

Fiscal Year 2005 Program Performance Report

**U.S. Department of Education
November 15, 2005**

Contents

Introduction 1

Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement

APEB: American Printing House for the Blind 5

CRA: Training and Advisory Services 8

ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers 10

ESEA: Advanced Credentialing 14

ESEA: Advanced Placement 15

ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity 17

ESEA: Arts In Education 18

ESEA: Charter Schools Grants 19

ESEA: Civic Education: Cooperative Education Exchange 21

ESEA: Comprehensive School Reform 22

ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities 24

ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development 26

ESEA: Early Reading First 28

ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians 30

ESEA: Educational Technology State Grants 31

ESEA: English Language Acquisition 33

ESEA: Even Start 38

ESEA: Excellence in Economic Education 41

ESEA: Foreign Language Assistance 42

ESEA: Impact Aid Basic Support Payments and Payments for Children
with Disabilities 43

Impact Aid Basic Support Payments

Impact Aid Payments for Children with Disabilities

ESEA: Impact Aid Construction 45

ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants 46

ESEA: Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies 48

ESEA: Javits Gifted and Talented Education 50

ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries 52

ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance 54

ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships 56

ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program 58

ESEA: National Writing Project 64

ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program 65

ESEA: Parental Information and Resource Centers 67

ESEA: Reading First State Grants 68

ESEA: Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution 71

ESEA: Ready to Teach 72

ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television 73

ESEA: Rural Education 76

Goal 2 (Continued)

ESEA: School Leadership	78
ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities	80
ESEA: Special Programs for Indian Children	82
ESEA: Star Schools Program	85
ESEA: State Assessments	87
ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs	90
ESEA: Teaching American History	91
ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies	92
ESEA: Transition To Teaching	95
ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers	97
ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice	99
ESEA: Women’s Educational Equity	100
ESRA: National Assessment	101
ESRA: Regional Educational Laboratories	102
HEA: High School Equivalency Program	103
HEA: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders	104
HEA: Teacher Quality Enhancement	105
IDEA: Special Education Grants for Infants and Families	107
IDEA: Special Education Grants to States	110
IDEA: Special Education Parent Information Centers	116
IDEA: Special Education Personnel Preparation	118
IDEA: Special Education Preschool Grants	121
IDEA: Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination	124
IDEA: Special Education Technology and Media Services	126
MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths	128
VTEA: Occupational and Employment Information	130
VTEA: Tech-Prep Demonstration	131
VTEA: Vocational Education National Programs	133
VTEA: Vocational Education State Grants and Tech-Prep Education State Grants ..	136
<i>Vocational Education State Grants</i>	
<i>Tech-Prep Education State Grants</i>	

Goal 3: Develop Safe and Drug-Free Schools

ESEA: Alcohol Abuse Reduction	143
ESEA: Civic Education: We the People	145
ESEA: Close-Up Fellowships	146
ESEA: Elementary and Secondary School Counseling	147
ESEA: Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners	149
ESEA: Mentoring Program	151
ESEA: Physical Education Program	153
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Other National Programs	154
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants	156

Goal 4: Transform Education into an Evidence-Based Field

ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination	163
RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research	168

Goal 5: Enhance the Quality and Access to Postsecondary and Adult Education

AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities	175
AEFLA: Adult Education State Grants	176
AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy	181
ATA: Assistive Technology Alternative Financing	182
ATA: Assistive Technology Programs	183
EDA: Gallaudet University	184
EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf	189
ESEA: Community Technology Centers	192
HEA: Aid for Institutional Development Title III & Title V	193
<i>AID Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions</i>	
<i>AID Minority Science and Engineering Improvement</i>	
<i>AID Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions</i>	
<i>AID Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities</i>	
<i>AID Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions</i>	
<i>AID Strengthening Institutions</i>	
<i>AID Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities</i>	
HEA: Byrd Honors Scholarships	196
HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents in School	197
HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program	200
HEA: Demonstration Projects to Ensure Quality Higher Education for Students with Disabilities	202
HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education	203
HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP)	205
HEA: Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN)	209
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Programs	212
<i>HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Domestic Programs</i>	
<i>HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Institute for International Public Policy</i>	
<i>MECEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Overseas Programs</i>	
HEA: Javits Fellowships	216
HEA: Student Financial Assistance Policy	218
<i>SFA Federal Direct Student Loans</i>	
<i>SFA Federal Family Education Loan Program & Liquidating</i>	
<i>SFA Federal Pell Grants</i>	
<i>SFA Federal Perkins Loans</i>	
<i>SFA Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants</i>	
<i>SFA Federal Work-Study</i>	
<i>SFA Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnerships</i>	
HEA: Student Aid Administration	223

Goal 5 (Continued)

HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers	225
HEA: TRIO McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement	226
HEA: TRIO Student Support Services	228
HEA: TRIO Talent Search	230
HEA: TRIO Upward Bound	231
HEA: Underground Railroad Program	233
HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults	234
NLA: Literacy Programs for Prisoners	237
RA: Client Assistance State Grants	238
RA: Independent Living Centers and State Grants	240
<i>Independent Living Centers</i>	
<i>Independent Living State Grants</i>	
RA: Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals	242
RA: Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers	244
RA: Projects with Industry	245
RA: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights	248
RA: Supported Employment State Grants	249
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs	250
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Grants for Indians	252
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Recreational Programs	253
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants	254
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training	259
20 USC: Howard University	262
VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions	269

Goal 6: Establish Management Excellence

DEOA: Office for Civil Rights	272
DEOA: Office of Inspector General	274

INTRODUCTION

The strategic goals and objectives set forth in the Department of Education's *FY 2002 - 2007 Strategic Plan* form the context for the broad outcomes that the Department believes should characterize American education. We continue our commitment to these 6 goals and the 26 related objectives.

The Department administers more than 150 programs in support of these goals and objectives. In our *Fiscal Year 2005 Program Performance Plan*, we established performance measures and targets for most of these programs. In this *FY 2005 Program Performance Report*, we report the most recent results for these program performance measures.

For most program measures we have set specific numeric performance targets, but for others we committed to targets based upon a stated increase or decrease from baseline data. Where baseline data are not yet available, we use "999" in the performance measure table as a placeholder for the target for each applicable year. In that case, we provide an explanation of targets and an estimate of baseline data availability.

Our *Fiscal Year 2005 Performance and Accountability Report* is located on our Web site at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2005report/index.html>.

Key to Legislation:

APEB = Act for the Promotion of Education for the Blind
AEFLA = Adult Education and Family Literacy Act
AID = Aid for Institutional Development
ATA = Assistive Technology Act
CRA = Civil Rights Act
DEOA = Department of Education Organization Act
EDA = Education of the Deaf Act
ESEA = Elementary and Secondary Education Act
ESRA = Education Sciences Reform Act
FIE = Fund for the Improvement of Education

HEA = Higher Education Act
HKNCA = Helen Keller National Center Act
IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
MECEA = Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act
MVHAA = McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act
NLA = National Literacy Act
RA = Rehabilitation Act
SFA = Student Financial Assistance Programs
USC = United States Code
VTEA = Vocational and Technical Education Act

Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement

APEB: American Printing House for the Blind - FY 2005

Program Goal: Pre-college-level blind students will receive appropriate educational materials that result in improved educational outcomes

Objective 1 of 1: *Appropriate, Timely, High-Quality Educational Materials Are Provided To Pre-College-Level Blind Students To Allow Them To Benefit More Fully From Their Educational Programs.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Customer satisfaction: The American Printing House's customers/consumers will agree that the educational materials provided through the act are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.

Measure 1.1.1 of 4: Trustees-Percentage that agree		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	95	
1999	96	95
2000	96.50	96
2001	97	96
2002	99	96
2003	98.75	96
2004	99.50	96
2005	100	98

Measure 1.1.2 of 4: Advisory Committees-Percentage that agree		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	100	100
2000	100	100
2001	100	100
2002	100	100
2003	100	100
2004	100	100
2005	100	100

Measure 1.1.3 of 4: Consumers-Percentage that agree		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	90	
2000	100	95
2001	97	95
2002	96	95
2003	100	95
2004	99	95
2005	96	95

Measure 1.1.4 of 4: Teachers - Percentage that agree		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	96	
2003	97	96
2004	98	96
2005	99	96

Source: Survey of Ex Officio Trustees; Input from Research and Publications Advisory Committees; consumer surveys, and teacher surveys.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The survey instrument used by APH was constructed with the input of an external research firm and was designed to measure the levels of customer/consumer satisfaction with each of the factors. The survey was distributed to 144 ex officio trustees as well as to various professional groups whose members work in the field of blindness. Additionally, the survey was available on the APH Web site. The Web-based format also provided accessibility to visually impaired individuals who require alternate media. All 2005 targets were exceeded.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Student performance and participation: The percentage of American Printing House ex officio trustees who report that the performance of students and their participation in their educational programs improves as a result of the availability of educational materials provided through the act will be maintained.

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: Trustees-Percentage that agree		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	98	
1999	98	98
2000	97	99
2001	97	99

2002	100	99
2003	99.50	99
2004	100	99
2005	99.50	99

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: Teachers--Percentage that agree		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	93	
2003	95	95
2004	98.50	95
2005	98.50	95

Source: Survey of Ex Officio Trustees and Survey of Teachers

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The ratings have been consistently high. Both 2005 targets were exceeded.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Student Achievement: The percentages of students who attain identified concepts or skills during the field testing of products in four areas--low vision, early childhood, multiple disabilities, and tactile graphics.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Percentage of students								
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets			
	Low Vision	Early Childhood	Multiple Disabilities	Tactile Graphics	Low Vision	Early Childhood	Multiple Disabilities	Tactile Graphics
2005					999	999	999	999

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

CRA: Training and Advisory Services - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.004D - Training and Advisory Services

Program Goal: To support access and equity in public schools and help school districts solve equity problems in education related to race, gender, and national origin.

Objective 1 of 1: *Provide high-quality technical assistance and training to public school districts in addressing equity in education.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Training and technical assistance services result in the promotion of policies and practices to ensure that all children regardless of race, gender, or national origin have equal access to quality education and equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: The percentage of customers of the Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices in eliminating, reducing, or preventing harassment, conflict, and school violence.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		999

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: The percentage of customers of the Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices ensuring that students of different race, national origin, and gender have equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Equity Assistance Center Customer Survey and Equity Assistance Center Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1 percent.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Training and technical assistance services result in products and services that are deemed to be

of high usefulness to education policy or practice.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of customers that report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high usefulness to their policies and practices.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Equity Assistance Center Customer Survey and Equity Assistance Center Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1 percent.

ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.287 - Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers

Program Goal: To establish community learning centers that help students in high-poverty, low-performing schools meet academic achievement standards; to offer a broad array of additional services designed to complement the regular academic program; and to offer families of students opportunities for educational development.

Objective 1 of 2: Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Achievement: Students regularly participating in the program will show improvement in achievement through measures such as test scores, grades, or teacher reports.

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: Percentage of regular program participants whose math/English grades improved from fall to spring.													
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets						
	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle School Math	Middle School English	Overall Math	Overall English	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle School Math	Middle School English	Overall Math	Overall English	
2000	43	45	36	37	39	41							
2001	43	46	37	39	40	43	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
2002	41.10	44.20	37.20	39.40	39.40	42.30	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
2003	42.70	45.20	35.50	37.40	40	42.10	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
2004	43.70	47	35.60	37.30	40.30	43.10	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
2005							45	45	45	45	45	45	45

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: Percentage of regular program participants whose achievement test scores improved from below grade level to at or above grade level.													
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets						
	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle School Math	Middle School English	Overall Math	Overall English	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle School Math	Middle School English	Overall Math	Overall English	
2000	5.80	5.10	3.90	3.90	4.80	4.50							

2001	5	4.10	8.10	5.50	6.60	6	6	6	6	6	6
2002	3.70	4	2	3.90	3.70	4.10	6	6	6	6	6
2003	5.10	4.30	3.70	4.40	4.50	4.40	6	6	6	6	6
2004	0.30	1.40	0.90	1.10	1	1.60	6	6	6	6	6
2005							6	6	6	6	6

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: Percentage of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Elementary	Middle or High School Math	Overall	Elementary	Middle or High School Math	Overall
2000	76	64	69			
2001	74	71	73	75	75	75
2002	76.30	73.60	75.50	75	75	75
2003	77.70	73.40	76.60	75	75	75
2004	79.80	75	78.20	75	75	75
2005				75	75	75

Source: U.S. Department of Education, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, program report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Data for 2004 is reported through Annual Performance Reports only for 2569 centers which received federal grants prior to the program becoming a state administered program. Data for state grantees is available for 2004, but since data collection instruments were not comparable, this data will be reported in the 2006PM. There are possible methodological differences in the way the achievement scores were calculated relative to earlier years, which might explain the decrease from 2003.

Explanation: 1) Program participants who improved from fall to spring showed mixed results in achieving FY 2004 targets. These are listed below: (Elementary Math)-Did not meet target. (Elementary English)-Exceeded Target. (Middle and High School Math)-Did not meet target. (Middle and High School English)-Did not meet target. (Overall Math)-Did not meet. (Overall English)-Did not meet target. 2) None of the grade groups met the FY 2004 targets on the percent of students moving from below grade level to above. 3) For the measure on teacher-reported student improvement the following results were reported: Elementary- exceeded target Middle school and High School-met target. Overall- exceeded target.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Behavior: Students participating in the program will show improvement through measures such as school attendance, classroom performance, and decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of students with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

	Elementary Middle or High School Overall			Elementary Middle or High School Overall		
2000	62	57	59	70	70	70
2001	73	75	74	75	75	75
2002	76	76.90	76.30	75	75	75
2003	77.60	76.10	77.50	75	75	75
2004	78.20	74.60	77	75	75	75
2005				77	77	77

Source: U.S. Department of Education, 21st Century Community Learning Centers. Data for 2004 are reported through Annual Performance Reports only for 600 centers that received federal grants prior to the program becoming a state administered program. Data for state grantees are available from 2004 and will be reported in the 2006PM.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Teacher reports are subjective and thus subject to variation over time and across sites.

Explanation: FY 2004 results on the percentage of teachers reporting improved student behavior varied by grade grouping. The program met its FY 2004 target of 75 percent at the elementary level, but fell slightly short at the Middle and High School level. The overall rating was above the FY 2004 target.

Objective 2 of 2: *21st Century Community Learning Centers will offer high-quality enrichment opportunities that positively affect student outcomes such as school attendance and academic performance, and result in decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Core educational services: More than 85 percent of Centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of 21st Century Centers reporting emphasis in at least one core academic area.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	97	85
2001	96	85
2002	94.80	85
2003	96.10	85
2004	96.10	85
2005		100

Source: U.S. Department of Education, 21st Century Community Learning Centers. Data for 2004 are reported through Annual Performance Reports and were obtained from 2924 centers that received federal grants prior to the program becoming a state administered program.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: We exceeded the FY 2004 target of 85 percent.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Other enrichment activities: More than 85 percent of Centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and physical education.

Measure 2.2.1 of 2: Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in technology		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	70	85
2001	79	85
2002	80.60	85
2003	81.30	85
2004	80.50	85
2005		85

Measure 2.2.2 of 2: Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in other areas.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	97	85
2001	95	85
2002	96	85
2003	95.90	85
2004	94.70	85
2005		100

Source: U.S. Department of Education, 21st Century Community Learning Centers. Data for 2004 are reported through Annual Performance Reports only for 2924 centers that received federal grants prior to the program becoming a state administered program. Data for state grantees are available for 2004, but since data collection instruments were not comparable, these data will be reported in the 2006PM.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: 1) The percentage of 21 Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in technology did not meet the FY 2004 target. 1) The percentage of 21 Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in other areas exceeded the FY 2004 target.

ESEA: Advanced Credentialing - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.925 - Advanced Certification or Advanced Credentialing

Program Goal: Support teachers seeking advanced certification through high-quality professional teacher enhancement programs designed to improve teaching and learning.

Objective 1 of 1: *To increase the number of National Board Certified Teachers.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The number of teachers awarded National Board Certification will increase annually.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Cumulative number of teachers certified.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	23,936	
2003	32,142	
2004	40,200	35,000
2005		40,000
2006		45,000
2007		50,000

Source: Data on the number of National Board Certified Teachers (NCBTS) was provided initially in a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) press release announcing those teachers who have received National Board certification. This information is also available on the NBPTS Web site and is included in the annual program performance report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Upon release of the number of NBCTs, the name of each individual and the certification area are available on the NBPTS Web site.

Explanation: We exceeded our target for 2004. The target has been set at an increase of 5,000 National Board-certified teachers each year. Currently, all 50 states and 544 local school districts offer some kind of incentive for teachers to apply for National Board certification; these incentives have helped to increase the number of applicants for National Board certification. These incentives include fee support, salary supplements, and license portability. The Candidate Subsidy Program, that supports up to one half of the candidate fee, along with targeted recruitment efforts have led to the National Board being able to exceed its target.

ESEA: Advanced Placement - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.330B - Advanced Placement Test Fee Program
84.330C - Advanced Placement Incentives Program

Program Goal: To increase the number of low-income high school students prepared to pursue higher education

Objective 1 of 1: Encourage a greater number of low-income students to participate in the AP and IB programs and pass the exams.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Students served: The number of low-income students who are successful on AP and IB tests.

Measure 1.1.1 of 4: (a) Number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income students nationally.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	92,570	83,300
2000	102,474	102,000
2001	112,891	112,200
2002	140,572	124,180
2003	166,649	154,629
2004	190,350	170,092
2005	220,542	183,314
2006		220,000

Measure 1.1.2 of 4: (b) Number of IB tests taken by low-income students nationally.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Measure 1.1.3 of 4: (c) Percentage of low-income students served by the API program who receive a passing score on AP tests.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Measure 1.1.4 of 4: (d) Percentage of low-income students served by the API program who receive a passing score on IB tests.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Advanced Placement Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Data for (a) are available annually in November. New performance measures have been established for (b), (c) and (d). The FY 2005 target for (b), (c), and (d) is to set the baseline. Data for these measures will be available annually in December.

ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.356A - Alaska Native Educational Programs

Program Goal: Alaska Native Education Program Internal Goal

Objective 1 of 1: Support supplemental educational programs to benefit Alaska Natives.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Percentage of participants benefiting from the Alaska Native Education program will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: The percentage of students participating in the program that meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science or reading.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005	42	999

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: The percentage of Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs that improve on measures of school readiness.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005	76	999

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: The dropout rate of Alaska Native and American Indian middle school students in the Anchorage School District.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005	2	999

Source: Grantee Annual performance report- 524b

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Data for 2004 was unusable. 2005 data sets the baseline. 2006 target is baseline plus 2

ESEA: Arts In Education - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.351C - Professional Development for Arts Educators--Arts in Education
 84.351D - Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination Grants Program
 84.351E - Arts in Education

Program Goal: To help ensure that all program participants meet challenging state academic content standards in the arts.

Objective 1 of 1: *Activities supported with federal funds will improve the quality of standards-based arts education for all participants.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Percentage of participants who benefit from standards-based arts education and meet state standards in the arts will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: (a) The percentage of students participating in arts models programs who demonstrate higher achievement than those in control or comparison groups.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: (b) The number of students who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the VSA and JFK Center for Performing Arts.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	low-income	students with disabilities	low-income	students with disabilities
2005			999	999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Arts in Education Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%. For measure (b), data will be disaggregated for low-income participants and for those with disabilities.

VSA=Very Special Arts
 JFK=John F. Kennedy

ESEA: Charter Schools Grants - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.282 - Charter Schools

Program Goal: To support the creation of a large number of high-quality charter schools.

Objective 1 of 1: Encourage the development of a large number of high-quality charter schools that are free from state or local rules that inhibit flexible operation, are held accountable for enabling students to reach challenging state performance standards, and are open to all students.

Indicator 1.1 of 2: State legislation: The number of states that have charter school legislation.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of states with charter school legislation (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico)		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995	12	
1996	19	
1997	27	
1998	31	
1999	38	
2000	38	40
2001	39	42
2002	40	42
2003	41	43
2004	41	44
2005	41	44

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Charter Schools Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Data are verified by U.S. Department of Education program staff through monitoring and technical assistance activities and by a review of data from the Center for Education Reform's Annual Survey of America's Charter Schools.

Limitations: There are substantial differences in the definition of charter schools among states. Some states count a single charter with multiple sites as single charter schools, while other states count a single charter with multiple sites as multiple charter schools, causing variability in the counts reported by state educational agencies.

Explanation: We did not meet our target for 2005. Targets are based on previous growth trends, which have averaged 10 percent per year over the last five years. Growth in the number of charter schools is largely under the control of state legislatures that maintain authority to pass laws authorizing the creation and regulation of charter schools. While some states have reached capacity in terms of the number of charter schools allowed by their state laws, other states have successfully amended their statutes to allow for multiple authorizers and, therefore, greater flexibility. Additionally, some states have used the "corrective action" provisions under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) for local educational agencies to convert low performing Title I schools into charter schools.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Charter operations: The number of charter schools in operation.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of charter schools in operation		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995	100	
1996	255	
1997	428	
1998	790	
1999	1,100	
2000	1,700	2,060
2001	2,110	2,667
2002	2,431	3,000
2003	2,700	3,000
2004	2,996	3,000
2005	3,344	3,300

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Charter Schools Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

On site monitoring by ED and data from the Center for Education Reform.

