Archived Information

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DISABILITY AND REHABILITATION RESEARCH (NIDRR)

| Goal: To support the conduct and dissemination of high-quality research that contributes to improvement in the quality of life of persons with disabilities. | Funding History (\$ in millions) | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| | Fiscal Year | Appropriation | Fiscal Year | Appropriation |
| Legislation: Title II of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by P.L. 105-220 (29 | 1985 | \$39 | 2000 | \$86 |
| U.S.C. 760-764). | 1990 | \$54 | 2001 | \$100 |
| | 1995 | \$70 | 2002 (Requested) | \$110 |

Program Description

The goal of this program is to enhance the ability of individuals with disabilities to be independent, employed, productive, and integrated into their communities by supporting and disseminating research that is relevant and scientifically sound by providing for a program of research, demonstration projects, training, and related activities that promote, full inclusion and integration into society, employment, independent living, maintenance of health and function for individuals of all ages with disabilities; and the transfer of rehabilitation technology to individuals with disabilities. The program also works to ensure the distribution of practical scientific and technological information related to rehabilitation and disability, in usable formats to appropriate user populations and to increase opportunities for disabled individuals, including those who are members of underserved minority groups.

NIDRR supports rehabilitation research and development, demonstration projects, and related activities, including the training of persons who provide rehabilitation services or who conduct rehabilitation research. In addition, NIDRR supports project to disseminate and promote the use of information concerning developments in rehabilitation procedures, methods, and devices. Information is provided to rehabilitation professionals, persons with disabilities, and other relevant groups. Awards are competitive, with applications reviewed by panels of experts, including rehabilitation professionals, rehabilitation researchers, and persons with disabilities.

NIDRR is responsible for about 500 studies and 600 training sessions serving approximately 60,000 rehabilitation professionals every year. NIDRR funds research and related activities through 9 programs. The Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers program is the largest investment of NIDRR resources. NIDRR is responsible for advanced training in research for physicians and other clinicians and for promoting coordination and cooperation among other Federal agencies conducting rehabilitation research through an Interagency Committee on Disability Research. Congress assigned responsibility to NIDRR for supporting regional programs to facilitate the implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and to maintain a program of model spinal cord injury demonstration projects.

Program Performance

OBJECTIVE 1: CONDUCT HIGH-QUALITY RESEARCH THAT LEADS TO HIGH-QUALITY RESEARCH PRODUCTS.

| Indicator 1.1 Scientific excellence: Grantee research quality is good or excellent, as reflected in research design and its usefulness to customers. | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| Targets and Performance Data | | | Assessment of Progress | Sources and Data Quality | | |
| Percentage of grantees sampled who had good or excellent ratings | | Status: Positive Movement Toward target. | Source: The data sources for this year are the | | | |
| Year | 8 | | | NIDRR Summative and Formative Reviews and | | |
| 1997-98: | 37 % | | Explanation: NIDRR conducts two types of | the data analysis done by CESSI, VA. And Info- | | |
| 1998-99: | 55% | No targets previously set | reviews, Formative and Summative. Summative | Use, CA. The Research Triangle Institute, NC, | | |
| 1999-00: | Formatives: 53% | 60% | reviews began in 1997 and formative reviews | is no longer involved in this process. | | |
| 2000-01: | | 65% | began in 1999. The Formative reviews evaluate | Frequency: Experts' continuous evaluation of | | |
| 2001-02: | | 70% | research design in the first 12 or 18 months of a | programs. | | |
| | | | 5-year grant. The Summative reviews describe | Next collection update: September 2001. | | |
| | | | the usefulness of research after a project enters | Data to be reported: October 2001. | | |
| | | | the end of its fourth year or its fifth year. | Wild B I B. Bill II I | | |
| | | | Reviews consist of ordinal ratings, comments | Validation Procedure: Data are validated by the | | |
| | | | based on individual reviewers' assessments, | program experts' review process and contractors' | | |
| | | | group discussion and a closing session that reflects the general agreement on strengths and | analysis. | | |
| | | | weaknesses of all panel constituents. The | Validation Procedure: Verified by Dept. of Ed. | | |
| | | | review moves the grantees towards NIDRR's | attestation process and ED. Standards for | | |
| | | | Center of Excellence Model. The model is | Evaluation Program Performance Data. | | |
| | | | comprised of four major components- | Evaluation I rogram I erjormance Data. | | |
| | | | Administration, research, relevance, Productivity | Limitations of Data and Planned | | |
| | | | and Capacity Building. This year report is based | Improvements: The Summative and Formative | | |
| | | | on a small sample of Formatives (19). The | review process is a very labor intensive and | | |
| | | | Formatives average score were 3.82 (on a five | costly process. We are experimenting with | | |
| | | | point scale) with 53 percent of the grantees | electronic formats to streamline the process and | | |
| | | | reviewed receiving scores of 3.90 or higher. | facilitate implementation of recommendations. | | |
| | | | These percentages are based on one question on | • | | |
| | | | excellence. The Summative reviews include four | Limitations of Data and Planned | | |
| | | | questions that address scientific rigor. | Improvements: A larger sample of respondents | | |
| | | | | is being developed to allow for more diverse | | |
| | | | | responses on the usefulness of materials. During | | |
| | | | | next year we plan to conduct 54 reviews and | | |
| | | | | include in our reporting the Summatives' | | |
| | | | | reviews. | | |

