

Archived Information

**Interim**  
**Revisions to the**  
***FY 2004 Annual Plan***

U. S. Department of Education  
December 31, 2003



# Interim Revisions to the *FY 2004 Annual Plan*

The Department published our *FY 2004 Annual Plan* in March 2003 based on our *Strategic Plan 2002 – 2007*. Based on our results as published in our *FY 2003 Performance and Accountability Report (PAR)*, we found that it was appropriate to make some revisions to our *FY 2004 Annual Plan*; these revisions are contained herein. After Congress passes the FY 2004 appropriations, the Department will finalize the revisions.

## Key to Tables

M = Million.

For acronyms, please see the glossary following the tables.

Note: Fiscal Year 2005 corresponds to school year 2004-05; Fiscal Year 2004 corresponds to school year 2003-04, etc.

**The following strategies replace all previously published strategies.**

Objective 1.1: Link federal education funding to accountability for results.

- State NCLB accountability systems
- Federal accountability
- Performance-based grants
- Outcomes-based performance management
- Targeted support and outreach
- Evaluations informing legislation

Objective 1.2: Increase flexibility and local control.

- Flexibility provisions for state and local educational agencies

Objective 1.3: Increase information and options for parents.

- Public school parental choice and supplemental services
- Charter and magnet school options
- Parental information and involvement
- Development and improvement of report cards
- Expansion of choice options

Objective 1.4: Encourage the use of scientifically based methods within federal education programs.

- Scientifically based research
- Targeted support and outreach

Objective 2.1: Ensure that all students read on grade level by the third grade.

- Early cognitive development and intervention
- Application and awareness of scientifically based reading research
- Reading achievement for special populations
- High-quality teacher supply and support
- Data-based decision-making

Objective 2.2: Improve mathematics and science achievement for all students.

- High-quality teacher supply and support
- Data-based decision-making
- Partnerships in mathematics and science
- Research-based mathematics and science instruction
- Mathematics and science awareness and technical assistance

Objective 2.3: Improve the performance of all high school students.

- High school accountability
- Strengthened high school curricula
- Rigorous research on high schools
- Alternative high school options
- High-quality teacher supply and support

Objective 2.4: Improve teacher and principal quality.

- Reduced barriers to becoming a teacher or a principal
- Rigorous teacher preparation
- Research-based professional development
- Rigorous research on teacher quality
- Principal quality
- Retention of high-quality teachers

Objective 2.5: Improve U.S. students' knowledge of world languages, regions, and international issues and build international ties in the field of education.

- International partnerships
- International education awareness
- Enhanced foreign language instruction

Objective 3.1: Ensure that our nation's schools are safe and drug free and that students are free of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs.

- Accountability for results
- Research-based strategies and effective practices
- Information dissemination and technical assistance

Objective 3.2: Promote strong character and citizenship among our nation's youth.

- Research-based strategies and effective practices
- Coordination and collaboration
- Information dissemination and technical assistance

Objective 4.1: Raise the quality of research funded or conducted by the Department.

- Rigorous standards for education research

Objective 4.2: Increase the relevance of our research in order to meet the needs of our customers.

- Systemic stakeholder input
- Responsive allocation of resources
- Accessible findings

Objective 5.1: Reduce the gaps in college access and completion among student populations differing by race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and disability while increasing the educational attainment of all.

- Rigorous academic preparation for postsecondary education
- Reduced barriers to postsecondary education
- Effective partnerships
- Improved services for student populations, including students with disabilities
- Efficient credit transfer among public institutions

Objective 5.2: Strengthen accountability of postsecondary education institutions.

- Enhanced monitoring and reporting
- Data-based decision-making
- Improved discretionary grant process
- Outcomes-based performance management
- Comprehensive information for parents and students

Objective 5.3: Establish effective funding mechanisms for postsecondary education.

- Knowledge management for student aid
- Student aid award accuracy

Objective 5.4: Strengthen Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, and Tribal Colleges and Universities.

