

# Archived Information

## COMPREHENSIVE CENTERS PROGRAM

<b>Goal:</b> To assist Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) recipients in improving teaching and learning for all children, particularly children at risk of education failure.	<b>Funding History</b> (\$ in millions)			
	<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Appropriation</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Appropriation</b>
<b>Legislation:</b> Title XIII, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended (20 U.S.C. 8621-8625).	1985	\$0	2000	\$28
	1990	\$0	2001	\$28
	1995	\$30	2002 (Requested)	\$28

### Program Description

Title XIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended in 1994, created fifteen Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers to help states and local educational agencies implement educational reform.

The Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers are part of a national technical assistance and dissemination system designed to make technical assistance available to states, local educational agencies, tribes, schools, and other recipients of funds under the ESEA. Specific technical assistance goals are to provide assistance in (1) administering and implementing ESEA programs; (2) implementing school reform programs to improve teaching and learning; (3) coordinating ESEA programs with other federal, state, and local education plans so that all students (particularly, students at risk of educational failure) are given opportunities to meet challenging state content and performance standards; and (4) adopting, adapting, and implementing promising and proven practices for improving teaching and learning.

## Program Performance

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE HIGH-QUALITY COMPREHENSIVE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES, TERRITORIES, TRIBES, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AND SCHOOLS THAT HELPS STUDENTS REACH HIGH ACADEMIC STANDARDS.

<b>Indicator 1.1 Addressing legislative priorities: 80% of comprehensive center customers served will be schoolwide programs, high-poverty schools, and Bureau of Indian Affairs-funded schools.</b>							
Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets	<p><b>Status:</b> Target exceeded.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Although the target was exceeded in 2000, the target is still an appropriate one. In addition to serving the targeted customers identified in indicator 1.1, a significant level of Comprehensive Centers effort is also directed to providing support to other customers, including State agencies, local school districts, and intermediate school units. The ESEA also requires that the Comprehensive Centers provide TA for educators serving <i>all</i> children, including special populations.</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> Comprehensive Centers (CC) performance reports, including <u>Data Tables</u>, for 2000.  <i>Frequency:</i> Semi-annually (Jan. 30 and July 30).  <i>Next collection update:</i> July 31, 2001.  <i>Date to be reported:</i> 2001.</p> <p><b>Validation Procedure:</b> Data supplied by project's uniform reporting system. No formal verification procedure applied to data collection, but data analysis validated by outside contractor.</p> <p><b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> Self-reported project-level data have been analyzed with assistance of an outside contractor. Improvement in the uniform data collection system has resulted in more valid data being reported in 2000.</p>
	Schoolwide Programs	High-poverty schools, non-schoolwide programs	BIA Schools	TOTAL			
1998:	50%	12%	4%	66%			
1999:	44%	30%	3%	77%	80%		
<b>2000:</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>80%</b>		
2001:					80%		
2002:					80%		

<b>Indicator 1.2 Integrating technical assistance: An increasing percentage of CC activities will provide integrated, noncategorical technical assistance (such as focusing on standards, assessment of special populations, reading, other challenging curricula, leadership development, and whole-school reform).</b>					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Noncategorical topics</i>		<p><b>Status:</b> Unable to judge</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Baseline is established with the 2000 data. Prior counts are not reported here because the method for counting integrated technical assistance was incorrect. The definition and method of how to count “integrated” were clarified this year, 2000.</p> <p>Examples of network-wide Center “integrated” results are the Reading Success Network; comprehensive school reform technical assistance; and support for turning around low performing schools. A major policy shift for the ESEA in 1994 was the move to serve children in comprehensive, coordinated, non-categorical teaching and learning situations. The Comprehensive Centers were established to support this coordinated effort, as well as to serve targeted, educationally disadvantaged students.</p>		<p><b>Source:</b> Comprehensive Centers (CC) performance reports, including <u>Data Tables</u>, for 2000.</p> <p><i>Frequency:</i> Semi-annually (Jan. 30 and July 31). <i>Next collection update:</i> July 31, 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> 2001.</p> <p><b>Validation Procedure:</b> Data supplied by project’s uniform reporting system. No formal verification procedure applied to data collection, but data analysis validated by outside contractor.</p> <p><b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> Same as 1.1.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
2000:	51%				55%
2001:					58%
2002:					58%
<b>Indicator 1.3 Addressing customer needs: An increasing percentage of state and local administrators served by the CCs will report satisfaction with the usefulness of technical assistance provided.</b>					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Satisfaction with usefulness of technical assistance</i>		<p><b>Status:</b> Target expected to be met or surpassed in 2000.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> None.</p>		<p><b>Source:</b> Customer satisfaction survey</p> <p><i>Frequency:</i> Biannually. <i>Next collection update:</i> 2000. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Fall 2001.</p> <p><b>Validation Procedure:</b> Data to be validated by external evaluation contractor.</p> <p><b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> Customer satisfaction surveys were not conducted for 2000.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
1998:	64% of state Federal-program administrators				
1999:	79% of state and local administrators				65%
2000:	<b>Data Collected Biennially</b>				<b>80%</b>
2001:					80%
2002:					

<b>Indicator 1.4 Showing impact with customers: Participants in center activities report that they have incorporated information or skills they have learned from the Centers activities into their work.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>Status:</b> Target expected to be met or surpassed in 2000.  <b>Explanation:</b> None.	<b>Source:</b> Customer satisfaction survey <i>Frequency:</i> Biannually. <i>Next collection update:</i> 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Fall 2001.  <b>Validation Procedure:</b> Data to be validated by external evaluation contractor.  <b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> Customer satisfaction surveys were not conducted for 2000.
1999:	72%	Continuing increase		
<b>2000:</b>	<b>Data Collected Biennially</b>	<b>75%</b>		
2001:		75%		
2002:				