	100	75																	
2003		75																	
2004		75																	
2005		75																	



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

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 4: The percentage of new research projects funded by IES that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational practice as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of new research projects funded by IES that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational practice as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> External panel of qualified practitioners will evaluate the relevance of a random sample of newly funded research proposals. Data will be collected annually. The final target of 75% recognizes that some important research may not seem immediately relevant, but will make important contributions over the long-term.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p>Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel. Inclusion of only experienced practitioners and administrators in education and special education assures the quality of the data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	25	25		
2003		37		
2004		50		
2005		62		
2006		75		

**Indicator 8.2.2 of 4: The percentage of K-16 policymakers and administrators who report routinely considering evidence of effectiveness before adopting educational products and approaches.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of K-16 policymakers and administrators who report routinely considering evidence of effectiveness before adopting educational products and approaches.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Survey of education decision-makers and policymakers. Data will be collected every 3 years.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.</p> <p>Data are valid to the extent that sample includes education decision-makers across high-, low-, and average-achieving districts and states, across urban and rural areas, and from all regions of the country. The sample included district superintendents, chief state school officers, and state higher education executive officers across all of these dimensions.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	42	42		
2005		66		

Indicator 8.2.3 of 4: The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse web site.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse web site.</i>			<b>Additional Source Information:</b> What Works Clearinghouse. Baseline data for number of annual hits is FY 2003.  Web-based program will automatically count hits on web site.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003				1,000,000
2004				4,000,000
Indicator 8.2.4 of 4: Percent of What Works Clearinghouse web site users surveyed randomly who responded to the question, " Would they recommend the WWC web site to a colleague or friend" (by checking "agree" or "strongly agree")				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percent of What Works Clearinghouse web site users surveyed randomly who responded to the question, " Would they recommend the WWC web site to a colleague or friend" (by checking "agree" or "strongly agree").</i>			<b>Additional Source Information:</b> What Works Clearinghouse. Baseline data for web site users who would recommend it is FY 2004.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2004				60
2005				70

# Institutional Development, Title III & Title V - 2004

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

**Goal 8: To improve the capacity of Minority-Serving Institutions, that traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high quality educational opportunities for their students.**

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

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Academic Quality: The percentage of Title III and Title V project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.</b>														
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
<p><i>The percentage of project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that have been met or exceeded.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2002</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">75</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2003</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">75</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2004</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>2002</b>		75	<b>2003</b>		75	<b>2004</b>		75
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets												
<b>2002</b>		75												
<b>2003</b>		75												
<b>2004</b>		75												
<p><b>Explanation:</b> In order to better measure the success of these programs new GPRA indicators were developed in 2002 based on the new Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR was designed with extensive consultation with the grant community. These indicators provide program success information across the diverse types of institutions as well as across the seven different programs within this one GPRA program report. February 2003 will be the first time that data will be available for these indicators.</p>														
<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Data Available:</b> February 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.  <b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>														

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management or fiscal stability that have been met or exceeded.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> In order to better measure the success of these programs new GPRA indicators were developed in 2002 based on a new Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR was designed with extensive consultation with the grant community. These indicators provide program success information across the diverse types of institutions as well as across the seven different programs within this one GPRA program report. February 2003 will be the first time that data will be available for these indicators.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> February 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002		75		
2003		75		
2004		75		

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of Title III and Title V project goals relating to the improvement of student services or student outcomes that have been met or exceeded.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> In order to better measure the success of these programs new GPRA indicators were developed in 2002 based on the new Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR was designed with extensive consultation with the grant community. These indicators provide program success information across the diverse types of institutions as well as across the seven different programs within this one GPRA program report. February 2003 will be the first time that data will be available for these indicators.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> February 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002		75		
2003		75		
2004		75		

# Byrd Honors Scholarships Program - 2004

CFDA Number: [84.185](#) - Byrd Honors Scholarships

## Goal 8: To promote student excellence and to recognize exceptionally able students who show promise of continued excellence

Objective 8.1 of 1: Byrd scholars will successfully complete postsecondary education programs at high rates.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of Byrd scholars graduating within 4 years</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Prior to 2002, we collected data that show receipt of four years of funding or graduation. As of 2002, we changed the definition of data collected to report only four-year graduation rates. Therefore, in 2002, there is a significant decline in the performance measure.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by states, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are based on grantee reports of varying quality and accuracy on the number of Byrd Scholars graduating.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	22	90		
2003		26		
2004		26		

# HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents in School - 2004

CFDA Number: [84.335](#) - Child Care Access Means Parents in School

## Goal 8: To support the participation of low-income parents in the postsecondary education system through the provisions of campus-based child care services.

### Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase access for low-income parents to postsecondary education

#### Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Persistence rate: The percentage of students receiving child care services who persist in postsecondary education

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

#### Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Completion rate: The percentage of students receiving child care services who complete postsecondary education.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Median percentage of completion rate (2001 cohort)</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> the 2001 cohort of students receiving child care services, performance data were collected through 18 month Performance Reports (covering the period October 2001 through March 2003) and are presented under 2003, the end of the performance period. The 36 month performance report will contain data through September 2004. Data for the 2002 cohort of students are being collected for the 18 month Performance Report for the period</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantees are required to submit 18 and 36 month performance reports.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data are supplied by child care centers with no formal verification procedure provided</p>	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	18 month report	36 month report			
2003	25				30
2004					30
<i>Median percentage of completion rate (2002 cohort)</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		

	18 month report	36 month report	
<b>2004</b>			September 2002 through March 2004 and for the 36 month Performance Report for the period ending August 2005.
<b>2005</b>		30	

# HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.149A - College Assistance Migrant Program

## Goal 8: Assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students to successfully complete their first academic year of college and to continue at a post secondary education.

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

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>CAMP participants completing the first year of their academic or postsecondary program.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> The proportion of CAMP students who have completed their 1st year of college remains high at 80% but did not increase. This was because the new grantees, who are institutions of higher education did not receive grant award notification until August which made it difficult to met or exceed the target.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> February 2004</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p>Data were supplied by grantees. No froman verification procedure has been applied.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Improvements will be addressed in the Office of Migrant Education 2004 data Improvement plan</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	82			
2002	80			
2003		82		
2004		83		
2005		85		

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

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: CAMP students continue in Postsecondary: A Majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first year of college will continue in postsecondary education.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of CAMP students who after completing first year continue their postsecondary education.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> The proportion of CAMP students who, after successfully completing their first year of college then continue their college</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		



<b>2001</b>	78		<p>education continues to remain high at 75 percent. During the 2001-2002 time period this percentage decreased slightly, by 3 percent. This was because the new grantees, who are institutions of higher education did not receive grant award notification until August which made it difficult to met or exceed the target.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> February 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  Data were supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure has been applied.</p>
<b>2002</b>	75		
<b>2003</b>		78	
<b>2004</b>		79	
<b>2005</b>		80	

# TRIO Programs - 2004

CFDA Numbers: 84.042 - TRIO\_Student Support Services  
84.044 - TRIO\_Talent Search  
84.047 - TRIO\_Upward Bound  
84.047M - TRIO - Upward Bound Math/Science  
84.066 - TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers  
84.217A - TRIO - McNair Post-baccalaureate Achievement

**Goal 8: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Increase postsecondary enrollment rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of Upward Bound participants enrolling in college.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Upward Bound (UB): College Enrollment (percent)</i>					<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data from the national evaluation of Upward Bound provides the baseline data. The Upward Bound performance reports are and will be used to determine if the performance targets are met. The long-term goals for UB are to maintain the current overall enrollment rate while increasing the percentage of higher-risk students who are served, and to increase the enrollment rate of higher-risk students to 37% by 2007.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  No formal verification of performance report data The data are self-reported</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The national evaluation has provided baseline data for UB and also provides data on appropriate comparison groups. However, the evaluation cannot be used to measure program improvements on an annual basis.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Overall Enrollment	High-Risk Enrollment	Overall Enrollment	High-Risk Enrollment		
<b>2000</b>	65	34				
<b>2001</b>			65			
<b>2002</b>			65			
<b>2003</b>			65	35		
<b>2004</b>			65	35.50		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase postsecondary persistence and completion rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.**

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Postsecondary persistence and completion: Percentages of Student Support Services participants persisting and completing a degree at the same institution.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Student Support Services (SSS): College persistence (percent) and completion (percent)</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data from the national evaluation of Student Support Services provides the baseline data. The performance reports are and will be used to determine if the performance targets are met. The long-term goals for SSS are to increase the persistence and completion rates to 70% and 31%, respectively, by 2007. The college completion baseline of 29% includes only SSS students who remain at the same school through graduation. It has been set at this level because the annual performance reports will only report the academic progress of SSS participants that remain at the grantee institution. The national evaluation indicates that 68% of SSS participants complete at least an Associates degree at any college within 6 years. The long-term goal is intended to increase this rate to 70%.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004 No formal verification of performance report data. The data are self-reported.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The national evaluation provided baseline data for SSS and also provides data on appropriate comparison groups. However, the evaluation cannot be used to measure program improvements on an annual basis.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets				
	College Persistence	College Completion	College Persistence				College Completion
1999	67	29					
2000	67		67				29
2001			67				29
2002			67				29
2003			68				29.50
2004			68.50	30			

**Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Graduate school enrollment and persistence: Percentages of McNair participants enrolling and persisting in graduate school.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>McNair: Graduate school enrollment (percent) and persistence (percent)</i>					<p><b>Explanation:</b> The 1998-99 annual performance reports provide the baseline data for the McNair program. The McNair performance reports are and will be used to determine if the performance targets are met. Performance targets for 2003 and 2004 have been increased to reflect expected program outcomes.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. The data are self reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Enrollment	Persistence	Enrollment	Persistence		
1999	35	48				
2000	35	75	35	48		
2001			35	48		
2002			35	48		
2003			36	75		
2004			36	75		

# HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers - 2004

**Goal 8: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.**

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of EOC participants enrolling in college**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>EOC's : College Enrollment (percent)</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> This indicator is being introduced for the first time. The 2000 baseline from the EOC Annual Performance Reports is the only data currently available.</p>	<p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	57			
2001		57		
2002		57		
2003		57		
2004		57		
2005		57.50		
2006		58		
2007		58.50		

## HEA: TRIO Talent Search - 2004

**Goal 8: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.**

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

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Talent Search : College Enrollment (percent)</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> This indicator is being introduced for the first time. The 2000 baseline from the Talent Search Annual Performance Reports is the only data currently available.</p>	<p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	College Enrollment	College Enrollment		
<b>2000</b>	73			
<b>2001</b>		73		
<b>2002</b>		73		
<b>2003</b>		73		
<b>2004</b>		73.50		
<b>2005</b>		74		
<b>2006</b>		74.50		
<b>2007</b>		75		

# Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education - 2004

CFDA Number: [84.116](#) - Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

## Goal 8: To improve postsecondary education by making grants to institutions in support of reform and innovation.

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of FIPSE grantees reporting full project dissemination to others</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FIPSE considers itself successful on this measure if 90% or more projects result in project models being adapted on other campuses.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Final Report Scorecard</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Similar results from site visit scorecard.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data supplied by project directors in response to survey instruments. Have revised form to match indicators more closely. Planning an external evaluation of the Comprehensive Program through PES around these indicators.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	92			
1999	100			
2000	83	100		
2001	96	85		
2002	94.50	95		
2003		95		
2004		95		
2005		96		
2006		96		
2007		97		

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

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Projects sustained: The number of projects sustained at least 2 years beyond Federal funding.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of Projects reporting institutionalization on their home campuses</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FIPSE's emphasis on institutional contributions to projects and development of long-term continuation plans are designed to embed projects within campus structures. Expect the rate of institutionalization to be in the 90-100% range, but not 100% each year.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Final Report Scorecard. Assessment of projects based on review of final reports sent in at the completion of projects.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Similar Data from Site Visit Score Card. Assessment of project drawn from on-site visitation and evaluation of projects).</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data supplied as a result of the assessment of project final reports submitted by project directors.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Planning modification of assessment to work with planned on-line assessment for 2003. External evaluation of the Comprehensive Program is currently underway.</p>
1998	93		
1999	96		
2000	94	100	
2001	100	95	
2002	96	95	
2003		95	
2004		95	
2005		96	
2006		96	
2007		97	



# Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP) - 2004

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

## Goal 8: To significantly increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education.

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Completion of academically challenging curricula: Percentage of GEAR UP students who passed prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade and Algebra 1 by the end of the 9th grade.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of GEAR UP students who passed prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade and the percentage of GEAR UP students who passed Algebra 1 by the end of the 9th grade.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> Historical performance data through 2002 show the percentages of GEAR UP students who passed prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade. Target data beginning in 2003 continue to reflect the percentage of GEAR UP students who pass prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade, and the Algebra 1 standard will now be measured via GEAR UP student passage rates by the end of the 9th grade. Data will continue to be collected on successful completion of core academic subjects and other college preparatory courses. Note that standards to enter and complete above grade level math courses (such as prealgebra and Algebra I for 7th graders) are becoming more rigorous. This practice may limit the percentage of students in many schools served by GEAR UP who are entering and completing such courses. Also Note that data for Year 2001 were obtained from the GEAR UP Annual Performance Report covering April 2000 - March 2001. Data for Year 2002 were obtained from the GEAR UP Annual Performance Report covering April 2001 - March 2002.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency; and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets				
	Prealgebra		Prealgebra				Algebra 1
<b>2001</b>	18						
<b>2002</b>	18						
<b>2003</b>			19				19
<b>2004</b>			20				20
<b>2007</b>			35	70			

