

# Archived Information

## Comprehensive Centers Program - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.283 - Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers

**Goal 8: To assist Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) recipients in improving teaching and learning for all children, particularly children at risk of education failure**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide high-quality comprehensive technical assistance to states, territories, tribes, school districts, and schools that helps students reach high academic standards.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Addressing legislative priorities: 80% of comprehensive center customers served will be school wide programs, high-poverty schools, and Bureau of Indian Affairs-funded schools.**

| Targets and Performance Data                           |  |                      |             |       | Assessment of Progress   | Sources and Data Quality   |  |       |
|--|--|----------------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|-------|
| <i>Comprehensive Center customers (in percentages)</i> |  |                      |             |       | <p><b>Status: Target exceeded</b></p> <p><b>Progress:</b> In 2002, 87 percent of customers receiving CC services were legislative priority schools (high-poverty school-wides, high-poverty non-schoolwides or BIA schools). Of the legislative priority schools, the CCs targeted and provided services to an increasingly larger number of high-poverty schools in 2002.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> In addition to schools designated in the legislation as high priority schools, the CCs also provided services to State agencies, targeted local school districts, intermediate units, and non-priority schools. Since 1998, the CCs have increasingly targeted technical assistance to high-poverty, low-performing schools.</p> | <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Comprehensive Centers (CC) Semi-Annual Performance Report: Data Tables</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Semi-Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> April 2003</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported in the CC Performance Reports ( a uniform, reporting instrument), reviewed by ED during information synthesis, and compiled and analyzed by an external contractor.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The Comprehensive Centers recently refined reporting to ensure no duplication of school counts occurs during a given year.</p> |  |       |
| Year   | Actual Performance                             |                      |             |       |  |  | Performance Targets                            |       |
|  | High-poverty schools, non-school wide Programs | school wide programs | BIA Schools | TOTAL |  |  | High-poverty schools, non-school wide Programs | TOTAL |
| <b>1998</b>  | 50   | 12                   | 4           | 66    |  |  |  |       |
| <b>1999</b>  | 44   | 30                   | 3           | 77    |  |  | 80   |       |
| <b>2000</b>  | 59   | 26                   | 2           | 89    |  |  | 80   |       |
| <b>2001</b>  | 44   | 43                   | 3           | 89    |  |  | 80   |       |
| <b>2002</b>  | 52   | 34                   | 1           | 87    | 80   |  |  |       |

| Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: 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.   |                    |                            |                          |  |      |                    |                     |      |    |  |      |  |    |      |    |    |  |   |
|---|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--|------|--------------------|---------------------|------|----|--|------|--|----|------|----|----|--|---|
| Targets and Performance Data  |                    | Assessment of Progress     | Sources and Data Quality |  |      |                    |                     |      |    |  |      |  |    |      |    |    |  |   |
| <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Percentage of Participants</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>72</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>71</td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |                    | Percentage of Participants |                          |  | Year | Actual Performance | Performance Targets | 1999 | 72 |  | 2000 |  | 75 | 2001 | 71 | 75 | <p><b>Status:</b> Target not met</p> <p><b>Progress:</b> The data in the table represent the response of school-based (teachers and principals) respondents. However, in addition to collecting data from school-based customers, data were collected from state and local administrators. 82% of state and local administrators reported they have incorporated information or skills learned from the Centers into their work. When both categories of respondents are included in measuring progress, the Centers exceed their targets.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Additional data under this indicator come from a 2002 national evaluation of the Reading Success Network. Results: K-1 grades-RSN kindergartners showed more phonemic awareness skill growth, <math>p &lt; .001</math>, than non-RSN kindergartners in the 2001-2002 school year; RSN 1st graders showed more growth in phonemic awareness skills, <math>p &lt; .002</math>, and in decoding words, <math>p &lt; .001</math>, than did the non-RSN 1st graders. Results: 2nd and 3rd grades-Both LEP and monolingual students taught by RSN teachers made greater gains on vocabulary and word analysis skills than did non-RSN taught students.</p> | <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Customer survey.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> June 2003</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The national evaluation of the Reading Success Network, referenced above, provides data on both teachers' and their students' achievement, the ultimate goal of accountability measures. Control schools were used in the evaluation.</p> |
| Percentage of Participants  |                    |                            |                          |  |      |                    |                     |      |    |  |      |  |    |      |    |    |  |   |
| Year  | Actual Performance | Performance Targets        |                          |  |      |                    |                     |      |    |  |      |  |    |      |    |    |  |   |
| 1999  | 72                 |                            |                          |  |      |                    |                     |      |    |  |      |  |    |      |    |    |  |   |
| 2000  |                    | 75                         |                          |  |      |                    |                     |      |    |  |      |  |    |      |    |    |  |   |
| 2001  | 71                 | 75                         |                          |  |      |                    |                     |      |    |  |      |  |    |      |    |    |  |   |