- Improved technical assistance
- Targeted services for improved access, persistence, and completion
- Public/private partnerships
- Strengthened technological infrastructure
- Strengthened fiscal management

Objective 5.5: Enhance the literacy and employment skills of American adults.

- Accountability for state and local results
- Research-based strategies and effective practices
- Demonstration projects, information dissemination, and technical assistance
- Technology-based solutions

Objective 5.6: Increase the capacity of U.S. postsecondary education institutions to teach world languages, area studies, and international issues.

- Strengthened foreign language, international, and area studies capacity
- Effective partnerships and linkages

Objective 6.1: Develop and maintain financial integrity and management and internal controls.

- Financial systems integration
- Management decisions based on enhanced financial analysis

- Outcome-based stewardship of federal funds
- Optimal use of performance-based initiatives

Objective 6.2: Improve the strategic management of the Department's human capital.

- Human capital planning
- Skills gap analysis
- Emphasis on customer service and employee performance and accountability
- Human capital management core process improvements
- Strategic sourcing

Objective 6.3: Manage information technology resources, using e-gov, to improve services for our customers and partners.

- Implementation of an enterprise architecture
- Secure IT infrastructure
- Reduction of data-reporting burden
- Customer-oriented online business focus

Objective 6.4: Modernize the Student Financial Assistance programs and reduce their high-risk status.

- Integrated and efficient processes and delivery system
- Program integrity

Objective 6.5: Achieve budget and performance integration to link funding decisions to results.

- Aligned budget and planning processes
- Program effectiveness documentation

Objective 6.6: Leverage the contributions of faith-based and community organizations to increase the effectiveness of Department programs.

- Enhanced technical assistance and outreach for faith-based and community organizations
- Full participation of faith-based and community organizations in Department programs

**The following measures have been deleted from the FY 2004 Annual Plan.**

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
1.1	The percentage of states with complete school accountability systems, including testing in grades 3 – 8, in place as required by the No Child Left Behind Act.	All states had plans in place by September 30, 2003, so this measure has been achieved. It has been replaced with a measure that tracks implementation of state accountability systems.
1.1	The percentage of Department programs reviewed under the PART process that demonstrate effectiveness.	In the Department's <i>FY 2004 Annual Plan</i> , this measure was duplicated in Objective 6.5; we have now deleted it in Objective 1.1, but retained it in Objective 6.5.
1.1	The percentage of Department program dollars associated with programs reviewed under the PART process that demonstrate effectiveness.	In the Department's <i>FY 2004 Annual Plan</i> , this measure was duplicated in Objective 6.5; we have now deleted it in Objective 1.1, but retained it in Objective 6.5.
1.2	The OMB burden-hour estimate of Department program data collections per year.	The Department discontinued this measure because additional data collection requirements are added on a regular basis, making it difficult to set meaningful targets.
1.3	The percentage of parents who report having the information they need to determine the effectiveness of their child's school.	The Department discontinued this measure because we have no source of data. Beginning in FY 2005, we will add measures that cover a broader range of educational attainment.
5.1	The percentage of families who plan to help child pay for his/her education after high school.	The Department discontinued this measure because we have no source of data.
5.1	The percentage of families who believe they have enough information about the amount needed for college or vocational school to start planning how to pay for child's education.	The Department discontinued this measure because we have no source of data.
5.3	Unmet need as a percentage of the cost of attendance for low-income dependent students.	The Department discontinued this measure because we have no source of data.
5.3	Unmet need as a percentage of the cost of attendance for low-income independent students with children.	The Department discontinued this measure because we have no source of data.
5.3	Unmet need as a percentage of the cost of attendance for low-income independent students without children.	The Department discontinued this measure because we have no source of data.
5.5	The percentage of adults reading at the lowest level of literacy in national adult literacy assessments.	The Department discontinued this measure because data are collected infrequently.
5.6	Number of students graduating from National Resource Center-funded programs.	The Department discontinued this measure because it focused on only a single program. Beginning in FY 2005, we will add a broader set of measures addressing postsecondary education institutions' attention to international activities.

