



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS

Edward H. Jurith
Acting Director
Office of National Drug Control Policy
Executive Office of the President
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. Jurith:

In accordance with the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) Circular *Drug Control Accounting*, enclosed please find detailed information about performance-related measures for key drug control programs administered by the U.S. Department of Education contained in the *U.S. Department of Education's Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2008*, along with the Department of Education Assistant Inspector General's authentication of the management assertions included in that report.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about this information.

Sincerely,

William Modzeleski/s/
Assistant Deputy Secretary (Acting)

Enclosure #1: Department of Education Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2008, dated January 28, 2009

Enclosure #2: Authentication letter from Keith West, Assistant Inspector General for Audit Services, dated January 30, 2009

cc: Keith West

400 MARYLAND AVE., S.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202
www.ed.gov

Our mission is to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the nation.

Department of Education



Performance Summary Report Fiscal Year 2008

In Support of the

National Drug Control Strategy

As required by ONDCP Circular: *Drug Control Accounting*

January 28, 2009

Department of Education

Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Transmittal Letter 1

Performance Summary Information..... 2

 Safe Schools/Healthy Students 2

 Student Drug Testing..... 4

 Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants Program..... 9

 Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse..... 15

Assertions 20

 Performance Reporting System..... 20

 Methodology for Establishing Performance Targets20

 Performance Measures for Significant Drug Control Activities 20

Criteria for Assertions 20



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS

Ms. Mary Mitchelson
Inspector General (Acting)
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20202-1510

Dear Ms. Mitchelson:

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

Consistent with the instructions in the ONDCP Circular, please provide your authentication to me in writing and I will transmit it to ONDCP along with the enclosed Performance Summary Report. As you know, ONDCP requests these documents by February 1, 2009 if possible. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about the enclosed information.

Sincerely,

William Modzeleski /s/
Acting Assistant Deputy Secretary for
Safe and Drug-Free Schools

400 MARYLAND AVE., S.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

www.ed.gov

Our mission is to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the nation.

Performance Summary Information

Safe Schools/Healthy Students

Measure 1: The percentage of grantees demonstrating a decrease in substance abuse over the three-year grant period. (Safe Schools/Healthy Students – FY 2004, 2005, and 2006 cohorts)

Table 1

Cohort	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Target
2004	n/a	n/a	75	66.7	90	pending	n/a
2005	n/a	n/a	n/a	43.75	86.25	pending	n/a
2006	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	maintain a baseline	66.67	76.67%

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

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

FY 2008 Performance Results. Because the measure is established to look at progress over the three-year grant period, it has just a single target for the third year of implementation of each cohort. Sites were not required to provide or collect baseline data at the time of application or before program interventions were implemented, so grantees provide baseline data for their selected measures related to drug use after year one (for example in FY 2005 for the FY 2004 cohort). Grantees from the FY 2004 cohort generally completed no-cost extension years and will be providing GPRA data in final grantee reports that were due at the end of December 2008. Those data will be aggregated later in FY 2009 to determine if the FY 2007 target for the cohort has been met. The FY 2005 cohort of grantees is also operating under no-cost extensions. Final GPRA data for this cohort will be submitted at the end of December 2009. First performance results for the FY 2006 cohort are included in the table above.

FY 2009 Performance Targets. Targets for the two earliest cohorts were initially established before any performance data for this measure were received, and represented our judgment at the time, given the significant size of SS/HS grants and the emphasis on research-based programs that is central to the initiative. We elected in 2008 to revise the target for the FY 2005 cohort for this measure based on the actual performance to date (implementation year two) of the FY 2004 cohort. Based on our professional judgment, it seemed that the revised target of 86.25 percent was appropriately aggressive and that attaining that target would be a meaningful outcome for the program, while acknowledging that our target for the initial (FY 2004) cohort may have been unrealistic. In 2008 we also developed revised targets for the FY 2006 cohort, again, based on the limited data currently available for this measure.

Our ability to establish appropriate targets for this program has also been impacted by challenges associated with the quality of data supplied by grant sites. A significant number of sites have failed to provide valid data for this and some other SS/HS measures. Through technical assistance activities we have achieved some improvements in data quality for some sites, but have not completed a full grant cycle with cohorts that have received early and more intensive technical assistance.

Subsequently, we have adopted revised GPRA measures for this initiative beginning with the FY 2007 cohort and will establish 2009 targets for sites in that cohort shortly.