Limitations: Differences in the definition of charter schools (i.e., some states count multiple sites as single charters, while others count them as multiple charters) cause variability in the counts among SEAs. There is sometimes disagreement about numbers of charter schools in operation among the agencies that do the counting.

Explanation: We exceeded our target for 2005. Targets are based on previous growth trends, which have averaged 10 percent per year over the last five years. Growth in the number of charter schools is largely under the control of state legislatures that maintain authority to pass laws authorizing the creation and regulation of charter schools. While some states have reached capacity in terms of the number of charter schools allowed by their state laws, other states have successfully amended their statutes to allow for multiple authorizers and, therefore, greater flexibility. Additionally, some states have used the "corrective action" provisions under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) for local educational agencies to convert low performing Title I schools into charter schools.

ESEA: Civic Education: Cooperative Education Exchange - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.304A - Cooperative Education Exchange

Program Goal: To enhance the attainment of the third and sixth national goals by educating students about the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Objective 1 of 1: *Provide exemplary curricula and teacher training for teachers from emerging democracies under the Cooperative Civic and Economic Education program*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Quality of teacher training: The extent to which training under the program has improved the quality of instruction for students

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of teachers participating in training or professional development activities under the program (in the United States and in participating foreign countries) that have demonstrated improved quality of instruction.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	2005 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005		999

Source: Data will come from program evaluations supported by the grantee.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: Of funds appropriated under the Cooperative Education Exchange portion of the Civic Education program 37.5 percent must be distributed, as required by statute, to the Center for Civic Education and 37.5 percent must also be distributed to the National Council on Economic Education. The remaining 25 percent of this appropriation supports competitive awards (and continuations) to eligible entities. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.

ESEA: Comprehensive School Reform - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.332A - ESEA Comprehensive School Reform
84.332B - Comprehensive School Reform Quality Initiatives

Program Goal: To enable low-performing students to improve their achievement to meet challenging standards

Objective 1 of 2: Student achievement in core subjects generally will show marked improvement in comprehensive school reform (CSR) program schools.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: AYP results: The percentage of Comprehensive School Reform schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: Reading/Language arts		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	67	
2005		68

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: Mathematics		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	69	
2005		70

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report, grantee submissions.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

It should be noted that each year's data will represent a different cohort of schools reporting on their progress after three years of implementing CRS. This change in cohort means that a variation in the percentage meeting AYP may be a factor of the schools reporting rather than an indication of improvement or lack of it.

Limitations: The data for this indicator were self-reported by state educational agencies.

Explanation: FY 2004 data are baseline data. The target for FY 2005 is baseline plus 1%.

Objective 2 of 2: The number of schools providing high-quality curriculum and instruction and improving student outcomes will increase each year.

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Impact on school improvement: By 2014 no schools that have received CSR program funds will be designated as in need of improvement, while CSR funds continue to be targeted on the lowest achieving schools.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of principals in Title I schools reporting that they are implementing a research-based school reform model		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	31	
2000	46	
2001	62	55
2002		60
2003		70
2004		72
2005		74

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center of Education Statistics, National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999(baseline)/2000.

Frequency: Annually.

Explanation: Data were not collect data from 2002-2005. The program expected to conduct a special survey but this effort was never funded. This measure will be discontinued in FY 2006.

ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.354A - Charter Schools Facilities Program

**Program Goal: Increase the number of charter school facilities acquired,
constructed or renovated.**

Objective 1 of 2: Increase funds available for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Leveraged funds: The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, construction, or renovation of charter school facilities (in millions).		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	66	
2004	74	100
2005		100
2006		100

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Charter School Facilities Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: These multi-year grants received all the funding at the beginning of the first project period. As no reports are required for continuation funding, grantees were given a full year of performance before reporting data.

Explanation: We did not meet our target for 2004. Baseline data were collected in 2003. We reported initially that the 2003 baseline was \$99 million; that was revised in 2004 to \$105 million but corrected data established our actual performance for 2003 at \$66 million. Subsequently, our actual performance 2004 of \$70 million was revised to \$74 million. Definition of Leverage: The number of dollars (in millions) leveraged consists of the dollar amount raised (versus the amount contributed to the financing from the grant) as a direct result of the guarantee. If the grantee received a non-Department of Education grant (including a New Markets Tax Credit allocation) and is using it to provide additional leveraging for a school served by the federal grant, funds leveraged from these other funds may also be counted as funds leveraged by the federal grant. A grantee may count senior debt toward the total amount of funds leveraged if it uses grant funds to guarantee or insure subordinate debt but not the senior debt to which it is tied. Likewise, grantees may count subordinate debt toward the total amount of funds leveraged if it only uses grant funds to credit-enhance senior debt.

Objective 2 of 2: Increase the number of charter schools facilities acquired, constructed or renovated.

Indicator 2.1 of 1: The number of charter schools served through this indicator.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The number of charter schools served through this indicator.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	20	
2004	32	20
2005		20

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Charter School Facilities Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2004 actual figure indicates that the program served 32 schools, exceeding the target of 20 schools by an additional 12 schools. This was due largely to the fact that some of the organizations that received grant funds in fiscal years 2003 and 2004 were able to serve schools.

ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.349A - Early Childhood Educator Professional Development

Program Goal: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development (ECEPD)

Objective 1 of 2: *Early childhood educators will more frequently apply research-based approaches in early childhood instruction and child development and learning, including establishing literacy-rich classrooms.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Apply research-based approaches to early childhood pedagogy and child development and learning, including establishing literacy-rich classrooms: Average Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO) score will improve.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: ECEPD teachers' scores on ELLCO.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	20	999
2005		999

Source: Pre and post evaluation of ELLCO.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Limitations: Data collected may only represent a sample of grantees that use the ELLCO.

Explanation: FY 2004 data represent 2-year ECEPD cohorts. Beginning with FY 2005, ECEPD cohorts are funded for up to 3 years. The FY 2005 cohort will establish the baseline for reporting on the performance of 3-year funded grantees. ELLCO is used by mentors or supervisors to measure a teacher's classroom literacy environment.

Objective 2 of 2: *Children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy and numeracy skills.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Demonstrated improved readiness for school: At the end of the last preschool year, children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy, and numeracy skills.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of children who demonstrate improved readiness for school in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy, and numeracy skills.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Cognitive	Social / Emotional	Cognitive	Social / Emotional

2004	43	999	999
2005		43.40	999

Source: Annual Performance Report, grantee submissions.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Limitations: Data collected may only represent a sample of grantees that use the PPVT-III.

Explanation: FY 2004 data represent ECEPD 2-year cohorts. Data on numeracy and social/emotional skills were not reported consistently. Beginning in FY 2005, ECEPD will fund cohorts up to 3 years. Also beginning in FY 2005, documented use of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-III) and the PALS Pre-K Alphabet knowledge Test. The FY 2005 cohort will establish the baseline for reporting on the performance of 3-year funded grantees.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Demonstrated skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction: One year following instruction from a teacher who participated in an Early childhood Educator Professional Development program, children will demonstrate that they have the skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction at the end of the kindergarten year.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of children who demonstrate that they have the skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction at the end of the kindergarten year.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: ECEPD Annual Performance Report, grantee submissions.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: No data were collected in 2005 because program funds could not be used to collect this data after the pre-K level. This measure will be discontinued for 2006.

ESEA: Early Reading First - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.359 - Early Reading First

Program Goal: To support local efforts to enhance the early language, literacy, and prereading development of preschool age children through strategies and professional development based on scientifically based reading research.

Objective 1 of 1: *Preschool-aged children will attain the necessary early language, cognitive and pre-reading skills to enter kindergarten prepared for continued learning, including the age appropriate development of oral language, and alphabet knowledge.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Language: The percent of children who demonstrate age-appropriate development of receptive language.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percent of preschool-age children participating in ERF programs who demonstrate age-appropriate oral language skills as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Receptive	Receptive
2004	56	999
2005		57

Source: Early Reading First Program Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition (PPVT) nationally normed tests which has been validated internally and correlated with other measures of cognitive development.

Limitations: Data reported represent 50 percent of the grantees who use the PPVT to measure vocabulary development in 2004.

Explanation: The first full program year for Early Reading First grantees was FY 2003-2004. Early Reading First preschool children took a Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III pre-test and a post-test after the year of Early Reading First intervention. Post-test scores of ERF preschool children were compared to the national norms provided by the test publisher. Both fiscal year 2002 and 2003 grantees reported data. ERF 2002 grantees had a full year of implementation while 2003 grantees had approximately 6 months. Data from SY 2004 will provide the baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Alphabet Knowledge: The average number of letters that preschool-age children in ERF programs are able to identify as measured by the Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask on the PALS Pre-K assessment.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of letters ERF children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	15	999
2005		16

Source: Early Reading First Program Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

The PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask is a measure that has been validated using a statewide sample of typically developing children.

Limitations: Not all Early Reading First grantees used the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask to measure alphabet knowledge. Data reported represent approximately 50 percent of the grantees who used the measure. FY 2002 grantees had a full year of implementation while 2003 grantees had approximately 6 months.

Improvements: Early Reading First grantees will be encouraged to use the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask as the measure of alphabet knowledge.

Explanation: FY 2003-2004 is the first program year for Early Reading First grantees. The first Early Reading First Performance Report was due December 2004. The PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask is a measure of alphabet knowledge that will be administered to ERF preschool children with scores reported in the ERF Performance Report.

ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.209 - Native Hawaiian Family Based Education Centers
 84.210 - Native Hawaiian Gifted and Talented
 84.296 - Native Hawaiian Community-Based Education Learning Centers
 84.297 - Native Hawaiian Curriculum Development, Teacher Training and Recruitment
 84.316 - Native Hawaiian Higher Education Program
 84.362A - Native Hawaiian Education

Program Goal: Native Hawaiian Education Program Internal Goal

Objective 1 of 1: To support innovative projects that provide supplemental services that address the educational needs of Native Hawaiian children and adults.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Percentage of participants who will benefit from the Native Hawaiian Education program will increase

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: The percentage of teachers involved with professional development activities that address the unique education needs of program participants.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005	89.30	999

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: The percentage of Native Hawaiian children participating in the early education program provided by Alu Like, Inc. that improve on measures of school readiness and literacy.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005	63	999

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: The percentage of students participating in the program that meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science, or reading.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005	82	999

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report, grantee submissions.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2004 data was unusable. The target for FY 2005 was to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is baseline plus 2%.

ESEA: Educational Technology State Grants - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.318X - Enhancing Education Through Technology

Program Goal: To facilitate the comprehensive and integrated use of educational technology into instruction and curricula to improve teaching and student achievement.

Objective 1 of 3: Fully integrate technology into the curricula and instruction in all schools by December 31, 2006 (FY 2007) to enhance teaching and learning. .

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Curriculum Integration: The percentage of districts receiving Educational Technology State Grants (EETT) funds that have effectively and fully integrated technology, as identified by states, will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of districts receiving sufficient EETT funds that have integrated technology.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

Source: U.S. Department Education, Education Data Exchange Network.

Date Sponsored: 10/01/2005.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 5 percent.

Objective 2 of 3: To help ensure that students and teachers in high-poverty, high-need schools have access to educational technology comparable to that of students and teachers in other schools.

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Internet access in high poverty classrooms: Internet access in high-poverty school classrooms will be comparable to that in other schools.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of classrooms with Internet access.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Low-poverty classrooms	High-poverty classrooms	Low-poverty classrooms	High-poverty classrooms
2002	93	89		

2003	95	90	100	100
2004			100	100
2005			100	100

Survey/Assessment: Fast Response Survey System.

References: National Center for Education Statistics Study - Internet Access in U.S. Public Schools and Classrooms.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Poverty measures are based on data on free and reduced-price lunches, which may underestimate school poverty levels, particularly for older students and immigrant students.

Explanation: By 2003, 90 percent of high poverty classrooms had internet access. The FY 2004 and Fy 2005 targets are to maintain this level of connectivity.

Objective 3 of 3: *To provide professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and school administrators to develop capacity to effectively integrate technology into teaching and learning.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Professional Development: In districts that receive funding from the State Grant program, the percentage of teachers that meet their state technology standards will increase.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: Percentage of teachers that meet state technology standards		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

Source: U.S. Department Education, Education Data Exchange Network.

Date Sponsored: 10/01/2006.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2005 target is baseline plus one percent.

ESEA: English Language Acquisition - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.365A - English Language Acquisition Formula Grant Program

Program Goal: To help limited English proficient students learn English and reach high academic standards

Objective 1 of 3: *Improve English proficiency and academic achievement of students served by Title III.*

Indicator 1.1 of 7: The percentage of states that have demonstrated the alignment of English language proficiency (ELP) assessments with ELP standards.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of states that have demonstrated the alignment of English language proficiency (ELP) assessments with ELP standards.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	31	
2005		10
2007		40
2009		70
2011		100

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report; EDEN when available.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Explanation: All 52 entities (50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) are providing information regarding aligned English language proficiency assessments for the first time under No Child Left Behind. The data analysis was conducted by an OELA team using the following criterion: states were counted as having demonstrated progress in alignment if they explained how their current ELP assessment is being aligned with ELP standards. Sixteen states met this criterion.

Indicator 1.2 of 7: The percentage of states that have demonstrated their English language proficiency standards are linked to academic content standards in English language arts or reading.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of states that have demonstrated their English language proficiency standards are linked to academic content standards in English language arts or reading.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	85	
2005		10

2007		20
2009		30
2011		50

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report; EDEN when available.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Explanation: For the first time under NCLB, all 52 entities (50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) are to provide evidence of linking ELP standards to academic content standards in reading/language arts. The data analysis was conducted by an OELA team using the following criterion: states were counted as having demonstrated linking if they described how linking was accomplished. Forty-four states met this criterion.

Indicator 1.3 of 7: The percentage of states that have met state targets for Title III annual measurable achievement objectives.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of states that have met state targets for Title III annual measurable achievement objectives.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999
2008		999
2009		999
2010		999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report, EDEN when available; Biennial Evaluation Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2007

Explanation: Based on submissions by states the average annual measurable achievement objective (AMAO) for attainment and making progress is reflected in the performance target. The third AMAO for LEP students (in the state) served by Title III is to demonstrate those states meeting their AYP targets. Average annual percentage increases vary depending on the LEP population in the state and available resources in serving these students. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 10%. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 20%. The target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 40%. The target for FY 2010 is the baseline plus 70%.

Indicator 1.4 of 7: The percentage of states that have met state targets for making progress in English for LEP students who have received Title III services.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The percentage of states that have met state targets for making progress for LEP students who have received Title III services.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

2007		999
2008		999
2009		999
2010		999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report; EDEN when available; Biennial Evaluation Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 10%. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 20%. The target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 40%. The target for FY 2010 is the baseline plus 70%.

Indicator 1.5 of 7: The percentage of states that have met state targets for attainment in learning English who have received Title III services.

Measure 1.5.1 of 1: The percentage of states that have met state targets for attainment in learning English who have received Title III services.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999
2008		999
2009		999
2010		999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report; EDEN when available; Biennial Evaluation Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 10%. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 20%. The target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 40%. The target for FY 2010 is the baseline plus 70%.

Indicator 1.6 of 7: The percentage of states that have met state targets for making AYP for LEP students who have received Title III services.

Measure 1.6.1 of 1: The percentage of states that have met state targets for making AYP for LEP students who have received Title III services.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999
2007		999

2008		999
2009		999
2010		999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report; EDEN when available.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 10%. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 20%. target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 40%.The target for FY 2010 is the baseline plus 70%.

Indicator 1.7 of 7: The states' LEP graduation rate targets for the Title III-served students.

Measure 1.7.1 of 1: The percentage of states that have met state targets for LEP graduation rates for Title III-served student.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2007		999
2008		999
2009		999
2010		999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report and Title I data; EDEN when available.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2008

Explanation: This measure will be reported based on information collected through EDEN in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system thus not imposing a new reportable item through any other means of data collection but providing an effective measure of success through the programs provided in Title III. The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 10%. The target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 15%. The target for FY 20010 is the baseline plus 20%.

Objective 2 of 3: *Improve the quality of teachers of LEP students.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Of programs serving preservice teachers, the rate of placement of graduates in an instructional setting serving LEP students, within one year of graduation, will be higher than the placement rate of preservice teachers nationally.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Of preservice teachers the rate of placement of graduates in an instructional setting serving LEP students within one year of graduation.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Grantee Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Highly qualified teachers: The percentage of program completers who meet No Child Left Behind Highly Qualified Teacher requirements.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: Percentage of program completers who are Highly Qualified Teachers		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Grantee Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 3 of 3: *Improve English proficiency and academic achievement of students served by the Native American and Alaska Native Children in School Program.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: English Proficiency: Students in the program will annually demonstrate progress on English measures.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of projects in which three-quarters of students made gains in English proficiency.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		50
2007		75

Source: Grantee Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

ESEA: Even Start - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.213 - Even Start State Educational Agencies

Program Goal: To help break the cycle of poverty and illiteracy by improving the educational opportunities of the nation's low-income families through a unified family literacy program that integrates early childhood education, adult literacy and adult basic education, and parenting education.

Objective 1 of 1: *The literacy of participating families will improve.*

Indicator 1.1 of 4: Adult literacy achievement and English language acquisition: Percentage of adults who achieve significant learning gains on measures of literacy and limited English proficient (LEP) adults who achieve significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of Even Start adults showing significant learning gains on measures of literacy and Even Start LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition as measured by the CASAS and the TABE.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	70	999
2004	60.50	70.70
2005		71.40

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report (CPRs)

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2006

Explanation: We set a baseline in 2003 with fifteen states reporting. Thirty-four states reported in 2004. The 2004 target was not met. CASAS (Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System) and the TABE (Tests of Adult Basic Education) both measure reading and language acquisition. Therefore only one figure is being reported.

Indicator 1.2 of 4: Adult educational attainment: Percentage of Even Start parents who earn a high school diploma and the percentage of parents who earn a General Equivalency Diploma (GED).

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal or General Equivalency Diploma (GED) attainment goal that earn a high school diploma or equivalent.			
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	High School diploma	General Equivalency Diploma (GED)	High School diploma General Equivalency Diploma (GED)

2003	59	44	999	999
2004	44.60	80.20	59.60	44.40
2005			60.20	44.90

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2006

Explanation: We set a baseline in 2003 with five states reporting the number of high school diploma and 12 states reporting GED scores. For FY 2004, 34 states reported GED. However, the 2004 target was not met. Fifteen states reported high school diplomas. The GED target was exceeded,

Indicator 1.3 of 4: Children's language development: Percentage of Even Start children that are entering kindergarten who demonstrate age-appropriate development of receptive language.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Percentage of Even Start children that are entering kindergarten who are achieving age-appropriate benchmarks on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Receptive	Receptive
2003		999
2004	82.90	999
2005		83.70

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Not all Even Start programs use the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III to measure receptive language development. Data collected represent the sample of Even Start programs that use the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.

Improvements: Even Start programs will be encouraged to use the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III as the measure of receptive language development.

Explanation: No data were reported for FY 2003. Therefore, 2004 data served as baseline. For FY 2004, 10 states reported data. Even Start children will take a Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III pretest and a posttest in the year prior to kindergarten. Posttest scores of Even Start children will be compared to the national norms provided by the test publisher. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition (PPVT) nationally normed tests, which have been validated internally and correlated with other measures of cognitive development.

Indicator 1.4 of 4: Alphabet Knowledge: The score Even Start children attain on the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The number of letters Even Start children can identify as measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

The PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask is a measure that has been validated using a statewide sample of typically developing children.

Limitations: Not all of the Even Start programs use the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask to measure alphabet knowledge. Data collected represent the sample of Even Start programs that use the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.

Improvements: Even Start programs will be encouraged to use the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter naming Subtask as the measure of alphabet knowledge.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1 percent.

ESEA: Excellence in Economic Education - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.215B - Excellence in Economic Education

Program Goal: To promote economic and financial literacy among all students in kindergarten through grade 12.

Objective 1 of 5: *To increase students' knowledge of, and achievement in, economics to enable the students to become more productive and informed citizens.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Percent Teachers Trained: The percentage of students of teachers trained under the grant project who demonstrate an improved understanding of personal finance and economics as compared to similar students whose teachers have not had the training provided by the program.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of students taught by teachers trained under this grant who demonstrate improved understanding of personal finance issues.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Excellence in Economic Education annual grantee performance report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1%. The original grant award was for a period of one year; however a no-cost extension extended the grant period. Grantees received funds only from the FY 2004 appropriations.

ESEA: Foreign Language Assistance - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.293B - Foreign Language Assistance Grants (LEAs)
84.293C - Foreign Language Assistance Program (SEAs)

Program Goal: Assist local and state educational agencies in establishing, improving or expanding foreign language study for elementary and secondary school students.

Objective 1 of 1: *To improve the foreign language proficiency of students served by the Foreign Language Assistance program.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Increased student achievement: The percentage of projects that report improvements in proficiency in a foreign language for three quarters of school participants.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of projects		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	65	
2005		50
2006		75

Source: Annual grantee performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: There are no statutory reporting requirements. Grantee annual reports indicate that grantees use a multitude of various assessment measurements to determine and plot student growth in language ability.

Explanation: This program was previously funded under Title VII of the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA). The performance indicator and performance targets for FLAP were revised after the program was reauthorized under Title V of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). FY 2004 data established the baseline.