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

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Attendance and promotion: Program participants will have high rates of attendance in school and be promoted to the next grade level on time.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentages of participating 7th graders with fewer than five unexcused absences in the first two quarters of the academic year.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data reflect the percentages of participating 7th graders with fewer than 5 unexcused absences in the first 2 quarters of the academic year and those promoted to the next grade level. Data will continue to be collected on school attendance and grade level promotions, and in future years on high school completion and postsecondary education enrollment. Note that standards for promotion have become more rigorous in many school districts and states that have GEAR UP programs.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2003</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p>GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency; and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Attendance	Attendance		
2001	83			
2002	88			
2003		89		
2004		90		
2007		92		
<i>Percentages of participating 7th graders promoted to the next grade level.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Promotion	Promotion		
2001	98			
2002	97			
2003		97		
2004		97		
2007		98		

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Increase educational expectation for participating students and students and family knowledge and postsecondary education options, preparation, and financing.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of parents of program participants that have knowledge of available financial aid.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data reflect the percentages of GEAR UP students and their parents who have talked to school counselors, advisors, or someone else about academic preparation for college and college entrance requirements; as well as the percentages of GEAR UP students' parents who have talked to school counselors, advisors, or someone else about availability of financial assistance. Data will continue to be collected on students and parents' knowledge of postsecondary education entrance requirements, costs of attendance, and financial aid opportunities.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2003</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p>GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency; and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets			
	Parents: Aid	Parents: Aid			
2001	24				
2002	31				
2003		32			
2004		33			
2007		45			
<i>Percentage of program participants and their families that have knowledge of necessary academic preparation for college.</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Students: Prep	Parents: Prep	Students: Prep	Parents: Prep	
2001	50	31			
2002	53	39			
2003			54	40	
2004			56	42	
2007			75	50	

# Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) - 2004

CFDA Numbers: 84.170 - Javits Fellowships  
84.200 - Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need

## Goal 8: To increase the number of persons trained at the highest academic level

Objective 8.1 of 2: To increase the number of students of superior academic ability completing the terminal degree in designated areas of national need in order to alleviate that need.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Years of Support for Academic Study Provided to GAANN Fellows: The average number of years of additional support, beyond the 2 years of mandated institutional match to the 3-year grant period, provided to GAANN fellows by grantee programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Average number of additional years of support being provided to GAANN fellows by grantee programs.			<p><b>Explanation:</b> This is a new indicator for the program and requests grantees to go above and beyond the commitment currently required in the program regulations. As such the program office will need to publish the intent of this indicator for public comment and has not yet had an opportunity to implement the indicator. The baseline will be established in FY 2004. The competitive points will be offered beginning with the FY 2005 applications and the results will be available in December 2006.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report</b>  <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1840-0748                      GAANN Final Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Grantees are currently not required to submit performance reports beyond the 3-year grant period. Therefore, there is no method of formally validating that additional years of support are provided. This means that the only way to collect consistent data is in the application stage. Because GAANN grantees will usually apply year-after-year and therefore have an incentive to live up to their commitments, we believe that until regulatory changes can be put into place, years promised in an application is a reliable proxy for years of support actually provided.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The program office will seek to include in the program regulations a requirement that grantees must submit status updates for all years in which student support is attributable to the GAANN grant. This includes the 3-year grant period, 2-year required match, and any additional years committed to by the grantee in its application.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Enrollment of Underrepresented Populations: The percentage of GAANN fellows from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds compared to the national average of individuals from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds enrolled in programs leading to the terminal degree in the designated areas of national need.**

Targets and Performance Data						Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality					
<p><i>The difference between the percent of GAANN fellows from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds and the national average of individuals from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds enrolled in programs leading to the terminal degree in the designated areas of national need.</i></p>						<p><b>Explanation:</b> This is a new indicator for the program and the first data will be available in December 2003. Baseline will be established in 2003. 2004 data will be baseline data established in 2003 + 1%. The long-term goal for this measure is the 2003 baseline + 5%.</p>	<p><b>Source 1: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1840-0748 GAANN Final Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Source 2: NCES Survey/Assessment Survey/Assessment:</b> Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The performance of the GAANN program is limited in that the authorizing legislation recommends, but does not mandate, that grantees seek individuals from traditionally underrepresented groups when awarding fellowships. However, in responding to the selection criteria, grantees must address plans to include students from underrepresented groups.</p>					
Year	Actual Performance							Performance Targets				
	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Women			American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Women
<b>2002</b>	1	11	10	5	38							
<b>2003</b>	0	6	7	2	35							
<b>2004</b>						0	6	7	2	35		

# HEA: High School Equivalency Program - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.141A - High School Equivalency Program

**Goal 8: To assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students in obtaining the equivalent of a high school diploma, and subsequently, to begin postsecondary education, enter military service, or obtain employment.**

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: GED completion: The percentage of HEP participants who complete the program and receive the GED will continue to remain high, if not increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of HEP participants receiving a GED</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data were supplied by grantees.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996	70			
1997	66			
1998	72			
1999	73			
2000	58			
2001	53			
2003		60		
2004		60		
2005		65		

# International Education and Foreign Language Studies Program - 2004

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.015A - National Resource Centers Program  
 84.015B - Foreign Language and Area Studies Program  
 84.017 - International Research and Studies  
 84.229 - Language Resource Centers

## Goal 8: To meet the nation's security and economic needs through the development of a national capacity in foreign languages, and area and international studies.

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Maintain a US Higher Education system able to produce experts in less commonly taught languages and area studies who are capable of contributing to the needs of US Government, academic and business institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>Percentage of total national undergraduate language enrollments that are at NRC/FLAS funded institutions.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1995</td> <td>21</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>21</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td></td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td>22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>22</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		%	%	1995	21		2000	21	20	2002		20	2003		22	2004		22	<p><b>Explanation:</b> While Title VI-supported institutions account for less than 3 percent of all higher education institutions, most recent data show that they enroll 56 percent of the graduate enrolled students and 21 percent of the undergraduate enrollment in less commonly taught languages. If you count only the "least" commonly taught languages, they account for 64 percent of the graduate enrolled students and 40 percent of the undergraduate enrollments.</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> Non-NCES Survey/Research  <b>Collecting Agency:</b> .  <b>Survey/Research Report Title:</b> MLA Study of Foreign Language Enrollments.  <b>References:</b> Modern Language Association (MLA) and Associations of Departments of Foreign Languages "Study of Foreign Language Enrollments." This study has been funded since 1958 through the Title VI: International Research and Studies program..  <b>Web Site:</b> <a href="http://www.mla.org/adfl/projects/index.htm">http://www.mla.org/adfl/projects/index.htm</a>.  <b>Additional Source Information:</b> Modern Language Association (MLA) conducts language enrollment survey once every three to five years. This study has been funded since 1958 through the International Research and Studies program under Title VI.  <b>Frequency:</b> Other.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2003  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      NRC and FLAS performance reports through the EELIAS system will be checked against the data from the MLA study. The MLA data has been collected long before the Department's standards for evaluating program performance data were developed. Now that data can be validated by university enrollment figures reported in annual NRC performance reports this will provide tangible secondary validation.  <b>I limitations:</b> MI A studies are conducted once every 3 to 4 years, and therefore</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
	%	%																							
1995	21																								
2000	21	20																							
2002		20																							
2003		22																							
2004		22																							
<p><i>Percentage of total national graduate language enrollments that are at NRC/FLAS funded institutions.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1995</td> <td>55</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>56</td> <td>55</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>56</td> <td>55</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		%	%	1995	55		1999	56	55	2000	56	55								
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
	%	%																							
1995	55																								
1999	56	55																							
2000	56	55																							

2002		55
2003		56
2004		58

data for the out years must be extrapolated from annual performance reports.

**Improvements:** The MLA summary datasets will be integrated into the EELIAS system to provide a performance baseline for years when MLA study is not conducted.

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Graduate Employment: National Resource Center programs who report that their graduates found employment that utilizes their language and/or area expertise.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of Ph.D. graduates of NRC institutions with positions where they use their expertise.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> NRC Ph.D. graduates become the experts that ensure national capacity in language and area studies is maintained. Data shows that the Ph.D. graduates primarily select fields where their expertise linguistic and area is best utilized. Ph.D. graduates who enter into K-12 education, foreign government, state/local government or who are unemployed or whose status is unknown are not counted toward using their expertise. M.A. graduates entering the professions help to fulfill the needs of companies, organizations and government with their area and international expertise. Many M.A. recipients continue their graduate study thus becoming the future experts. The data from the EELIAS performance reporting system showed that of the 1,782 Ph.D. graduates for 2001 no employment data was available for 343 of these graduates. IEGPS will work with grantees to develop strategies for better tracking program graduates. M.A. placement data is consistent with projected targets. M.A. continuing education data is consistent with projected targets.</p>	<p><b>Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research</b>  <b>Survey/Research Report Title:</b> EELIAS.  <b>References:</b> National Resource Center Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system..  <b>Web Site:</b> <a href="http://www.eeliasonline.net/">http://www.eeliasonline.net/</a>.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002  <b>Data Available:</b> November 2003  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  <b>Limitations:</b> NRCs have difficulty tracking program graduates. Currently, most graduate tracking is the responsibility of a universities alumni association. NRCs will work toward collaborating better with these associations to get better data on graduate placements.  <b>Improvements:</b> Collection of the data via the EELIAS reporting system has improved the ability of Program staff to conduct analyses of performance data. Once three years of data are available in the EELIAS system, long term projections and performance targets will be easier to measure.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	%	%		
1996	76			
2000	80	76		
2001	71	76		
2002		76		
2003		76		
2004		78		
<i>Percent of M.A. graduates of NRC institutions with positions where they use their expertise.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	%	%		
1996	44			
2000	54	44		
2001	52	44		
2002		44		
2003		44		
2004		78		



<i>Percentage of M.A. graduates continuing their graduate studies and pursuing Ph.D.s.</i>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	%	%
1996	24	
2000	26	24
2001	34	24
2002		24
2003		32
2004		34

**Objective 8.2 of 2: To establish an Institute for International Public Policy (IIPP) to conduct a program to significantly increase the numbers of underrepresented minorities in the international service.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Graduate Placement: The number of IIPP program graduates who are employed in the international service.</b>			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of IIPP program graduates employed in international service.</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Previously, graduate data was collected through paper-based annual performance reports. Beginning in 2002, data will be collected through the EELIAS performance reporting system. This data will provide more information on the status of IIPP program graduates and alumni.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
	Graduates	Graduates	
2000	10	5	
2001	13	7	
2002		9	
2003		13	
2004		15	
<p><b>Explanation:</b> The IIPP comprehensive program of study is a 5-year program with six components. It currently consists of the following: (1) sophomore summer policy institute; (2) junior year abroad; (3) junior year summer policy institute; (4) post-senior-year intensive language instruction; (5) post-baccalaureate internships at international affairs agencies and organizations; and (6) Master's degree in international relations. Fellows from the first cohort completed the comprehensive program in June 2000.</p>			

	<p>The number of fellows graduated should become more consistent as the program matures. As the IIPP program graduates students more consistently, a greater pool of students with international competency becomes available for government and international organizations to draw upon. The goal of the program is to develop a positive reputation for IIPP graduates, such that they become a sought after commodity for internationally focused organizations.</p>	<p><b>Limitations:</b> The data on program graduates is being provided by the grantee, with little opportunity for the Department to double-check the data. As the number of fellows employed in international service increases, tracking all of these individuals will become more difficult.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> EELIAS system will provide greater tools for the electronic analysis of report data. This will prove useful for conducting longitudinal studies on the IIPP program graduates.</p>
--	--	--

# HEA: Javits Fellowships - 2004

CFDA 84.170 - Javits Fellowships  
 Number:

**Goal 8: To provide financial assistance to graduate students who have demonstrated superior academic ability, achievement and exceptional promise**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To enable students of superior ability in the arts, humanities, and social sciences to complete their terminal degree.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Graduate school completion: The percentage of Javits fellows who complete a terminal degree within 7 years.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Rates of doctorate attainment by Javits fellows 7 years from enrollment</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The Survey of Earned Doctorates collects only information on attainment of a doctorate degree. Some Javits fellows pursue programs in fields for which the terminal degree is below the doctorate level; their attainment is not accounted for.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program performance reports, 2002; Survey of Earned Doctorates, 1999.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> May 2003  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The new Annual Performance Report will require grantees to report completion data on their fellows (thus obtaining completion information on both doctoral programs and those programs where the Master of Fine Arts is the terminal degree).</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>1998</b>	30			
<b>1999</b>	26			
<b>2003</b>		29		
<b>2004</b>		30		

# HEA: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders - 2004

CFDA  
Number:

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

## Goal 8: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders Goal

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

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Improved vocational and academic achievement:: By Fall 2002, increasing percentages of students participating in vocational and academic programs will complete a degree or certificate.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Students completing a postsecondary education certificate, associate of arts or bachelor's degree in the facility during the program year</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> Positive pattern established.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> In 1999, program performance data was impacted by program start up issues and issues with reporting. As the program has matured, completion rates above 50% are becoming more normative. Given issues of maturity and mobility, these rates seem fairly positive.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Sole source is the annual grantee performance reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. No independent validation.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data is based on continuous enrollment. Therefore, the current enrollment is being compared to the outcome of graduates, including individuals served in the prior year and those still enrolled at year end. This distorts the numbers when the program is either growing or contracting. Programs differ in objectives and degrees/certificates offered, so very different outcomes are being combined. Reporting is inconsistent from State to State. Some data being combined may not be reliable.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Percentage of Students Completing	Percentage of Students Completing		
2000	25.50	25		
2001	59.60	30		
2002		50		
2003		50		
2004		50		

# Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants - 2004

CFDA Number: [84.336](#) - Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants

## Goal 8: To improve the quality of teacher education and initial certification standards, and to improve the knowledge and skills of all teachers, particularly new teachers and teachers who work in high-need areas.