| Indicator 1.2 Increased publication and citation: Publication of research findings, with the appropriate citation, will increase in refereed journals. | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Targets and Performance Data | | | Assessment of Progress | Sources and Data Quality | |
| Average nu | Average number of publications per grantee (55 grantees total) | | Status: Unable to judge. | Source: The data source is the Research Triangle | |
| Year | Actual Performance | Performance Targets | | Institute, NC. | |
| 1997-98: | 7.1 | | Explanation: Previous data (97-98) did not | Frequency: Continuous process. The system will | |
| 1998-99: | No Data Available | No targets previously set | reflect the rigorous criterion that we need for this | allow grantees to enter information on an on- | |
| 1999-00: | No Data Available | Targets to be set | measure. Our standard for this measure has | going basis for an end-of-year report. | |
| 2000-01: | | | changed and it will be based on peer reviewed | Next collection update: September 2001. | |
| 2001-02: | | | publications only. In order to focus on | Data to be reported: October 2001. | |
| | | | measurement of quality research for this | | |
| | | | indicator we are working at implementing the | Validation Procedure: Verified by Dept. of Ed. | |
| | | use of a Performance Reporting System that has | attestation process and ED. Standards for | | |
| | | undergone OMB clearance. This web based | Evaluation Program Performance Data. | | |
| | | | system will collect data on grantees' program | | |
| | | | activities in NIDRR's major seven grantees' | Limitations of Data and Planned | |
| | | | types. All grantees will complete the forms via | Improvements: We have developed a web- | |
| | | | the Internet. The report system will yield | based Performance Reporting System that will | |
| | | | frequencies, cross tabulations, and other tabular | be available to grantees April with which | |
| | | | displays of information to meet GPRA and other | grantees give detailed information on research | |
| | | | reporting needs. | design, data analysis plan, reports and | |
| | | | | publications, presentations and the extent of | |
| | | | | consumer involvement in the conduct of | |
| | | | | research. | |

OBJECTIVE 2: DISSEMINATE AND PROMOTE USE OF INFORMATION ON RESEARCH FINDINGS, IN ACCESSIBLE FORMATS, TO IMPROVE REHABILITATION SERVICES AND OUTCOMES.