ESEA: Impact Aid Basic Support Payments and Payments for Children with Disabilities - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.041 - Impact Aid

Program Goal: To provide appropriate financial assistance for federally connected children who present a genuine burden to their school districts

Objective 1 of 2: Make payments in a timely manner

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Timeliness of payments: The percentage of eligible applicants who receive initial Basic Support and Children With Disabilities payments within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of applicants paid within 60 days of appropriation.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	75	
1998	87	
1999	13	90
2000	96	90
2001	73	90
2002	63	90
2003	98	90
2004	95	90
2005	94	90

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, grantee submitted electronic data files.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was exceeded. The actual percentage of eligible applicants who received Impact Aid Basic Support and Children with Disabilities payments (Impact Aid) within 60 days of appropriation exceeded the FY 2005 target by 4 percent. The Department attributes this increase to the continued enhancements to the Impact Aid System in conjunction with higher performance monitoring standards

Objective 2 of 2: Make accurate payments

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Overpayment forgiveness requests: The number of requests to forgive overpayments of Basic

Support Payments, and payments for Children With Disabilities.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Number of requests to forgive overpayments of Basic Support payments		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	5	10
2000	2	10
2001	10	10
2002	4	10
2003	3	10
2004	3	10
2005	2	10

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, grantee submitted electronic data files.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2005

Limitations: At the time of response, the data were incomplete. Final figures will not be available until September 30, 2005; however, the data are not expected to change.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was exceeded. The actual number of applicants who requested forgiveness from October 1, 2004 through September 30, 2005 totaled 2, exceeding the FY 2005 target by 8 cases. The Department attributes this increase to the continued enhancements in the Impact Aid System in conjunction with higher performance monitoring standards.

ESEA: Impact Aid Construction - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.041C - Impact Aid Construction Grants

Program Goal: To provide appropriate financial assistance for federally connected children who present a genuine burden to their school districts

Objective 1 of 1: *Improve the quality of public school facilities used to educate federally connected children.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Construction: The percentage of schools in LEAs receiving Impact Aid Construction funds that report that the overall condition of their school buildings is adequate.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of LEAs reporting that the overall condition of their school buildings is adequate.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000		70
2001	44	70
2002	43	70
2003	47	70
2004	54	70
2005	52	70

Source: Data collected from LEA application for Impact Aid Section 8003 payments.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Limitations: Data are self-reported by Impact Aid applicants. Assessment of the condition of school facilities may differ depending on the judgment of the individual responding.

Explanation: The program did not meet its FY 2005 target. The responses to the data collection are subjective and ratings may vary depending on the person completing the survey. Annual performance may experience significant changes due to factors such as emergency facilities conditions, administrative turnover, etc. Additionally, according to feedback from the districts, the funding provided by the formula program is insufficient to address any major facilities issues. Additional funds for larger projects are available through the discretionary construction program, but are limited.

ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.367 - Improving Teacher Quality State Grants

Program Goal: To improve teacher and principal quality and increase the number of highly qualified teachers in the classroom and highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools.

Objective 1 of 1: Show an annual increase in the percentage of highly qualified teachers.

Indicator 1.1 of 4: Highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools: Percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of core academic classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	74	
2004	81	
2005		90
2006		95
2007		100

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report, grantee submissions.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Limitations: The current method of data collection in the Consolidate State Performance Report does not accurately reflect the measure for high poverty schools since it does not differentiate between elementary and high schools. Modifications to the Consolidated State Performance Report have been proposed.

Indicator 1.2 of 4: Highly qualified teachers in low-poverty schools: Percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers by low-poverty schools.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers in low-poverty schools.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	89	
2005		90
2006		95

2007	100
-------------	-----

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report, grantee submissions.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: 2004 data are baseline data

Indicator 1.3 of 4: Highly qualified teachers in elementary schools: Percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of core academic classes in elementary schools taught by highly qualified teachers.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	85	999
2004	89	89
2005		90
2006		95
2007		100

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report, grantee submissions.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: We met our FY 2004 target of 89 percent.

Indicator 1.4 of 4: Highly qualified teachers in secondary schools: The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in secondary schools.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The percentage of core academic classes in secondary schools taught by highly qualified teachers.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	80	999
2004	84	85
2005		85
2006		92
2007		100

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report, grantee submissions.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: We did not meet our FY 2004 target of 85 percent.

ESEA: Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.060 - Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies

Program Goal: To help American Indian and Alaska Native children achieve to the same challenging standards expected of all students by supporting access to programs that meet their unique educational and culturally related academic need.

Objective 1 of 1: *American Indian and Alaska Native students served by LEAs receiving Indian Education Formula Grants will progress at rates similar to those for all students in achievement to standards, promotion, and graduation.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Student achievement: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will meet or exceed the performance standards established by national assessments.

Measure 1.1.1 of 4: Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 4 who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	63	
2002	51	60
2003	47	62
2005		53

Measure 1.1.2 of 4: Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 8 who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	61	
2003	57	66
2005		63

Measure 1.1.3 of 4: Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 4 who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	57	
2000	40	

2002		64
2003	64	66
2005		66

Measure 1.1.4 of 4: Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 8 who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	51	
2000	47	
2002		62
2003	52	64
2005		54

Survey/Assessment: National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: February 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.

Data validated by National Center for Education Statistics review procedures and National Center for Education Statistics statistical standards.

Limitations: The small sample (for the sub-population of American Indian and Alaska Native students) means there is a high degree of standard error surrounding the estimates and limits data collection and possibilities for comparison to other populations. These estimates will vary greatly until a larger population is surveyed.

Explanation: NAEP assessments for reading and math are not administered annually. National trends indicate performance in reading and math are declining. American Indian and Alaska Native students were oversampled, in the 2005 NAEP assessments, in both reading and math, to increase the reliability of the data.

ESEA: Javits Gifted and Talented Education - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.206A - Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Student Education

Program Goal: To improve the teaching and learning of gifted and talented students through research, demonstration projects, personal training, and other activities of national significance.

Objective 1 of 1: *Develop models for developing the talents of students who are economically disadvantaged, are limited English proficient, and/or have disabilities.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Model Effectiveness: The number of new evidence-based project designs, targeting at-risk children that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists and practitioners.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of new evidence-based project designs with average reviewer ratings for quality of "high and above"		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Data supplied by National Center for Gifted and Talented.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Data for 2005 are pending. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1%.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Model Effectiveness: The number of projects with significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations as indicated by scientifically based evaluations.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of projects with significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Source: Based on evaluations of gifted and talented programs

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: We did not collect data for 2005 The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Capacity Building: The number of high quality projects targeting at-risk children, with evidence of effective professional development focusing on Gifted and Talented education delivered to a significant number of practitioners, as measured by an independent review panel of qualified scientists and practitioners.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The number of project designs with average reviewer ratings for quality of "high and above"		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Based on review panel data from the National Center for Gifted and Talented.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Data for FY2005 pending. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1%.

ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.364 - Literacy through School Libraries

Program Goal: To improve literacy skills and academic achievement of students by providing students with increased access to up-to-date school library materials and resources.

Objective 1 of 2: *Improve the literacy skills of students served by the Improving Literacy Through School Libraries program.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: School/District/State Reading Assessments: The percentage of schools/districts served by Improving Literacy Through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of schools/districts served by Improving Literacy Through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

Source: The U.S. Department of Education, Improving Literacy Through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; program evaluation of 2005 by Department of Education.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: FY 2003-04 was the first program year grantees received funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries. The 2004 grantee performance reports were inadequate for reporting. Subsequently, the Department provided focused technical assistance to grantees and the FY 2005 data will now be used to establish the baseline.

Objective 2 of 2: *Enhance the school library media collection at grantee schools/districts to align with curriculum.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: School library media collection: The comparison between the rate at which the school library media collection is increased at schools participating in the grant program and non-participating schools.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Difference in rate of increase between participating schools and non-participating schools.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

2004		999
2005		999

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Improving Literacy Through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; program evaluation of 2005 by Department of Education.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Improvements: in 2005, OMB clearance was obtained to use a program specific performance report

Explanation: FY 2003-04 was the first program year grantees received funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries. The 2004 grantee performance reports were inadequate for reporting. Subsequently, the Department provided focused technical assistance to grantees and the FY 2005 data will now be used to establish the baseline.

ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.165 - Magnet Schools Assistance

Program Goal: Students have access to high-quality education in desegregated magnet schools.

Objective 1 of 2: Federally funded magnet schools will eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation in targeted elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group students.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The percentage of magnet schools whose student applicant pool in relation to the general student population in the school reduces, eliminates, or prevents minority group isolation increases annually.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of magnet schools whose student applicant pool reduces, prevents, or eliminates minority group isolation.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
2005			999	
2008				999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Magnet Schools Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Data are self reported by grantees.

Explanation: The Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) grants are three-year grants. New cohorts of grantees are established in SY 2004-05 (cohort 1) and in SY 2007-08 (cohort 2). The FY 2005 target is to set the baseline for cohort 1. The FY 2008 target is to set the baseline for cohort 2. The expectation is that the starting point for performance targets for cohort 2 will be higher than the previous starting point, but will not build directly on 2007 results because the participating schools will be different.

Objective 2 of 2: Magnet school students meet their state's academic achievement standards.

Indicator 2.1 of 2: The percentage of magnet schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed the State's annual yearly progress standard increases annually.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed state annual progress standard.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
2005			999	
2009				999

Source: Annual state test results required by NCLB

Next Data Available: October 2006 state educational agencies.

Limitations: Data are frequently late in being released.

Explanation: New cohorts of grantees are established in SY 2004-05 (cohort 1) and in SY 2008-09 (cohort 2). The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 1. The FY 2009 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 2. Actual performance data for 2005 will be obtained by comparing the SY 2004-05 data with spring 2004 test results. Similarly, actual performance data for 2009 will be obtained by comparing the SY 2008-09 data with spring 2008 test results.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: The percentage of magnet schools that meet or exceed the state's annual yearly progress standard increases annually.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of magnet schools that meet or exceed the state's annual yearly progress standard.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
2005			999	
2009				999

Source: State test results required by NCLB

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006 state educational agencies.

Limitations: Data are frequently late in being released.

Explanation: New cohorts of grantees are established in SY 2004-2005 (cohort 1) and in Sy 2008-09 (Cohort 2). The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 1. The FY 2009 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 2. Actual performance data for 2005 will be obtained by comparing the SY 2004-05 data with spring 2004 test results. Similarly, actual performance data for 2009 will be obtained by comparing the SY 2008-09 data with spring 2008 test results.

ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.366A - Mathematics and Science Partnership program

Program Goal: To improve the quality of mathematics and science teachers and increase both the number of highly qualified math and science teachers and the achievement of students participating in Mathematics and Science Partnerships programs.

Objective 1 of 2: *To increase the number of highly qualified mathematics and science teachers in schools participating in Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) programs.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in MSP schools: the number or percentage of elementary certified teachers who significantly increase their knowledge of mathematics and science.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of K-5 teachers who significantly increase their knowledge of mathematics and science.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

Source: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, project annual reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Improvements: MSP now has a contractor to collect and aggregate data, and expects to move to an on-line data collection system

Explanation: Data for 2005 are pending. The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. However, as most states made awards in late FY 2004, data were not available for FY 2004. FY 2005 is the new baseline year. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 20%.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in MSP schools: the percentage of mathematics and science middle and high school teachers who are not highly qualified upon beginning participation in the program who become highly qualified upon completion of the program.

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: Percentage of highly qualified middle school (grades 6-8) teachers.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: Percentage of highly qualified high school (grades 9-12) teachers		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

2004		999
2005		999

Source: Individual annual reports from Partnership projects.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Data for FY 2005 are pending. The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. However, as most states made awards in late FY 2004, data were not available for FY 2004. FY 2005 is the new baseline year. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 20%.

Objective 2 of 2: *To increase the percentage of students in classrooms whose teachers are participating in Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) programs who score at the proficient or advanced level in mathematics and science on state assessments.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Student achievement in MSP schools: the percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced on state mathematics assessments.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced in mathematics.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999

Source: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, project annual reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Data for 2005 are pending. The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. However, as most states made awards in late FY 2004, data were not available for FY 2004. FY 2005 is the new baseline year.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Student achievement in MSP schools: the percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced on State science assessments.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: Percentage of students at proficient or advanced levels in science.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
- No Data -		

Source: Individual annual reports from Partnership projects.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Data for 2005 are pending. The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. However, as most states made awards in late FY 2004, data were not available for FY 2004. FY 2005 is the new baseline year. Targets for subsequent years will be set based on those data that are collected and analyzed.

ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.011 - Migrant Education State Grant Program

Program Goal: To assist all migrant students in meeting challenging academic standards and achieving graduation from high school (or a GED program) with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.

Objective 1 of 1: *Along with other federal programs and state and local reform efforts, the Migrant Education Program (MEP) will contribute to improved school performance of migrant children.*

Indicator 1.1 of 6: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the elementary school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in reading.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Number of states meeting an annually set performance target in reading at the elementary level for migrant students.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	States meeting target	States that reported results	States meeting target	States that reported results
1996	4	10		
1997	4	15		
1998	7	18		
1999	2	19		
2000	5	26		
2001	6	23		
2002	8	29	8	27
2003	15	43	10	32
2004			14	36
2005			16	38

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Information that directly measures the impact of the Title I, Migrant Education Program is not available. However, each state has its own assessment to measure and determine student proficiency. Student achievement across states cannot be compared directly, but the results for migrant students can be tracked over time, providing the state proficiency levels and assessments' content remain consistent and the disaggregation of assessment data by subgroup is accurate.

Improvements: This indicator will have greater validity and reliability over time as state assessment systems stabilize, include all migrant students in testing, and properly disaggregate and report results.

Explanation: The annually set state target for 2003 through 2005 is 50 percent or more of migrant students at the proficient or advanced level. The FY 2003 target was exceeded. The actual number of states (15) that had 50 percent or more of their migrant students at the proficient or advanced level (of 43 states reporting assessment results for migrant students) exceeded the FY 2003 target (10 states) by 50 percent. These results also document an 88 percent increase in the number of states that met the target in the prior reporting period. [Note: For the reporting period (2002-2003), only 19 states set the state performance target at having 50 percent or more of ALL students at the proficient or advanced levels. The Department is currently reviewing the 2003-2004 assessment data submitted by the states. Following validation, the table will be updated with the 2003-2004 data. In addition, once 80 percent of all states have met the performance target of 50 percent of migrant students at or above the proficient level, the performance target will be raised in increments of 5 percent.]

Indicator 1.2 of 6: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the middle school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in reading.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Number of states meeting an annually set performance target in reading for middle school migrant students.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	States meeting target	States that reported results	States meeting target	States that reported results
1996	2	10		
1997	3	15		
1998	6	18		
1999	4	18		
2000	2	23		
2001	7	21		
2002	6	27	9	25
2003	9	45	11	29
2004			15	32
2005			17	34

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Information that directly measures the impact of the Title I, Migrant Education Program is not available. However, each state has its own assessment to measure and determine student proficiency. Student achievement across the states cannot be compared directly, but the results for migrant students can be tracked over time, providing the state proficiency levels and assessments' content remain consistent and the disaggregation of assessment data by subgroup is accurate.

Improvements: This indicator will have greater validity and reliability over time as state assessment systems stabilize, include all migrant students in testing, and properly disaggregate and report results.

Explanation: The annually set state target for 2003 through 2005 is 50 percent or more of migrant students at the proficient or advanced level. While progress was made, the FY 2003 target was not met. The actual number of states (9) that had 50 percent or more of their migrant students at the proficient or advanced level (of 45 states reporting assessment results for migrant students) did not meet the FY 2003 target (11 states). These results do document, however, a 50 percent increase in the number of states that met the target in the prior reporting period. [Note: For the reporting period (2002-2003), only 16 states set the state performance target at having 50 percent or more of ALL students at the proficient or advanced levels. The Department is currently reviewing the 2003-2004 assessment data submitted by the states. Following validation, the table will be updated with the 2003-2004 data. In addition, once 80 percent of all states have met the performance target of 50 percent of migrant students at or above the proficient level, the performance target will be raised in increments of 5 percent.]

Indicator 1.3 of 6: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the elementary school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in mathematics.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Number of states meeting an annually set performance target in math for elementary school migrant students.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	States meeting target	States that reported results	States meeting target	States that reported results
1996	4	10		
1997	5	15		
1998	9	18		
1999	6	19		
2000	7	25		
2001	10	23		
2002	6	29	12	27
2003	21	44	14	32
2004			18	36
2005			20	38

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Information that directly measures the impact of the Title I, Migrant Education Program is not available. However, each State has its own assessment to measure and determine student proficiency. Student achievement across the States cannot be compared directly, but the results for migrant students can be tracked over time, providing the State proficiency levels and assessments' content remain consistent and the disaggregation of assessment data by subgroup is accurate.

Improvements: It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the state assessment systems stabilize, include all migrant students in testing, and properly disaggregate and report results.

Explanation: The annually set state target for 2003 through 2005 is 50 percent or more of migrant students at the proficient or advanced level. The FY 2003 target was exceeded. The actual number of states (21) that had 50 percent or more of their migrant students at the proficient or advanced level (of 44 states reporting assessment results for migrant students) exceeded the FY 2003 target (14 states) by 50 percent. These results also document a 250 percent increase in the number of states that met the target in the prior reporting period. [Note: For the reporting period (2002-2003), only 14 states set the state performance target at having 50 percent or more of ALL students at the proficient or advanced levels. The Department is currently reviewing the 2003-2004 assessment data submitted by the states. Following validation, the table will be updated with the 2003-2004 data. In addition, once 80 percent of all states have met the performance target of 50 percent of migrant students at or above the proficient level, the performance target will be raised in increments of 5 percent.]

Indicator 1.4 of 6: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the middle school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in mathematics.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: Number of states meeting an annually set performance target in math for middle school migrant students.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	States meeting target	States that reported results	States meeting target	States that reported results
1996	3	10		
1997	3	15		
1998	7	18		
1999	4	18		
2000	2	22		
2001	4	20		
2002	4	27	6	24
2003	8	45	8	28
2004			12	32

2005		14	34
-------------	--	----	----

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Information that directly measures the impact of the Title I, Migrant Education Program is not available. However, each state has its own assessment to measure and determine student proficiency. Student achievement across states cannot be compared directly, but the results for migrant students can be tracked over time, providing the state proficiency levels and assessments' content remain consistent and the disaggregation of assessment data by subgroup is accurate.

Improvements: This indicator will have greater validity and reliability over time as state assessment systems stabilize, include all migrant students in testing, and properly disaggregate and report results.

Explanation: The annually set state target for 2003 through 2005 is 50 percent or more of migrant students at the proficient or advanced level. The FY 2003 target was met. The actual number of states (8) that had 50 percent or more of their migrant students at the proficient or advanced level (of 45 states reporting assessment results for migrant students) exceeded the FY 2003 target (8 states) by 50 percent. These results also document a 100 percent increase in the number of states that met the target in the prior reporting period. [Note: For the reporting period (2002-2003), only 11 states set the state performance target at having 50 percent or more of ALL students at the proficient or advanced levels. The Department is currently reviewing the 2003-2004 assessment data submitted by the states. Following validation, the table will be updated with the 2003-2004 data. In addition, once 80 percent of all states have met the performance target of 50 percent of migrant students at or above the proficient level, the performance target will be raised in increments of 5 percent.]

Indicator 1.5 of 6: Reducing Dropout Rate: More states have a decreasing percentage of migrant students who dropout from secondary school (grades 7 - 12).

Measure 1.5.1 of 1: Number of states meeting an annually set performance target for dropout rate for migrant students.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	States meeting target	States that reported results	States meeting target	States that reported results
2004			999	999
2005			999	999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: There are several limitations in collecting and using student dropout data. First, a number of states do not have data collection and reporting systems in place to accurately calculate and disaggregate student dropout rates for each of the required subgroups. Second, for those states reporting dropout data, there remain significant variations in the definition and calculation of a dropout rate (e.g., rates based on the number of enrolled students who drop out in the 12th grade of high school versus the number of students who were

enrolled in the ninth grade of high school and dropped out of school in either the ninth, tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grades).

Improvements: The Department is working with states to improve and standardize the definition and calculation of student dropout rates.

Explanation: The annually set state target for 2004 through 2005 is to set the baseline. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%. [Note: The Department is currently reviewing the 2003-2004 dropout rate data submitted by states. Following validation, the table will be updated with the 2003-2004 data.]

Indicator 1.6 of 6: Achieving High School Graduation: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will graduate from high school.

Measure 1.6.1 of 1: Number of states meeting an annually set performance target for high school graduation of migrant students.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	States meeting target	States that reported results	States meeting target	States that reported results
2004			999	999
2005			999	999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: There are several limitations in collecting and using graduation rate data. First, a number of states do not have data collection and reporting systems in place to accurately calculate and disaggregate student graduation rates for each of the required subgroups. Second, for those states reporting graduation rate data, there remain significant variations in the the definition and calculation of a graduation rate (e.g., rates based on the number of enrolled students in the 12th grade who graduate from high school versus the number of students who were enrolled in the ninth grade of high school and graduated from high school four years later.

Improvements: The Department is working with the States to improve and standardize the definition and calculation of graduation rates.

Explanation: The annually set state target for 2004 through 2005 is to set the baseline. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%. [Note: The Department is currently reviewing the 2003-2004 graduation rate data submitted by states. Following validation, the table will be updated with the 2003-2004 data.]