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Improve the skills and knowledge of new teachers by funding the development or state policies that strengthen initial licensing standards and the development of state or local policies/programs that reduce the number of uncertified teachers.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Teacher certification/licensure: Percentage of teachers participating in the Partnership Program who meet their state's initial licensure or certification requirements.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data will determine the baseline for the percentage of teachers meeting the standard. (The code for setting a baseline is 999.) The program will set a target of the baseline + 1% for FY 2004.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Secretary's Report on the Quality of Teacher Preparation (Sec. 207).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Secretary's Report will contain self-reported data from states.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Definitions of data elements are being refined to assure consistency with definitions contained in the No Child Left Behind legislation.</p>
<i>Percentage of new teachers in districts with Partnership Programs who meet their state's certification requirements.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		

# HEA: Underground Railroad Program - 2004

## Goal 8: Underground Railroad Program Internal Goal

### Objective 8.1 of 1: Underground Railroad Program Internal Objective 1

#### Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Fundraising initiatives: Private sector support will increase by 20 percent.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Private sector support (in dollars)</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> As of June, 2003 the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center has raised a total (including pledges) of 39,000,000 in private funds and \$16,000,000 in government funds for a total of \$55,000,000.	<b>Source:</b> Non-NCES Survey/Research  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	33,717,762			
2002	35,000,000			
2003	39,000,000			
2004		41,000,000		

# Helen Keller National Center (HKNC) for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults - 2004

**Goal 8: Individuals who are deaf-blind will become independent and function as full and productive members of their local community.**

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Services to consumers at headquarters: By FY 2008, the training program at headquarters will increase the number of adult consumers who have achieved successful employment to 45% or less restrictive setting outcomes to 75%.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality			
<i>% of adult consumers placed in employment and those in less restrictive settings</i>				<p><b>Status: Target not met</b></p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> In the year 2003, 40 of the 83 individuals who terminated training had a desire to achieve a vocational outcome. Of this 40, 17 or 42.5% achieved this goal. Of the remaining 23, 22 were home seeking competitive employment or supported employment and 1 is participating in sheltered employment. Among the 20 individuals not seeking a vocational outcome, 3 received short-term training in adaptive technology, 6 were homemakers, 2 attended college, 2 attended other voc/training programs, 3 are deceased and 4 discontinued training. In addition, HKNC served 13 high school and 10 senior citizen consumers in 2003. Of the 23 consumers who terminated the program with a desire to move to less restrictive living situations, 16 or 70% achieved this goal. Data prior to 2001 were calculated using a different method and are not included for the percentage placed in less restrictive settings.</p>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Final transition plans on each client will include the employment and living situations each client will be entering upon completion of training.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> 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 it implementation. HKNC will conduct a limited survey using selected RSA regions.</p>			
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets							
	% in Less Restrictive Settings	% Placed in Employment Settings	% in Less Restrictive Settings					% Placed in Employment Settings		
1999	75	45	85					38		
2000	82	52	90					45		
2001	87	71 38	90					59 45		
2002	85	80 27	95					59 45		
2003	100	70 42.50	90					59 45		
2004			95					70 45		
2005			95					70 45		
2006			95	70 45						
2007			95	75 45						
2008			95	75 45						

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Services to consumers at headquarters: To increase the percentage of training goals achieved by consumers by participating in the training program.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of identified training goals successfully achieved by participants</i>			<p><b>Status: Target exceeded</b></p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Consumers come to HKNC with training goals that go beyond those reported in</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	92	86		

<b>2002</b>	90	86	<p>indicator 1.1. This indicator represents the percent of training goals achieved by all adult consumers served during the program year. These measurable, instructional objectives are mutually developed by the consumers and their instructors. Data prior to 2001 were calculated using a different method and are not included.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data is based upon self-reported data from the grantee and are not independently verified.</p>
<b>2003</b>	88	86	
<b>2004</b>		88	
<b>2005</b>		88	
<b>2006</b>		88	
<b>2007</b>		90	
<b>2008</b>		90	

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

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

PPMD Source: 2004PM



# Howard University - 2004

## Goal 8: To assist Howard University with financial resources needed to carry out its educational mission.

Objective 8.1 of 3: Maintain and strengthen academic programs and achievement by (1) recruiting better students, (2) improving student retention, (3) improving graduation rates, and (4) promoting excellence in teaching.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Better students: The average SAT scores of incoming freshmen will increase by 1 percent per year.									
Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress				Sources and Data Quality
<i>Average SAT score</i>									
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets				
	Math	Verbal	Total	% Change	Math	Verbal	Total	% Change	
1997	494	513	1,007						
1998	506	519	1,025	1.80					
1999	517	533	1,050	2.40			1,035		
2000	525	537	1,062	1.10			1,055	2	
2001	516	530	1,046	-1.50			1,060	.50	
2002	534	545	1,079	3.20			1,065	.50	
2003							1,080	1.40	
2004							1,082	.20	

**Additional Source Information:**  
Howard University  
**Frequency:** Annually.  
**Collection Period:** 2003  
**Data Available:** 2003  
**Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Student retention: Decrease attrition for undergraduate FTIC (first time in college) students by 2 percent until national average is bettered.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Attrition rates</i>					<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> The Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange. Howard University.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	% National Rate	% HU Rate	%		
1997	26.70	19.60			
1998	26.40	17.60			
1999	25	16			
2000	20	15.10	15		
2001	20.20	12.90	14		
2002	21	14.90	13		
2003			13		
2004			13		

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Graduation rates: The undergraduate and graduate graduation rates will increase by 2 percent per year until the national average is reached or exceeded.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>6-year graduation rate</i>					<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The reported 6-year national rate comes from the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange at the University of Oklahoma. Howard University is a member of the institution.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Consortium Rate	HU Rate			
1997		49			
1998		40.90			
1999	54.20	46.10	43		
2000	54.10	48.70	48		
2001	54.90	51.30	50		
2002	54	48.80	52		
2003			52		
2004			55		

**Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Excellence in teaching and scholarship: The number of faculty in activities of the Fund for Academic Excellence will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data						Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of proposals</i>						<p><b>Explanation:</b> The principal goals for the Fund for Academic Excellence include: 1) serving as a catalyst for increasing extramural research; 2) improving the quality of teaching and learning; and 3) encouraging new and junior faculty to participate in seeking institutional focused research.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets				
	Submitted	Funded	Number of Participants	Funded	Number of Participants		
1998	258	153	189				
1999	218	152	200				
2000	149	128	173	125	210		
2001	154	130	160	140	200		
2002	258	163	292	150	225		
2003				160	240		
2004				160	240		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: To promote excellence in research.**

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Grants received: The number of grant proposals that are funded will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of grant proposals</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Targets for 2004 remain to be determined.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	232			
1998	279			
1999	299			
2000	252	301		
2001	261	260		
2002	250	270		
2003		275		

**Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Grant funding: The total funds received through research grants will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Funds received through research grants</i>					<p><b>Explanation:</b> Targets for 2004 remain to be determined.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Value of Grants Received	% Change	Value of Grants Received	% Change		
1997	45,268,427					
1998	44,057,827	2.70				
1999	47,533,841	7.90				
2000	50,294,706	5.80	48,009,180	20		
2001	53,416,128		51,700,000			
2002	63,000,000		53,800,000			
2003			65,000,000			

**Objective 8.3 of 3: INCREASE HOWARD UNIVERSITY'S FINANCIAL STRENGTH AND INDEPENDENCE FROM FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS.**

**Indicator 8.3.1 of 4: Endowment: The value of the endowment each year will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Market value of endowment (in millions)</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> This indicator is not a measure for 2003 or 2004.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University &amp; the Chronicle of Higher Education.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Audited Financial Statements.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	211.20			
1998	252.90			
1999	297			
2000	329.30	320		
2001	340.90	346		
2002	323.70			

**Indicator 8.3.2 of 4: Outside support: The funds raised from all private sources will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Alumni contribution (in millions)</i>				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Audited Financial Statements.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	11.80			
1998	8.40			
1999	9.20			
2000	13.90	11		
2001	18.40	14.50		
2002	18.30	18		
2003		20		
2004		35		

**Indicator 8.3.3 of 4: Outside support—alumni: The participation rate of alumni who contribute to the school will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Participation rate</i>				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University. <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	11.40			
1999	9.40			
2000	12.20	25		
2001	15	30		
2002	18	32		
2003		20.50		
2004		23		

**Indicator 8.3.4 of 4: Cost savings at the Howard University Hospital: The difference between the hospital's net revenue (excluding federal appropriations) and total expenses will decrease.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Net Revenue</i>				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Howard University  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	170,084,807			
1998	183,789,977			
1999	204,360,845			
2000	213,879,600	184,510,111		
2001	216,598,823	193,735,617		
2002	225,252,566	203,422,397		
2003		226,394,000		
2004		234,522,000		
<i>Total Expense</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	209,761,348			
1998	211,689,178			
1999	234,841,266			
2000	246,819,944	225,813,215		
2001	242,028,727	237,103,876		
2002	252,072,279	248,959,070		
2003		234,286,000		
2004		233,695,000		

# IDEA Part C -- Infants and Toddlers With Disabilities - 2004

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

**Goal 8: To enhance the development of infants and toddlers with disabilities and the capacity of families to meet the special needs of their child by assisting States in providing a comprehensive system of early intervention services.**

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: FUNCTIONAL ABILITIES: By 2013, all infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in Part C will exhibit improved and sustained functional abilities.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of infants and toddlers demonstrating improved and sustained functional abilities</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Baseline data are not yet available. The IDEA Early Childhood Outcomes Center is developing data collection methods for this indicator. The target for 2013 is 100 percent.	<b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> July 2005
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		60		
2006		65		
2007		70		
2008		75		
2009		80		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: FAMILY CAPACITY: By 2013, all families served through Part C will report that early intervention services have increased their capacity to enhance their child's development.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of families reporting increased capacity.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Data for 1998 and 2001 were obtained from the IDEA National Early Intervention Study (NEILS). The IDEA Early Childhood Outcomes Center is developing data collection methods for future data collections. The target for 2013 is 100 percent.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Performance Report under IDEA  <b>Frequency:</b> Other. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	72			
2000	73	67		
2001	73			
2002		80		
2003		80		
2004		80		
2005		80		
2006		80		

2007		80		
2008		83		
2009		87		

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

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: INFANTS SERVED: The numbers if States that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under the age of 1 through Part C will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of States serving at least 1 percent</i>				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> IDEA section 618 State-reported data.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	21			
2002	23			
2003		30		
2004		37		
2005		43		
2006		48		
2007		54		
2008		57		

**Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: INFANTS AND TODDLERS SERVED: The number of States that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age2, through Part C will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of States serving at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers birth through age two</i>				<b>Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research</b> <b>Survey/Research Report Title:</b> National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study..  <b>Additional Source Information:</b> Part B, section 619 State-reported data  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	25			
2002	28			
2003		35		
2004		40		
2005		45		
2006		50		
2007		55		
2008		57		



<b>Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: SERVICE SETTINGS: The percentage of children receiving age-appropriate services primarily in home, in community-based settings, and in programs designed for typically-developing peers, will increase</b>					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of children receiving age-appropriate services primarily in home, in community-based settings, and in programs designed for typically-developing peers, will increase</i>					<b>Additional Source Information:</b> IDEA section 619 State-reported data  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>			
1996	56				
1997	58				
1998	63				
1999	67				
2000	73	67			
2001	76	69			
2002	82	71			
2003		78			
2004		79			
2005		83			
2006		84			
2007		85			
2008		86			
2009		87			

# IDEA Part B -- Grants to States and Preschool Grants Program - 2004

CFDA Numbers: [84.173](#) - Special Education\_Preschool Grants  
[84.181](#) - Special Education\_Grants for Infants and Families with Disabilities

**Goal 8: To assist State and local educational agencies in providing children with disabilities access to high quality education to help them meet challenging standards and prepare them for employment and independent living.**

Objective 8.1 of 4: All preschool children with disabilities receive services that prepare them to enter school ready to learn