Methodology. Data are collected by grantees, generally using student surveys. Data are furnished in the second of two semi-annual performance reports provided by grantees each project year. If grantees identified more than one measure of drug abuse or provided data for individual school-building types (for example, separate data for middle and high schools), grantees were considered to have experienced a decrease in substance abuse if data for a majority of measures provided reflected a decrease. If a grant site provided data for an even number of measures and half of those measures reflected a decrease and half reflected no change or an increase, that grant site was judged not to have demonstrated a decrease in substance abuse. The response rate for the FY 2004 cohort for this measure was 35 percent. While most sites were able to provide some data related to this measure, we considered as valid data only data from sites that used the same elements/items in each of years one and two. Nearly 80 percent of grantees from the FY 2006 cohort were able to provide valid data for this measure.

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

completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relies on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and does not conduct further reviews.

Targets were established for this measure after the baseline data for the FY 2004 cohort were provided. Based on the available results for this first cohort, targets for future cohorts have been adjusted. For example, the targets for the FY 2005 and 2006 cohorts were adjusted in 2008.

Student Drug Testing

Measure 2: The percentage of student drug testing grantees that experience a 5 percent reduction in current (30-day) illegal drug use by students in the target population. (Student Drug Testing – FY 2003, 2005, 2006, and 2007 cohorts—no new grants were awarded under this program in FY 2004)

Table 2

Cohort	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Target
2003	n/a	n/a	33	25	n/a	n/a	n/a
2005	n/a	n/a	n/a	pending	50	pending	n/a
2006	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	50	66.7	60
2007	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	33	pending	50

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

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

FY 2008 Performance Results. FY 2007 data for the FY 2003 cohort were submitted as part of final reports for these grants, and the aggregate of those data is included in the chart above.

In FY 2008 we completed a preliminary review of data submitted by the FY 2005 cohort for this measure and identified significant concerns about the quality and comparability of the data. Grant sites have reported on prevalence rates for a variety of illegal drugs and have not always provided data from the same items/elements across project years one and two. Also, some sites surveyed their entire student population and others surveyed only students in the testing pool. Based on these concerns, we obtained

assistance from the U.S. Department of Education's Data Quality Initiative contractor. With their help, we created and disseminated detailed data collection and reporting guidance for the program, as well as data standards that we will use to determine what constitutes valid data for this measure, and disseminated this guidance to the new cohort of 2008 grantees. Based on that guidance, as well as data quality and aggregation checks, in FY 2009 we will begin aggregating available data from the FY 2007 and 2008 cohorts and record those data in the Department's software that houses GPRA measures and data.

Data for the FY 2006 cohort come from the evaluation being conducted for the Department of Education by a contractor. Data for this cohort were collected by the contractor in 2007 and again in 2008; the data reported in the chart above reflects the results of student surveys administered by the contractor.

FY 2009 Performance Targets. We established targets for the percentage of grantees experiencing a 5 percent reduction in current illegal drug use after reviewing the first two years of data for the FY 2003 cohort of grant sites. Consistent with research that suggests that changes in student behavior related to student drug testing may not be realized immediately, we assumed that we could look for an increased number of grantees to experience positive change and, using our professional judgment, set that target at 50 percent of grantees. Although we have received data for three project years from a single cohort of sites (the FY 2003 cohort), the information provided by the grantees did not provide an adequate basis for revisiting targets for future cohorts. This cohort was very small (eight grantees), and also experienced extensive delays in implementation and data collection activities. Because only a handful of grantees were able to eventually provide data specific to the measure, we do not believe that it would be appropriate to base expectations about the performance of other cohorts on this limited information.

Similar problems with data quality for the FY 2005 cohort of grant sites mean that data from that cohort will not be helpful in determining if targets for the program will need to be readjusted. Challenges with data quality have resulted in only a very limited proportion of grant sites that provided approximately comparable data. Conversely, because the data from the evaluation are being collected by a contractor using comparable survey items and collection procedures (in contrast to the varying procedures used by individual grant sites in the other cohorts), data for the 2006 cohort does not provide an appropriate basis for making adjustments in existing targets under the program for the FY 2007 cohort. As a result, we have retained the established FY 2009 target for the FY 2007 cohort of grantees at this time.