ESEA: National Writing Project - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.928 - National Writing Project (OII)

Program Goal: To improve the quality of student writing and learning

Objective 1 of 1: To support and promote the establishment of teacher training programs designed to improve the writing skills of students and teachers.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Students taught by the National Writing Project (NWP) teachers will show improved student writing skills.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: Percentage of students of NWP trained teachers who achieve effectiveness in major areas of writing competence such as persuasive and rhetorical.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: Percentage of students of NWP trained teachers who demonstrate clear control of the writing conventions of usage, mechanics, and spelling.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Sites will determine assessment instruments to be used (possible examples are Academy for Educational Development-derived tests and the NAEP Test of Writing) in cooperation with the National Writing Project Research Division.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: National Writing Project sites measure effectiveness using different instruments, so data are difficult to aggregate.

Explanation: No data were available for school year 2003-2004. Therefore, the FY 2005 target is to set the baseline.

ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.013 - Title I Program for Neglected and Delinquent Children

Program Goal: To ensure that neglected and delinquent children and youth will have the opportunity to meet the challenging state standards needed to further their education and become productive members of society.

Objective 1 of 1: *Neglected or delinquent (N or D) students will improve academic and vocational skills needed to further their education or obtain employment.*

Indicator 1.1 of 4: Progress and achievement: The percentage of neglected or delinquent students obtaining a secondary school diploma, or its recognized equivalent, or obtaining employment will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of N or D students obtaining diploma, diploma equivalent, or employment.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	8	999
2004		8.40
2005		8.80

Source: Data will be collected through a State Performance Report that includes information from Subpart I State Agency awardees. Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.

Explanation: This measure was new for FY 2003 and represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success. However, it was based on a sample of only 6 of 51 grantees. No data were collected in 2004.

Indicator 1.2 of 4: High school course credits: The number of high school course credits earned by neglected or delinquent students will increase.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Average number of high school course credits earned by N or D students will increase.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	78.40	999
2004		82.32

2005	86.24
-------------	-------

Source: Data will be collected through a state performance report that includes information from Subpart I State Agency awardees. Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.

Improvements: .

Explanation: This measure was new for FY 2003 and represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success. However, it was based on a sample of only 6 of 51 grantees. No data were collected in 2004.

Indicator 1.3 of 4: Academic skills: Neglected or delinquent students shall have the same opportunities to learn as students served in regular classrooms. The academic skills of neglected or delinquent students served will increase, closing this gap.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Percent of N or D students that improve academic skills as measured on approved and validated measures.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Limitations: Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.

Explanation: This indicator represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success. No data were collected for 2003 or 2004, as originally planned.

Indicator 1.4 of 4: Transition plan: The percentage of students who have a high-quality transition plan will increase.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: Percent of N or D students with transition plans to return to local school programs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	40	999
2004		42
2005		44

Explanation: We did not collection data for 2004 or 2005. We plan to discontinue the measure in 2006 because this was not a requirement of the program.

ESEA: Parental Information and Resource Centers - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.310A - Parental Assistance and Local Family Information Centers

Program Goal: To increase information and options for parents.

Objective 1 of 1: *Federally funded PIRC programs provide parents of children attending schools that are not making adequate yearly progress with the information they need to understand their state accountability systems and their rights and opportunities for supplemental services and public school choice.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The number of parents of children attending schools that are not making adequate yearly progress who are participating in PIRC activities designed to provide them with the information necessary to understand their state accountability systems and the rights and opportunities for supplemental services and public school choice afforded to their children under section 1116 of the ESEA.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of parents of children attending schools that are not making adequate yearly progress and who participate in PIRC activities that receive information on their state accountability systems, rights and opportunities for supplemental services, and public school choice options.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999
2007		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Parent Information Resource Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Data are self-reported by grantees.

Explanation: Performance reporting requirements for the PIRC program are being revised to incorporate the collection of information needed to respond to this indicator. This was a new indicator based on a program priority for 2004. There is insufficient information available to pre-determine a reasonable baseline number for the first year. Consequently, actual data collected for the first year will serve as the baseline and growth based on that number will be used to establish the performance targets for succeeding years. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 5%. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 10%. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 15%.

ESEA: Reading First State Grants - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.357 - Reading First State Grants

Program Goal: To improve kindergarten through third-grade student achievement in reading by supporting state and local educational agencies in establishing reading programs that are based on scientifically based reading research.

Objective 1 of 3: *To increase the percentage of students that learn to read proficiently by the end of third grade.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Reading Achievement in Reading First Schools: Increased percentages of grade 1-3 students will read at grade level or above in schools participating in Reading First programs, as measured by meeting or exceeding the Proficient level of performance on state reading assessments.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of students in Reading First schools in grades 1-3 meeting or exceeding Proficient level in reading.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3
2003				999	999	999

Source: Contractor Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Data were collected from the small number of states that began local implementation during the 2002-2003 school year. However, the data collected cannot be reported in this format. This indicator has been revised to more meaningfully report the collected data, beginning with the FY06 performance plan.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Reading Achievement in Reading First Schools for At-Risk Students: Increased percentages of grade 1-3 at-risk Reading First students will read at grade level or above, as measured by meeting or exceeding the proficient level of performance on state reading assessments.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of at-risk RF students in grades 1-3 meeting or exceeding Proficient level in reading.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3
2003				999	999	999

Source: Contractor Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Data were collected from the small number of States that began local implementation during the 2002-2003 school year. However, the data collected cannot be reported in this format. This indicator has been revised to more meaningfully report the collected data, beginning with the FY06 performance plan.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Reading Achievement Statewide: Increased percentages of students will read at grade level or above, as measured by meeting or exceeding the Proficient level on the NAEP reading assessment.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of fourth-grade students scoring at or above Proficient in reading on the NAEP.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	28	
2002	30	
2003	30	31
2005	30	32

Survey/Assessment: National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: November 2007

Data Validated By: NCES.

Explanation: FY 2005 target was not met. Beginning in FY 2006 this indicator will be changed to reflect state third grade data.

Objective 2 of 3: *To decrease the percentage of kindergarten through third grade students in schools participating in Reading First who are referred for special education services based on their difficulties learning to read.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Referrals to Special Education: Decreasing percentages of RF K-3 students will be referred for special education services based on their difficulties learning to read.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of RF K-3 students referred for special education services.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999

Source: Contractor Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Usable data could not be collected through the state performance reports. An evaluation study has been initiated. This indicator has been eliminated.

Objective 3 of 3: *To advance the success of the Reading First program by monitoring the progress of states in implementing their approved state plans.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Implementation of Reading First Programs: The percentage of states that demonstrate progress in the implementation of their Reading First programs, as outlined in their approved state plans, will reach 100%.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: Percentage of states that demonstrate progress in implementing approved Reading First plans.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	100	999

Source: Contractor Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The 2003 target was exceeded. Because this performance measure is not robust enough, it has been dropped from the FY06 performance plan.

ESEA: Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution - FY 2005

Program Goal: To motivate low-income children to read.

Objective 1 of 1: To distribute books and to provide reading strategies to low-income children, their families, and service providers.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Reading is Fundamental will provide books and scientifically based reading services to low-income children at risk of educational failure due to delays in reading.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of low-income children who receive books and reading services through the Reading is Fundamental Program.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	3,713,541	999
2004	3,704,383	3,899,218
2005		4,089,895
2006		4,270,572

Source: Reading is Fundamental annual grantee performance report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: We did not meet our target for 2004. The program has had an across the board decrease in funding of .58 percent since the original baseline target was established in FY 2003. In addition, the costs of books have substantially increased. Thus, the grantee could only start a small number of new programs. As a result, this decreases the possibility that the grantee can continue to raise the percentage of students served since there will be too few new programs to substantially impact the book distribution. Target adjustments will be made to future years to account for these factors.

ESEA: Ready to Teach - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.286 - Ready to Teach

Program Goal: To improve student achievement by developing high-quality, standards-based digital professional development to teachers and by developing high-quality, standards-based digital classroom content.

Objective 1 of 1: *To use multiple digital technologies to develop and deliver digital courses and classroom content, and to provide training to teachers using these materials.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Students participating in Ready to Teach will demonstrate enhanced academic achievement.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of students who participate in Ready To Teach programs and demonstrate enhanced academic achievement.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Ready to Teach Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Validated by outside contractors for evaluation and by Department staff.

Limitations: Because of shifting demographics, some students may not remain in the assigned school district, but steps are being taken to track these students.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 5%. The following data may be collected: test scores, participation in more rigorous course-taking, or any other established measure of achievement. Materials developed under Ready To Teach are intended for distribution beyond the project period.

ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.295 - Ready-To-Learn Television

Program Goal: The Ready-to-Learn Television Program will enhance the learning strategies of preschool and early elementary children.

Objective 1 of 1: *Develop, produce, and distribute high-quality televised educational programming for preschool and early elementary school children.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Children ages 3-6 years old who view literacy based Ready-to-Learn shows will demonstrate expressive vocabulary skills and emergent literacy skills.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: (a) Percentage of children ages 3-6 years old who viewed literacy based Ready-to-Learn television shows that demonstrate expressive vocabulary skills at or above national norms.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Children Ages 3-6	Children Ages 3-6
2003	28.40	
2004	40	
2005	43	40

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: (b) Percentage of children ages 3-6 years old who viewed literacy based Ready-to-Learn television shows that demonstrate emergent literacy skills at or above national norms.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Children Ages 3-6	Children Ages 3-6
2003	54.90	
2004	75	
2005	78	40

Source 1: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc, Ready to Learn National Evaluation

References: Woodcock-Munoz Language Survey Normative Update Picture Vocab Test & Woodcock Munoz Letter-Word Identification Test.

Source 2: WestED, PBS Ready-to-Learn Performance Indicator Study of Viewing Effects

References: Proportion of students age equivalent or higher on the Woodcock-Munoz Language Survey Normative Update Picture Vocab Test & Woodcock-Munoz Normative Update Letter-Word Identification Test.

Source 3: Head Start Family & Child Experiences Survey: Longitudinal Findings on Program Performance 3rd Progress Report.

Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Data were validated by the contractor WestEd and reviewed by staff of PBS Ready To Learn and by Department staff.

Limitations: Data are only being collected on preschool children due to insufficient funds to include elementary school children through third grade. The parents and child educators of all children included in the sample attended Ready-To-Learn workshops.

Explanation: We exceeded our 2005 targets for both expressive vocabulary and emergent literacy skills. Baseline data were collected from 3,200 children in a nationally stratified random sample of 40 Head Start classrooms. Twenty-five percent of Head Start children scored at or above national norms in expressive vocabulary skills and emergent literacy skills. Children participating in full-year Head Start programs who score at or above national norms for expressive vocabulary and emergent literacy skills can be expected to increase by approximately 9 percent annually. The 5 percent annual increase is ambitious because, unlike Head Start, Ready-to-Learn services are not "full year." Further, the intervention is just one tool in educators' toolkits and not a full curriculum central to their classroom instruction. Ready-to-Learn services included in this measure have four target populations: children with limited literacy; children with disabilities; rural children; and children whose primary language is not English.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Parents who attend workshops will demonstrate daily reading to their children.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of parents who attend workshops that demonstrate daily reading to their children.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Parents	Parents
2003	56.50	
2004	68	
2005	48	53

Source 1: Survey (paper & pencil, Internet, telephone) of parent and child educator workshop attendees. WestEd.

Date Sponsored: 07/15/2004.

Source 2: Mathematica- Research Contractor. Data collected from parents in face-to-face interviews..

Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

The contractor Mathematica and reviewed by Department staff.

Limitations: Data collected from 3,200 parents in a nationally stratified random sample of 40 Head Start classrooms are self-reported by parents.

Explanation: We did not meet our 2005 target. We found some demographic differences between respondents in 2004 and 2005 that indicate these samples are drawn from two different populations. That is, these two groups could differ in some important ways that were beyond the scope of this survey. Thirty-eight percent of Head Start parents read to their children on a daily basis. In 2005, 89 percent of parents reported reading to their children 2-4 times per week or more frequently while 93 percent did so in 2004.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Percentage of parents and child educators who actively implement the Ready To Learn Triangle

(View, Do, Read).

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Percentage of parents and child educators who actively implement the Ready-to-Learn Triangle following attendance at a Ready-to-Learn Workshop.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Parents and Child Educators	Parents and Child Educators
2003	43.75	
2004	61.50	
2005		54

Source 1: Mathematica - Research Contractor. Data collected from parents in face-to-face interviews. Data collected from child educators by phone interviews..

Date Sponsored: 09/30/2003.

Source 2: Survey (pencil & paper, Internet, telephone) of parent and child educator workshop attendees. WestEd.

Date Sponsored: 07/15/2004.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

WestEd and reviewed by staff of PBS Ready To Learn by Department staff.

Limitations: 2005 data are self-reported from 238 parents and 195 educators who attended a Ready To Learn workshop from a random sample of workshops within stations.

Explanation: No data were collected for this measure. This is the last year of this cooperative agreement with the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS). The measures on outreach will be discontinued in future GPRA reports. The focus of this reporting period was 148 PBS stations and their local outreach through coordinators at the local level using workshops that taught the "View, Do, Read" Learning Triangle. Two studies done by Mathematica and West Ed indicated that a change in strategy was needed. A panel of experts recommended that Outreach and Programming be separated in future awards. There are three new awards for 2005-2010 - two awards for Programming and one for Outreach. Future performance measures will focus on the effectiveness of children's television programming. The Outreach grant will shift from a local approach to a national approach with some targeted local activities.

ESEA: Rural Education - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.358A - Small, Rural School Achievement Program
84.358B - Rural Education Achievement Program

Program Goal: Raise educational achievement of students in small, rural school districts.

Objective 1 of 3: Local educational agencies (LEAs) participating in the Small Rural Schools Achievement (SRSA) Program will make adequate yearly progress after the third year.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Adequate Yearly Progress: Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress after three years.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		999

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report, grantee reports, State Report Card, Evaluation Survey, NCES & PBDMI

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Explanation: The performance target for FY 2005 is to set the baseline.

Objective 2 of 3: Local educational agencies (LEAs) participating in the Rural and Low-Income Schools (RLIS) program will make adequate yearly progress after the third year.

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Adequate Yearly Progress: Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress after three years.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		999

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report, grantee reports, State Report Card, Evaluation Survey, NCES & PBDMI

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Explanation: The performance target for FY 2005 is to establish the baseline.

Objective 3 of 3: LEAs will participate in the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Participation.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of eligible school districts utilizing the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	61	999
2004	59	71
2005		65

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report, grantee reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Explanation: The program did not meet the FY 2004 target. In FY 2004, 59 percent of participating LEAs took advantage of Rural Education Achievement. This was two percent fewer than in FY 2003.

ESEA: School Leadership - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.363A - School Leadership Program

Program Goal: To increase the number of qualified assistant principals and principals serving in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.

Objective 1 of 1: *To recruit and train teachers and individuals from other fields to become assistant principals and principals who will serve in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The percentage of new participants recruited and trained to become qualified assistant principals and principals to serve in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: Percentage of all new recruits who enroll and complete training programs to become assistant principals or principals in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	78	999
2005		79

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: The percentage of new assistant principals or principals receiving full certification/licensure.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	28	999
2005		29

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: The percentage of fully certified/licensed assistant principals and principals who apply for positions in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	100	999
2005		100

Source: Grantee Performance Report, School Leadership Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Each grantee uses its own method of recording and reporting data, and inconsistencies exist.

Explanation: The data were collected from 24 School Leadership Program projects of which 20 were funded in

FY 2002 and 4 were funded in FY 2003. The data for measure (a) were calculated from the number of all new recruits who enroll and complete training programs (1,956) by the number of all recruits. For measure (b) data were calculated on the number of project participants that enrolled or completed training programs and received full certification and licensure (557) by the number of project participants that enrolled and completed the training program (557). For measure (c) data were calculated on the number of project participants that enrolled and completed and received full certification that applied and were hired and placed in high-need schools in high-need LEAs by the number of project participants that enrolled and completed training programs and received full certification and licensure (557). The target for 2005 is the baseline plus 1 percentage point.

ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.215L - FIE/Smaller Learning Communities

Program Goal: To assist high schools to create smaller learning communities that can prepare all students to achieve to challenging standards and succeed in college and careers.

Objective 1 of 1: Students in schools receiving smaller learning communities implementation grants will demonstrate continuous improvement in achievement in core subjects, as well as exhibit positive behavioral changes.

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Academic achievement: Increasing percentages of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants will score at or above basic on state and local reading and math assessments.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of students scoring at or above basic on state and local reading and math assessments.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Percentage Meeting Levels in Reading	Percentage Meeting Levels in Math	Percentage Meeting Levels in Reading	Percentage Meeting Levels in Math
2001	65.70	57.10		
2003	54.90	50.45	66.70	58.10
2004	54	48	70	60
2005			74	63

Source: Contractor Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2004 targets were not met.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Graduation: Increasing percentages of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants will graduate from high school.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants who graduate from high school (based on 9th grade enrollment).		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities

2001	59.20	
2003	56.60	60.20
2004	83	63
2005		66

Source: Contractor Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was exceeded.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Postsecondary Transition: Increasing percentages of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants plan to attend a 2- or 4-year college.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants planning to attend a 2- or 4-year college.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	69.90	
2003	66.50	70.90
2004	78	74
2005		78

Source: Contractor Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was exceeded.

ESEA: Special Programs for Indian Children - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.299A - Indian Education Special Programs for Indian Children
84.299B - Indian Education--Professional Development Grants

Program Goal: Special Programs for Indian Children

Objective 1 of 2: Discretionary programs will focus on improving educational opportunities and services for American Indian and Alaska Native children and adults.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Increasing percentages of the teacher and principal workforces serving American Indian and Alaska Native students will themselves be American Indian and Alaska Native.

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: The percentage of program participants who become principals/vice principals/school administrators with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Principals	Principals
2005		20

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: Percentage of program participants who become teachers in schools with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Teachers	Teachers
2005		23

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: The percentage of program participants who receive full state licensure.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		75

Source: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Indian Education, project performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.

Limitations: This national survey sample results in an under- representation of American Indian and Alaska Native students. The solution to this problem would be to oversample for this group. However, this approach would increase the cost of the data collection.

Improvements: Monitor the number of American Indian and Alaska Native students through LEAs' reporting on program effectiveness in their Annual Performance Report.

Explanation: FY 2005 will provide baseline data. Performance targets developed through monitoring of annual performance reports.

Objective 2 of 2: *Discretionary programs will focus on improving educational opportunities and services for Indian children and adults.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Increasing percentages of preschool American Indian and Alaska Native students will possess school readiness skills gained through a scientifically based research designed curriculum that prepares them for kindergarten.

Measure 2.1.1 of 3: Percentage of 3-4 year old children achieving educationally significant gains on a measure of language and communication development based on curriculum benchmarks.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		46

Measure 2.1.2 of 3: Percentage of 3-4 year old children achieving educationally significant gains on prescribed measure of cognitive skills and conceptual knowledge, including mathematics, science and early reading based on curriculum benchmarks.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		46

Measure 2.1.3 of 3: Percentage of 3-4 year old children achieving educationally significant gains on prescribed measure of social development that facilitates self-regulation of attention, behavior and emotion based on curriculum benchmarks.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		46

Source: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Indian Education, project performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Substantial variation will exist in curriculum benchmarks and assessments.

Explanation: FY 2005 will provide baseline data. Performance targets developed through monitoring of annual performance reports.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native high school graduates will increase competency and skills in challenging subject matters, including mathematics and science, to enable successful transition to postsecondary education.

Measure 2.2.1 of 2: Percentage of high school students successfully completing (as defined by receiving a passing grade) challenging core courses. Core subjects include English, math, science and social studies.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		46

Measure 2.2.2 of 2: The percentage of students participating in the program that have college assessment scores (ACT, SAT or PSAT) as high or higher than the district average.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		46

Source: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Indian Education, project performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Office of Indian Education performance report data are supplied by grantees.

Limitations: Substantial variation may exist in methods used to assess student performance.

Explanation: FY 2005 will provide baseline data. Performance targets developed through monitoring of annual performance reports.

ESEA: Star Schools Program - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.203 - Star Schools

Program Goal: To improve student learning and teaching through the use of distance learning technologies.

Objective 1 of 1: *Promote the delivery of challenging content in core subjects.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: The percentage of students participating in Star Schools courses and modules who demonstrate improvement in reading, math, or science.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of students demonstrating improvement in reading, math, or science.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999
2004	64.89	999
2005		69

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Star Schools Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Sample sizes are very small due to a limited number of grantees. Data are difficult to aggregate because grantees do not use a standard instrument to measure student achievement.

Explanation: This was a new indicator for 2003. FY 2003 data were collected showing an actual performance of 69.30, but these data were deemed insufficient to recognize as a baseline because only one grantee of the 18 funded in FY 2003 provided credible data. Subsequently, FY 2004 data established the baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Challenging content aligned with state or district standards at all academic levels (including high school credit, advanced placement, adult education, and Graduate Equivalency Diploma courses).

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Number of full credit courses or modules offering challenging content that is aligned with state and district standards.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995	30	
1997	81	
1998	105	

1999	126	
2000	921	
2001	387	
2002	1,502	1,000
2003	1,338	1,600
2004	1,373	1,700
2005		1,300

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Star Schools Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Data were originally collected and reported using whole numbers; however, as the total number of grantees has decreased, it is no longer possible to meaningfully demonstrate progress. Data are self-reported by projects. Evidence of alignment with standards has been particularly difficult to assess.

Improvements: Planned improvements include verifying whether projects use content experts to review and validate the extent to which a) content is challenging, or b) standards are appropriate for the content delivered.