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of preschool children with disabilities receiving services in inclusive settings</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Data for actual performance were rounded to the nearest whole number.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Includes children in early childhood settings and home settings from 50 States, DC, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Virgin Islands, Northern Marianas, and BIA (57 entities).  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies. New State data collections typically take up to five years to achieve reliability.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	41			
2000	40			
2001	39			
2002		39		
2003		40		
2004		40		

**Objective 8.2 of 4: All children with disabilities have access to the general curriculum and assessments, with appropriate accommodations, supports, and services, consistent with high standards.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																														
<p><i>The percentage of school age children with disabilities reported by states as being served in the regular education classroom at least 80 percent of the day</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>% of children</td> <td>% of children</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>46</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>46</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>47</td> <td>48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>47</td> <td>48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>47</td> <td>49</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td></td> <td>49</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td>48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>48</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		% of children	% of children	1997	46		1998	46		1999	47	48	2000	47	48	2001	47	49	2002		49	2003		48	2004		48	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The percentage of children served in regular education classrooms at least 80 percent of the day decreased from 47.3 percent in 2000 to 46.5 percent in 2001.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data required under IDEA. Numerator: Number served at least 80 percent of day in regular classroom. Denominator: All settings. 50 States, DC, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, Northern Marianas, and BIA (57 entities).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2003  <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																
	% of children	% of children																																
1997	46																																	
1998	46																																	
1999	47	48																																
2000	47	48																																
2001	47	49																																
2002		49																																
2003		48																																
2004		48																																
<p><i>Percentage of students excluded from NAEP - 4th Grade</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">- No Data -</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	- No Data -																												
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																
- No Data -																																		
<p><i>Percentage of students excluded from NAEP-8th Grade</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">- No Data -</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	- No Data -																												
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																
- No Data -																																		
<p><i>Percentage of students excluded from NAEP-12th Grade</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">- No Data -</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	- No Data -																												
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																
- No Data -																																		

**Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: The percentage of students with disabilities scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels on the NAEP**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of 4th grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels on the NAEP</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> For Math and Science the percentage excluded from NAEP includes public and private school students. For Reading the percentage includes only public school students. The percentage reported for 8th grade Math who met or exceeded basic levels has been corrected to 26.8 percent based on an error in reporting last year's data.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Analysis of data from National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2002  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Analysis of data from National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data on children with disabilities who meet or exceed basic standards and those who do not meet basic standards are based on very small sample sizes, and, therefore, have a low level of reliability.</p>			
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	Reading					Reading	
2002						33	
2003						35	
2005						37	
2007						47	
<i>The percentage of 8th grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels on the NAEP Mathematics Test.</i>							
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	Math					Math	
2003						28	
2005						32	
2007						42	
<i>The percentage of 12th grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels on the NAEP Reading Test.</i>							
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math			
2002			39				
2003				30			
2005			43	34			
2007			53	44			

**Objective 8.3 of 4: Secondary school students with disabilities receive the support they need to complete high school prepared for postsecondary education or employment.**

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Graduation: The percentage of children with disabilities exiting school with a regular high school diploma, and the percentage who drop out.					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of children with disabilities that drop out or exit school with a regular high school diploma</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Graduation	Drop out	Graduation	Drop out	
1996	52.60	34.10			
1997	53.50	32.70			
1998	55.40	31			
1999	57.40	28.90	56	31	
2000	56.20	29.40	57	30	
2001	57	29.40	59	27	
2002			60	26	
2003			57	29	
2004			57	29	
			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Targets for 2002-2004 reflect a decrease from prior years due to the increased use of high-stakes testing among states. This factor may produce a drop in desired results at first, before instruction catches up to standards.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data required under IDEA for 50 States, DC, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Virgin Islands, Northern Marianas, BIA (57 entities).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 - 2002  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2003  <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Supplemental descriptive information will be provided by the National Longitudinal Study II. The Department is taking steps to reduce the amount of time for collecting and reporting data.</p>

**Objective 8.4 of 4: States are addressing their needs for professional development consistent with their comprehensive system of personnel development (CSPD).**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of States with at least 90 percent of special education teachers fully certified in the area in which they are teaching</i>					<p><b>Explanation:</b> There is a clustering of states around the 90 percent goal in the indicator, which may result in unpredictable changes from year to year. However, evidence of a positive trend is expected to be evident over a 5- to 7- year period. The Department is examining the possible effects of the fully qualified personnel provisions in the <i>No Child Left Behind Act</i> on targets for this indicator. Once alignment and NCLB and IDEA is determined, this indicator may be revised. Actual data have been revised to eliminate the effect of rounding percentages upward to the nearest whole number.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State reported data required under IDEA.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 - 2002  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2002  <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	No. of States Serving Ages 3-5	No. States Serving Ages 6-21	No. of States Serving Ages 3-5	No. States Serving Ages 6-21		
<b>1996</b>	34	35				
<b>1997</b>	35	36				
<b>1998</b>	37	37				
<b>1999</b>	34	36	40	41		
<b>2000</b>	36	36	41	42		
<b>2001</b>	35	37	40	42		
<b>2002</b>			40	42		
<b>2003</b>			36	37		
<b>2004</b>			36	37		

## IDEA Part D -- National Activities - 2004

**CFDA Numbers:** [84.323](#) - Special Education\_State Program Improvement Grants for Children with Disabilities  
[84.324](#) - Special Education\_Research and Innovation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities  
[84.325](#) - Special Education\_Personnel Preparation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities  
 84.325A - IDEA Part D National Activities  
[84.326](#) - Special Education\_Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities  
 84.326R - IDEA Part D Assistance and Dissemination  
[84.327](#) - Special Education\_Technology and Media Services for Individuals with Disabilities  
[84.328](#) - Special Education\_Parent Information Centers  
 84.328M - IDEA Part D Parent Information Centers

**Goal 8: To link scientifically based practices to states, school systems and families to improve results for infants, toddlers and children with disabilities**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Programs respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Responsive to critical needs: The percentage of program funding priorities that respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress				Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of program funding priorities that respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families.</i>									
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets				
	Research & Innovation	Technology (from T&M)	Media (from T&M)	Personnel Preparation	Research & Innovation	Technology (from T&M)	Media (from T&M)	Personnel Preparation	
<b>2001</b>	82	79	82	85					
<b>2002</b>					75	75	75	75	
<b>2003</b>					75	75	75	75	
<b>2004</b>					75	75	75	75	
<b>2005</b>					75	75	75	75	
<b>2006</b>					75	75	75	75	
<b>2007</b>					75	75	75	75	
									<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Published funding priorities.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2003</p>

*The percentage of program funding priorities that respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families.*

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Technical Assistance	Parent Information	State Improvement	Technical Assistance	Parent Information	State Improvement
2001	75	90	80			
2002				75	75	75
2003				75	75	75
2004				75	75	75
2005				75	75	75
2006				75	75	75
2007				75	75	75



**Objective 8.2 of 3: Projects use high-quality methods and materials**

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Highest standards for methods and materials: The percentage of IDEA-funded projects use exceptionally rigorous quantitative or qualitative research and evaluation methods or current research-validated practices and materials, as appropriate.**

Targets and Performance Data									Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that use exceptionally rigorous quantitative or qualitative research and evaluation methods or current research-validated practices and materials, as appropriate</i>									<p><b>Explanation:</b> All successful applications under IDEA programs include high quality methods and materials, as judged by panels during the review process. This indicator applies a more rigorous standard to assess projects that have exceptionally high standards based on a standard measurement protocol. It takes at least three years to achieve stability in review and assessment process. Fluctuations in data are expected for several years while the data collection methodology is refined. The improvement in Demonstration and Outreach activities from 2000 to 2001 resulted after significant changes were made in the application requirements for these activities. Increased emphasis was placed on project evaluation, and limits on the length of applications were increased.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Project information.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2003  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets					
	Research (from R&I)	Demonstration (from R&I)	Outreach (from R&I)	Technology & Media	Research (from R&I)	Demonstration (from R&I)	Outreach (from R&I)	Technology & Media		
1998	60	12	20							
1999	50	70	20	50	65	20	25			
2000	77	13	11	50						
2001	69	67	50	16						
2002					75	70	55	25		
2003					75	75	60	35		
2004					75	75	65	45		
2005					75	75	70	55		
2006					75	75	75	65		
2007					75	75	75	75		
<i>The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that use exceptionally rigorous quantitative or qualitative research and evaluation methods or current research-validated practices and materials, as appropriate</i>										
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets						
	Personnel Preparation	Technical Assistance	State Improvem.	Personnel Preparation	Technical Assistance	State Improvem.				
2001	27	33	66							
2002				35	35	70				
2003				45	45	75				
2004				55	55	75				
2005				65	65	75				
2006				75	75	75				
2007				75	75	75				

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Projects Communicate appropriately and products are used for children with disabilities and their families.**

**Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Practitioners use results: Expert panels determine that practitioners, including policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or others as appropriate, use products and practices developed through IDEA programs to improve results for children with disabilities.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality																																																																																			
<p><i>The percentage of expert panels that determine that practitioners, including policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or others as appropriate, use products and practices developed through IDEA programs to improve results for children with disabilities.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Year</th> <th colspan="3">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="3">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Research &amp; Innovation</th> <th>Technology</th> <th>Personnel Preparation</th> <th>Research &amp; Innovation</th> <th>Technology</th> <th>Personnel Preparation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td></td> <td>78</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>89</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>53</td> <td>47</td> <td>55</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>58</td> <td>62</td> <td>55</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>65</td> <td>65</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets			Research & Innovation	Technology	Personnel Preparation	Research & Innovation	Technology	Personnel Preparation	1998		78					1999					89		2000	53	47	55				2001	58	62	55				2002				65	65	65	2003				75	75	75	2004				75	75	70	2005				75	75	75	2006				75	75	75	2007				75	75	75	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Fluctuations in data are expected for several years while the data collection methodology is refined. To improve the quality of the evaluations the size of the review panel representing the variety of stakeholders in special education was increased from 5 persons in 2000 to 80 in 2001. This improvement has resulted in a much more robust and accurate measure of this indicator.</p>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Project information.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 September 2003</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets																																																																																					
	Research & Innovation	Technology	Personnel Preparation	Research & Innovation	Technology	Personnel Preparation																																																																																				
1998		78																																																																																								
1999					89																																																																																					
2000	53	47	55																																																																																							
2001	58	62	55																																																																																							
2002				65	65	65																																																																																				
2003				75	75	75																																																																																				
2004				75	75	70																																																																																				
2005				75	75	75																																																																																				
2006				75	75	75																																																																																				
2007				75	75	75																																																																																				

*The percentage of expert panels that determine that practitioners, including policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or others as appropriate, use products and practices developed through IDEA programs to improve results for children with disabilities.*

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Technical Assistance	Parent Information	State Improvement	Technical Assistance	Parent Information	State Improvement
1998	67					
1999				78		
2000	59					
2001	69	75	60			
2002				75	75	65
2003				75	75	75
2004				75	75	75
2005				75	75	75
2006				75	75	75
2007				75	75	75

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Communication with target audiences																																																																																																																																	
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality																																																																																																																											
<p><i>The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that both (1) communicate high-quality products and information and (2) employ strategies to communicate with appropriate target audiences will increase.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th colspan="3">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="3">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <th>Research (from R&amp;I)</th> <th>Demonstration (from R&amp;I)</th> <th>Outreach (from R&amp;I)</th> <th>Research (from R&amp;I)</th> <th>Demonstration (from R&amp;I)</th> <th>Outreach (from R&amp;I)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>60</td> <td>40</td> <td>100</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>91</td> <td>57</td> <td>80</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>60</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>65</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>70</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that both (1) communicate high-quality products and information and (2) employ strategies to communicate with appropriate target audiences will increase.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th colspan="2">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="2">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <th>Technology</th> <th>Technical Assistance</th> <th>Technology</th> <th>Technical Assistance</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>40</td> <td>100</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>80</td> <td>71</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>							Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets				Research (from R&I)	Demonstration (from R&I)	Outreach (from R&I)	Research (from R&I)	Demonstration (from R&I)	Outreach (from R&I)	2000	60	40	100				2001	91	57	80				2002				75	60	75	2003				75	65	75	2004				75	70	75	2005				75	75	75	2006				75	75	75	2007				75	75	75	Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			Technology	Technical Assistance	Technology	Technical Assistance	2000	40	100			2001	80	71			2002			75	75	2003			75	75	2004			75	75	2005			75	75	2006			75	75	2007			75	75	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Experts review a sample of products submitted by project directors of a sample of funded projects that have ended. Raters use a scale of 0 to 2, with an overall mean rating of 1.5 considered appropriate communication with target audience.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Project information from products developed by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2003</p> <p>No formal verification. Project information is reviewed by a panel consisting of independent, third party reviewers who are experts in the program content and trained in the review procedures. The panel results are analyzed by experts in evaluation research.</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets																																																																																																																													
	Research (from R&I)	Demonstration (from R&I)	Outreach (from R&I)	Research (from R&I)	Demonstration (from R&I)	Outreach (from R&I)																																																																																																																											
2000	60	40	100																																																																																																																														
2001	91	57	80																																																																																																																														
2002				75	60	75																																																																																																																											
2003				75	65	75																																																																																																																											
2004				75	70	75																																																																																																																											
2005				75	75	75																																																																																																																											
2006				75	75	75																																																																																																																											
2007				75	75	75																																																																																																																											
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets																																																																																																																														
	Technology	Technical Assistance	Technology	Technical Assistance																																																																																																																													
2000	40	100																																																																																																																															
2001	80	71																																																																																																																															
2002			75	75																																																																																																																													
2003			75	75																																																																																																																													
2004			75	75																																																																																																																													
2005			75	75																																																																																																																													
2006			75	75																																																																																																																													
2007			75	75																																																																																																																													

# MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.196 - Education for Homeless Children and Youth

**Goal 8: To ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education as is provided to other children and youth.**

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Public schools: Percentage of homeless children and youth that remain in their school of origin will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of homeless children and youth that remain in their school of origin, as reported by LEA subgrantees.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> This indicator is deleted.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> This indicator was written with the assumption that data would be collected from the States. Upon review of the draft data collection instrument for this program, OGC determined that this item will pose an unreasonable burden for States to collect at this time. Additionally, comments received from States on the McKinney-Vento collection indicated that this item will pose an unreasonable time/effort/cost burden for local school districts.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> November 2007</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		999		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: State assessment participation: Percentage of homeless students that participate annually in the state assessments in reading and mathematics will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of homeless children and youth included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics as reported by LEA subgrantees.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> FY 2003 data were not collected.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> There was a one-time collection in 2002 which serves as the baseline. Homeless students are required</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> LEAs that are recipients of grant funds will report on the percentage of homeless students who participate in the state assessment in reading and mathematics.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	20			
2003		999		
2004		21		

	<p>under NCLB to be included in statewide assessments. The performance targets for outyears are set at a 5% increase to the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> November 2004  Data collected by state assessments are validated by the individual state's data quality standards procedures.</p>
--	---	---

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: State assessment achievement: Percentage of homeless students meeting or exceeding state proficiency level or standard in reading and mathematics.**

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
<p><i>Percentage of homeless students meeting or exceeding state proficiency standards.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>53</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>56</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	53		2003		999	2004		56	<p><b>Progress:</b> FY 2003 data were not collected. Program determined that 2002 will be used as baseline.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> This indicator reflects a new statutory requirement. Homeless students are required under NCLB to be included in statewide assessments. The performance targets for outyears are set at a 5% increase to the baseline. The validity of outyear targets will be re-examined following the determination of the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> LEAs that are recipients of grant funds will report on the percentage of homeless students who meet or exceed proficiency standards on state assessments.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> November 2004</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the LEA level by schools that receive McKinney-Vento subgrants.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets												
2002	53													
2003		999												
2004		56												

## Client Assistance Program (CAP) - 2004

**Goal 8: To provide assistance and information to help individuals with disabilities secure the benefits available under the Vocational Rehabilitation State grants program and other programs funded under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Accurately identify problem areas requiring systemic change and engage in systemic activity to improve services under the rehabilitation act.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Effects of systemic change: By FY 2008, the percentage of CAPs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will increase to a rate of 55%.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of CAPs reported that their systematic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice</i>			<b>Status: Target met</b>  <b>Explanation:</b> Performance percentage based on reporting of successful systemic change activity by 30 out of 56 CAPs. A baseline of 43% was established in FY 1999.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> CAP FY 2002 performance report, RSA-227, narrative section.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  <b>Limitations:</b> Data will be limited because it is self-reported and in a narrative format. The data submitted are reviewed by program specialists, but data validity will be unattainable.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	50.90			
1999	43			
2000	44	44		
2001	45	45		
2002	45	46		
2003		48		
2004		49		
2005		50		
2006		52		
2007		54		
2008		55		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Alternative dispute resolution (ADR): Through FY 2008, the percentage of cases resolved through the use of ADR will be maintained at a rate of 84%.**

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of cases resolved though ADR will be maintained at a rate</i>		<b>Additional Source</b>

of 84%.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	84	
2002	85	
2003		84
2004		84
2005		84
2006		84
2007		84
2008		84

**Explanation:** A more accurate method of calculation, beginning with FY 2001 data, utilizes a more expansive definition of ADR-related services. A baseline rate of 84% and performance targets have been established based on FY 2001 and 2002 data.

**Information:** CAP performance report, RSA-227

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003

**Data Available:** April 2004

**Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialists. On-site compliance reviews are conducted and random sampling of on site files is cross-checked with reported data for verification.

**Limitations:** The collection instrument does not contain known data limitations.



## Demonstration and Training Programs - 2004

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

### Goal 8: To expand, improve or further the purposes of activities authorized under the Act

Objective 8.1 of 2: Expand and improve the provision of rehabilitation services that lead to employment outcomes.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Expansion: A high percentage of projects will be judged to have successfully implemented strategies or yielded results that can contribute to the expansion of services for or the employment of individuals with disabilities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of projects will be judged to have contributed to the expansion of services for the employment of individuals with disabilities.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Analysis by RSA staff of data received in the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees will be used to determine progress. Data analyzed by RSA staff based on information received from the web-based Unified Data Collection Forms Annual Performance Report was used to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Web-based Annual Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2003  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting. No formal verification procedure applied.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The web-based system has been transferred from a contractor to the Department. A number of errors have shown up in this process, which are in the process of being corrected.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	95.60			
2000	100			
2001		80		
2002		82		
2003		85		
2004		90		

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Impact: The percentage of projects reporting an impact on rehabilitation service providers including state VR agencies, community rehabilitation service providers, and other providers of rehabilitation services.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of Grantees that Interacted and Presented to State VR Agencies</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Baseline data based on information obtained in the FY 2000 reporting year when 83% of the grantees interacted with and made presentations to their State VR Agencies, with 56% of the consumers referred by VR and 8% of the consumers referred by the Demonstration projects to VR.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Web-based Annual Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> November 2003</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p>Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting. No formal verification procedure applied.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Grantees may have difficulty in reporting on their impact to an external agency. Numerous external factors may change the provision or methods of rehabilitation services, and grantees may not be able to pinpoint their impact in the process. Increased contact/interaction with State VR and other rehabilitation service agencies should increase the impact.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	83			
2001		85		
2002		85		
2003		87		
2004		89		
<i>Percentage of Consumers Referred by State VR to Projects</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	56			
2001		58		
2002		58		
2003		60		
2004		62		
<i>Percentage of Consumers Referred by Projects to State VR</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	8			
2001		10		
2002		10		
2003		10		
2004		10		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Disseminate information about successful new types or patterns of services or devices for individuals with disabilities and report the impact of the projects.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Funded projects that disseminate information to state VR agencies and other funded projects and disability-related organizations and the number of presentations.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data from FY 2000 was used to establish a baseline. FY 2000 was the first year of using the web-based reporting system to establish baseline figures.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Web-based Annual Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2003  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting. No formal verification procedure applied.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Goals, objectives and activities are diverse among grantees, and can range from direct consumer services, systems change, technical assistance, etc. This makes comparison of data difficult, since no one data element can be used as a measure of performance.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data will be reported in categories that use the format of the web-based system to give a more complete picture of the accomplishments of the program.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Grantee Presentations	Grantee Presentations		
2000	83			
2001	83	85		
2002		85		
2003		87		
2004		89		

# Independent Living Services Program - 2004

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.132 - Centers for Independent Living  
84.169 - Independent Living State Grants  
84.177B - Services for Older Blind Individuals

**Goal 8: Individuals with significant disabilities served by Title VII, Chapter 1, programs will achieve consumer determined independent living goals, and Independent Living Services will be provided and activities will be conducted to improve or expand services to older individuals who are blind.**

**Objective 8.1 of 4: Increase the number of individuals with significant disabilities who are served by and benefit from the Title VII, Chapter 1, programs.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of consumer goals set and achieved in all service areas measured</i>				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA - 704 Annual Performance Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2003
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>1997</b>	62.30			
<b>1998</b>	65			
<b>1999</b>	67	62.50		
<b>2000</b>	63	63		
<b>2001</b>	64	63		
<b>2002</b>		75		
<b>2003</b>		80		
<b>2004</b>		80		

**Objective 8.2 of 4: Improve access to personal assistance services (PAS), housing, transportation, and community-based living**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Individuals who leave nursing homes and other institutions for community-based housing				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of individuals who leave nursing homes and other institutions for community-based housing</i>				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA 704 Report, 2002.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 <b>Data Available:</b> May 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.  <b>Limitations:</b> Grantees may interpret definitions differently. We are providing training and technical assistance.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	74			
1998	1,671			
2000	1,372	850		
2001	1,777	900		
2002		900		

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: The number of individuals at risk of entering nursing homes and other institutions who are receiving IL services and can remain at home.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of individuals at risk of entering nursing homes and other institutions who are receiving IL services and can remain at home.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999		8,500		
2000	18,306	8,500		
2001	23,983	9,000		
2002		9,500		

**Objective 8.3 of 4: Increase the amount of funds in addition to title VII that support chapter 1 grantees.**

**Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Increased funding from alternative sources: A high number of CILs will have greater than 25 percent of their budget from sources other than Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B, and a high percentage of states will contribute more than the required minimum match for Title VII, Chapter 1, Part C.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of CILs that have greater than 25 percent of their budget from sources other than Title VII, Chapter 1, Part A, and percentage of states that contribute more than the required minimum match for Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B.</i>						<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who Are Blind (7-OB Report)</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> May 2003 Program and budget staff or two program staff visually scan data for errors and compare to prior year's data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Number of CILS	Percent of States Overmatch Part B	Number of CILS	Percent of States Overmatch Part B		
1997	74	80				
2000	66		75	80		
2001			76	80		
2002			76	80		
2003			76	80		
2004			80	80		

**Objective 8.4 of 4: Provide chapter 2 services to increasing numbers of individuals who are older and severely visually impaired, and increase consumer satisfaction**

**Indicator 8.4.1 of 1: Increased number of individuals served:: The number of older and severely visually impaired individuals served will increase annually.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Individuals receiving services</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who Are Blind (7-OB Report), 1997.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> May 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Research and Training Center and program staff review data</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Targets based on estimates of program funding level.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1994	14,968			
1995	22,103			
1996	26,846			
1997	31,460			
1998	36,280			
1999	38,150	28,500		
2000	47,596	35,000		
2001		40,000		
2002		41,000		
2003		63,000		
2004		68,000		

## RA: Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers - 2004

### Goal 8: To increase employment opportunities for migrant and seasonal farmworkers who have disabilities

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that eligible migrant and seasonal farmworkers with disabilities receive rehabilitation services and achieve employment.**

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Percentage of individuals served who were placed in employment outcomes</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Baseline 2002 data submission is suspect; Consequently, the targets 2003 and 2004 have been projected at a lower rate until 2003 data is analyzed. Targets for the VR only category are represented as static numbers because the focus of these projects is to improve the performance for the VR + Project participants.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Rehabilitation Services Administration agency state data from the RSA-911 and grantee performance reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> By 2005, it is anticipated that data quality will be more dependable.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	VR & Project	VR Only				VR & Project	VR Only
<b>2002</b>	65	53.10					
<b>2003</b>						62	53
<b>2004</b>			62	53			

# National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) - 2004

CFDA Number: [84.133](#) - National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research

## Goal 8: To conduct high-quality research that leads to high quality research products

### Objective 8.1 of 3: Conduct high-quality research

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: The percentage of grantee research that is deemed to be good to excellent as reflected in the appropriateness of the designs used and the rigor with which accepted standards of scientific and/or engineering methods are applied.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>Percentage of grantee research and development activity rated 4 or greater in appropriateness of study designs, the rigor with which accepted standards of scientific and/or engineering methods are applied, and the degree to which the research and development activity builds on and contributes to the level of knowledge in the field, based on a 5-point Likert-type scale.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>54</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>67</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>80</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	54	65	2003	67	70	2004		70	2005		75	2006		75	2007		80	<p><b>Progress:</b> Data for 2002 and 2003 were re-analyzed to be consistent with refinements made to this measure in the 2005 PPMD. It is important to point out that this measure is based in large part on data from NIDRR's summative program reviews and only two of these reviews are scheduled for 2004. This means that the next data collection period for this measure will be 2005 with results available in 2006.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Data for 2003 are based on ratings from summative program reviews conducted with 9 RERCs and RRTC's between October and November of 2003. Ratings were performed by expert panelists selected from key stakeholder groups, including other researchers, practitioners and service providers, policy analysts, industry representatives, and individual with disabilities. Five specific areas of performance were rated taken from NIDRR's "centers of excellence" model for scientific research and include conducting an innovative program of applied R&amp;D, use of appropriate and rigorous methods, appropriateness of research tools, adequacy and diversity of sample size, and potential contribution to advancement of knowledge and/or product development. Unlike</p>	<p><b>Source: Other</b> <b>Other:</b> Other.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Triangulation of data from the web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and the planned GPRA-related Expert Panels.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data are based upon ratings obtained from expert panels during reverse site visits. Extensive efforts have been made to ensure that centers being rated and experts serving as reviewers are conversant with the evidence based and outcomes oriented approaches to the review process.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2002	54	65																							
2003	67	70																							
2004		70																							
2005		75																							
2006		75																							
2007		80																							



	previous years, there were no differences by type of center in the percentage who met the criteria for "good to excellent" (i.e., scored 4 or higher) in this area. Both Rehabilitation Engineering Research and Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers scored 67 percent on this measure.	
--	--	--