**The following measures have been deleted from the FY 2004 Annual Plan.**

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
6.1	The financial management grade received on report card by the Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Financial Management and Intergovernmental Relations.	The Department discontinued this measure because the Subcommittee no longer issues the report card.
6.3	Percentage of loan programs providing online application capability.	The Department discontinued this measure because all loan programs now offer online application capability.
6.3	The OMB burden-hour estimate of Department program data collections per year.	The Department discontinued this measure because additional data collection requirements are added on a regular basis, making it difficult to set meaningful targets.
6.5	The percentage of Department programs reviewed under the PART process that demonstrate effectiveness.	The Department discontinued this measure to focus on a similar measure related to the amount of program dollars rather than a count of programs.
6.6	Issuance of clear guidance that explains the ground rules for participation of faith-based groups in Department grant programs in accordance with applicable constitutional standards.	The Department discontinued this as a measure and will establish it as an action step for FY 2005.
6.6	Percentage of program staff who work on programs open by statute to FBCOs and attorneys in the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) that receive training on the ground rules for the participation of FBCOs in the Department's grant programs.	The Department discontinued this activity-based measure and replaced it with outcome measures.

**The following FY 2004 measures or targets have been revised. (Revisions are shown in bold and strikethrough.)**

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>FY 2004 Target</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
1.3	The number of children attending charter schools.	<b>800,000</b>	The Department modified the target for this measure because of the slower-than-anticipated growth of new charter schools and because states with caps on the number of charter schools have not revised their charter school statutes that govern establishment of new charter schools.
1.4	The number of hits on the What Works Clearinghouse Web site.	<b>2 M</b>	The Department modified this target based on FY 2003 data, which was the first year that data were available. M = million.

<b>The following FY 2004 measures or targets have been revised. (Revisions are shown in bold and strikethrough.)</b>			
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>FY 2004 Target</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
2.1	<b>Of states<sup>1</sup> with third-grade reading assessments, the percentage</b> <del>number of states</del> meeting their targets for third-grade reading achievement for all students.	<b>100</b>	NCLB requires that all states have third-grade reading assessments by SY 2005 – 06. The Department modified this measure to limit the universe of this measure to only states with third-grade reading assessments and to measure percentage rather than number. Additionally, we modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state that has implemented its third-grade reading assessment will meet its targets.
2.1	<b>Of states with third-grade reading assessments, the percentage</b> <del>number of states</del> meeting their targets for third-grade reading achievement for low-income students.	<b>100</b>	NCLB requires that all states have third-grade reading assessments by SY 2005 – 06. The Department modified this measure to limit the universe of this measure to only states with third-grade reading assessments and to measure percentage rather than number. Additionally, we modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state that has implemented its third-grade reading assessment will meet its targets.
2.1	<b>Of states with third-grade reading assessments, the percentage</b> <del>number of states</del> meeting their targets for third-grade reading achievement for African American students.	<b>100</b>	NCLB requires that all states have third-grade reading assessments by SY 2005 – 06. The Department modified this measure to limit the universe of this measure to only states with third-grade reading assessments and to measure percentage rather than number. Additionally, we modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state that has implemented its third-grade reading assessment will meet its targets.
2.1	<b>Of states with third-grade reading assessments, the percentage</b> <del>number of states</del> meeting their targets for third-grade reading achievement for Hispanic students.	<b>100</b>	NCLB requires that all states have third-grade reading assessments by SY 2005 – 06. The Department modified this measure to limit the universe of this measure to only states with third-grade reading assessments and to measure percentage rather than number. Additionally, we modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state that has implemented its third-grade reading assessment will meet its targets.