Explanation: We did not meet our 2004 target. The number of grantees decline as grants are closed out. The FY 2005 target is lower than in 2004 because of adjustments made based on the close out of grants. Between 1999 and 2002, inconsistencies in data collection yielded unreliable results.

ESEA: State Assessments - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.368A - Enhanced Assessment Grants
84.369 - Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

Program Goal: To support states in the development of state assessments.

Objective 1 of 1: *By the 2005-2006 school year, all states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics in grades three through eight and high school and will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (3-5, 6-8 and high school) in science, all of which are aligned with their content specific academic content standards.*

Indicator 1.1 of 5: Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades 3 through 8 and in high schools in reading/language arts that align with the state's academic content standards.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of states (including DC and PR) that have reading/language arts assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	0	999
2005	0	18
2006		52

Source: Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: Each state has developed a schedule by which its reading/language arts assessments for grades 3-8 and high school will be developed and field tested, and submitted to the Department for review and approval, prior to implementation. The Department developed the Standards and Assessment External Review process to review and approve the state assessments and conducted its first peer review in early 2005. No assessments were reviewed in 2004. States are required to have their reading/language arts assessments in place by SY 2005-06. The 2006 performance target of 52 reflects the compliance of the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. The 2005 target was not met. Eight additional states have submitted and their plans are under Department review.

Indicator 1.2 of 5: Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades 3 through 8 and in high schools in mathematics that align with the state's academic content standards.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of states (including DC and PR) that have mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	0	999
2005	0	18
2006		52
2007		52
2008		52

Source: Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: Each state has developed a schedule by which its mathematics assessments for grades 3-8 and high school will be developed and field tested, and submitted to the Department for review and approval, prior to implementation. The Department developed the Standards and Assessment External Peer Review process to review and approve the state assessments and conducted its first peer review in early 2005. No assessments were reviewed in 2004. States are required to have their mathematics assessments in place by SY 2005-06. The 2006 performance target of 52 reflects the compliance of the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. The 2005 target was not met. However, 8 additional states have submitted their plans and are under Department review.

Indicator 1.3 of 5: Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (3-5, 6-8 and high school) in science that align with the state's academic content standards.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The number of states (including DC and PR) that have science assessments in each grade span (grades 3-5, 6-8, and high school).		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	0	999
2005	0	18
2006		21
2007		25
2008		52

Source: Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: Each state has developed a schedule by which its science assessments in each grade spans (3-5, 6-8, and high school) will be developed and field tested, and submitted to the Department for review and

approval, prior to implementation. The Department developed the Standards and Assessment External Review process to review and approve the state assessments. No state submitted their science assessments for review in 2004 or 2005; therefore the 2004 and 2005 targets were not met. States are required to have their science assessments in place by SY 2007-08. The 2008 performance target of 52 reflects the compliance of the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

Indicator 1.4 of 5: Field Testing Reading: States field testing assessments in reading/language arts.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The number of states that have completed field testing of the required assessments in reading/language arts.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	16	
2004	20	
2005	47	30
2006		52

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports and state Web sites.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: Field testing is one of the initial phases of establishing statewide assessments. The 2005 target was exceeded.

Indicator 1.5 of 5: Field Testing Math: States field testing assessment in mathematics.

Measure 1.5.1 of 1: The number of states that have completed field testing of the required assessments in mathematics.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	16	
2004	20	
2005	47	30
2006		52

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports and state Web sites

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: Field testing is one of the initial phases of establishing statewide assessments. The 2005 target was exceeded.

ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.298 - Innovative Education Program Strategies

Program Goal: To support state and local programs that are a continuing source of innovation and educational improvement.

Objective 1 of 1: *To encourage states to use flexibility authorities in ways that will increase student achievement.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Improved student achievement: School districts that direct Title V funds to activities designated as strategic priorities by the U.S. Department of Education will be more likely to achieve adequate yearly progress than those that use funds for all other activities. Strategic priorities include (1) those that support student achievement, and enhance reading and math, (2) those that improve the quality of teachers, (3) those that ensure that schools are safe and drug free, (4) and those that promote access for all students.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of LEAs meeting AYP.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Of districts targeting Title V Funds, the % achieving AYP	Of districts not targeting Title V Funds, the % achieving AYP	Of districts targeting Title V Funds, the % achieving AYP	Of districts not targeting Title V Funds, the % achieving AYP
2003	65	55	65	55
2004	69	49	68	58
2005			69	59

Source: State Report Cards; Title V Monitoring; Consolidated State Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2004 targets were met. The number of LEAs meeting AYP exceeded the 2004 target of 68%. Conversely, LEAs that did not direct funds to a strategic priority area were less likely to meet AYP. These results were based upon on complete data submitted from 43 states.

ESEA: Teaching American History - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.215X - Teaching of Traditional American History

Program Goal: To improve student achievement by providing high-quality professional development to elementary and secondary-level teachers of American history.

Objective 1 of 1: *Demonstrate the effectiveness of professional development activities for secondary-level teachers of American history through the increased achievement of their students.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Students in experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational effectiveness in Teaching American History projects will demonstrate higher achievement on course content measures and/or statewide U.S. history assessments than students in control and comparison groups.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: (a) Percentage of students in studies of educational effectiveness who demonstrate higher achievement than those in control or comparison groups.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: (b) Percentage of school districts that demonstrate higher educational achievement for students in TAH classrooms than those in control or comparison groups.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Teaching American History Grantee Performance Report.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Explanation: For measure (a), the FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%. For measure (b), the FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.

ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.010 - Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies

Program Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Objective 1 of 3: *The performance of low-income students will increase substantially in reading and mathematics.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Fourth-grade reading proficiency: The number of states administering fourth-grade reading assessments that report an increase in the percentage of low-income students who perform at either the proficient or advanced performance levels will increase annually.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade low-income students meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in reading on state assessments.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	25	
2005		25

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: SY 2002-03 was the first year for which states were required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report. Actual performance data for 2004 was obtained by comparing SY 2002-03 data to 2003-04 data.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Eighth-grade mathematics proficiency: The number of states administering eighth-grade mathematics assessments that report an increase in the percentage of low-income students who perform at either the proficient or advanced performance levels will increase annually.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade low-income students meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in mathematics on state assessments.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	31	
2005		25

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: SY 2002-03 is the first year for which states are required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report. Actual performance data for 2004 was obtained by comparing SY 2002-03 data to 2003-04 data.

Objective 2 of 3: AYP status

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Making AYP: Number of states that report an increase in schools making AYP.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of schools making adequate yearly progress.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		10

Source: NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006
Contractor conducts edit checks.

Explanation: SY 2002-03 is the first year for which states are required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated Performance Report. Actual performance data for 2005 will be obtained by comparing SY 2004-05 data to 2003-04 data.

Objective 3 of 3: Performance of low-income students in high-poverty schools will increase in reading and mathematics.

Indicator 3.1 of 2: NAEP Performance - Fourth-Grade Reading: The percentage of low-income fourth-grade students who score at or above Basic and at or above Proficient in reading on the NAEP.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of low-income fourth-grade students scoring at or above Basic and Proficient in reading on the NAEP.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	At or above Proficient	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At or above Basic
2000	13	38		
2002	16	46	14	40
2003	15	44	15	41
2005	15	46	17	43

Source: NCES - NAEP

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: November 2007

Limitations: NAEP is not aligned with state assessments.

Explanation: The 2005 target for at or above proficient was not met; the target for at or above basic was exceeded. Trend data are based on methodology that NCES began using in 2002.

Indicator 3.2 of 2: NAEP Performance - Eighth-Grade Mathematics: The percentage of low-income eighth-grade students who score at or above Basic or at or above Proficient in mathematics on the NAEP.

Measure 3.2.1 of 1: The percentage of low-income eighth-grade students scoring at or above Basic and Proficient in mathematics on the NAEP.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	At or above Proficient	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient	At or above Basic
2000	10	41		
2003	11	47	11	43
2005	13	51	13	45

Source: NCES - NAEP

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: November 2007

Limitations: NAEP is not aligned with state assessments.

Explanation: The 2005 target for at or above proficient was met; the target for at or above basic was exceeded. Trend data are based on methodology that NCES began using in 2002.

ESEA: Transition To Teaching - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.350 - Transition to Teaching

Program Goal: To increase the number of mid-career professionals, qualified paraprofessionals, and recent college graduates who become highly qualified teachers in high-need schools in high-need LEAs and teach for at least three years.

Objective 1 of 1: *Recruit and retain highly qualified teachers in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: The percentage of new, highly qualified Transition to Teaching teachers who teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for at least three years.

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: (a) Percentage of all TTT participants who become highly qualified teachers and teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	54	
2004	60	
2005		70
2006		80
2007		85
2008		85

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: (b) Percentage of all TTT participants who become highly qualified math or science teachers.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	19	
2004	18	
2005		25
2006		25
2007		25
2008		25

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: (c) Percentage of new, highly qualified Transition to Teaching teachers who teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for at least three years.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Transition to Teaching Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Though not a formal verification system, 2002 grantees are providing an interim evaluation by allowing us to review the progress of the first three years of the grant in addition to the on-line uniform annual report system developed in 2005. The grantees are using the Department's new approved reporting format, the 524B, for this interim evaluation. The data are being analyzed by an outside contractor, American Institutes for Research (AIR), and will provide some validation of the annual performance report data. Additionally, AIR will be analyzing all 2002 and 2004 grantees annual report data as part of the official evaluation that will be provided to Congress as required by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002.

Limitations: In the past, each grantee used its own method of recording and reporting data and inconsistencies resulted. The Department piloted a uniform reporting system in 2005. While the system improved data quality over time by providing grantees with agreed upon definitions and reporting formats, the system was cumbersome in many ways and is unlikely to be used in future years.

Explanation: For measure (a), 2003 provided a baseline and, given data for 2004, the slope of trajectory for measure (a) is expected to rise gradually over the period of grant performance allowing us to establish a 2005 target. The target is the cumulative number of teachers in high-need schools/LEAs over total number of Transition To Teaching participants. For measure (b), the target is the total number teaching math and science over the total number teaching. However, in 2006 the program will no longer report on this, as it is not a meaningful measure of performance. For measure (c), 2006 data will establish the baseline and will be the cumulative number of teachers of record in high-need schools/LEAs over the total number of TTT participants. Under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002, all TTT participants are required to serve in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for at least three years therefore targets are anticipated to be high for this measure. Targets will increase annually from the baseline by 5 percent.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: The percentage of Transition to Teaching teachers who receive full state certification or licensure.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of teachers receiving full certification/licensure.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	24	
2005		25

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Transition to Teaching Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Explanation: This measure applies to the Transition to Teaching Program under NCLB, which differs from the previous program and its measures. Therefore, FY 2004 data will establish the baseline.

ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.815 - Troops to Teachers

Program Goal: To increase the number of military personnel or qualified participants in a reserve component who become highly qualified teachers in high-need LEAs and teach for at least three years.

Objective 1 of 1: *To provide schools in high-need LEAs with highly qualified teachers who are former military or reserve component personnel.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Recruitment: Recruit and retain highly qualified teachers in high-need LEAs.

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: (a) Percentage of recruits who become highly qualified teachers.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	71	
2004	76	
2005		75

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: (b) Percentage of recruits who become highly qualified math and science teachers.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	19	
2004	22	
2005		28
2006		30

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: (c) Percentage of Troops-to-Teachers participants who remain in teaching for three or more years after placement in a teaching position in a high-need LEA.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		80

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Troops to Teachers Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: FY 2003 data established the baseline. We had originally reported on recruits, but data for 2005

are based on participants. Participants are defined as those receiving financial support from the Troops-to-Teachers program in either a stipend or a bonus. "Highly qualified" is defined as those Troops-to-Teachers participants hired by an eligible school district, including those in alternate route programs. For measure (a), the denominator is the total number of highly qualified Troops teachers since January 2002 divided by the total number of Troops participants. For measure (b), the denominator is the total number of math or science teachers since January 2002 divided by the total number of Troops participants since January 2002. For (c), the target group of 851 Troops participants who began teaching in the 2003-2004 school year is being tracked. The earliest data available will be from 2006. 2003 data for all measures were recalculated using above definitions.

ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.361 - Voluntary Public School Choice

Program Goal: To assist states and local school districts in creating, expanding, and implementing a public school choice program.

Objective 1 of 1: *The Voluntary Public School Choice Program increases options for public school choice.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The number and percentage of families who exercise public school choice will increase annually.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: (a) The number of students who have the option of attending participating VPSC schools selected by their parents.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	755,148	
2005		849,864

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: (b) The percentage of students participating at each site who exercised school choice by changing schools.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	11	
2005		13

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Voluntary Public School Choice Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Explanation: FY 2004 data established the baseline for measures (a) and (b). The number of students who have the option of attending participating Voluntary Public School Choice (VPSC) schools is the total of all students eligible to apply for transfers. In some instances, grantees may not have slots available for all students applying for a transfer. For instance, VPSC in Chicago includes 23 schools, but the transfer option is offered districtwide. Nine sites reported that 3,694 students transferred under VPSC. The percentage of students participating in VPSC for measure (b) is the percentage of students who transfer among those eligible to participate across the 13 total grantees. For measure (a), the performance target is the estimated number of participating students when projects are fully implemented, excluding Florida, for which no estimate was possible. For measure (b), the target for 2005 is the baseline plus 2 percent.

ESEA: Women's Educational Equity - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.083 - Women's Educational Equity Act Program

Program Goal: To promote gender equity in education in the United States.

Objective 1 of 1: *To ensure equal access to mathematics, science and computer science educational courses, programs and careers for women and girls.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Increase in the number/percentage of female students pursuing advanced courses in mathematics, sciences, and computer science.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: (a) The percentage of female students served by the Women's Educational Equity program (WEE) that are enrolled in advanced mathematics and science courses (including computer science).		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		999

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: (b) The percentage of students served by WEE who indicate increased knowledge of and intent to pursue career options in mathematics and the sciences (including computer science).		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Women's Educational Equity Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Data are self-reported by grantees.

Explanation: The 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 target is the baseline plus 10 percent. The FY 2007 target is the baseline plus 7 percent more than the 2006 target. The percentage for measure (a) will be calculated by dividing the number of participants enrolled in advanced mathematics by the total number of participants. The percentage for measure (b) will be calculated by dividing the number of participants who indicate increased knowledge and intent to pursue career options in mathematics and sciences (including computer science) by the total number of participants.

ESRA: National Assessment - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.902 - Assessments

Program Goal: To collect, analyze, and disseminate information on the condition of education in the United States and to provide comparative international statistics.

Objective 1 of 1: *Timeliness of NAEP data for reading and mathematics assessment in support of the President's No Child Left Behind initiative.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The time from the end of data collection to initial public release of results in reading and mathematics assessments shall be reduced from 15 months to 6 months.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Number of months from end of data collection to initial public release of results.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	8	6
2005		6
2007		6

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, program report.

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: NCES.

Data will be validated by determining number of months between actual end of data collection and the release date.

Improvements: NCES has added an additional goal in GPRA, i.e., "Timeliness of NAEP data for Reading and Mathematics Assessment in support of the President's No Child Left Behind Initiative." In addition, NCES is developing a monitoring system to measure external uses of NCES products. Both volume and actual use will be documented in the monitoring system, for specific user groups. The monitoring system will establish baseline measures of usage and application of NCES products from which long-term outcomes can be established.

ESRA: Regional Educational Laboratories - FY 2005

Program Goal: Support evidence-based educational improvement through high-quality, relevant applied research development, technical assistance, and dissemination.

Objective 1 of 1: Provide high-quality, relevant products and project designs for making policy decisions and improving educational practice.

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Quality of products and project designs: The percentage of evidence-based products and project designs that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of evidence-based products and project designs with average reviewer ratings for quality of "high" and above. If there is a large number of new evidence-based products and project designs, a random sample may be assessed.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

Source: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Evaluation, independent review panel report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Relevance of products and project designs: The percentage of all products and project designs that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of a random sample of all products and project designs with average ratings for relevance of "high" and above.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

Source: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Evaluation, independent review panel report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%.

HEA: High School Equivalency Program - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.141A - High School Equivalency Program

Program Goal: To assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students in obtaining the equivalent of a high school diploma, and, subsequently, to begin postsecondary education, enter military service, or obtain employment.

Objective 1 of 1: *An increasing percentage of HEP participants will complete the program and receive their GED.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: GED completion: The number and percentage of HEP participants who complete the program and receive the GED will continue to remain high, if not increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of HEP participants receiving a GED		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	70	
1997	70	
1998	66	
1999	72	
2000	73	
2001	58	
2002	53	
2003	63	60
2004		60
2005		65

Source: HEP grantee performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: OME is working with grantees to provide detailed information in its annual performance reports.

Explanation: The percentage of HEP students who receive the GED decreased for several reasons. First, the GED requirements changed. Secondly, grantees had difficulties getting students tested at GED testing centers. Finally, many of the centers were not prepared to test in Spanish. In addition, new projects experienced difficulties because of late grant notification dates. The performance targets are developed by dividing the number of HEP students who received the GED by the number of students funded to be enrolled in GED instruction.

HEA: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.331A - Grants to States for Workplace and Community Transition Training for Incarcerated Youth Offenders

Program Goal: Contribute to the reduction of recidivism by providing incarcerated youth offenders with educational services

Objective 1 of 1: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Improved vocational and academic achievement: Completion of a degree or certificate by students participating in the program

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of students participating in the program completing a postsecondary education certificate, associate of arts or bachelor's degree in the facility during the program year		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	54.69	50
2003	44.12	50
2004	50	50
2005		50
2006		55
2007		60

Source: Data are provided in periodic reports from grantees.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Data are based on continuous enrollment. Therefore, the current enrollment is being compared to the outcome of graduates, including individuals served in the prior year and those still enrolled at year end. This distorts the numbers when the program is either growing or contracting. Programs differ in objectives and degrees/certificates offered, so very different outcomes are being combined in this report. Reporting is inconsistent from state to state. Some data being combined may not be reliable.

Explanation: Target for 2004 was met. Data was not collected for 2002 and 2003.

HEA: Teacher Quality Enhancement - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.336 - Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants

Program Goal: To improve the quality of teacher education and initial certification standards, and to improve the knowledge and skills of all teachers, particularly new teachers and teachers who work in high-need areas.

Objective 1 of 2: *Improve the skills and knowledge of new teachers by funding the development of state policies that strengthen initial licensing standards and the development of state or local policies/programs that reduce the number of uncertified teachers.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Pass rates: Pass rates will increase for preservice teachers taking subject matter competency tests as part of State licensure requirements, in the states that receive funds from the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program for states to prepare teachers that are highly competent in the academic content areas in which they will be teaching (HEA, Title II, Sec. 202 (d) (1)).

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of preservice teachers taking and passing subject matter competency tests as part of state licensure requirements.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	93	
2001	93	
2002	94	
2003	94	
2004	95	
2005		95
2006		95

Source: ED's HEA Title II Reporting System.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Data are verified by testing entities and certified by state licensing authorities. The data collection, with statistical data quality checks, meets the Title II, Higher Education Act requirement for a national reporting system on the quality of teacher preparation.

Explanation: FY 2000 data established the baseline. States use a variety of different licensure and certification exams or batteries of exams. The Department asks states to report across six categories of tests: basic skills; professional knowledge and pedagogy; academic content areas; teaching special populations; other content areas; and performance assessments. The guide also calls for a single "summary rate" that reflects the total of the graduates' testing experience. The summary rate provides the data for this measure. The data for FY 2005 will be available in August 2006.

Objective 2 of 2: *To reform teacher preparation programs in partnership with high need school districts and schools of arts and sciences to produce highly qualified teachers.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Highly qualified teachers: The percentage of program completers who are highly qualified teachers

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of program completers who are highly qualified teachers.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	89	
2005		80
2006		89
2007		89

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Data are verified by testing entities and certified by state licensing authorities. The data collection, with statistical data quality checks, meets the Title II, Higher Education Act requirement for a national reporting system on the quality of teacher preparation.

Limitations: Data are self-reported through annual performance reports.

Explanation: FY 2004 data established the baseline. "Highly qualified" is defined in No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Title IX, Sec. 9101. A highly qualified program completer is a graduate of a grantee teacher preparation program with a bachelor's degree, subject area competence established through testing, and certification from state licensing authorities. Program completion definition includes a reasonable period of time for graduates to pass certification examinations. FY 2005 data are expected in August 2006.

IDEA: Special Education Grants for Infants and Families - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.181 - Special Education Grants for Infants and Families with Disabilities

Program Goal: To enhance the development of infants and toddlers (0-3) with disabilities and support families in meeting the special needs of their child.

Objective 1 of 2: *The functional development of infants and toddlers will be enhanced by early intervention services.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: FUNCTIONAL ABILITIES: The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in Part C that exhibit improved and sustained functional abilities

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in Part C that exhibit improved and sustained functional abilities		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Source: Part C Annual Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2007

OSEP is currently determining a data collection methodology for this indicator.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: FAMILY CAPACITY: The percentage of families participating in Part C that report that early intervention services have increased their capacity to enhance their child's development.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of families participating in Part C that report that early intervention services have increased their capacity		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	72	
2001	73	
2002		80
2003		80
2004		80
2005		80
2006		80
2007		80
2008		83

2009		87
2010		90

Source: Part C Annual Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2008

OSEP is currently determining a data collection methodology for this indicator.

Explanation: Data for 1998 and 2001 were obtained from the IDEA National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study (NEILS). Data not collected for FY 2002-2006.