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: A significant percentage of new studies funded by NIDRR assess the effectiveness of interventions using rigorous and appropriate methods.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of new studies funded by NIDRR assess the effectiveness of interventions using rigorous and appropriate methods.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> No data were collected for this measure in 2003. The measure was revised for the FY 2005PM and re-numbered as 7.1.1. It is also important to point out that implementation of NIDRR's planned GPRA-related Expert Panels upon which this measure depends, and which will replace the current system of summative review, has been delayed until the beginning of 2005. This means that the next data collection period for performance measure 7.1.1 will be 2005 with results available in 2006.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> In 2004 and 2005 NIDRR will develop and test strategies for deriving this measure using information from the web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and preliminary data from the initial round of GPRA Expert Panels. A baseline will be set in 2006 and performance targets for out years will be baseline +5%.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Triangulation of data from the web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and the planned GPRA-related Expert Panels.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: The number of publications based on NIDRR-funded research in refereed journals**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The average number of publications per award based on NIDRR-funded research and development activities in refereed journals.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> The 2002 performance target for this measure was converted to Baseline in the 2005PM to give NIDRR time work out significant data entry and compilation problems associated with the web-based annual project performance reporting system (APPR) used to collect information on publications. These problems were resolved in July 2004 allowing</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> NIDRR.  <b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> The web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR)</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	2.74			
2003		8		
2004		5		
2005		5		

<b>2006</b>		10	<p>NIDRR to report an accurate and verifiable average of 2.74 peer reviewed publications per award for the three program mechanisms (i.e., RRTCs, RERCs and SCI, TBI and Burn Model systems) required to provide citation data in the existing APPR. Despite improvements in accuracy, however, data for this measure are not reflective of the performance of all 18 of NIDRR's program mechanisms and do not include peer reviewed publications cited in the final reports of grantees whose funding cycle ended in 2002, since these reports are not part of the APPR. NIDRR plans to correct these limitations with the new version of the APPR, which will be complete the end of 2005.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> The average number of peer reviewed publications for 2002 differs across reporting program mechanisms from a high of 3.48 for Model Systems to 2.89 for RRTCs and 1.1 for RERCs. This variation is due in part to differences in the nature of the research conducted (e.g., medical rehabilitation vs. engineering), the size of the award, and the amount of institutional support provided for publications. Because of this, additional analyses are being conducted to explore the merits of creating sub-measures of this indicator for future reporting. It is also important to explain that actual performance on this measure lags one year behind the collection period. This is necessary in order to capture all the publications published in a given calendar year, but which may not have come out in time to be included in the APPR for that year. The performance target for 2003 publications will be baseline + 5%.</p>	<p>system.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are based upon reports by the funded centers. Concerns have been raised about the potential for under reporting. Methods to independently confirm publications are planned. The number of publications using the strict definitions employed are likely to fairly represent the productivity of centers in areas related to engineering and medicine. However, these definitions may not fully represent the productivity of centers in other areas.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> NIDRR is evaluating methods of assessing productivity that fairly represent all parts of the NIDRR grant portfolio.</p>
<b>2007</b>		10		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Disseminate and promote use of information on research findings, in accessible formats, to improve rehabilitation services and outcomes.**

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Grantees deemed to be implementing a plan for widespread dissemination and utilization of validated research findings, developed with stakeholder input and based on measurable objectives, that is producing products and services at sufficient levels and in accessible formats and reaching targeted customers in sufficient numbers, including those from diverse and underserved populations**

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of grantees deemed to be implementing a plan for widespread dissemination and utilization of validated research findings, developed with</i>		<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Triangulation of data from the web-

*stakeholder input and based on measurable objectives, that is producing products and services at sufficient levels and in accessible formats and reaching targeted customers in sufficient numbers, including those from diverse and underserved populations*

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	55.50	50
2004		55
2005		60
2006		65
2007		70

**Progress:** Data for 2003 were re-analyzed to be more consistent with the new measure developed for this area of performance in the FY 2005PM. The number of the new measure also was changed in the FY 2005PM to 7.2.1. Results from 2003 data indicate that 55.5% of centers receiving summative program review were rated 4 or higher on dissemination and promotion of research findings by expert panels. This figure slightly exceeds the original performance target set under the previous version of the dissemination indicator. It is important to point out that only two summative program reviews are scheduled for 2004. This means that the next data collection period for measure 7.2.1 will be 2005 with results available in 2006.

**Explanation:** Data for 2003 are based on ratings from summative program reviews conducted with 9 RERCs and RRTCs between October and November of 2003. Ratings were performed by expert panelists selected from key stakeholder groups, including other researchers, practitioners, service providers, policy analysts, industry representatives, and individual with disabilities. Five specific areas of performance were rated from NIDRR's "centers of excellence" model for Dissemination, Relevance and Productivity and include evidence that the Center is implementing a systematic dissemination plan with clearly stated and appropriate goals, dissemination outputs are being evaluated for quality and relevance to end-users, and consumer-oriented products and programs are accessible to persons with disabilities. The percentage of Centers rated 4 or higher on these CoE indicators differs by type of center with 67% (2 out of 3) of RERCs meeting the criteria compared ot 50% (3 out of 6) of RRTCs.

based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and the planned GPRA-related Expert Panels.

**Frequency:** Annually.  
**Collection Period:** 2005  
**Data Available:** January 2006  
**Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Ensure Utility of Research Problems and Products to End-Users**

**Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Outcomes-Oriented Measure of Results of R&D Investment: The number of new or improved assistive and universally-designed technologies, devices and systems developed by grantees that are deemed to improve rehabilitation services and outcomes and/or enhance opportunities for full participation, and are successfully transferred to industry for potential commercialization.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>Number of new or improved assistive and universally-designed technologies, devices and systems developed by grantees that are rated "good to excellent" in ability to improve rehabilitation services and outcomes and/or to enhance opportunities for full participation, and are successfully transferred to industry for potential commercialization.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004		999	2005		5	<p><b>Explanation:</b> A baseline will be set in FY 2004 based on analysis of data from the web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and judgments of expert panels. For FY 2005 the target will be 5 percent over the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1820-0642 Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination &amp; Utilization Projects).  <b>Program:</b> National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research..</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Triangulation of data from the web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and program review-type meetings with expert panels.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.  Review by expert panel</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> To reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of collecting qualitative judgements from experts panels, in 2004 NIDRR will experiment with using Internet-based alternatives to face to face program-review-type meetings.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
2004		999											
2005		5											

# RA: Projects with Industry - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.234 - Projects with Industry

## Goal 8: Projects with Industry Program (PWI) Internal Goal

Objective 8.1 of 2: ENSURE THAT PWI SERVICES (THROUGH PARTNERSHIPS WITH BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY) RESULT IN COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT, INCREASED WAGES, AND JOB RETENTION FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of individuals served who were placed in competitive employment</i>			<p><b>Status:</b> Target exceeded</p> <p><b>Progress:</b> FY 2001 performance exceeded the 2001 target.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> In FY 1998, following a new grant competition, there were significantly fewer projects (104 projects) participating in the PWI program as compared to the FY 1997 base year (119 projects). The number of projects operating in fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 were 101, 99, and 102 respectively. Following a corresponding drop in performance in 1998, the percent of individuals placed in competitive employment by the program has increased annually. Performance in FY 2001 surpassed the 1997 level.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee performance indicator data.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p>The sources and data quality are validated by checking to see if the data are reasonable. On site compliance reviews are also conducted on at least 15 percent of grant recipients annually to (a) determine whether that grant is managed in accordance with Federal requirements; (b) identify areas where the project can be improved; and (c) assess the project's mission as it relates to the Department's mission.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The primary limitation of the data is that they are self-reported. Technical assistance and regular monitoring is provided to grantees in order to receive updated reports from the grantee regarding progress toward meeting project goals.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	59			
1998	49			
1999	59	61		
2000	61.90	61		
2001	62.40	62		
2002	63.19	62.20		
2003	53.28	62.40		
2004		62.70		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Average increase in weekly earnings in dollars</i>			<p><b>Status: Target exceeded</b></p> <p><b>Progress:</b> FY 2001 performance exceeded the 2001 target by \$18.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2001 performance reflected an average increase in earnings of \$236 per week. On average, the FY 2001 group of grantees demonstrated higher performance on this indicator than in most prior years. However, we have only raised the FY 2002 target to \$226 per week because of the variability in annual performance.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee performance indicator data.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies. Same as 1.1</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Same as Indicator 1.1. In addition, performance data on this indicator are further limited because the national average is calculated based on self-reported project averages.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	207			
1998	209			
1999	226	209		
2000	252	218		
2001	236	218		
2002	231	226		
2003	244	231		
2004		233		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: ENSURE THAT PWI SERVICES ARE AVAILABLE FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH THE MOST NEED.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of previously unemployed individuals served who were placed in competitive employment</i>			<p><b>Status: Target exceeded</b></p> <p><b>Progress:</b> FY 2000 performance slightly exceeded the 2000 target, bringing the actual performance rate back up to a level commensurate with performance experienced in the 1997 base year.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> The overall number and percent of previously unemployed persons who were placed in competitive employment has increased annually since 1998. In addition, both the number and percentage of persons served who were previously unemployed has increased. However, we have raised the FY 2002 target only slightly above the FY 2001</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies. Grantee performance indicator data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Same as Indicator 1.1</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	60			
1998	48			
1999	58	62		
2000	60.80	60		
2001	69	61		
2002	70.82	61.20		
2003	73.09	63		

2004		64	target because this population faces greater challenges in obtaining competitive employment.	
------	--	----	--	--

# Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) - 2004

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

## Goal 8: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) Internal Goal

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Policy Changes: By FY 2008, the percentage of PAIRs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will increase to a rate of 82%.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of PAIRs reported that their systemic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Actual performance percentage based on 46 out of 57 PAIRs reporting successful systemic change activities for FY 2002. Performance trends are based on actual data reported for FY 2000 through 2002.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1820-0627 Annual Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) Program Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data will be supplied through uniform data reporting. Once data are submitted appropriate review will be conducted by program specialists.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data will be limited because it is self-reported and in a narrative format. The data submitted will be reviewed by program specialists, but data validity will be unattainable.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	54			
2001	68			
2002	81			
2003		75		
2004		77		
2005		79		
2006		80		
2007		81		
2008		82		



# Training Program - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.129 - Rehabilitation Long-Term Training

## Goal 8: To provide the public vocational rehabilitation (VR) sector with well-trained staff and to maintain and upgrade the skills of current staff.

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

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Scholars supported</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> FY 2000 data are based on actual numbers using the new electronic reporting system. Previous numbers were based on estimates made from a small number of prospects.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual grantee reporting from Baseline data collected for academic year 2003.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2003 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	1,600			
1998	1,550			
1999	1,665	1,473		
2000	2,390	2,000		
2001		2,000		
2002		2,000		
2003		2,050		
2004		2,050		
<i>Scholars supported per \$1 million</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	101			
1998	96			
1999	94	93		
2000	172	170		
2001		170		
2002		170		
2003		165		
2004		165		

<i>Scholars graduating</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>1997</b>	800	
<b>1998</b>	817	
<b>1999</b>	832	729
<b>2000</b>	764	688
<b>2001</b>		700
<b>2002</b>		700
<b>2003</b>		725
<b>2004</b>		725

<i>Scholars graduating per \$1 million</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>1997</b>	50	
<b>1998</b>	50.50	
<b>1999</b>	47	47
<b>2000</b>	54.90	46
<b>2001</b>		44
<b>2002</b>		44
<b>2003</b>		42
<b>2004</b>		42

<i>Investment (in thousands)</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>1997</b>	15,835	
<b>1998</b>	16,181	
<b>1999</b>	16,933	14,585
<b>2000</b>	13,874	13,771
<b>2001</b>	14,143	13,500
<b>2002</b>	13,657	13,500
<b>2003</b>		17,000

<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Percentage working: The percentage of graduates fulfilling their payback requirements through acceptable employment will increase annually.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> 2002 data are reported by grantees in January 2003 and will be available in April 2003.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual grantee reporting form.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2002  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  Data supplied by grantees.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> We are using a new reporting system, which is being refined. Same as indicator 1.1</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2000</b>	72			70
<b>2001</b>				71
<b>2002</b>				72
<b>2003</b>				72
<b>2004</b>				74

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Maintain and upgrade the knowledge and skills of personnel currently employed in the public VR system.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Qualified personnel: The percent of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their State's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standard will increase annually.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their State's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standards</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> In FY 2000, RSA began an evaluation of the Training program that will collect data on each state's CSPD current standard and the number of staff that meet that standard. Many external factors could affect the ongoing collection of data for this indicator.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Evaluation. Ongoing collection could be through the In-Service Training program's annual performance report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2002  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  Data would be supplied through external RSA contractor. No formal verification procedure applied.</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2000</b>	69			
<b>2001</b>				70
<b>2002</b>				75
<b>2003</b>				77
<b>2004</b>				79

# RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Recreational Programs - 2004

## Goal 8: Recreational Programs

### Objective 8.1 of 1: Recreational Programs Project Continuation Objective

#### Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Project Continuation: The percentage of Recreation programs sustained after Federal funding ceases.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>The percentage of projects in operation 1, 2, and 3 years after federal funding ceases will maintain baseline.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>66</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td></td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>66</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	66		2002		66	2003		66	2004		66	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Previous reporting reflected only programs in operation 1 year after federal funding ceased. This new measure will indicate the cumulative number of programs in existence 1, 2, and 3 years following the end of federal funding. Number of programs being tracked after federal funding ceases: FY 1999 (N=4); 2000 (N=8); 2001(N=6); 2002 (N=9); 2003 (N=6); 2004 (N=10). For 1999-2001, 12 of the 18 programs were still in operation. Targets for 2002 -2004 are based on 1 year of data and may need to be adjusted in subsequent years subject to actual performance.</p>	<p><b>Source: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Other.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Telephone Monitoring.  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 12/31/2003.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b>            Telephone monitoring.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2004</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Contacting past grantees.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
2001	66																		
2002		66																	
2003		66																	
2004		66																	

# VTEA: Occupational and Employment Information - 2004

## Goal 8: To provide support to career guidance and academic counseling programs.

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

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

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>Number of customers receiving technical assistance and number of products disseminated to customers (students, parents, teachers, counselors, administrators, and others) through America's Career Resource Network.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> We provided a low estimate for the number of products to be disseminated to customers in the first year of the Career Resource Network because we thought only a few states would be able to fully implement their programs. However, more States than anticipated implemented programs and disseminated more products than expected.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> America's Career Resource Network Annual Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Semi-Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by states on an OMB-approved report form</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The number of products is a duplicated count; that is, it accounts for multiple copies of the same product being disseminated to one or more customers.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
	Number of Customers	Number of Products	Number of Customers					Number of Products
2001	25,910	8,540,106	20,000					800,000
2002	39,404	5,573,349	30,000					8,000,000
2003			20,000					8,527,748
2004			20,000	8,527,748				

# State Vocational Rehabilitation Services - 2004

CFDA Number:

84.126 - Rehabilitation Services\_Vocational Rehabilitation  
Grants to States

## Goal 8: Individuals with disabilities served by the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grant program will achieve high quality employment.

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Ensure that individuals with disabilities who are served by the vocational rehabilitation (vr) state grant program achieve employment consistent with their particular strengths, resources, abilities, capabilities, and interests.**

### Indicator 8.1.1 of 5: Number achieving employment: The number of individuals with disabilities who achieve employment will increase.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of individuals who achieved an employment outcome</i>						<b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA state agency data from the RSA-113.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 <b>Data Available:</b> October <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.  <b>Limitations:</b> Appropriate crosschecks and edits to verify and validate the quality of these data are currently being implemented.
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Number of Individuals	Percent Increase	Number of Individuals	Percent Increase		
<b>1997</b>	211,503					
<b>1998</b>	223,668	5.80				
<b>1999</b>	231,714	3.60	215,770			
<b>2000</b>	236,220	1.90	234,040			
<b>2001</b>	233,687	-1	238,582			
<b>2002</b>			238,582			
<b>2003</b>			240,968			
<b>2004</b>			243,378			

### Indicator 8.1.2 of 5: Percentage of individuals obtaining employment: The percentage of all persons served who obtain employment will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage obtaining employment.</i>				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA state agency data from the RSA-113. <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2002 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.  <b>Limitations:</b> Appropriate crosschecks and edits to verify and validate the quality of these
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>1997</b>	61.20			
<b>1998</b>	62.20			
<b>1999</b>	62.50	61		
<b>2000</b>	62.50	62.70		
<b>2001</b>	60.70	63		
<b>2002</b>		63		

2003		63.20		data are currently being implemented.
2004		63.20		

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 5: Percentage of individuals obtaining competitive employment: Of individuals obtaining employment, the percentage who obtain competitive employment will increase. Among individuals with significant disabilities obtaining employment, the percentage obtaining competitive employment will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of all individuals with disabilities who obtained competitive employment</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2002 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Accuracy/consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	81.20			
1998	80			
1999	83.10	82.30		
2000	86	82.50		
2001	87.60	86.20		
2002		86.40		
2003		86.60		
2004		86.80		
<i>Percentage of individuals obtaining competitive employment who are individuals with significant disabilities.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	78.40			
1998	81.10			
1999	83.80			
2000	86.50			
2001	87.40	86.70		
2002		86.90		
2003		87.10		
2004		87.30		

**Indicator 8.1.4 of 5: Improved earnings: Among individuals exiting the program in competitive employment, the median ratio of their average hourly wage to the state's average hourly wage for all individuals in the state who are employed will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Median ratio for state agencies</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA state data from the R-911.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2002 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Same limitations and planned improvements reported under 1.3 apply to this indicator. In addition, the data for this indicator are limited by the fact that the required comparison involves numbers reported from two different sets of state-reported data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	.56			
1998	.56			
1999	.56	.57		
2000	.57	.57		
2001	.56	.57		
2002		.58		
2003		.58		
2004		.59		

**Indicator 8.1.5 of 5: Own income as primary support: The percentage of individuals who report upon obtaining employment that their own income is their primary source of support will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of individuals who report upon obtaining competitive employment that their own income is their primary source of support.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2002 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Same as discussed under Indicator 1.3.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	84.10			
1998	82.60			
1999	82.50			
2000	84.60			
2001	84.60	84.80		
2002		85		
2003		85.20		
2004		85.40		



**Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the number of individuals with the most significant disabilities who have received supported employment services but achieve competitive employment outcomes.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal achieving competitive employment: The percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieve a competitive employment outcome (including supported employment outcomes in which the individual receives the minimum wage or better) will continue to increase.</b>																													
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress																											
<p><i>Percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieved a competitive employment outcome</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>69.60</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>69.10</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>73.30</td> <td>71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>77.30</td> <td>71.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>79.20</td> <td>77.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td></td> <td>77.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td>77.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>78</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1997	69.60		1998	69.10		1999	73.30	71	2000	77.30	71.50	2001	79.20	77.40	2002		77.60	2003		77.80	2004		78	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2002 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Same as discussed under Indicator 1.3.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																											
1997	69.60																												
1998	69.10																												
1999	73.30	71																											
2000	77.30	71.50																											
2001	79.20	77.40																											
2002		77.60																											
2003		77.80																											
2004		78																											

# VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions - 2004

## Goal 8: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions Internal Goal

### Objective 8.1 of 2: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions Internal Objective 1

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary outcomes: By Fall 2002, 60 percent of vocational students will receive an AA degree or certificate. See Limitations for definition of student base.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of vocational students earning an AA degree or certificate</i>			<p><b>Status:</b> Unable to judge</p> <p><b>Progress:</b> .</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Data for 2003 and 2004 will be available in June of 2003 and 2004, respectively.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> May 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Enrollment and graduation lists supplied by two funded institutions.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Calculations of completion are based on degree completers relative to all students 'available to graduate' (ie, students in their final semester).</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Planned improvements for data collection include investigating whether a single cohort of students can be selected and tracked to more effectively calculate completions over time.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Percentage of students	Percentage of students		
1999	23			
2000	57	25		
2001	82	59		
2002	46	65		
2003	48	47		
2004		49		

### Objective 8.2 of 2: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions Internal Objective 2

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: The percentage of vocational students who go on to continuing education will increase - see Obj. 7.2 for definition of students: % of vocational students going on to continuing education

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<p align="center"><b>- No Targets And Performance Data -</b></p>	<p><b>Status: Unable to judge</b></p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Grantees have not yet been asked specifically to provide ED with this data. Objective 7.2 and Indicator 7.2.1 are proposed. If approved, the grantees can be asked to provide specific data regarding institutions where the graduates are now attending or to which they have been accepted.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2002  <b>Validated By:</b> NCES.</p>

# VTEA: Vocational Education National Programs - 2004

**Goal 8: Increase access to and improve programs at the high school, and community and technical college levels that raise academic achievement, strengthen workforce preparation, promote economic development and lifelong learning.**

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

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Conduct quality research: By 2004, all research studies conducted by the National Center for Research in Career and Technical education will represent rigorous design as defined by the Department's definition of evidence based research.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percent of research studies with rigorous designs</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Baseline and targets established in 2002, progress toward future targets likely. Studies of the center are being designed in alignment with the Department's increased emphasis on rigorous methodology and scientifically-based approaches. The center will be judged successful when the results of its research are rapidly and readily available and feed, as appropriate, into educational practice, policy development or use by the private sector, and judged by an independent, external peer review panel.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Independent review panel assessments.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
2002	71				50
2003					70
2004					100

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Disseminate quality research: BY 2004, increasing numbers of customers will be using the products and services of the National Centers for Research and Dissemination in Career and Technical Education.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Customers receiving electronic and print materials or information from the Centers</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> Baseline established; progress toward future target likely. Actual performance for 2001 includes only information disseminated through the Center's web site since studies begun under the current Center will not yield publishable results in print from until 2001. Progress has been substantial given the Department's increased emphasis on disseminating high quality research products and related services through the newly funded National Research Centers.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Centers Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 -  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The number of customers does not represent an unduplicated count of individuals receiving information through the Centers</p>	
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets
	Electronic	Print	Total			Electronic Print Total
2000	273,546	273,546				
2001	1,569,999	131,254	1,701,253			300,000
2002	3,004,898	219,729	3,224,627			350,000
2003						2,000,000 100,000 2,100,000
2004				2,300,000 100,000 2,400,000		

<b>Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Promote quality research: By 2004, the percentage of customers who are "very satisfied" with products and services received from the National Center for Research and Dissemination in Career and Technical Education will be at least 85%.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Customers responding to a customer satisfaction survey indicated that they were "very satisfied" with the products and services received from the Center.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The Center has a program improvement and quality assurance process that enable it to address the needs of the field, and results in high customer satisfaction.	<b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	Percent of customers	Percent of customers		
<b>2001</b>	85	85		
<b>2002</b>	80	85		
<b>2003</b>		85		
<b>2004</b>		85		

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

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: By fall, 2004, all states will have improved, high quality data systems that include information from all school systems, school districts and community colleges.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of states</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Approximately 40% of states currently have full data collection capability for high school and postsecondary reporting. Performance reporting relies on state accountability reports, as specified in the 1998 Perkins Act. States started using new measures, negotiated in 1999-2000 to report 2000-01. Although state data is collected annually, local data are not received by the states until 4-6 months after completion of the school year, resulting in a substantial lag in receiving and being able to use data for performance. States are at different levels of expertise and capacity in their ability to address data and reporting requirements, and to use data for program improvement. The Data quality Initiative will streamline data collection and verification and promote greater	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> State Combined Annual Performance Reports - Data and Narrative  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. OVAE verified data by internal electronic consistency via instrumentation checks, experts staff analysis, and requiring data by state directors. State data is also checked independently by ED/OVAE during on-site monitoring and state audit reviews.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	Percentage of Performance	Percentage of Target		
<b>2001</b>	92			
<b>2002</b>	97			
<b>2003</b>		98		
<b>2004</b>		100		

	consistency in measurement and reporting approaches.	
--	--	--

# VTEA: Vocational Education State Grants and Tech-Prep Education State Grants - 2004

**Goal 8: Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen education achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.**

**Objective 8.1 of 6: Ensure that vocational concentrators, including special populations, will achieve high levels of proficiency in mathematics, science, and English.**

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of vocational concentrators meeting state-established academic standards</i>			<p><b>Status:</b> Target exceeded</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> While states use different strategies for measuring academic attainment, they all use students (concentrators) as the unit of analysis and identify the percentage of students meeting state established standards. Performance data developed by states is reported to OVAE 90 days after termination of the grant, i.e., the 2003 data was reported by December 31, 2003.</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> Performance Report <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State performance is reported in the Consolidated Annual Performance, Accountability, and Financial Status Report for State-Administered Vocational Education Programs.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. States are asked to attest to their data quality at the time of their submissions.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> There is no interstate comparability.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> ED will continue</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>1998</b>	33			
<b>1999</b>	45			
<b>2000</b>	44			
<b>2001</b>	70			
<b>2002</b>	71	72		
<b>2003</b>	75	74		
<b>2004</b>		76		

	to provide technical assistance to the states to improve their program quality.
--	---

**Objective 8.2 of 6: Ensure that secondary and postsecondary concentrators, including special populations, will achieve high levels of proficiency in core curriculum areas, including mathematics, science, and English.**

**Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Skills Proficiencies: An increasing percentage of secondary and post secondary vocational concentrators, including special populations, will meet state recognized skill standards.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality			
<i>Percentage of secondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally adopted skill standards, using state recognized approaches</i>				<p><b>Status:</b> Target not met</p> <p><b>Progress:</b> Considerable progress was made by states toward achieving the secondary performance target, although they fell just short.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> While states use different strategies for measuring skill proficiencies, they all use students (concentrators) as the unit of analysis and identify the percentage of students meeting state established standards. Performance data developed by states is reported to OVAE 90 days after termination of the grant, i.e., the 2003 data was reported by December 31, 2003.</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> Performance Report Grantee Performance Report: 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State performance data are reported in the Consolidated Annual Performance, Accountability and Financial Status Report For State-Administered Vocational Education Programs.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. States are asked to attest to their data quality at the time of their submissions.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> There is no interstate comparability.</p>			
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets		
	National or State Assessment	Program Completion	Other Approaches			National or State Assessment	Program Completion	Other Approaches
1998	61.33							
1999	63.40	29.80	84.10					
<i>Percentage of secondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally adopted skill standards, using state recognized approaches</i>								
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets		
2000	39							
2001	61							
2002	59					63		
2003	64					65		
2004						70		
<i>Percentage of Post secondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally-adopted skill standards, using state recognized approaches</i>								
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets		
	State Assessment	Completion	Other			State Assessment	Completion	Other