<sup>1</sup> For measures related to state assessments, *state* refers to the states and jurisdictions that are required under NCLB to implement assessment systems; this includes the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

**The following FY 2004 measures or targets have been revised. (Revisions are shown in bold and strikethrough.)**

Objective	Measure	FY 2004 Target	Explanation
2.1	<del>Of states with third-grade reading assessments, the number of states</del> <b>Of states with third-grade reading assessments, the percentage</b> The number of states meeting their targets for third-grade reading achievement for students with disabilities.	100	NCLB requires that all states have third-grade reading assessments by SY 2005 – 06. The Department modified this measure to limit the universe of this measure to only states with third-grade reading assessments and to measure percentage rather than number. Additionally, we modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state that has implemented its third-grade reading assessment will meet its targets.
2.1	<del>Of states with third-grade reading assessments, the number of states</del> <b>Of states with third-grade reading assessments, the percentage</b> The number of states meeting their targets for third-grade reading achievement for English language learners.	100	NCLB requires that all states have third-grade reading assessments by SY 2005 – 06. The Department modified this measure to limit the universe of this measure to only states with third-grade reading assessments and to measure percentage rather than number. Additionally, we modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state that has implemented its third-grade reading assessment will meet its targets.
2.2	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for <del>eight-grade</del> <b>middle school</b> mathematics achievement for all students.	100	Because not all states have implemented the mathematics assessment at the eighth grade, the Department modified this measure to reflect middle school students in grades 6, 7, and 8 and to measure percentage rather than number. Additionally, we modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its targets.
2.2	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for <del>eight-grade</del> <b>middle school</b> mathematics achievement for low-income students.	100	Because not all states have implemented the mathematics assessment at the eighth grade, the Department modified this measure to reflect middle school students in grades 6, 7, and 8 and to measure percentage rather than number. Additionally, we modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its targets.
2.2	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for <del>eight-grade</del> <b>middle school</b> mathematics achievement for African American students.	100	Because not all states have implemented the mathematics assessment at the eighth grade, the Department modified this measure to reflect middle school students in grades 6, 7, and 8 and to measure percentage rather than number. Additionally, we modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its targets.

**The following FY 2004 measures or targets have been revised. (Revisions are shown in bold and strikethrough.)**

Objective	Measure	FY 2004 Target	Explanation
2.2	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for <del>eighth-grade</del> <b>middle school</b> mathematics achievement for Hispanic students.	<b>100</b>	Because not all states have implemented the mathematics assessment at the eighth grade, the Department modified this measure to reflect middle school students in grades 6, 7, and 8 and to measure percentage rather than number. Additionally, we modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its targets.
2.2	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for <del>eighth-grade</del> <b>middle school</b> mathematics achievement for students with disabilities.	<b>100</b>	Because not all states have implemented the mathematics assessment at the eighth grade, the Department modified this measure to reflect middle school students in grades 6, 7, and 8 and to measure percentage rather than number. Additionally, we modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its targets.
2.2	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for <del>eighth-grade</del> <b>middle school</b> mathematics achievement for English language learners.	<b>100</b>	Because not all states have implemented the mathematics assessment at the eighth grade, the Department modified this measure to reflect middle school students in grades 6, 7, and 8 and to measure percentage rather than number. Additionally, we modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its targets.
2.3	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for high school reading achievement for all students.	<b>100</b>	The Department converted from measuring number to percentage and modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its target.
2.3	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for high school reading achievement for low-income students.	<b>100</b>	The Department converted from measuring number to percentage and modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its target.
2.3	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for high school reading achievement for African American students.	<b>100</b>	The Department converted from measuring number to percentage and modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its target.
2.3	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for high school reading achievement for Hispanic students.	<b>100</b>	The Department converted from measuring number to percentage and modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its target.
2.3	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for high school reading achievement for students with disabilities.	<b>100</b>	The Department converted from measuring number to percentage and modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its target.
2.3	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for high school reading achievement for English language learners.	<b>100</b>	The Department converted from measuring number to percentage and modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its target.
2.3	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for high school mathematics achievement for all students.	<b>100</b>	The Department converted from measuring number to percentage and modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its target.