Objective 2 of 2: *All infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families will receive early intervention services in natural environments that meet their individual needs.*

Indicator 2.1 of 3: INFANTS SERVED: The number of states that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under the age of 1 through Part C

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Number of states that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under the age of 1 through Part C.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	21	
2002	21	
2003	23	
2004	23	37
2005	24	27
2006		28

Source: State reported data under IDEA Section 618 and US Census data.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The 2005 target was not met. In 2005, 24 states served at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under age 1 through Part C, an improvement of one state above the 2004 level of 23 states. This represents continued progress toward the target. The 1 percent threshold in this indicator is based on the prevalence rates of 5 conditions: 0.4% severe mental retardation; 0.2% hearing impairment; 0.1% visual impairment; 0.2% physical conditions (spinal bifida, CP, etc.); and 0.1% autism.

Indicator 2.2 of 3: INFANTS AND TODDLERS SERVED: The number of states that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, through Part C

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: Number of states that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, through Part C.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	25	
2002	25	

IDEA: Special Education Grants for Infants and Families

2003	27	20
2004	28	40
2005	30	31
2006		32

Source: State reported data under IDEA Section 618 and U.S. Census data.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: The 2005 target was not met, although there was an increase over the previous year's data.

Indicator 2.3 of 3: SERVICE SETTINGS: The percentage of children receiving early intervention services in home or in programs designed for typically developing peers

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: Percentage of children receiving early intervention services in home or in programs designed for typically developing peers		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	56	
1997	58	
1998	63	
1999	67	
2000	73	67
2001	76	69
2002	82	71
2003	83	78
2004	85	79
2005		83
2006		84
2007		85
2008		86
2009		87
2010		88

Source: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: In 2004, the percent of children with disabilities who were receiving early intervention services in home or in programs designed for typically developing peers increased to 85 percent, compared with 83 percent the prior year, exceeding the target set for this indicator.

IDEA: Special Education Grants to States - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.027 - Special Education Grants to States

Program Goal: Ensure all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education to help them meet challenging standards and prepare them for independent living and postsecondary education and/or competitive employment by assisting state and local educational agencies and families.

Objective 1 of 3: All children with disabilities will meet challenging standards as determined by national and state assessments with accommodations as appropriate.

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Performance on NAEP: The percentage of students with disabilities that meet or exceed basic levels in reading and math on the NAEP

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic in reading on the NAEP.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	22	
2002	29	24
2003	29	25
2005	33	35
2007		37

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic in mathematics on the NAEP.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	20	
2003	29	23
2005	31	32
2007		37

Source: NCES.

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: November 2007

Data Validated By: NCES.

Limitations: Results of the NAEP scores for students with disabilities from this sample cannot be generalized to the total population of such students.

Explanation: The 2005 targets were not met. Targets for 2002-2003 have been adjusted to be consistent with the Department's Strategic Plan 2002-2007. The 2002 & 2003 targets were exceeded.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Exclusion from NAEP: The percentage of students excluded from NAEP due to their disability

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: The percentage of fourth-grade students included in the NAEP reading sample who are excluded from testing due to disabilities.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	4	
2002	5	
2003	5	
2005		5
2007		4

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: The percentage of eighth-grade students included in the NAEP mathematics sample who are excluded from testing due to disabilities.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	3	
2003	3	
2005		3
2007		3

Source: NCES

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Explanation: For reading, the percentage of students with disabilities excluded from the NAEP includes only public school students. For math, the percentage excluded from NAEP includes public and private school students. The Department modified the language of these measures for clarification.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Performance on State Assessments: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above on state assessments

Measure 1.3.1 of 2: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in reading on state assessments.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	24	
2005		25
2006		25

Measure 1.3.2 of 2: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in mathematics on state assessments.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	25	
2005		25
2006		25

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: FY 2004 data served as the baseline. The data were calculated by comparing SY 2002-03 to 2003-04 data.

Objective 2 of 3: *Secondary school students with disabilities will complete high school prepared for independent living and postsecondary education and/or competitive employment.*

Indicator 2.1 of 3: Graduation Rate: The percentage of students with disabilities that graduate high school with a regular high school diploma

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of students with disabilities that graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	42	
1997	43	
1998	45	
1999	47	
2000	46	
2001	48	
2002	51	
2003	52	
2004	54	
2005		54
2006		55
2007		56
2008		57
2009		58
2010		59

Source: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618. Denominator includes graduation with diploma or

certificate, dropout, maximum age, deceased, and not known to continue.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: Starting with 2004, we changed the method for calculating graduation rates. The graduation rate is now calculated by dividing the number of students aged 14 and older with disabilities who graduated with a regular diploma by the total number of students with disabilities in the same age group who are known to have left school (i.e., graduated with a regular diploma, received a certificate of completion, reached the maximum age for services, died, dropped out, or moved (not known to have continued)). This includes calculations for 57 entities (50 states, DC, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, N. Marianas and BIA). The "Actual Performance" values were revised accordingly back to 1996. The previously published 2004 target of 57 applied to the old calculation and is therefore not included here.

Indicator 2.2 of 3: Dropout Rate: The percentage of students with disabilities that drop out of school

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: Percentage of students with disabilities that drop out of school		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	47	
1997	46	
1998	44	
1999	42	
2000	42	
2001	41	
2002	38	
2003	34	
2004	31	
2005		34
2006		33
2007		32
2008		31
2009		30
2010		29

Source: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: Starting with 2004, the program changed the method for calculating graduation rates. The dropout rate is now calculated by dividing the number of students aged 14 and older with disabilities who dropped out or moved (not known to have continued in education) by the total number of students with disabilities in the same age group who are known to have left school (i.e., graduated with a regular diploma, received a certificate of completion, reached the maximum age for services, died, dropped out, or moved (not known to have continued)). This includes calculations for 57 entities (50 states, DC, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, N. Marianas and BIA). The "Actual Performance" values were revised accordingly back to 1996.

The previously published 2004 target of 29 applied to the old calculation and is therefore not included here.

Indicator 2.3 of 3: Postsecondary School and Employment: The percentage of students with disabilities that are either competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within two years of leaving high school

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: Percentage of students with disabilities that are either competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within two years of leaving high school.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	59	
2005		59.50
2006		60

Source: NLTS II.

Date Sponsored: 09/30/2002.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: National Longitudinal Transition Study I (NTLS - I) was conducted in SY 1986-87 (N= 52 percent). NLTS - II was conducted in SY 2003-04 (N = 59 percent). No target was set for FY 2004.

Objective 3 of 3: All children with disabilities will receive a free appropriate public education.

Indicator 3.1 of 3: Certified Teachers Under IDEA (Ages 6-21): The number of States with at least 90 percent of special education teachers of children with disabilities aged 6-21 fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: Number of States with at least 90 percent of special education teachers fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	35	
1997	36	
1998	37	
1999	36	41
2000	36	42
2001	37	42
2002	33	42
2003	30	37
2004	36	37
2005		39
2006		40

Source: State-reported data under IDEA section 618.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Limitations: Data reflect grades 1-12, not teachers teaching children aged 6-21. States maintain data by grades taught, not ages of students. State requirements for teacher certification vary widely (i.e., teachers fully certified in one state might not be considered eligible for full certification in another state).

Explanation: 2004 actual performance represents a 6-State increase over 2003. As a result of this increase, we are within one state of our 2004 target. There continues to be a clustering of States around the 90 percent threshold in this indicator which may result in unpredictable changes from year to year.

Indicator 3.2 of 3: Highly Qualified Teachers Under NCLB: The number of special education teachers who teach core academic subjects that are highly qualified, consistent with NCLB

Measure 3.2.1 of 1: The percentage of special education teachers who teach core academic subjects that are highly qualified.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2005

Limitations: NCES does not collect data on high qualified teachers because there is no standard definition.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for 2006 will be determined after receipt of the 2005 baseline data.

Indicator 3.3 of 3: Services Outside the Regular Classroom: The percentage of students ages 6-21 served outside of the regular classroom 60% or more of the day because of their disability

Measure 3.3.1 of 1: Percent of students served outside of the regular classroom 60% or more of the day due to their disability (as a percentage of the school population)		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	2.85	
2002	2.81	
2003	2.77	
2004	2.67	
2005		2.69
2006		2.65

Source: Numerator: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618. Denominator: U.S. Census (CCD enrollment)

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: There was no target set for FY 2004.

IDEA: Special Education Parent Information Centers - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.328 - Special Education Parent Information Centers

Program Goal: To provide training and information to parents of children with disabilities

Objective 1 of 2: *Improve the quality of the parent training and information projects*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: HIGH-QUALITY PRODUCTS AND SERVICES: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of products and services deemed to be of high quality		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Primary source: Panel of Experts

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 2 of 2: *Parent Training and Information Centers' products and services will be used to improve results for children with disabilities in the target areas.*

Indicator 2.1 of 3: RELEVANCE: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the target audiences of the information.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Primary source: Stakeholder panel review.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2005

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 3: USE: The percentage of all products and services used by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: Percentage of all products and services used by target audiences		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Source: Primary source: Sample of recipients of products and services.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.3 of 3: COST PER OUTPUT: Cost per output defined as cost per unit of information, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating.

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: Cost per output		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Source: Sample of grantees products

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

IDEA: Special Education Personnel Preparation - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.325 - Special Education Personnel Preparation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

Program Goal: To prepare service providers and leadership personnel in areas of critical need who are highly qualified to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

***Objective 1 of 2:** Improve the curricula of IDEA training programs to ensure that personnel preparing to serve children with disabilities are knowledgeable and skilled in practices that reflect the current knowledge base.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: RESEARCH-BASED CURRICULUM: The percentage of projects incorporating evidence-based curriculum will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of projects incorporating evidence-based curriculum.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Source: Primary source: Researcher/expert panel review of a sample of program curricula.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: KNOWLEDGEABLE AND SKILLED SCHOLARS: The percentage of scholars who are knowledgeable and skilled in evidence-based practices.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of scholars who are knowledgeable and skilled in evidence-based practices.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Source: Primary source: Sample of scholars.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 2 of 2: Increase the supply of teachers and service providers who are highly qualified for and serve in positions for which they are trained.

Indicator 2.1 of 4: SCHOLARS EXITING PROGRAM: The percentage of scholars who exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance will decrease.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of scholars who exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005	0.95	999

Source: Primary source: Personnel Preparation Annual Data Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Explanation: OSEP initially anticipated that the performance target for this measure would be to achieve decreases in the rate over time. However, because baseline data were better than anticipated (e.g., less than 1 percent), instead of expecting even further decreases in outyears, OSEP believes that maintaining a rate of less than or equal to 1 percent is desirable.

Indicator 2.2 of 4: SCHOLARS EMPLOYED UPON COMPLETION: The percentage of degree/certification program scholars who are employed upon program completion in the area(s) for which they were trained will increase.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: Percentage of degree/certification program scholars who are employed upon program completion in the area(s) for which they were trained		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	79	
2005	68	82
2006		83
2007		85
2008		86
2009		88
2010		89

Source: Primary source: Personnel Preparation Annual Data Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Explanation: The significant decrease from the 2003 actual figure of 79 percent to the 2005 actual figure of 68 percent is due to refinements to the data collection system that permit a more accurate link between area of

employment and area of training. Therefore, the 2005 actual figure will serve as the baseline for future reporting. No FY 2004 data were collected.

Indicator 2.3 of 4: SCHOLARS EMPLOYED AND FULLY QUALIFIED: The percentage of degree/certification program completers who are employed upon program completion in the area(s) for which they are trained AND are fully qualified under IDEA and under NCLB as appropriate will increase.

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: Percentage of degree/certification program completers who are employed upon program completion in the area(s) for which they are trained AND are fully qualified under IDEA and under NCLB		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Primary source: Sample of scholars in the field -- post-completion.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.4 of 4: SCHOLARS EMPLOYED THREE OR MORE YEARS: The percentage of degree/ certification scholars who maintain employment beyond program completion for three or more years in the areas for which they are trained will increase.

Measure 2.4.1 of 1: Percentage of program completers that maintain employment for at least three years in the areas for which they were trained.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Primary source: Sample of scholars in the field -- post completion.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

IDEA: Special Education Preschool Grants - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.173 - Special Education Preschool Grants

Program Goal: To help preschool children with disabilities enter school ready to succeed by assisting states in providing special education and related services.

Objective 1 of 1: *Preschool children with disabilities will receive special education and related services that result in increased skills that enable them to succeed in school.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: SERVICE SETTING: The percentage of children receiving special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of children with disabilities receiving special education and related services with typically developing peers (early childhood settings and home).		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	41	
2000	40	
2001	39	
2002	40	39
2003	38	40
2004	37	40
2005	36	41
2006		42

Source: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Limitations: OSEP is planning to change the data collection by 2006-07 to reflect where the child spends most of his or her time, as opposed to where the child is receiving special education services.

Explanation: The 2005 target was not met; actual data decreased one percent from 2004. We believe that the trend away from the target is an artifact of the definition used in the data collection, which measures where the child is receiving special education services as opposed to where the child spends most of his or her time.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: CERTIFIED PRESCHOOL TEACHERS UNDER IDEA: The number of states with at least 90 percent of preschool special education teachers fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Number of states with at least 90 percent of special education teachers of children ages 3-5 that are fully certified in the area in which they are teaching.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	34	
1997	35	
1998	37	
1999	34	40
2000	36	41
2001	35	40
2002	34	40
2003	32	36
2004	34	36
2005		37
2006		38

Source: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Limitations: States maintain data by grades taught, not by ages of students taught. Therefore, these data are for teachers teaching pre-kindergarten and kindergarten.

Improvements: Certification of related services personnel are not included because those requirements vary even more widely than requirements for teachers. (e.g., some states certify sign language interpreters, but other states do not). OSEP will implement follow-up actions regarding increasing emphasis on related services personnel; possibly follow-up on SPeNSE study.

Explanation: The number of states with at least 90 percent of special education teachers of children ages 3-5 who are fully certified in the area in which they are teaching increased by 2 from 2003 to 2004, to 34 states, thus making progress towards the target. There is a cluster of states around the 90 percent threshold in this indicator, which may result in unpredictable changes from year to year.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: IMPROVED SKILLS: The percentage of preschool children with disabilities that improve their early language/communication, early literacy and social-emotional skills

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Percentage of preschool children with disabilities that improve their early language/communication, early literacy and social-emotional skills		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Source: Initial data for 2005 from the IDEA Pre-elementary Education Longitudinal Study (PEELS). Subsequent years' data collection methodology will be determined through the Early Childhood Outcome Center, and will utilize State-reported data under the Annual Performance Reports and IDEA section 618.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2007

Explanation: This indicator focuses on early language/ communication, early literacy and social-emotional skills because these skills are the best indicators of success in later years. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

IDEA: Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.326 - Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

Program Goal: To assist states and their partners in systems improvement through scientific-based practices.

Objective 1 of 2: *Improve the quality of technical assistance and dissemination projects.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: HIGH QUALITY PRODUCTS AND SERVICES: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of products and services deemed to be of high quality		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Panel of Experts

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 2 of 2: *TA&D products and services will be used to improve results for children with disabilities in the target areas.*

Indicator 2.1 of 3: RELEVANCE: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the target audiences of the technical assistance and disseminations.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Primary source: Stakeholder panel review.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2005

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 3: USE: The percentage of all products and services used by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: Percentage of all products and services used by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Source: Primary source: Sample of recipients of products and services.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.3 of 3: COST PER OUTPUT: Cost per output defined as cost per unit of technical assistance, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating.

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: Cost per output		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

IDEA: Special Education Technology and Media Services - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.327 - Special Education Technology and Media Services for Individuals with Disabilities

Program Goal: To promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology and media services to improve results for children with disabilities.

Objective 1 of 2: *Increase the relevance of research in technology to address the needs of children with disabilities.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: RELEVANCE: The percentage of new research projects in technology judged to be of high relevance to improving outcomes of children with disabilities as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of technology research projects judged to be of high relevance		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Panel of qualified practitioners.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 2 of 2: *Increase the quality of technology research and technical assistance and dissemination projects.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Quality: Quality of technology research proposals.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of newly funded technology research proposals judged to be of high quality by a panel of researchers.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Panel of researchers.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: QUALITY: Technical Assistance & Dissemination

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of products and services judged to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Expert panel.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.196 - Education for Homeless Children and Youth

Program Goal: To ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education as is provided to other children and youth.

Objective 1 of 1: Homeless children and youth will have greater access to a free and appropriate public education.

Indicator 1.1 of 2: State assessment participation: Percentage of homeless students that participate annually in the state assessments in reading and mathematics will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of homeless children and youth, grades 3-8, included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics as reported by LEA subgrantees.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
2004	16	15		
2005			17	16

Source: The data to be collected from states are from LEAs that have subgrantees and are capable of reporting such data. However, approximately only 10% of all school districts receive subgrant funds.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Data collected by state assessments are validated by the individual state's data quality standards procedures. Data will reflect information principally from LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

Limitations: Collecting these data is not a statutory requirement; at this time, states will be required to provide program improvement data by 2006.

Explanation: Baseline data were from a one-time collection from 2002. The 2002 results could not be disaggregated by subject matter. In 2004, the FY 2002 data were incorrectly reported (20%). The performance was actually 24%, the aggregate figure for reading and math. Data were not collected in 2003. Beginning with 2004, data were disaggregated by subject. For 2004, Reading N=55,752; Math=53,177.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: State assessment achievement: Percentage of homeless students meeting or exceeding state's proficiency level or standard in reading and mathematics.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of homeless students, grades 3-8, meeting or exceeding state proficiency standards in reading/language arts and mathematics.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
2002	30	24		
2004	36	36		
2005			34	26

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Data collected by state assessments are validated by the individual state's data quality standards procedures. Data will reflect information principally from LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

Limitations: There is no statutory requirement for annual data collections to determine year to year progress.

Explanation: FY 2002 baseline data were from a one-time collection. Data were not collected in 2003. Data were collected for 2004. Reading N= 21,001; Math N=19,706.

VTEA: Occupational and Employment Information - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.346 - Occupational and Employment Information State Grants

Program Goal: To provide support to career guidance and academic counseling programs.

Objective 1 of 1: Increase access to and improve career and academic guidance and counseling services.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Provide Quality Resources: Increasing numbers of customers will receive technical assistance by their states on the availability and use of America's Career Resource Network career development resources, and increasing numbers of career development products will be disseminated to customers through America's Career Resource Network.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Number of customers receiving technical assistance and number of products disseminated to customers (students, parents, teachers, counselors, administrators, and others) through America's Career Resource Network.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Number of Customers	Number of Products	Number of Customers	Number of Products
2001	25,910	8,540,106	20,000	8,000,000
2002	39,404	5,573,349		
2003	55,081	8,041,241		
2004	72,730	8,284,464	20,000	8,527,748
2005	13,850,896	6,111,518	25,000	8,527,000

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1830-0548 America's Career Resource Network State Grants Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Semi-Annually.

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: The number of products is a duplicated count; that is, it accounts for multiple copies of the same product being disseminated to one or more customers.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target for the number of customers receiving technical assistance was exceeded. The FY 2004 target for the number of products disseminated to customers was not met. In FY 2005, we expanded the definition of the "number of customers receiving technical assistance" to include, in addition to the customers trained, the participants in other ACRN activities, Career Information Delivery System users, and users of Web-based products. This accounts for the huge increase in the number of customers receiving technical assistance.

VTEA: Tech-Prep Demonstration - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.353 - Tech-Prep Demonstration Grants

Program Goal: To provide opportunities and incentives for Tech-Prep students to enroll in postsecondary education after high school graduation.

Objective 1 of 2: *To create a program infrastructure to ensure student persistence and success in Tech-Prep education.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Percentage of program participants who stayed in the Tech-Prep program as they transitioned from 11th to 12th grade.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of program participants who stayed in the Tech-Prep program as they transitioned from 11th to 12th grade.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		80

Source: Grantee Performance Report: 1830-0550 Tech--Prep Demonstration Grants

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. Targets were estimates and future targets will be revised based upon an analysis of the data received.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Percentage of program participants who graduated from high school.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of program participants who graduated from high school.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		75

Source: Grantee Performance Report: 1830-0550 Tech-Prep Demonstration Grants

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. Targets were estimates and future targets will be revised based upon an analysis of the data received.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Percentage of program participants who enrolled in a postsecondary education following high

school graduation.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Percentage of program participants who enrolled in postsecondary education following high school graduation.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		70

Source: Grantee Performance Report: 1830-0550 Tech-Prep Demonstration Grants

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. Targets were estimates and future targets will be revised based upon an analysis of the data received.

Objective 2 of 2: *To provide opportunities for students to participate in Tech-Prep programs.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: An increase in the number of program participants.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Number of participants enrolled in the program.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	661	
2005		725

Source: Contractor Performance Report,

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Explanation: FY 2004 data were not collected.

VTEA: Vocational Education National Programs - FY 2005

Program Goal: Increase access to and improve programs at the high school and community and technical college levels that raise academic achievement, strengthen workforce preparation, and promote economic development and lifelong learning.

