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.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: These objectives support Goal 2, Objective 4 (related to special populations), and Goal 4. FY 2000—\$86,500,000 FY 2001—\$100,000,000 (Requested budget)

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 cus tomers.

| 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 are the Research |
| Year | Actual Performance | Performance Targets | | Triangle Institute, NC, and Info-Use, CA. |
| 1997-98: | 37 % | | Explanation: The score of "good" or "excellent" | Frequency: Experts' continuous evaluation of |
| 1998-99: | 55% | No targets previously set | is based on peer review judging several criteria | programs. |
| 1999-00: | | 60% | using a Likert Scale instrument. | Next Update: May 2000. |
| 2000-01: | | 65% | | |
| 2001-02: | | 70% | | Validation Procedure: Data are validated by the program experts' review process and contractors' analysis. |
| | | | | Limitations of Data and Planned |
| | | | | Improvements: A larger sample of respondents |
| | | | | is being developed to allow for more diverse |
| | | | | responses on the usefulness of materials. |

| Indicator 1. | Indicator 1.2 Increased publication and citation: Publication of research findings, with the appropriate citation, will increase in refereed journals. | | | | | |
|--------------|--|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | Targets and Performa | ance Data | Assessment of Progress | Sources and Data Quality | | |
| Average num | ber of publications per grantee (55 | grantees total) | Status: Target not met. | Source: The data source is the Research Triangle | | |
| Year | Actual Performance | Performance Targets | | Institute, NC. | | |
| 1997-98: | 7.1 | | Explanation: Sample size of grantees is too | Frequency: Continuous process. | | |
| 1998-99: | No data available | No targets previously set | small to represent a valid statement of grantees' | Next Update: April 2000. | | |
| 1999-00: | | Targets to be set | performance. | Validation Procedure: Data were validated by contractors. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: We are developing a reporting system where grantees can give us detailed information on their publications and type. This system is being pilot tested and preliminary data will be available January 2000. | | |

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

| Targets and Performance Data | | | | | Assessment of Progress | Sources and Data Quality |
|--|---|---------------|---|---|--|---|
| Indica | tor 2.1 Infor | mation and | l TA usefuln | oducts, information, and technical assistance | that they receive from grantees useful. | |
| Percentage (and number) of recipients responding "yes," "no," and "N/A" to the | | | | | Status: Negative movement away from target. | Source: The data source is the AIMS. |
| question | n on being ser | ved adequatel | 'y | | | Frequency: Continuous process. |
| Year | Year Actual Performance Performance Targets | | | Performance Targets | Explanation: Information on this indicator is | Next Update: April 2000. |
| | Yes | No | N/A | | based on Disability and Business Technical | |
| 1998: | 80% (225) | 15% (41) | 5% (13) | | Assistance Centers (DBTACs) reporting system | Validation Procedure: Data are reported by |
| 1999: | 1999: No data available No targets previously set | | ADA Impact Management System (AIMS) only. | grantees and validated by contractors. | | |
| 2000: | | | 83.5% will respond "yes" | AIMS is the DBTACs system which procures | | |
| 2001: | | | | 86.0% will respond "yes" | data about the impact of the technical assistance | Limitations of Data and Planned |
| 2002: | | | | 88.5% will respond "yes" | that centers provide. | Improvements: We plan to address issues of |
| | | | | | | design for collecting information and utilize |
| | | | | | | different formats. Sample is too small. |

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.

| Indicator 3.1 Contributions of trainees and fellows: Contributions by NIDRR trainees and fellows that apply to study rehabilitation will increase. | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| | Targ | ets and Performa | nce Data | | Assessment of Progress | Sources and Data Quality |
| Out of 18 ind | 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: Data gathering activities have not | <i>Frequency:</i> Continuous analysis of data reported |
| 1998: | (15) 6.7 | (10) 18.2 | | | started. | in the Performance Management System. |
| | average | average | | | | Next Update: 2000. |
| 1999: | No data | available | No targets previously set | | | |
| 2000: | | | Targets to be set | | | Validation Procedure: Data will be validated |
| 2001: | | | Targets | to be set | | by contractors. |
| | | | | | | Limitations of Data and Planned |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Improvements: Planning for utilizing the |
| | | | | | | Performance Management System is under way. |

Indicator 3.2 Researchers with disabilities and from underserved groups: Participation of researchers working in the field who have disabilities or are from underserved groups will increase.

| | Targets and Performa | ince Data | Assessment of Progress | Sources and Data Quality | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Number of p | people with disabilities and members | of minority populations who | Status: Unable to judge at this time. | Source: The data source is the Research Triangle | | |
| received NII | DRR fellowships | | | Institute, NC. | | |
| Year | Actual Performance | Performance Targets | Explanation: Pilot test of modified reporting | Frequency: Continuous analysis of data reported | | |
| 1998: | No data available | Baseline | instructions to grantees begins in January 2000. | in the Performance Management System | | |
| 1999: | No data available | No targets previously set | | | | |
| 2000: | | Targets to be set | | Validation Procedure: Data will be validated | | |
| 2001: | | Targets to be set | | by contractors. | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | Limitations of Data and Planned | | |
| | | | | Improvements: In 2000 we will begin to pilot | | |
| | | | | test a new set of grantees and will ask for this | | |
| | | | | indicator information. | | |

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 Performa | ance Data | Assessment of Progress | Sources and Data Quality | |
| Year | r Actual Performance Performance Targets | | Status: Unable to judge at this time. | Source: The data source will be a biennial | |
| 1998: | No data available | Baseline | | customer survey. | |
| 1999: | No data available | No targets previously set | Explanation: Customer Survey will begin in fall | Frequency: Biennial customer survey. | |
| 2000: | | Targets to be set | 2000. | Next Update: Fall 2000. | |
| 2001: | | Targets to be set | | Validation Procedure: Data will be validated by contractors. | |
| | | | | Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Customer survey begins in 2000. | |

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999 N/A.

N/A.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- For Indicator 1.1, we will add more questions to the program review on scientific knowledge and excellence and on the quality of grantees' research design. The data will be organized by formative and summative reviews. The formative review will evaluate research design. The summative review will describe the usefulness of the research.
- Indicator 2.1 will be applied to all dissemination and technical assistance projects.
- Indicator 3.1 data will be collected on the number of people trained by research discipline, by disability, and by underserved group. This will be done by adding questions to the Performance Management System.
- Indicator 4.1 data will be collected through a customer satisfaction measurement instrument that will provide us with an information on improving our products and dissemination techniques.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

• We work primarily with the Rehabilitation Services Administration and the Office of Special Education Programs. We also coordinate our activities with disability agencies in the Departments of Health and Human Services and Labor.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

• OMB clearance for customer survey can take 6 months before final approval.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted-None.

Dropped

- Indicator 1.2 (research usefulness) was dropped because it is incorporated in scientific excellence.
- Indicator 1.4 was dropped because it was too broadly framed.
- Indicators 2.1 (dissemination plan) and 2.2 (product availability) were dropped because data were obtained through grantee self-reporting and because of the limited value of the data as a measurable outcome.
- Indicator 3.3 (impact on field) was dropped because data were obtained through grantee self-reporting.
- Indicator 4.1 (relevant priorities) was dropped because the data to be reported had limited value as a measurable outcome.
- From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

Targets have been adjusted in an effort to be more realistic for Indicators 1.1, 2.2, and 3.1.

Dropped-None.

New-None.