**The following FY 2004 measures or targets have been revised. (Revisions are shown in bold and strikethrough.)**

Objective	Measure	FY 2004 Target	Explanation
2.3	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for high school mathematics achievement for low-income students.	<b>100</b>	The Department converted from measuring number to percentage and modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its target.
2.3	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for high school mathematics achievement for African American students.	<b>100</b>	The Department converted from measuring number to percentage and modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its target.
2.3	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for high school mathematics achievement for Hispanic students.	<b>100</b>	The Department converted from measuring number to percentage and modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its target.
2.3	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for high school mathematics achievement for students with disabilities.	<b>100</b>	The Department converted from measuring number to percentage and modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its target.
2.3	The <del>number</del> <b>percentage</b> of states meeting their targets for high school mathematics achievement for English language learners.	<b>100</b>	The Department converted from measuring number to percentage and modified the target to reflect the expectation that every state will meet its target.
2.3	The percentage of <del>all</del> 12th-grade students who scored 3 or higher on at least one of the AP English exams.	<b>65.5</b>	The Department changed the universe to include only those 12th-grade students taking that category of AP exams and modified the target based on trend data.
2.3	The percentage of <del>all</del> 12th-grade students who scored 3 or higher on <b>at least one of</b> the AP <del>American</del> -history exams.	<b>67.6</b>	The Department changed the universe to include only those 12th-grade students taking that category of AP exams. Additionally, we expanded the universe to include European History and World History exams, as well as the U.S. History exam. We modified the target based on trend data.
2.3	The percentage of <del>all</del> 12th-grade students who scored 3 or higher on at least one of the AP calculus exams.	<b>68.7</b>	The Department changed the universe to include only those 12th-grade students taking that category of AP exams and modified the target based on trend data.
2.3	The percentage of <del>all</del> 12th-grade students who scored 3 or higher on at least one of the AP science exams.	<b>59.9</b>	The Department changed the universe to include only those 12th-grade students taking that category of AP exams and modified the target based on trend data.
2.4	The percentage of the nation's teachers of core academic subjects that are "highly qualified" as defined by NCLB.	<b>75</b>	Our <i>FY 2004 Annual Plan</i> indicated that we would set a baseline in FY 2004; instead, we will use FY 2003 results as baseline and we set a numerical target for FY 2004.
3.2	The percentage of 14- to 18-year-olds who believe cheating occurs among half or most students.	<b>40</b>	The Department modified this target to more accurately reflect our goals and preliminary trend data.

<b>The following FY 2004 measures or targets have been revised. (Revisions are shown in bold and strikethrough.)</b>			
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>FY 2004 Target</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
4.1	The percentage of new IES and OSEP research and evaluation projects funded by the Department <b>to conduct research on or evaluate programs, practices, and policies designed to improve student learning and achievement</b> that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.	<b>70</b>	The Department modified this measure to define which projects would be in the universe to reflect adherence to rigorous standards for research and evaluation on the processes of teaching and learning, and programs, practices, and policies to improve the teaching and learning environments for all students. Additionally, based on trend data, we modified the target to be more reasonable.
4.1	The percentage of new IES and OSEP research and evaluation publications <b>reporting research on or evaluation of programs, practices, and policies designed to improve student learning and achievement</b> that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.	95	The Department modified this measure to define which publications would be in the universe to reflect adherence to rigorous standards for research and evaluation on the processes of teaching and learning, and programs, practices, and policies to improve the teaching and learning environments for all students.
4.1	Of new IES and OSEP research and evaluation projects funded by the Department <b>to conduct research on or to evaluate programs, practices, and policies designed to improve student learning and achievement, the percentage of projects</b> that addressing causal questions, <del>the percentage</del> that employ randomized experimental designs.	75	The Department modified this measure to define which projects would be in the universe to reflect adherence to rigorous standards for research and evaluation on the processes of teaching and learning, and programs, practices, and policies to improve the teaching and learning environments for all students.
4.1	Of IES and OSEP new research and evaluation publications funded by the Department <b>reporting research on or evaluation of programs, practices, and policies designed to improve student learning and achievement, the percentage of publications</b> that addressing causal questions, <del>the percentage</del> that describe studies that employ randomized experimental designs.	75	The Department modified this measure to define which publications would be in the universe to reflect adherence to rigorous standards for research and evaluation on the processes of teaching and learning, and programs, practices, and policies to improve the teaching and learning environments for all students.
5.1	Percentage of 16- to 24-year-old high school graduates enrolled in college the October following high school graduation.		The Department made minor revisions to the targets for enrollment based upon re-analysis of 1998 – 2001 enrollment data.
	Overall	<b>67.0</b>	
	White	<b>69.4</b>	
	African American	<b>60.8</b>	
	White–African American Gap	<b>8.6</b>	
	Hispanic	<b>57.5</b>	
	White–Hispanic Gap	<b>11.9</b>	
	Low Income	<b>51.0</b>	
	High Income	<b>80.0</b>	
	Income Gap	<b>29.0</b>	
5.1	The percentage of full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking students who graduate within six years.		The Department made minor revisions to the targets for graduation based upon re-analysis of 1998 – 2000