Objective 1 of 2: *Increase the use of rigorous research findings to inform program direction and improve state and local practices, through the identification of research-based education practices and communicating what works to practitioners, parents and policy-makers.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Conduct quality research: By 2005, all research studies conducted by the National Centers for Research in Career and Technical education will represent rigorous design as defined by the Department's definition of evidence-based research.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percent of research studies with rigorous designs		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	71	
2003	83	
2004	100	100
2005		100

Source: Independent review panel assessments.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was met. All current studies of the center are aligned with the Department's increased emphasis on rigorous methodology and scientifically based approaches.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Disseminate quality research: By 2005, increasing numbers of customers will be using the products and services of the National Centers for Research and Dissemination in Career and Technical Education.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Number of customers receiving electronic and print materials or information from the Centers						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Electronic	Print	Total	Electronic	Print	Total

VTEA: Vocational Education National Programs

2000	273,546	273,546				
2001	1,569,999	131,254	1,701,253			300,000
2002	3,004,898	219,729	3,224,627			350,000
2003	6,054,535	13,567	6,068,102			
2004	19,904,845	412,000	20,316,845	2,300,000	100,000	2,400,000
2005				2,300,000	50,000	2,350,000

Source: Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: The number of customers does not represent an unduplicated count of individuals receiving information through the Centers.

Explanation: The FY 2004 targets were exceeded. Most deliverables were made available through the center's Web site. Hard copy and print materials were also distributed upon request, especially at meeting and conference exhibits. The rise in the number of requests for materials may be attributed to increased interest generated through the expanded number of Web casts offered during the performance period.

Objective 2 of 2: *Improve and expand the use of accountability systems and effective program strategies at the high school and postsecondary levels that promotes student achievement, performance and successful transition.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: By fall 2005, all states will have data systems with the capacity to include information on all indicators and subindicators for secondary and postsecondary programs.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of states that have data systems with the capacity to include information on all indicators and subindicators for secondary and postsecondary programs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Percentage of Performance	Percentage of Target
2001	92	
2002	97	
2003	98	
2004	98	100
2005		100

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1830-0530 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

State Directors for Career and Technical Education attest to data. Data also are checked for accuracy and completeness through a five-step data auditing process by ED staff and an outside contractor.

Limitations: States use different measures and strategies to report data.

Improvements: ED is working with states to improve their data quality.

Explanation: We did not meet our FY 2004 target of 100. Actual performance is based on the percentage of states that were able to report data on each of the four core indicators included in the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act. It is important to note that Department does not gather information on what percentage of all school systems, school districts and community colleges are included in the states' data. Only one state was unable to meet the data reporting requirement for the four core indicators. The Department continues to provide training and technical assistance to states and has provided additional technical assistance to the one state missing the one core indicator.

VTEA: Vocational Education State Grants and Tech-Prep Education State Grants - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.048 - Vocational Education Basic Grants to States
 84.101 - Vocational Education Indians Set-aside
 84.243 - Tech-Prep Education
 84.259 - Native Hawaiian Vocational Education

Program Goal: Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen education achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.

Objective 1 of 3: *Ensure that vocational concentrators, including special populations, will achieve high levels of proficiency in mathematics, science, and English.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Academic Attainment: An increasing percentage of vocational concentrators, including special populations, will meet state-established academic standards.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: Percentage of vocational concentrators meeting state-established academic standards		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Percentage of vocational concentrators	Percentage of vocational concentrators
1998	33	
1999	45	
2000	44	
2001	70	
2002	71	72
2003	75	74
2004	75	76
2005		77

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: Percentage of Tech-Prep students who meet state-established academic standards.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Percentage of Tech-Prep students who meet state-established academic standards.	Percentage of Tech-Prep students who meet state-established academic standards.
2001	79	
2002	71	

2004	75	
2005		77

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: 1) States set their goals using a three-year rolling average. 2) States are allowed maximum flexibility in their data collection procedures and protocols. This limits data validity and reliability at the national level.

Improvements: The State Administration and Accountability Group (SAAG) will conduct national and regional training institutes to improve data collection efforts especially in the areas of special populations and minority students. The SAAG will also conduct targeted individual state technical assistance to improve performance for special populations and minority students. SAAG will collaborate with other divisions and agencies to improve the performance of CTE students, particularly special population and minority students.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was not met. The FY 2004 data established a baseline for Tech-Prep students. The State Administration and Accountability Group (SAAG) is undertaking initiatives to improve the performance of special population students through targeted technical assistance, additional professional development and national and regional performance institutes.

Objective 2 of 3: *Ensure that secondary and postsecondary concentrators, including special populations, will achieve high levels of proficiency in core curriculum areas, including mathematics, science, and English.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Skills Proficiencies: An increasing percentage of secondary and postsecondary vocational concentrators, including special populations, will meet state recognized skill standards.

Measure 2.1.1 of 2: Percentage of secondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally adopted skill standards, using state-recognized approaches		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	39	
2001	61	
2002	59	63
2003	64	65
2004	64	70
2005		79

Measure 2.1.2 of 2: Percentage of Post secondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally-adopted skill standards, using state-recognized approaches		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

	Percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally adopted skill standards	Percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally adopted skill standards
2000	76	
2001	76	
2002	76	77
2003	77	78
2004	78	80
2005		79

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: 1) States have set their goals using a three-year rolling average. 2) States are allowed maximum flexibility in their data collection procedures and protocols. This limits data validity and reliability at the national level.

Improvements: The State Administration and Accountability Group (SAAG) will conduct national and regional training institutes to improve data collection efforts especially in the areas of special populations and minority students. The SAAG will also conduct targeted individual state technical assistance to improve performance for special populations and minority students. SAAG will collaborate with other divisions and agencies to improve the performance of CTE students, particularly special population and minority students.

Explanation: The FY 2004 targets were not met. The State Administration and Accountability Group (SAAG) is undertaking initiatives to improve the performance of special population students through targeted technical assistance, additional professional development and national and regional performance institutes.

Objective 3 of 3: *Ensure that concentrators, including special populations, make successful transitions to further education and employment.*

Indicator 3.1 of 2: Secondary Student Outcomes: An increasing proportion of vocational concentrators, including special populations, will attain high school diplomas, enter postsecondary programs, or attain employment.

Measure 3.1.1 of 2: Percentage of vocational concentrators who have completed high school and transitioned to postsecondary education or employment				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or Employment	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or Employment
2000	80	79		

2001	84	84		
2002	84	84	85	85
2003	84	84	86	86
2004	84	87	88	87
2005			87	87

Measure 3.1.2 of 2: Percentage of Tech-Prep students who have completed high school and transitioned to postsecondary education.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education
2001	87			
2002	87			
2004	87	86		
2005			87	87

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: 1) There is a substantial lag each year before performance data can be reported. In addition, states collect placement data from 6 months to 1 year after the school year resulting in a further lag in data reporting. Issues related to FERPA and use of social security numbers is also a great barrier to both accurate reporting and completeness of data. The numbers provided in Actual Performance and Performance Targets do not represent a national average nor the results of any single national assessment. 2) States have set their goals using a three-year rolling average. 3) States are allowed maximum flexibility in their data collection procedures and protocols. This limits data validity and reliability at the national level.

Improvements: The State Administration and Accountability Group (SAAG) will conduct national and regional training institutes to improve data collection efforts especially in the areas of special populations and minority students. The SAAG will also conduct targeted individual state technical assistance to improve performance for special populations and minority students. SAAG will collaborate with other divisions and agencies to improve the performance of CTE students, particularly special population and minority students.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target for high school completion was not met. The FY 2004 target for placement in post-secondary education and /or employment was met. The FY 2004 data established a baseline for Tech-Prep students. The State Administration and Accountability Group (SAAG) is undertaking initiatives to improve the performance of special population students through targeted technical assistance, additional professional development and national and regional performance institutes.

Indicator 3.2 of 2: Postsecondary Student Outcomes: Increasing proportions of postsecondary vocational students, including special populations, will have a positive placement in one or more of the following categories of outcomes: retention in and completion of a postsecondary degree or certificate, placement in military service, or placement or

retention in employment.

Measure 3.2.1 of 1: Percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators who have completed postsecondary education and have a positive placement in military or employment.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Postsecondary Degree/Certificate/ Completion	Placement in Military or Employment	Postsecondary Degree/Certificate/ Completion	Placement in Military or Employment
2000	32	82		
2001	37	84		
2002	41	86	39	84
2003	41	83	42	85
2004	41	83	45	86
2005			44	88

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: 1) States have set their goals using a three-year rolling average. 2) States are allowed maximum flexibility in their data collection procedures and protocols. This limits data validity and reliability at the national level.

Improvements: The State Administration and Accountability Group (SAAG) will conduct national and regional training institutes to improve data collection efforts especially in the areas of special populations and minority students. The SAAG will also conduct targeted individual state technical assistance to improve performance for special populations and minority students. SAAG will collaborate with other divisions and agencies to improve the performance of CTE students, particularly special population and minority students.

Explanation: The FY 2004 targets were not met. The State Administration and Accountability Group (SAAG) is undertaking initiatives to improve the performance of special population students through targeted technical assistance, additional professional development and national and regional performance institutes.

Goal 3: Develop Safe and Drug-Free Schools

ESEA: Alcohol Abuse Reduction - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.184A - Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse Program

Program Goal: To help reduce alcohol abuse among secondary school students.

Objective 1 of 1: Support the implementation of research-based alcohol abuse prevention programs in secondary schools.

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Reduce Binge Drinking: The extent to which students decrease their rate of binge drinking.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of grantees whose target students show a measurable decrease in binge drinking.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			999	
2006				999

Source: Grantee performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: Grantees will collect data concerning binge drinking behavior of students served by the grant as a grant condition. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Improve students' attitudes relative to alcohol abuse: The extent to which students' attitudes relative to alcohol abuse change.

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: 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.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			999	
2006				999

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: The percentage of grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who disapprove of alcohol abuse.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			999	
2006				999

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: Grantees will collect information about the attitudes of students served under the program relative to perception of health risk and social disapproval of alcohol abuse as a grant condition. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.

ESEA: Civic Education: We the People - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.929A - We the People Program
84.929C - We the People Program

Program Goal: To enhance the attainment of the third and sixth national goals by educating students about the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Objective 1 of 1: Provide high quality civic education curricula to elementary and secondary school students through the "We the People: Citizen and the Constitution" program.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Quality of teacher training under the program: The extent to which training under the program has improved the quality of instruction for students

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of teachers participating in training or professional development activities provided as part of the "We the People" program that will have demonstrated improved quality of instruction through an evaluation will increase.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Grantee evaluations reported via Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: 100 percent of funds appropriated under the We the People portion of the Civic Education program must be distributed, as required by statute, to the Center for Civic Education. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

ESEA: Close-Up Fellowships - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.927A - Close-Up Fellowship Program

Program Goal: To improve participants' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding the three branches of government.

Objective 1 of 1: *Make progress toward full financial independence from federal funding*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Increased private funding: An increasing amount of grantees' funding that is allocated for teachers and economically disadvantaged students will come from non-federal sources.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Amount of funding (in dollars)		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	865,000	
2001	1,047,340	955,000
2002	1,137,975	
2003	2,382,489	
2004		970,000
2005		975,000

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Close-Up Foundation Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Data are obtained from audited program records.

Explanation: The performance targets represent approximately a two-to-one federal vs. nonfederal match. Also, targets are based on the grantees' past performance in obtaining non-federal contributions.

ESEA: Elementary and Secondary School Counseling - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.215E - Elementary and Secondary School Counseling Discretionary Grants

**Program Goal: To increase the availability of counseling programs and services
in elementary schools.**

Objective 1 of 1: *Support the hiring of qualified personnel to expand available counseling services for elementary school students.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Student/Counselor ratio: Progress of grantees in reducing student/counselor ratio to meet American School Health Association recommended ratios

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of grantees closing the gap between their student/mental health professional ratios and the student/mental health professional ratios recommended by the American School Health Association (ASHA).				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			999	
2006				999

Source: Annual Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Student disciplinary actions: Number of referrals and suspensions in participating schools.

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: Number of referrals for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the program.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			999	
2006				999

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: Number of suspensions for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the program.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			999	
2006				999

Source: Annual Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.

ESEA: Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.215Y - Educational, Cultural, Apprenticeship, and Exchange Programs for Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, and their Historical Whaling and Trading Partners in Massachusetts

Program Goal: To develop innovative, culturally based educational programs, cultural exchanges and internships and apprentice programs to assist Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and children and families of Massachusetts linked by history and tradition, to learn about their shared culture and tradition.

Objective 1 of 1: Grantees will demonstrate increased capability to produce and disseminate educational programs (including internships) that highlight the historical trading and whaling patterns and cultural themes among partner museums and the communities they serve (including schools and other institutions).

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Number/percentage of shared products, resources (including collections) and technical staff exchanges that result in new or enhanced capabilities among partner institutions that address programmatic goals.

Measure 1.1.1 of 5: Number of partnership exchanges		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	120	999
2005		132

Measure 1.1.2 of 5: Number of new partner capabilities		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

Measure 1.1.3 of 5: Number of individual participants involved in educational and cultural enrichment activities (including online participants).		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	885,000	999
2005		973,500

Measure 1.1.4 of 5: Number of schools, community groups, and family programs involved in educational and cultural enrichment activities.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

Measure 1.1.5 of 5: Number of participants in a culturally based youth internship program involving career awareness, leadership and job skills development		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	120	999
2005		132

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Historic Whaling Partnerships Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Data are self-reported by grantees.

Explanation: The average frequency for participation is 3 per partner. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 10%. For the first measure, there were 120 partnership exchanges, representing 20 percent of grantees. For the third measure, there were 885,000 participants in the program, representing 10 percent of grantees. For the fifth measure, there were 120 interns exchanged, representing 20 percent. 2004 data are not yet available for measures 2 and 4 as it is part of a larger data collection process that is currently underway.

ESEA: Mentoring Program - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.184B - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Mentoring Program

Program Goal: To support mentoring programs and activities for children who are at risk of educational failure, dropping out of school, or involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models.

Objective 1 of 1: Provide grants to community-based organizations and local school districts to support mentoring programs for high-risk youth.

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Sustained mentoring matches: Proportion of student/mentor matches that are sustained for over one year.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of student/mentor matches that are sustained by the grantees for a period of 12 months.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Source: Annual grantee performance report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Improved academic achievement: Proportion of mentored students demonstrating improved academic competencies.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of mentored students who demonstrate improvement in core academic subjects as measured by grade point average after 12 months.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Source: Annual grantee performance report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Unexcused absences: Proportion of mentored students with unexcused absences.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of mentored students who have unexcused absences from school.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Annual grantee performance report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

ESEA: Physical Education Program - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.215F - Carol M. White Physical Education Program

Program Goal: To promote physical activity and healthy lifestyles for students.

Objective 1 of 1: Support the implementation of effective physical education program and strategies.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Meeting state physical education standards: Program evaluations will demonstrate that program activities are helping grantees meet state standards for physical education

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: The percentage of students served by the grant who make progress toward meeting state standards for physical education.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			999	
2006				999

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: The percentage of students served by the grant actively participating in physical education activities.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			999	
2006				999

Source: Data are collected from annual grantee performance reports to ED.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.

ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Other National Programs - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.184 - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs

Program Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug and violence-prevention strategies.

***Objective 1 of 2:** Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in improving student behaviors and school environments.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Safe Schools/Healthy Students

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: The percentage of SS/HS grant sites that experience a decrease in the number of violent incidents at schools during the 3-year grant period.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: The percentage of SS/HS grant sites that experience a decrease in substance use during the 3-year grant period.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: The percentage of SS/HS grant sites that improve school attendance during the 3-year grant period.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Contractor Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: Grantees submit data for these performance measures, as required by GPRA, via an annual report. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

***Objective 2 of 2:** Student Drug Testing grantees will make substantial progress in reducing*

substance abuse incidence among target students.

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Reduction in substance use: Proportion of grantees that experience a 5 percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-month and past-year drug use by students in the target population.

Measure 2.1.1 of 2: The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees experiencing a 5 percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-month drug use by students in the target population served by these grants.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Measure 2.1.2 of 2: The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees experiencing a 5 percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-year drug use by students in the target population served by these grants.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Contractor Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: Grantees submit data for these performance measures as required by GPRA, via an annual report. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.186A - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: State and Local Educational Agency Program
84.186B - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Governors' Program

Program Goal: Develop Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-free Learning Environments

Objective 1 of 1: *To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of programs that reflect scientifically based research.*

Indicator 1.1 of 6: Illegal drugs at school: The proportion of students in grades 9-12 who were offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: 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.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	30	
2003	28.70	29
2005		28
2007		27
2009		26

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

Limitations: Data are collected in alternate years from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9 through 12 and are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis. The Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System includes a national school-based survey conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as well as state and local school-based surveys conducted by education and health agencies. The 2003 report summarized results from the national survey, 32 state surveys, and 18 local surveys conducted among students in grades 9 through 12 during February through December 2003. Data presented for these measures are rounded to the next whole number.

Explanation: The most recent data from 2003 show no significant change for drug access on school property. The data, which represent total responses from all surveyed students, are also reported for male and female respondents. Data for male and female categories provide useful insights into drug use among youth. Between 2001 and 2003, the underlying data show an increase in drug exposure for females, and a decrease in exposure to drugs for males. Females reported a 2.3 percent increase from 25.0 percent in 2001 to 31.9 percent in 2003. This increase offset the reported decrease for males from 34.6 percent in 2001 to 31.9 percent in 2003.

Indicator 1.2 of 6: Students using marijuana: Percentage of students who used marijuana one or more times during

the past 30 days

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who used marijuana one or more times during the past 30 days.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	24	
2003	22	
2005		21
2007		19
2009		18

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control.

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

Data are collected in alternate years from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9 through 12 and are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis. The Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System includes a national school-based survey conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as well as state and local school-based surveys conducted by education and health agencies. The 2003 report summarized results from the national survey, 32 state surveys, and 18 local surveys conducted among students in grades 9 through 12 during February through December 2003. Data presented for these measures are rounded to the next whole number.

Explanation: The most recent data from 2003 show declining marijuana use. The data, which represent total responses from all surveyed students, are also reported for male and female respondents. Data for male and female categories provide useful insights into drug use among youth. Between 2001 and 2003, the underlying data show an increase in drug exposure for females, and a decrease in exposure to drugs for males. Females reported a 2.3 percent increase from 25.0 percent in 2001 to 31.9 percent 2003. This increase offset the reported decrease for males from 34.6 percent in 2001 to 31.9 percent in 2003. Data for both male and female marijuana usage declined. Reported marijuana use for males dropped from 27.9 percent in 2001 to 25.1 percent in 2003, while female use dropped from 20.0 percent to 19.3 percent during the same period.

Indicator 1.3 of 6: Binge drinking: The proportion of students grades 9-12 who report engaging in episodic heavy (binge) drinking.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of students grades 9-12 who had five or more drinks of alcohol in a row (that is, within a couple of hours) one or more times during the past 30 days.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	30	
2003	28	
2005		27
2007		26
2009		25

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control.

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

Data are collected in alternate years from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9 through 12 and are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis. The Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System includes a national school-based survey conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as well as state and local school-based surveys conducted by education and health agencies. The 2003 report summarized results from the national survey, 32 state surveys, and 18 local surveys conducted among students in grades 9 through 12 during February through December 2003. Data presented for these measures are rounded to the next whole number.

Explanation: The most recent data from 2003 show declining heavy alcohol use. The data, which represent total responses from all surveyed students, are also reported for male and female respondents. Data for both male and female heavy alcohol consumption showed reductions in heavy drinking for males and slight increases for females. For heavy drinking, the percentage of females increased from 26.4 percent in 2001 to 27.5 percent in 2003, while heavy drinking decreased among males from 33.5 percent to 29.0 percent.

Indicator 1.4 of 6: Fights at School: Proportion of students in grades 9-12 reporting being involved in a fight at school.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The percentage of students grades 9-12 who were in a physical fight on school property one or more times during the past 12 months.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	13	
2003	13	
2005		12
2007		12
2009		11

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

Limitations: Data are collected in alternate years from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9 through 12 and are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis. The Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System includes a national school-based survey conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as well as state and local school-based surveys conducted by education and health agencies. The 2003 report summarized results from the national survey, 32 state surveys, and 18 local surveys conducted among students in grades 9 through 12 during February through December 2003.

Explanation: Between 2001 and 2003, the data show no significant change in the total percentages of students fighting on school property. In addition to the data for the total percentage of students, the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System also reports the percentage of males and females for measures 3.4. Though 2003 data total show no significant change from 2001, several changes in male and female participation occurred in the same period. There were notable reductions for males and slight increases for females. During this period, females in fights increased from 7.2 percent to 8.0 percent, while males in fights decreased from 18.0 percent to 17.1 percent.

Indicator 1.5 of 6: Students carrying weapons to school: The proportion of students in grades 9-12 who carried a weapon on school property

Measure 1.5.1 of 1: The percentage of students grades 9-12 who carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property one or more times during the past 30 days.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	6	
2003	6	
2005		5
2007		5
2009		4

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

Limitations: Data are collected in alternate years from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9 through 12 and are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis. The Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System includes a national school-based survey conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as well as state and local school-based surveys conducted by education and health agencies. The 2003 report summarized results from the national survey, 32 state surveys, and 18 local surveys conducted among students in grades 9 through 12 during February through December 2003.

Explanation: Between 2001 and 2003, the data show no significant change in the total percentages of students carrying weapons on school property. In addition to the data for the total percentage of students, the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System also reports the percentage of males and females for measures 3.4 and 3.5. Though 2003 data total show no significant change from 2001, several changes in male and female participation occurred in the same period. There were notable reductions for males and slight increases for females. During this period, the percentage of males carrying a weapon on school property decreased from 10.2 percent to 8.9 percent, while the percentage of females slightly increased from 2.9 percent to 3.1 percent.

Indicator 1.6 of 6: Use of research based programs: The proportion of SDFSCA State Grants-funded programs and practices that are research based.