| Targets and Performance Data | | | ince Data | Assessment of Progress | Sources and Data Quality | | |
|------------------------------|---|----------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| Indica | Indicator 2.1 Information and TA usefulness: Recipients will find the products, information, and technical assistance that they receive from grantees useful. | | | | | | |
| Percent | Percentage (and number) of recipients responding "yes," "no," and "N/A" to the | | | g "yes," "no," and "N/A" to the | Status: Exceeded target. | Source: The data source is the AIMS and. | |
| questio | n on being ser | ved adequatel | y | | | NCDDR. | |
| Year | Act | ual Performa | nce | Performance Targets | Explanation: Current information on this | Frequency: Continuous process. | |
| | Yes | No | N/A | | indicator is based on Disability and Business | Next collection update: July 2001. | |
| 1998: | 80% (225) | 15% (41) | 5% (13) | | Technical Assistance Centers (DBTACs) | Data to be reported: September 2001. | |
| 1999: | N | o data availab | le | No targets previously set | reporting system ADA Impact Management | | |
| 2000: | AIMS | AIMS | NA | 83.5% will respond "yes" | System (AIMS, data for Year '00) and the | Validation Procedure: Verified by Dept. of Ed. | |
| | (00) | (00) | | 2 0 | National Center for the Dissemination Disability | attestation process and ED. Standards for | |
| | 95% 2%(30) NA | | Research Customer Satisfaction Survey (Recent | Evaluation Program Performance Data. | | | |
| | (1593) NCDDR | | quarterly data only). | | | | |
| | NCDDR (Quarter | | The AIMS and the NCDDR use a Likert Scale. | Limitations of Data and Planned | | | |
| | (Quarter Only) | | We have collapsed the Likert Scale data as | Improvements: We are working to expand the | | | |
| | Only) 6% (296) | | follows: Very Useful, Good and Fair as "yes" | sample to other dissemination and utilization | | | |
| | 94% | | | | and Poor and Very Poor as "no" or Very Useful | grantees by suggesting that they add to their | |
| | (296) | | | | and Somewhat Useful as "Yes" and Not Very | individual reporting systems a question on | |
| 2001: | 2001: 86.0% will respond "yes" | | Useful as " No." | "usefulness of technical assistance, products and | | | |
| 2002: | | | | 88.5% will respond "yes" | | services". | |

OBJECTIVE 3: EXPAND SYSTEM CAPACITY FOR CONDUCT OF HIGH-QUALITY REHABILITATION RESEARCH AND SERVICES BY ENSURING AVAILABILITY OF QUALIFIED RESEARCHERS AND PRACTITIONERS, INCLUDING PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES AND OTHER UNDERSERVED GROUPS.