We need to establish a revised FY 2009 target for this measure for the FY 2006 cohort of grant sites since FY 2008 performance already exceeds the current FY 2009 target. We will consider the data collected and reported by the contractor about changes in the illegal drug use in grant sites, in conjunction with the limited information about performance of other cohorts in this grant program to establish an appropriate FY 2009 target for this cohort.

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

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

Data for the FY 2006 cohort are being collected as part of an evaluation of student drug testing. Data for the measures are being collected by the evaluation contractor, using common survey items and collection procedures. Survey responses are analyzed by the contractor and data are provided to the Department.

The anticipated levels of decrease in substance abuse are consistent with those included in the National Drug Control Strategy – five percent per year. Targets were initially established following the report of baseline data for grant sites from the FY 2003 cohort. As discussed above, we do not currently have data of sufficient quality to support adjustment of targets for this program at this time.

Measure 3: The percentage of student drug testing grantees that experience a 5 percent reduction in past-year illegal drug use by students in the target population. (Student Drug Testing – FY 2003, 2005, 2006, and 2007 cohorts—no new grants were awarded under this program in FY 2004)

Table 3

Cohort	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Target
2003	n/a	n/a	25	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
2005	n/a	n/a	n/a	pending	50	pending	n/a
2006	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	50	55.5	60
2007	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	33	pending	50

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

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

FY 2008 Performance Results. FY 2007 data for the FY 2003 cohort were submitted as part of final reports for these grants and the aggregate of those data is included in the chart above.

In FY 2008 we completed a preliminary review of data submitted by the FY 2005 cohort for this measure and identified significant concerns about the quality and comparability of the data. Grant sites have reported on prevalence rates for a variety of illegal drugs and have not always provided data from the same items/elements across project years one and two. Also, some sites surveyed their entire student population and others surveyed only students in the testing pool. Based on these concerns, we obtained assistance from the U.S. Department of Education's Data Quality Initiative contractor. With their help, we created and disseminated detailed data collection and reporting guidance for the program, as well as data standards that we will use to determine what constitutes valid data for this measure, and disseminated this guidance to the new cohort of 2008 grantees. Based on that guidance, as well as data quality and aggregation checks, in FY 2009 we will begin aggregating available data from the FY 2007 and FY 2008 cohorts and record those data in the Department's software that houses GPRA measures and data.

Data for the FY 2006 cohort come from the evaluation being conducted for the Department of Education by a contractor. Data for this cohort were collected by the contractor in 2007 and again in 2008; the data reported in the chart above reflects the results of student surveys administered by the contractor. An important note is that data supplied for the measure for the 2006 cohort represents student drug use in the six months prior to the survey (rather than the one-year period called for in the measure.)

FY 2009 Performance Targets. We established targets for the percentage of grantees experiencing a 5 percent reduction in annual illegal drug use after reviewing the first two years of data for the FY 2003 cohort of grant sites. Consistent with research that suggests that changes in student behavior related to student drug testing may not be realized immediately, we assumed that we could look for an increased number of grantees to experience positive change and, using our professional judgment, set that target at 50 percent of grantees. Although we have received data for three project years from a single cohort of sites (the FY 2003 cohort), the information provided by the grantees did not provide an adequate basis for revisiting targets for future cohorts. This cohort was very small (eight grantees), and also experienced extensive delays in implementation and data collection activities. Because only a handful of grantees were able to eventually provide data specific to the measure, we do not believe that it would be appropriate to base expectations about the performance of other cohorts on this limited information.

Similar problems with data quality for the FY 2005 cohort of grant sites mean that data from that cohort will not be helpful in determining if targets for the program will need to be readjusted. Challenges with data quality have resulted in only a very limited proportion of grant sites that provided approximately comparable data. Conversely, because the data from the evaluation are being collected by the contractor using comparable survey items and collection procedures (in contrast to the varying procedures used by individual grant sites in the other cohorts), data for the 2006 cohort does not provide an appropriate basis for making adjustments in existing targets under the program for the FY 2007 cohort. As a result, we have retained the established FY 2009 target for the FY 2007 cohort of grantees.