<b>The following FY 2004 measures or targets have been revised. (Revisions are shown in bold and strikethrough.)</b>			
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>FY 2004 Target</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
	Overall	<b>54.0</b>	graduation and completion data.
	White	<b>56.8</b>	
	African American	<b>37.4</b>	
	White–African American Gap	<b>19.4</b>	
	Hispanic	<b>43.2</b>	
	White–Hispanic Gap	<b>13.6</b>	
5.1	The percentage of full-time degree- or certificate-seeking students who graduate, earn a certificate, or transfer from two-year institutions within three years.		The Department made minor revisions to the targets for completion based upon preliminary trend analysis.
	All	<b>34.0</b>	
	White	<b>34.5</b>	
	African American	<b>27.3</b>	
	White–African American Gap	<b>7.2</b>	
	Hispanic	<b>31.1</b>	
	White–Hispanic Gap	<b>3.4</b>	
5.2	The percentage of states and territories submitting HEA Title II reports with all data reported using federally-required definitions.	<b>91</b>	The Department revised this target to better reflect actual performance.
5.3	Average national increase in college tuition in percentage, adjusted for inflation.	<b>5.0</b>	The Department modified this target to reflect recent trend data, which indicate that our prior target was not reasonable.
5.3	Borrower indebtedness (expressed as average borrower payments) for federal student loans as a percentage of borrower income.	<b>9.9</b>	The Department modified this target to provide a more specific numerical value.
5.4	The percentage of HBCUs, HSIs, and TCUs with a positive fiscal balance.	<b>70</b>	The Department modified this target because recent decreases in state contributions to higher education have resulted in declines in fiscal balance performance.
5.4	The percentage of HBCUs, HSIs, and TCUs with evidence of increased technological capacity (such as wireless systems, high speed Internet connections, distance learning programs, or other evidence of technological innovation).	<b>50</b>	The Department modified this target to provide a numerical value.
5.5	The percentage of <del>all</del> <b>employed</b> persons served by state VR agencies who obtain <b>competitive</b> employment.	<b>63.2</b>	The Department modified this measure to reflect competitive employment, a more policy-specific and useful measure than the previous measure, which included multiple placements.
6.1	The number of audit recommendations from prior-year financial statement audits remaining open.	<b>2</b>	This new measure was added to provide broader accountability of postsecondary educational institutions' attention to international activities. The baselines will be set in FY 2004.
6.1	The percentage of eligible dollars in performance-based contract actions.	<b>60</b>	Based on trend data, the Department modified the target to be more challenging.