	Assessment			Assessment
<b>1998</b>	59.30	87.30	65.10	
<b>1999</b>	73.90	76.70	62.60	

  

<i>Percentage of Post secondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally-adopted skill standards, using state recognized approaches</i>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
<b>2000</b>	76	
<b>2001</b>	76	
<b>2002</b>	76	77
<b>2003</b>	77	78
<b>2004</b>		80

**Improvements:** ED will continue to provide technical assistance to the states to improve their program quality.

**Objective 8.3 of 6: Ensure that concentrators, including special populations, make successful transitions to further education and employment.**

**Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Secondary Student Outcomes: An increasing proportion of vocational concentrators, including special populations, will attain high school diplomas, enter postsecondary programs, or attain employment.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of vocational concentrators who have completed high school and transitioned to postsecondary education or employment</i>				<p><b>Status:</b> Target not met</p> <p><b>Progress:</b> The states performance did not meet the performance target, although the performance held steady.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> States used various measurement approaches for postsecondary completion and placement, such as, UI wage record exchanges and surveys to indicate completion and placement performance. Performance data developed by</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> Performance Report <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State performance data are reported in the Consolidated Annual Performance, Accountability, and Financial Status Report For State-</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or Employment Adm. Record Exchange	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or Employment Survey		
<b>1998</b>	83.80	62.50	80		
<b>1999</b>	77.40	72.70	82.20		
<i>Percentage of vocational concentrators who have completed high school and transitioned to postsecondary education or employment</i>					

<i>postsecondary education or employment</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or Employment	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or Employment
2000	80	79		
2001	84	84		
2002	84	84	85	85
2003	84	84	86	86
2004			88	87

states is reported to OVAE 90 days after termination of the grant, i.e., the 2003 data was reported by December 31, 2003.

Administered Vocational Education Programs.

**Frequency:** Annually.  
**Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003  
**Data Available:** April 2004  
**Validated By:** No Formal Verification. States are asked to attest to their data quality at the time of their submissions.

**Limitations:** There is no interstate comparability.

**Improvements:** ED will continue to provide technical assistance to the states to improve their program quality.

**Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Postsecondary Student Outcomes: Increasing proportions of postsecondary vocational students, including special populations, will have a positive placement in one or more of the following categories of outcomes: retention in and completion of a postsecondary degree or certificate, placement in military service, or placement or retention in employment.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators who have completed postsecondary education and have a positive placement in military or employment</i>					<b>Status:</b> Target not met  <b>Progress:</b> The states performance held steady on postsecondary degree completion, although performance dropped for placement.	<b>Source:</b> Performance Report <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Postsecondary Degree/Certificate/Completion	Placement in Military Adm. in Military or Employment	Postsecondary Degree/Certificate/Completion	Placement in Military Adm. in Military or Employment		

	Data	Record Exchange	Data	Record Exchange
<b>1998</b>	55.90	81.90	87.70	
<b>1999</b>	32.80	86.20	78.10	

*Percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators who have completed postsecondary education and have a positive placement in military or employment.*

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Postsecondary Degree/Certificate/ Completion	Placement in Military or Employment	Postsecondary Degree/Certificate/ Completion	Placement in Military or Employment
<b>2000</b>	32	82		
<b>2001</b>	37	84		
<b>2002</b>	41	86	39	84
<b>2003</b>	41	83	42	85
<b>2004</b>			45	86

**Explanation:** States used various measurement approaches for postsecondary completion and placement, such as, UI wage record exchanges, administrative record exchanges and surveys to indicate completion and placement performance. Performance data developed by states is reported to OVAE 90 days after termination of the grant, i.e., the 2003 data was reported by December 31, 2003.

**Additional Source Information:** State performance was reported in the Consolidated Annual Performance, Accountability, and Financial Status Report For State-Administered Vocational Education Programs.

**Frequency:** Annually.  
**Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003

**Data Available:** March 2004

**Validated By:** No Formal Verification. States are asked to attest to their data quality at the time of their submissions.

**Limitations:** There is no interstate comparability.

**Improvements:** ED will continue to provide technical assistance to the states to improve their program quality.

**Objective 8.4 of 6: Vocational Education State Grants - Native Hawaiian Vocational and Technical Education Program**

**Indicator 8.4.1 of 2: An increasing number of vocational education students will attain high school diplomas.**

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

<i>Number of vocational students attaining high school diplomas</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The grantee has been provided with the indicators and are collecting data now that will be reported with the performance report due October 2003. The 2003 data will be used as baseline data for establishing performance targets. The 2004 performance target will be the baseline plus 1percent and the 2005 performance target will be the baseline plus 2 percent.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2003		999	
2004		1	
2005		2	

  

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of vocational students who obtained employment.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The grantee has been provided with the indicators and are collecting data now that will be reported with the performance report due October 2003. The 2003 data will be used as baseline data for establishing performance targets. The 2004 performance target will be the baseline plus 1 percent and the 2005 performance target will be the baseline plus 2 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		1		
2005		2		
<i>Number of students entering postsecondary or advanced programs.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The grantee has been provided with the indicators and are collecting data now that will be reported with the performance report due October 2003. The 2003 data will be used as baseline data for establishing performance targets. The 2004 performance target will be the baseline plus 1 percent and the 2005 performance target will be the baseline plus 2 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		1		
2005		2		
<i>Number of students entering military service.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The grantee has been provided with the indicators and are collecting data now that will be reported with the performance report due October 2003. The 2003 data will be used as baseline data for establishing performance targets. The 2004 performance target will be the baseline plus 1 percent and the 2005 performance target will be the baseline plus 2 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003		999		
2004		1		
2005		2		

**Objective 8.5 of 6: Vocational Education State Grants—Pacific Vocational Education Improvement Program**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of vocational students obtaining a high school diploma.</i>				<b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> July 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	87.20			
2004		89		
2005		90		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percent of vocational education teachers in Pacific outlying areas offered professional development.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Significantly more teachers received professional development due to the grantees' emphasis on meeting the Administration's and Department's priorities surrounding teacher quality.	<b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> July 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002		5		
2003	56	5		
2004		5		
2005		35		

**Objective 8.6 of 6: Vocational Education State Grants - Native American Vocational and Technical Education**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Students enrolled in NAVTEP projects.</i>			<b>Progress:</b> The number of Native American and Alaskan Native students in NAVTEP programs continued to increase in 2003.  <b>Explanation:</b> The new indicator reflects	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program performance reports]  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	6,067	2,497		
2003	6,381	6,100		
2004		6,400		

<b>2005</b>		6,500	the total number of students served in the NAVTEP rather than only those in community colleges.	<p>Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data is self-reported by grantee through a performance, statistical and evaluation report.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data will be checked by staff during on-site monitoring of projects. ED will continue to request increased enrollment numbers during clarification conferences with grantees for new and continuation awards.</p>
-------------	--	-------	---	--

**Indicator 8.6.2 of 2: An increasing percentage of Native American and Alaska Native students in the NAVTEP will have positive outcomes in one or more of the following categories: attaining a vocational and technical education postsecondary certificate or degree, or placement in employment or the military services.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of NAVTEP students attaining a certificate or degree.</i>			<p><b>Progress:</b> The number of students, enrolled in NAVTEP projects, who attained a certificate, earned a degree or were placed in employment or joined the military, continued to increase in 2003.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee performance, statistical and evaluation reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.  ED program officers review data through NAVTEP grantee performance, statistical and evaluation reports.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data is self-reported by grantee through a performance, statistical and evaluation report.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2002</b>	664			
<b>2003</b>	728	690		
<b>2004</b>		725		
<b>2005</b>		761		
<i>Number of NAVTEP students placed in employment or military services</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2002</b>	1,606			
<b>2003</b>	1,690	1,650		
<b>2004</b>		1,715		
<b>2005</b>		1,800		



# Adult Education: State Grants and Knowledge Development - 2004

CFDA Number: 84.002 - Adult Education\_State Grant Program

## Goal 8: To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.

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

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

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of adults in Adult Basic Education Programs who acquire the level of basic skills needed to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> Indicator has been changed to require validation of basic skills acquisition through standardized assessment. Because of change to the indicators, new performance target/baseline has been established. 2001 is the baseline year. Data reflect percent of Adult Education Learners (Adults With Limited Basic Skills) who demonstrated a level of basic skill proficiency needed to advance to the next educational functioning level. Educational functioning levels range from beginning literacy through high school. Revised indicators require validation of basic skill proficiency through standardized assessment. New targets reflect new standard.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets			
	Percentage of adults	Percentage of adults			
1997	40				
1998	31				
1999	44				
2000	26	40			
2001	36	40			
2002		40			
2003		41			
2004		42			



**Indicator 8.1.2 of 5: Basic English language acquisition: Percentage of adults enrolled in English Literacy programs will acquire (validated by standardized assessment) the level of English language skills needed to complete the levels of instruction in which they enrolled.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																														
<p><i>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. 2001 is the new baseline.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>49</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>20</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>31</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td></td> <td>32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td>34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>35</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1996	30		1997	28		1998	28		1999	49		2000	20	40	2001	31	40	2002		32	2003		34	2004		35	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Indicator has been changed to require validation of basic skill acquisition through standardized assessment. Because of change to the indicator, new performance target/baseline has been established. Data reflect percent of English Literacy learners (adults with minimal English language skills) who demonstrated a level of English language proficiency needed to advance to the next educational functioning level. Educational functioning levels range from beginning-level English Literacy through advanced-level English Literacy. Revised indicators requires validation of English proficiency through standardized assessment. New targets reflect new standard.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the (OVAE) implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																
1996	30																																	
1997	28																																	
1998	28																																	
1999	49																																	
2000	20	40																																
2001	31	40																																
2002		32																																
2003		34																																
2004		35																																

**Indicator 8.1.3 of 5: Secondary completion: Percentage of adults with a high school completion goal and who exit during the program year that earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Because of change to the indicator, new performance benchmark targets have been established. 2001 is the baseline year. The performance data reflect % of adult learners with a goal to complete high school in secondary level programs of instruction, who, upon exit earned their high school diploma or GED credential within the reporting period.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Percent of adults	Percent of adults		
1996	36			
1997	37			
1998	33			
1999	34			
2000	34	40		
2001	33	40		
2002		40		
2003		41		
2004		42		

**Indicator 8.1.4 of 5: Transition to post-secondary education or training: Percentage of enrolled adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who exit during the program year that enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																																																						
<p><i>Percentage of adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Year</th> <th colspan="2">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="2">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Number of adults</th> <th>Percentage of adults</th> <th>Number of adults</th> <th>Percentage of adults</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>175,255</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>178,520</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>158,167</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>148,803</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>161,650</td> <td></td> <td>300,000</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>27</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		Number of adults	Percentage of adults	Number of adults	Percentage of adults	1996	175,255				1997	178,520				1998	158,167				1999	148,803				2000	161,650		300,000		2001		25			2002				25	2003				26	2004				27	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Because of the change to the indicator new performance benchmarks/targets have been established. 2001 is the baseline year. The new performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners with a goal of further education or training, who, upon exit from adult education, enrolled in a postsecondary education or training program.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and a data quality review.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets																																																									
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults	Number of adults	Percentage of adults																																																								
1996	175,255																																																											
1997	178,520																																																											
1998	158,167																																																											
1999	148,803																																																											
2000	161,650		300,000																																																									
2001		25																																																										
2002				25																																																								
2003				26																																																								
2004				27																																																								

**Indicator 8.1.5 of 5: Transition to work: The percentage of unemployed adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																																																						
<p><i>Percentage of adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Year</th> <th colspan="2">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="2">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Number of adults</th> <th>Percentage of adults</th> <th>Number of adults</th> <th>Percentage of adults</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>306,982</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>340,206</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>294,755</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>409,062</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>454,318</td> <td></td> <td>425,000</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td></td> <td>36</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>36</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>38</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		Number of adults	Percentage of adults	Number of adults	Percentage of adults	1996	306,982				1997	340,206				1998	294,755				1999	409,062				2000	454,318		425,000		2001		36			2002				36	2003				37	2004				38	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Because of the change to the indicator, new performance benchmark targets have been established. 2001 is the baseline year. The 2001 performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners with an employment goal, who, upon exit from an adult education program obtain a job.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and a data quality review.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets																																																									
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults	Number of adults	Percentage of adults																																																								
1996	306,982																																																											
1997	340,206																																																											
1998	294,755																																																											
1999	409,062																																																											
2000	454,318		425,000																																																									
2001		36																																																										
2002				36																																																								
2003				37																																																								
2004				38																																																								