Methodology With the exception of the FY 2006 cohort, data are collected by grantees using student surveys. Data are provided as part of the grantees' annual performance reports. Grantees do not use the same survey items to collect data for this measure but, rather, self-select survey items (often from surveys already administered) in order to provide these data. Survey items may relate to different substances, but must collect information concerning annual use in order to be included in the data reported for this measure. Grantees did not provide baseline data in their applications, so we have to wait until grantees provide data both from project year one and two in order to determine if they have experienced a decrease in substance abuse. For the FY 2003 cohort, project implementation was delayed for one full year while grantees sought needed institutional review board clearance to drug test students, so performance data were initially received in 2005 and 2006. Only three of eight grantees provided comparable data across the first two years of their project. The FY 2005 cohort of grant sites has also provided data, but similarly of questionable quality; therefore, data from many sites cannot be included in aggregating data for the cohort, resulting in only a partial picture of grantee progress.

Authorized representatives for the grant site sign the annual performance report and, in doing so, certify that to the best of the signer's knowledge and belief, all data in the

performance report are true and correct and that the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relies on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and does not conduct further reviews.

Data for the FY 2006 cohort are being collected as part of an evaluation of student drug testing. Data for the measures are being collected by the evaluation contractor, using common survey items and collection procedures. Survey responses are analyzed by the contractor and data are provided to the Department.

The anticipated levels of decrease in substance abuse are consistent with those included in the National Drug Control Strategy – five percent per year. Targets were initially established following the report of baseline data for grant sites from the FY 2003 cohort. As discussed above, we do not currently have data of sufficient quality to support adjustment of targets for this program at this time.

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants

Measure 4: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who were offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months. (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants)

Table 4

FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Target
None	25.4	None	22.3	None	None	26

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

FY 2008 Performance Results. There is no target and no data collected for this measure in FY 2008 because data are collected only in odd-numbered years.

FY 2009 Performance Targets. The target identified for this measure in FY 2009 is currently 26 percent. Given the FY 2007 results, ED will need to revise the target to reflect the progress achieved in FY 2007.

Methodology. Data for this measure are collected from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12 as part of the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance

System (YRBSS), sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Data are collected in odd years and reported in the following even years. No data are collected for even years and, as a result, no targets have been established for even years.

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

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

Table 5

FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Target
None	20	None	19.7	None	None	18

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

FY 2008 Performance Results. This is no target and no data for this measure in FY 2008 because data are collected only in the odd-numbered years. .

FY 2009 Performance Targets. The target for this measure in FY 2009 is 18. Given the limited progress made toward achieving the established target level in FY 2007, we do not plan to revise this target.

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

Detailed information about the methodology used to sample and report data for the YRBSS is available at the CDC website at: <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/ss5505a1.htm>. We rely on the assertions

provided about the methodology presented by CDC in using this data to report on performance of SDFSC State Grants.

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

Table 6

FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Target
None	26	None	26	None	None	25

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

FY 2008 Performance Results. There is no target and no data for measure in FY 2008 because data are collected only in the odd-numbered years.

FY 2009 Performance Targets. The target for this measure for FY 2009 is 25. Given that there was no change in the data for this measure between 2005 and 2007, we do not plan to revise the target for FY 2009.

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

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

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

Table 7

FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Target
None	7.8	None	None	None	n/a	13

The measure. This measure examines the extent to which programs and practices supported with SDFSC State Grant funds are based on research. The measure supports attainment of National Drug Control Strategy goals by focusing on the quality of programs supported with SDFSC State Grants funds and the likelihood that the programs will reduce or prevent youth drug use. The 2005 data constitute the baseline for this measure.

FY 2008 Performance Results. No FY 2008 target is in effect for this measure in FY 2008; data will be collected in 2009 for this measure.

FY 2009 Performance Targets. A contract to collect data to implement this measure could not be issued in time to permit data collection during FY 2008 as originally scheduled. As a result, we established a 2009 target against the 2005 baseline that is a linear extrapolation of a previously established FY 2008 target for this measure. The next data collection is scheduled to collect information about programs implemented during the 2008-2009 school year.

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

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

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

Survey instruments used included 89 prevention programs; respondents were also able to write in any programs omitted from those listed. The contractor received responses from 91 percent of the districts included in the sample and 86 percent of schools.

The study conducted by the contractor to obtain data for this measure has some limitations that are the result of both the research synthesis and survey data collections. Despite significant efforts to be comprehensive, it is possible that the literature searches used may not have identified some published studies on prevention programs and, as a result, the number of research-based program may be understated.