<b>The following FY 2004 measures or targets have been revised. (Revisions are shown in bold and strikethrough.)</b>			
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>FY 2004 Target</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
6.1	The percentage of erroneous payments.	<b>Less than 2.5</b>	The Department modified this target to provide a numerical value.
6.1	The federal administrative cost per <b>discretionary</b> grant transaction.	<b>\$8,128</b>	The Department separated the previous single measure into separate measures for the two major types of grants and provided numerical targets.
6.1	The federal administrative cost per <b>formula</b> grant transaction.	<b>\$4,065</b>	
6.2	The percentage of principal offices that have identified recruitment needs in their principal office recruitment plan <del>and that are taking actions to fill critical positions with needed skills.</del>	<b>95</b>	The Department separated the previous single measure into two separate measures to track actions taken separately from recruitment plans and has set distinct targets for each of these.
6.2	The percentage of principal offices that are taking actions to fill critical positions with needed skills.	<b>60</b>	
6.2	The percentage of personnel in the lowest two EDPAS rating levels who have performance improvement activities under way.	<b>70</b>	The Department has modified the target based on trend data that became available in 2003.
6.2	Percentage of EDPAS employees who have documented ratings of record in <b>FPPS within 90 days of the close of the rating cycle.</b>	<b>80</b>	The Department added language to specify the timing of the ratings and modified the target based on trend data.
6.2	Number of <del>positions for which solicitations are issued under the revised A-76 guidelines</del> <b>business functions reviewed for strategic sourcing.</b>	<b>8</b>	The Department modified this measure to have a wider focus than just A-76 competitions.
6.3	Percentage of grant programs providing online application capability.	<b>65</b>	Based on trend data, the Department modified the target to be more challenging.
6.3	The percentage of major IT investments that achieve less than a 10% variance of cost <del>and schedule</del> goals.	91	The Department has separated the previous single measure into separate measures for cost variance and schedule variance.
6.3	The percentage of major IT investments that achieve less than a 10% variance of cost <del>and schedule</del> goals.	91	
6.4	Default recovery rate (percentage of <b>FSA's collections, excluding consolidations</b> ).	<b>9.5</b>	The Department reworded this measure to clarify that the recovery rate is based on FSA efforts only and, based on trend data, we modified the target to be more challenging.
6.4	The percentage of Pell grant erroneous payments.	<b>4.9</b>	Based on trend data, the Department modified the target to more reasonably reflect trend data.
6.4	FSA Customer Service (measures of service levels of targeted FSA transactions with public).		The Department has separated the previous single measure into the specific customer service items being targeted by FSA and we provided numerical targets to replace general targets.
	<b>Customer service level for FAFSA on the Web</b>	<b>86</b>	
	<b>Customer service level for Direct Loan Servicing</b>	<b>77</b>	
	<b>Customer service level for Common Origination and Disbursement (COD)</b>	<b>70</b>	
	<b>Customer service level for Lender Reporting System (LaRS)</b>	<b>74</b>	

**The following FY 2004 measures or targets have been revised. (Revisions are shown in bold and strikethrough.)**

Objective	Measure	FY 2004 Target	Explanation
6.5	The percentage of Department program dollars associated with programs reviewed under the PART process that demonstrate effectiveness.	<b>56</b>	Although this measure statement is unchanged from the <i>FY 2004 Annual Plan</i> , the Department modified the definition of effectiveness that it will use; the revised definition will reflect the overall ratings of programs on the PART. Based on trend data, we modified the target for consistency with the new definition.
6.6	Number of grant applications from FBCOs <del>in</del> <b>for Federal</b> discretionary grant programs.	Baseline (2003) + 10%	The Department modified the measure statement to clarify that it applies only to Federal programs.