| Indica | Indicator 3.1 Contributions of trainees and fellows: Contributions by NIDRR trainees and fellows that apply to study rehabilitation will increase. | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| Targets and Performance Data | | | | | Assessment of Progress | Sources and Data Quality | |
| Out of 18 individuals surveyed: | | | | Status: Unable to judge at this time. | Source: The data source is the Research Triangle | | |
| Year | Year Actual Performance | | Performance Targets | | _ | Institute, NC. | |
| | Published | Presentations | Published | Presentations | Explanation: Our Capacity Building efforts | Frequency: Continuous analysis of data reported | |
| 1998: | (15) 6.7 average | (10) 18.2 | | | include three activities: ARRTC's, NIDRR | in the Performance Management System. | |
| | | average | | | Scholars and Switzer Fellows. Data collected to | Next collection update: September 2001. | |
| 1999: | No Data A | Available | No targets p | reviously set | date are highly anecdotal and qualitative. We are | Data to be reported: October 2001. | |
| 2000: | No Data | Available | | to be set | moving away from this type of data and are | | |
| 2001: | | | Targets | to be set | developing instruments to obtain quantitative | Validation Procedure: Verified by Dept. of Ed. | |
| 2002: | | | | | information for each of the programs. Data | attestation process and ED. Standards for | |
| | | | | | gathering activities will start with the | Evaluation Program Performance Data. | |
| | | | | | implementation of a Performance Reporting | L'aritetta e e CD-te and Dlamad | |
| | | | | | System that has undergone OMB clearance. This web-based system will collect data on | Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: We are developing a web-based | |
| | | | | | grantees' program activities in NIDRR's major | Performance Reporting System that will be | |
| | | | | | seven grantees' types. All grantees will complete | available to grantees April 2001 where we can | |
| | | | | | the forms via the Internet. The report system | collect specific data on the ARRTC's, Switzer | |
| | | | | | will yield frequencies, cross tabulations, and | Fellows and NIDRR Scholars detailed | |
| | | | | | other tabular displays of information to meet | contributions. | |
| | | | | | GPRA and other reporting needs. | Controlled. | |
| Indica | tor 3.2 Research | ers with disabilit | ies and from und | lerserved grains | : Participation of researchers working in the | field who have disabilities or are from | |
| | served groups wi | | ics and irom unc | icisci veu groups | s. I articipation of researchers working in the | inclu who have disabilities of are from | |
| unaci | | argets and Perform | nance Data | | Assessment of Progress | Sources and Data Quality | |
| Numbe | Number of people with disabilities and members of minority populations who | | Status: Unable to judge at this time. | Source: The data source is the Research Triangle | | | |
| | d NIDRR fellowship | | ~ ·J | | James and the James and the second | Institute, NC. | |
| Year | Actual Per | | Performar | ice Targets | Explanation: As indicated in last year's report a | Frequency: Continuous analysis of data reported | |
| 1998: | No Data | | | eline | pilot test activity was conducted with 5 grantees. | in the Performance Management System | |
| 1999: | No Data | | | reviously set | The information collected was partial and | Next collection update: September 2001. | |
| 2000: | No Data | | | to be set | updated for GPRA reporting purposes. The | Data to be reported: October 2001. | |
| 2001: | | | | | grantees that helped with the pilot activities have | | |
| 2002: | | | | | not used the system since the test and they have | Validation Procedure: Verified by Dept. of Ed. | |
| | | | | | not been required to update their information. | attestation process and ED. Standards for | |
| | | | | | Therefore no data is available through this | Evaluation Program Performance Data. | |
| | | | | | mechanism. Data gathering activities will start in | | |
| | | | | | April 2001. | Limitations of Data and Planned | |
| | | | | | | Improvements: This question refers only to | |
| | | | | | | NIDRR fellowships. We are working on | |
| | | | | | | expanding this indicator data by adding | |
| | | | | | | information on the number of paid Center staff | |
| | | | | | | with disabilities and from underserved groups. | |
| | | | | | | We will add this change as we implement the | |
| | | | | | | web based Reporting System that will be | |
| | | | | | | available to grantees April 2001. | |

OBJECTIVE 4: ENSURE PRODUCTIVITY AND MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS.

| Indicator 4.1 Usefulness of NIDRR products: The percentage of customers reporting that NIDRR products and information are useful will increase. | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| Targets and Performance Data | | | Assessment of Progress | Sources and Data Quality | |
| Year | Actual Performance | Performance Targets | Status: Unable to judge at this time. | Source: The data source will be a yearly | |
| 1998: | No Data Available | Baseline | | customer survey placed in the web sites of | |
| 1999: | No Data Available | No targets previously set | Explanation: Data gathering activities have not | NIDRR, NARIC and NCDDR. | |
| 2000: | No Data Available | Targets to be set | started. In order to focus on measurement of | Frequency: Annual customer survey. | |
| 2001: | | Targets to be set | quality research for this indicator we will work at | Next collection update: June 2001. | |
| 2002: | | | implementing an Internet based yearly survey | Data to be reported: September 2001. | |
| | | | using the NIDRR, NARIC and NCDDR web | | |
| | | | sites. The survey will yield information on | Validation Procedure: Verified by Dept. of Ed. | |
| | | | customer's assessments of NIDRR's products. | attestation process and ED. Standards for | |
| | | | | Evaluation Program Performance Data. | |
| | | | | L'adda a CData a IDlama I | |
| | | | | Limitations of Data and Planned | |
| | | | | Improvements: Planning for creating a web | |
| | | | | based placeholder for customer input on | |
| | | | | NIDRR's products is underway. The web site of | |
| | | | | NCDDR and NARIC will also be used for | |
| | | | | collecting this information. | |