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

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

Table 8

FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Target
None	44.3	None	None	None	n/a	53.1

The measure. This measure examines the extent to which research-based curriculum programs supported with SDFSC State Grant funds are implemented with fidelity. The measure supports attainment of National Drug Control Strategy goals by focusing on the quality of implementation of the research-based programs and practices supported with SDFSC State Grants funds, and the corresponding likelihood that the programs will reduce or prevent youth drug use. The 2005 data constitute the baseline for this measure.

FY 2008 Performance Results. No FY 2008 target is in effect for this measure; data will be collected in 2009 for this measure.

FY 2009 Performance Targets. A contract to collect data to implement this measure could not be issued in time to permit data collection during FY 2008 as originally scheduled. As a result, we established a 2009 target against the 2005 baseline that is a linear extrapolation of a previously established FY 2008 target for this measure. The next data collection is scheduled to collect information about programs implemented during the 2008-2009 school year.

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

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

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

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

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

Similar problems occurred for programs that had multiple components or different versions that are implemented for different ages or grade levels. Study staff reviewed program materials for different components or versions and worked to identify the

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

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

Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse

Measure 9: The percentage of grantees whose target students show a measurable decrease in binge drinking. (Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse Program – FY 2004, 2005 and FY 2007 cohorts – no new grants were awarded under this program in FY 2006.)

Table 9

Cohort	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Target
2004	n/a	n/a	50	pending	n/a	n/a	n/a
2005	n/a	n/a	n/a	65	75	pending	n/a
2007	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	set a baseline	61.5	baseline + 25%(76.87)

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

FY 2008 Performance Results. Actual performance data for the FY 2004 cohort will be contained in final reports for these grant projects, which were due at the end of December 2008. Data supplied by grantees in these reports will be aggregated by the Department and be available in early 2009. Grantees from the FY 2005 cohort are currently operating in no-cost extensions; generally, their final reports are due at the end of 2009. Data will be aggregated and available in March 2010.

We did not establish a FY 2008 target for the FY 2007 cohort because we were not certain that grantees would be able to provide both baseline data and year one performance data in their first annual performance report. However grantees were generally able to provide these data, and we will use them to establish an FY 2009 target for this cohort. Performance for this measure for this cohort after a single year of implementation was almost equal to that of the prior cohort after two years.

FY 2009 Performance Targets. We established an FY 2009 target for the FY 2007 cohort based on the performance of prior cohorts. Since this cohort achieved performance levels after one year that were close to those met after two years by a prior cohort, we plan to revisit the FY 2009 target for the FY 2007 cohort and enter the target into ED's software for recording measures, targets and actual results before the deadline for revisions to FY 2009 targets.

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

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

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

We have provided significantly increased guidance and technical assistance beginning for the FY 2007 cohort, and believe that these efforts have produced data that are of higher quality and more comparable across sites than those of previous cohorts.

Measure 10: The percentage of grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who believe that alcohol abuse is harmful to their health. (Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse – FY 2004, 2005, and 2007 cohorts)

Table 10

Cohort	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Target
2004	n/a	n/a	55.6	pending	n/a	n/a	n/a
2005	n/a	n/a	n/a	70	80	pending	n/a
2007	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	set a baseline	69.2	baseline + 25% (86.5)

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

FY 2008 Performance Results. Actual performance data for the FY 2004 cohort will be contained in final reports for these grant projects, which were due at the end of December 2008. Data supplied by grantees in these reports will be aggregated by the Department and be available in early 2009. Grantees from the FY 2005 cohort are currently operating in no-cost extensions; generally, their final reports are due at the end of 2009. Data will be aggregated and available in March 2010.

We did not establish a FY 2008 target for the FY 2007 cohort because we were not certain that grantees would be able to provide both baseline data and year one performance data in their first annual performance report. However grantees were generally able to provide these data, and we will use them to establish an FY 2009 target for this cohort. Performance for this measure for this cohort after a single year of implementation was almost equal to that of the prior cohort after two years.

FY 2009 Performance Targets. We had established an FY 2009 target for the FY 2007 cohort based on the performance of prior cohorts. Since this cohort achieved performance levels after one year that were close to those met after two years by a prior cohort, we plan to revisit the FY 2009 target for the FY 2007 cohort and enter any revised target into ED’s software for recording measures, targets and actual results before the deadline for revisions to FY 2009 targets.