**The following measures and targets have been added for FY 2004.**

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>2004 Target</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
1.1	The percentage of states with final No Child Left Behind accountability systems that are fully implemented.	15	Since all states now have approved NCLB plans in place, this measure will track the number of states that fully implement those plans prior to the mandated deadline of SY 2005 – 06.
5.2	The percentage of institutions of higher education submitting required reports and information on time:		The Department added these measures, which assess institutional activities, to complement the existing measure of state activities.
	Audit data	99	
	Campus crime data	100	
	IPEDS data	99	
5.2	Percentage of OPE grants closed on time.	90	The Department added this measure, which assesses Department activities, to complement the existing measure of state activities.
5.2	The percentage of IG and GAO audits of OPE activities that are resolved on time.	75	The Department added this measure, which assesses Department activities, to complement the existing measure of state activities.
5.6	The number of foreign-language course offerings by Title VI institutions.	Set baseline	This new measure was added to provide broader accountability of postsecondary educational institutions' attention to international activities.
5.6	The percentage of Title VI graduates who find employment in higher education, government service, and national security.	Set baseline	This new measure was added to provide broader accountability of postsecondary educational institutions' attention to international activities.
5.6	The number of comprehensive instructional resources (assessments, publications, curricular materials, etc.) produced at Title VI institutions of higher education.	Set baseline	This new measure was added to provide broader accountability of postsecondary educational institutions' attention to international activities.
5.6	The number of K-12 teachers trained through the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays Programs.	Set baseline	This new measure was added to provide broader accountability of postsecondary educational institutions' attention to international activities.
6.1	Timeliness of major account reconciliations, expressed as the number of days after month end.	30	The Department added this measure because timely reconciliations are critical to meeting the accelerated audit schedule and to using financial data in making day-to-day business decisions.
6.3	Percentage of completed FISMA Plan of Actions and Milestones (POA&M).	55	The Department added this measure to further address IT security.
6.4	Overall default recovery rate (percentage of FSA and GA's collections excluding consolidations).	11.0	The Department added this measure to track the recovery rate on both FFEL and DL loans.
6.4	The percentage of Pell grant underpayments.	1.8	The Department added this measure to complement the existing measure of overpayments.

<b>The following measures and targets have been added for FY 2004.</b>			
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>2004 Target</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
6.4	Number of material weaknesses and reportable conditions in FSA financial audit statements.	1	The Department added this measure to track material weaknesses and reportable conditions.
6.6	Percentage of FBCOs that successfully apply for federal discretionary grant programs.	The success rate for FBCOs will be within 10 percent of non-FBCOs.	The Department added this measure to determine whether FBCOs are as successful as non-FBCOs.
6.6	Number of FBCOs approved by states as supplemental educational service providers under NCLB.	90	The Department added this measure to help determine progress at the state level.

Additionally, the Department has revised FY 2004 program performance plans for the following programs. These revised plans and other FY 2004 program performance plans can be found on the Web at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2004plan/program.html>.

EDA: Gallaudet University  
EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf  
ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Program  
ESEA: Early Reading First  
ESEA: Even Start  
ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants  
ESEA: State Assessments  
HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults  
IDEA: Grants for Infants and Families  
RA: Client Assistance State Grants  
RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research  
RA: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights  
RA: State Vocational Rehabilitation Grants—Grants to States

## Glossary

AP	Advanced Placement	IES	Institute of Education Sciences
COD	Common Origination and Disbursement	IG	Inspector General
DL	Direct Loan	IPEDS	Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System
EDA	Education for the Deaf Act	IT	Information Technology
EDPAS	Education Department Performance Appraisal System	LaRS	Lender Reporting System
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act	M	Million
FAFSA	Free Application for Federal Student Aid	NCLB	No Child Left Behind Act
FBCO	Faith-Based and Community Organization	OGC	Office of the General Counsel
FFEL	Federal Family Education Loan	OMB	Office of Management and Budget
FISMA	Federal Information Security Management Act	OPE	Office of Postsecondary Education
FPFS	Federal Personnel and Payroll System	OSEP	Office of Special Education Programs
FSA	Federal Student Aid	PAR	Performance and Accountability Report
FY	Fiscal Year	PART	Program Assessment Rating Tool
GA	Guaranty Agency	POA&M	Plan of Actions and Milestones
GAO	General Accounting Office	RA	Rehabilitation Act
HBCU	Historically Black College and University	SY	School Year
HKNCA	Helen Keller National Center Act	TCU	Tribal College and University
HSI	Hispanic-Serving Institution	VR	Vocational Rehabilitation
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act		