Methodology. Data for this measure are collected by grantees and reported as part of annual performance reports. If data for this measure are not available at the time that performance reports are submitted, staff follow up with sites to attempt to obtain data for

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

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

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

We have provided significantly increased guidance and technical assistance beginning for the FY 2007 cohort, and believe that these efforts have produced data that are of higher quality and more comparable across sites than those of previous cohorts.

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

Table 11

Cohort	FY 2004 Actual	FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target	FY 2008 Actual	FY 2009 Target
2004	n/a	n/a	66.7	pending	n/a	n/a	n/a
2005	n/a	n/a	n/a	71	87	pending	n/a
2007	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	set a baseline	69.2	baseline + 25 % (86.5)

The measure. This measure examines a key outcome for the Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse (GRAA) program – perception of health risk for alcohol abuse among target students. While the National Drug Control Strategy is focused most intensively on the preventing the use of controlled substances, the Strategy does address the role of

alcohol use as a drug of choice for teenagers. Data do suggest that increases in the percentage of target students who believe that alcohol abuse is not socially acceptable are associated with declines in consumption of alcohol.

FY 2008 Performance Results. Actual performance data for the FY 2004 cohort will be contained in final reports for these grant projects, which were due at the end of December 2008. Data supplied by grantees in these reports will be aggregated by the Department and be available in early 2009. Grantees from the FY 2005 cohort are currently operating in no-cost extensions; generally, their final reports are due at the end of 2009. Data will be aggregated and available in March 2010.

We did not establish a FY 2008 target for the FY 2007 cohort because we were not certain that grantees would be able to provide both baseline data and year one performance data in their first annual performance report. However grantees were generally able to provide these data, and we will use them to establish an FY 2009 target for this cohort. Performance for this measure for this cohort after a single year of implementation was almost equal to that of the prior cohort after two years.

FY 2009 Performance Targets. We had established an FY 2009 target for the FY 2007 cohort based on the performance of prior cohorts. Since this cohort achieved performance levels after one year that were close to those met after two years by a prior cohort, we plan to revisit the FY 2009 target for the FY 2007 cohort and enter the target into ED's software for recording measures, targets and actual results before the deadline for revisions to FY 2009 targets.

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

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

Applicants are not required to furnish baseline data as part of their applications. Data supplied after year one are considered baseline data for the projects. Projects require

two years of data in order to determine if a decrease in binge drinking among target students has occurred.

We have provided significantly increased guidance and technical assistance beginning for the FY 2007 cohort, and believe that these efforts have produced data that are of higher quality and more comparable across sites than those of previous cohorts.

Assertions

Performance Reporting System

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

Data related to the drug control programs included in this Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2008 are recorded in the Department of Education's software for recording performance data and are an integral part of our budget and management processes.

Methodology for Establishing Performance Targets

The methodology described in the Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2008 to establish performance targets for the current year is reasonable given past performance and available resources.

Performance Measures for Significant Drug Control Activities

The Department of Education has established at least one acceptable performance measure for each Drug Control Decision Unit identified in its Detailed Accounting of Fiscal Year 2008 Drug Control Funds.

Criteria for Assertions

Data

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

Other Estimation Methods

No estimation methods other than professional judgment were used to make the required assertions. When professional judgment was used, the objectivity and strength

of those judgments were explained and documented. Professional judgment was used to establish targets for programs until data from at least one grant cohort were available to provide additional information needed to set more accurate targets. We routinely re-evaluate targets set using professional judgment as additional information about actual performance on measures becomes available.

Reporting Systems

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



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

January 30, 2009

MEMORANDUM

To: William Modzeleski
Acting Assistant Deputy Secretary
Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools

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

Subject: Office of Inspector General's Independent Report on the *U.S. Department of Education's Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2008*, dated January 28, 2009

Attached is our authentication of management's assertions contained in the *U.S. Department of Education's Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2008*, dated January 28, 2009, as required by section 705(d) of the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. § 1704(d)).

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

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

Attachment



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

January 30, 2009

Office of Inspector General's Independent Report on the U.S. Department of Education's Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2008, dated January 28, 2009

We have reviewed management's assertions contained in the accompanying Performance Summary Report, titled *Department of Education Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2008*, dated January 28, 2009. The U.S. Department of Education's management is responsible for the Performance Summary Report and the assertions contained therein.

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

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

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

Keith West /s/
Assistant Inspector General for Audit Services