Measure 1.6.1 of 2: The percentage of drug and violence prevention programs/practices supported with SDFSCA State Grant funds that are research based.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Measure 1.6.2 of 2: The percentage of SDFSC-funded research-based drug and violence prevention programs/practices that are implemented with fidelity.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Department will issue contract for an Evaluation Study

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Explanation: Data will be reported to ED via state performance reports. Targets will be established once baseline data are available.

**Goal 4: Transform
Education into an
Evidence-Based Field**

ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.305 - Education Research

Program Goal: Transform education into an evidence-based field.

Objective 1 of 2: *Raise the quality of research funded or conducted by the Department.*

Indicator 1.1 of 4: The percentage of newly funded research proposals funded by IES that receive an average panel review score of excellent.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of new research proposals funded by the Department's National Center for Education Research that receive an average score of excellent or higher from an independent review panel of qualified scientists.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	88	
2004	97	
2005	100	100

Source: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Research, review panel. The average panel review score for each newly funded research proposal will be calculated.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the peer review panel. Inclusion of only senior scientists and leading researchers in their fields helps assure the quality of these data.

Indicator 1.2 of 4: Whether or not the modal rating (most common judgment) of an independent review panel of qualified scientists is that new research and evaluation publications by IES are of high quality.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Whether or not the modal rating (most common judgment) of an independent review panel of qualified scientists is that new research and evaluation publications by IES are of high quality. (Data tables will indicate "2" for "Yes", "1" for "No", "0" for "No new publications/evaluations issued").		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	0	
2004	0	

2005		2
2006		2

Source: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Research, review panel. Staff from the National Center for Education Research selects a random sample of new research and evaluation publications. Publications are distributed to senior scientists in the field for review.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel. Inclusion of only eminent senior scientists who are distinguished professors in their institutions, editors of premier research journals, and leading researchers in education and special education assures the quality of the data.

Explanation: No new research/evaluation publications were issued in 2003 or 2004. The indicator was changed from focusing on percentages of publications deemed to be of high quality to focusing on whether or not the modal response (most common judgment) of the review panel is that new IES publications are of high quality. This is because the number of IES research and evaluation publications is currently quite small. With very small numbers, percentages are not very meaningful, because changes in one or two reports can translate into large changes in percentages. In this case, focusing on whether the most common rating is that publications are of high quality is a more meaningful indication of the overall judgment of the review panel.

Indicator 1.3 of 4: Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	32	32
2002	100	75
2003	97	75
2004	90	75
2005		75

Source: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Research, review panel. National Center for Education Research researchers evaluate all newly funded research and evaluation proposals to identify projects that address causal questions and of those projects, those that use randomized experimental designs to answer those questions. Data will be collected annually. The 75% target for 2002-2005 recognizes that some high-quality research addressing causal questions will not be able to employ randomized experimental designs.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the proposal reviewers. Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as a check of inter-rater agreement in which the two IES researchers independently evaluate a subset of proposals (with minimum inter-rater agreement of 90%), minimizes threats

to the validity and reliability of data. Presence of a causal question is defined as instances in which the investigation is designed to examine the effects of one variable on a second variable. A causal relation might be expressed as one variable influencing, affecting, or changing another variable. A randomized experimental design is defined as instances in which there are (a) an experimental (treatment) group and one or more comparison groups, and (b) random assignment of participants to treatment and comparison groups, or random assignment of groups (e.g., classrooms or schools) to treatment and comparison conditions. If a proposal includes a design in which two or more groups of participants are compared, but the PI does not explicitly indicate that random assignment procedures will be used, the proposal is recorded as not using a randomized experimental design.

Indicator 1.4 of 4: Of new research and evaluation publications funded by IES that address causal questions, the percentage of publications that employ randomized experimental designs.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: Of new research and evaluation publications funded by IES that address causal questions, the percentage of publications that employ randomized experimental designs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	100	75
2003	0	75
2004	0	75
2005		75

Source: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Research, review panel. National Center for Education Research staff evaluate all newly funded research and evaluation publications by the Center to identify projects that address causal questions and of those projects, those that use randomized experimental designs to answer those questions. Data will be collected annually. The 75% target recognizes that some high quality studies will not be able to employ randomized experimental designs.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the proposal reviewers. Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as a check of inter-rater agreement in which the two IES researchers independently evaluate a subset of publications (with minimum inter-rater agreement of 90%), minimizes threats to the validity and reliability of data. Presence of a causal question is defined as instances in which the investigation is designed to examine the effects of one variable on a second variable. A causal relation might be expressed as one variable influencing, affecting, or changing another variable. A randomized experimental design is defined as instances in which there are (a) an experimental (treatment) group and one or more comparison groups, and (b) random assignment of participants to treatment and comparison groups, or random assignment of groups (e.g., classrooms or schools) to treatment and comparison conditions. If a publication includes a design in which two or more groups of participants are compared, but does not explicitly indicate that random assignment procedures will be used, the publication is recorded as not using a randomized experimental design.

Explanation: No new research/evaluation publications were issued in 2003 or 2004.

Objective 2 of 2: Increase the relevance of our research in order to meet the needs of our customers.

Indicator 2.1 of 3: The percentage of new research projects funded by IES that are deemed to be of high relevance to education practice as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of new research projects funded by IES that are deemed to be of high relevance to education practice as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	21	
2002	25	25
2003	60	37
2004	50	50
2005		65
2006		75

Source: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Research, external review panel. An external panel of qualified practitioners will evaluate the relevance of a random sample of newly funded research proposals. Data will be collected annually. The final target of 75% recognizes that some important research may not seem immediately relevant, but will make important contributions over the long term.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel. Inclusion of only experienced practitioners and administrators in education and special education assures the quality of the data.

Explanation: We met our FY 2004 target of 50.

Indicator 2.2 of 3: The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse Web site.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse Web site.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	1,522,922	1,000,000
2004	4,249,668	2,000,000
2005	4,734,767	4,500,000
2006		5,000,000

Source: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Research, What Works Clearinghouse, program report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

A Web-based program will automatically count the hits on this Web site.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was exceeded. FY05 actual hits through 7/27/05 was 4,734,767 so we exceeded our target of 4.5 million with over two months remaining in FY05. Final figures should be available in early October.

Indicator 2.3 of 3: The percentage of WWC Web site users surveyed randomly who responded to the following statement, "Evidence provided on the WWC Web site is useful in making decisions about education programs and practices," by checking "agree" or "strongly agree."

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: The percentage of WWC Web site users surveyed randomly who responded to the following statement, "Evidence provided on the WWC Web site is useful in making decisions about education programs and practices," by checking "agree" or "strongly agree."		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005	67	30

Source: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Research, What Works Clearinghouse, program report. Data collected in 2005 will be the baseline data. Subsequent targets will be adjusted after we have the baseline data. There were no available data in 2003 or 2004.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was exceeded based upon partial data. Through August 4, with about 2 months remaining in FY 2005, we exceeded our target levels by more than double.

RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.133 - National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research

Program Goal: To conduct high-quality research that leads to high-quality research products

Objective 1 of 3: Advance knowledge through capacity building: Increase capacity to conduct and use high-quality and relevant disability and rehabilitation research and related activities designed to guide decision-making, change practice and improve the lives of individuals with disabilities.

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Percentage of NIDRR-supported fellows, postdoctoral trainees, and doctoral students who publish results of NIDRR-sponsored research in refereed journals.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of NIDRR-supported fellows, post-doctoral trainees, and doctoral students who publish results of NIDRR-sponsored research in refereed journals.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Fellows	Post-doctoral trainees	Doctoral students	Fellows	Post-doctoral trainees	Doctoral students
2005				999	999	999

Source: Contractor Performance Report, Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC, Model Systems, DRRPs, and ARRTs), Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

NIDRR is planning to work with other ED staff to conduct an audit of publications entered into the web-based reporting system to verify grantees' self-reports of peer-reviewed journal articles.

Explanation: This is an output-oriented annual performance measure. The FY 2005 target is to set a baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: By 2015, at least 10 percent of all projects will be multisite, collaborative controlled trials of interventions and programs.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of active projects conducting multisite, collaborative controlled trials. (Long-term Measure)		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Contractor Performance Report, Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTCcs, Model Systems, and DRRPs), Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: September 2007

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. This is a long-term measure. The first three-year cycle will include data from 2005, 2006, and 2007.

Objective 2 of 3: Advance knowledge through research and related activities: Generate scientific-based knowledge, technologies, and applications to inform policy, change practice, and improve outcomes.

Indicator 2.1 of 3: The average number of publications per award based on NIDRR-funded research and development activities in refereed journals.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The average number of publications per award based on NIDRR-funded research and development activities in refereed journals. (Annual Measure)		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	2.74	
2003	2.84	8
2004	2.71	5
2005		5

Source: Contractor Performance Report, Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTCcs, DBTACs, Model Systems, DRRPs, FIP, and SBIRs), Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

NIDRR is planning to work with other ED staff to conduct an audit of publications entered into the Web-based project performance reporting systems to verify grantees' self-reports of publications.

Limitations: Data on 2002 and 2003 peer-reviewed publications are limited to only the three NIDRR program funding mechanisms (i.e., RERCs, RRTCcs, SCI, TBI and Burn Model Systems) that were required to provide citations in the existing APPR. In addition, data for these two years may underrepresent the number of refereed publications due to terminating centers with no-cost extensions of 6 months or longer, which would delay the submission of final reports beyond the data collection period for the 2002 and 2003 measures. Another possible limitation involves reliance on a single aggregate measure of scientific productivity regardless of amount of award or nature of research conducted. Refereed journal articles may be a better indicator of scientific productivity for awards in medical rehabilitation research than they are for other areas of NIDRR's portfolio related to community integration and product development.

Improvements: NIDRR plans to correct these limitations through the redesigned APPR, which will collect publication data from four additional program funding mechanisms (DBTACs, DRRPs, FIPs, and KDU projects), and additional analyses of variations in publication rates across program mechanisms with the aim of creating sub-measures.

Explanation: The 2004 target was not met. The average number of peer-reviewed journal articles published in 2003 per award varied across program types from a high of 4.95 for Model Systems (183 publications/37 centers) to 1.66 for RRTCcs (48/29) and .96 for RERCcs (22/23). The same ordering was observed for 2002-

refereed publications, although the numbers were different. Average peer-reviewed publications per award increased approximately 1.5 points for Model Systems (from 3.48), whereas RRTC's declined by almost the same amount (from 2.89), and RERCs stayed relatively the same (from 1.1 to .96). Variations in performance by program type are most likely due to differences in the nature of R&D activities conducted (i.e. medical rehabilitation research vs. psychosocial research and engineering design) and differences in publication practices and expectations associated with these disciplines. Variations over time probably have more to do with changes in the number and types of centers reporting in a given year as a result of natural fluctuations in funding cycles.

Indicator 2.2 of 3: Percentage of new studies funded by NIDRR that assess the effectiveness of interventions, programs, and devices using rigorous and appropriate methods.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of new studies that assess the effectiveness of interventions, programs, and devices using rigorous and appropriate methods.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	65	
2003	59	
2004	59	
2005		999

Source: Contractor Performance Report, Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, Model Systems, DBTACs, DRRPs, and FIPs.), Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Improvements: To reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of collecting qualitative judgments from experts panels in 2004 and 2005, NIDRR will experiment with using Internet-based alternatives to face-to-face program-review-type meetings.

Explanation: This is a new activity-oriented annual measure. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. 2005 data will come from the revised Web-based annual project performance reporting system (APPR) and judgments of expert panelists participating in NIDRR's new portfolio assessment system.

Indicator 2.3 of 3: The percentage of grantee research and development that has appropriate study design, meets rigorous standards of scientific and/or engineering methods, and builds on and contributes to knowledge in the field.

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: The percentage of grantee research and development that has appropriate study design, meets rigorous standards of scientific and/or engineering methods, and builds on and contributes to knowledge in the field.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	82	
2003	96	

2004	89	
2005	99	999

Source: Peer Review

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was met, based on the scores from 77 grantees. The methodology for assessment of quality of funded projects changed in 2004. As of 2005, NIDRR no longer uses a second expert review of peer review of grantee research designs. The current measure is calculated as the Percentage of funded grant applications that received an average peer review score of 85 or higher. The trend data have been recalculated using the new methodology.

Objective 3 of 3: *Advance knowledge through translation and dissemination: Promote the effective use of scientific-based knowledge, technologies, and applications to inform policy, improve practice, and enhance the lives of individuals with disabilities.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: The number of new or improved assistive and universally designed technologies, products, and devices developed by grantees that are judged by an expert panel to be effective in improving outcomes and have the potential to be transferred to industry for commercialization.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The number of new or improved assistive and universally designed technologies, products, and devices that are judged by an expert panel to be effective in improving outcomes and have the potential to be transferred to industry for commercialization.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1820-0642 Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utilization Projects).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Review by expert panels.

Improvements: To reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of collecting qualitative judgments from experts panels, in 2004 NIDRR will experiment with using Internet-based alternatives to face-to-face program-review-type meetings.

Explanation: This measure was revised for 2005 and is an output-oriented annual performance measure. Baseline data were not collected in FY 2004 as expected. The FY 2005 target is to establish a preliminary baseline using the 2005 pilot version of the redesigned Web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and judgments of expert panels.

**Goal 5: Enhance the
Quality and Access to
Postsecondary and Adult
Education**

AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.191 - Adult Education National Leadership Activities

Program Goal: National Programs (Adult Education and Literacy Act) (new-2002) - 2002

Objective 1 of 1: *To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The National Reporting System (NRS), which supports performance-based reporting, will be fully implemented in all states to consistently provide high-quality learner assessment data.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of states yielding high-quality learner assessment data.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	50	
2003	65	75
2004	75	95
2005		96

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Program monitoring and data review and analysis by ED and Data Quality Certification Process. Data will be verified by electronic checks and expert staff analysis, and by requiring confirmation and attestation of data by state directors. State data are also checked independently by ED/OVAE during on-site monitoring and state audit reviews.

Limitations: Total data quality and full systems development are dependent on investments of staff and resources by states to adopt and adapt the models developed and promoted by ED/OVAE. States are supported by the technical assistance and expertise provided by ED.

Explanation: The 2004 target was not met, but the program made progress. Performance reporting is largely on learner assessment data. The NRS requires greater validity and reliability of this data. OVAE policies are requiring continuous improvement of state-level assessment data. States are at various levels of expertise and capacity to collect high-quality assessment data. The percentage of states yielding high quality assessment data increased by 10 percentage points from prior year and by 25 percentage points from baseline year data. This increase in performance correlates with targeted compliance monitoring and technical assistance to specific states. The percentage of states yielding high quality data is expected to increase as a result of continued technical assistance.

AEFLA: Adult Education State Grants - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.002 - Adult Education State Grant Program

Program Goal: To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.

Objective 1 of 1: Provide adult learners with opportunities to acquire basic foundation skills (including English language acquisition), complete secondary education, and transition to further education and training and to work.

Indicator 1.1 of 5: Basic skill acquisition: The percentage of adults in Adult Basic Education programs who acquire the level of basic skills needed (validated by standardized assessments) to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of adults in Adult Basic Education programs who acquire the level of basic skills needed to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Percentage of adults	Percentage of adults
1997	40	
1998	31	
1999	44	
2000	26	40
2001	36	40
2002	37	40
2003	38	41
2004	38	42
2005		42

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: As a third-tier recipient of these data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. OVAE uses data collection protocols that include standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review.

Improvements: The OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was not met. An increasing percentage of adults enrolled in English literacy programs acquired the level of English language they needed between FY 2001 and 2004. While there is a trend of improvement, we did not meet our target for 2004. To improve grantee performance on this measure, the Department has funded a three-year project called the Center for Adult English Language Acquisition, which has completed its first year. It provides direct technical assistance to states by holding a series of trainings for English as a second language (ESL) trainers from 23 states. It also publishes resources and maintains a Web collection.

Indicator 1.2 of 5: Basic English language acquisition: Percentage of adults enrolled in English Literacy programs will acquire (validated by standardized assessment) the level of English language skills needed to complete the levels of instruction in which they enrolled.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of adults enrolled in English literacy programs who acquire the level of English language skills needed to complete the levels of instruction in which they enrolled.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	30	
1997	28	
1998	28	
1999	49	
2000	20	40
2001	31	40
2002	34	42
2003	36	44
2004	36	45
2005		45

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: As a third-tier recipient of these data, the Department must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. The Department has improved the quality of data using data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review. The Department also provides technical assistance to states to improve the quality of data and, as a result in 2003, 38 states provided high-quality assessment data. In 2004, this figure increased to 44 states providing quality assessment data.

Improvements: The OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was not met. An increasing percentage of adults enrolled in English literacy

programs acquired the level of English language they needed between FY 2001 and 2004. While there is a trend of improvement, we did not meet our target for 2004. To improve grantee performance on this measure, the Department has funded a three-year project called the Center for Adult English Language Acquisition, which has completed its first year. It provides direct technical assistance to states by holding a series of trainings for English as a second language (ESL) trainers from 23 states. It also publishes resources and maintains a Web collection. Out-year targets have been adjusted because trend data suggest that they were inappropriately projected.

Indicator 1.3 of 5: Secondary completion: Percentage of adults with a high school completion goal and who exit during the program year that earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Percent of adults	Percent of adults
1996	36	
1997	37	
1998	33	
1999	34	
2000	34	40
2001	33	40
2002	42	40
2003	44	41
2004	45	42
2005		46

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

As a third-tier recipient of these data, the Department must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. The Department has improved the quality of data using data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review. The Department also provides technical assistance to states to improve the quality of data and, as a result in 2003, 38 states provided high-quality assessment data. In 2004, this figure increased to 44 states providing quality assessment data.

Limitations: As a third-tier recipient of these data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. OVAE uses data collection protocols that include standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting.

Improvements: The OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was exceeded. An increasing percentage of adults with a high school completion goal earned a high school diploma or recognized equivalent between FY 2001 and 2004. The Department attributes the increase in the percentage of adults who earned a high school diploma or recognized equivalent to technical assistance that focused on grantees setting higher targets for this performance measure. As a result, many states created initiatives to encourage adults to earn their GEDs (General Educational Development, a high school equivalency diploma), for example, some states offered GED recipients a scholarship for the first semester of postsecondary education. In addition, the Department sponsored "train the trainers" professional development activities that equipped teachers to prepare students for the new GED test, provided technical assistance to states on options for providing distance learning, and encouraged states to offer GED courses online.

Indicator 1.4 of 5: Transition to postsecondary education or training: Percentage of enrolled adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who exit during the program year that enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: Percentage of adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults	Number of adults	Percentage of adults
1996	175,255			
1997	178,520			
1998	158,167			
1999	148,803			
2000	161,650		300,000	
2001		25		
2002		30		25
2003		30		26
2004		30		27
2005				30

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: As a third-tier recipient of these data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. OVAE uses data collection protocols that include standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and a data quality review.

Improvements: The OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was exceeded.

Indicator 1.5 of 5: Transition to work: The percentage of unemployed adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.

Measure 1.5.1 of 1: Percentage of adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults	Number of adults	Percentage of adults
1996	306,982			
1997	340,206			
1998	294,755			
1999	409,062			
2000	454,318		425,000	
2001		36		
2002		39		36
2003		37		37
2004		36		38
2005				40

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: As a third tier recipient of these data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. OVAE uses data collection protocols that include standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and a data quality review.

Improvements: The OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was not met.

AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.257 - National Institute for Literacy

Program Goal: To provide knowledge and resources to improve literacy instruction across the lifespan

Objective 1 of 2: *Translate findings from scientifically based or the most rigorous research available into useful information and products for practitioners.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Research to Practice: Translate findings from scientifically based or the most rigorous research available into useful information and products for practitioners.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of recipients who say they will use the product and/or information to improve instructional practice and/or service delivery within six months.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	100	999
2005	94	95

Source: Contractor Training & Technical Assistance evaluations.

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: This measure was new for FY 2004. FY 2004 data established the baseline. In future years, the program will add a follow-up component to determine actual use of information versus intention only.

Objective 2 of 2: *Disseminate high-quality information and resources on literacy.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Dissemination: Disseminate high-quality information and resources on literacy.

Measure 2.1.1 of 2: Number of visitors to NIFL Web site (in millions).		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005	1.80	1.50

Measure 2.1.2 of 2: Percentage of visitors to any of the "special collections" of high quality literacy resources who stay 5 minutes or more.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005	38	35

Source: NIFL will use software that tracks the length of time visitors stay on the "special collections" of high-quality literacy resources.

Frequency: Monthly.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: FY 2005 data will establish the baseline. In addition, there were 1.8 million visits to the NIFL Web site.

ATA: Assistive Technology Alternative Financing - FY 2005

Program Goal: To increase availability of, funding for, access to, and provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services.

Objective 1 of 1: *Facilitate the change of laws and policies to obtain increased availability or provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Outcome-oriented measure of loans: The number of loans to individuals with disabilities per \$1 million in federal investment and state matching funds.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Number of loans to individuals with disabilities per \$1 million federal investment and state matching funds					
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets
	Fed dollars in Millions	State dollars in Millions	# of loans	# of loans per 1million dollars invested	# of loans per 1million dollars invested
2000	3.80	3.80	247	33	
2001	13.60	4.60	594	33	
2003	35.80	13	753	15	
2004	54	22	1,121	15	33
2005					33

Source: Annual Web-based reporting system.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Limitations: 19 of 31 grantees reported their 2004 data. The data collection system was not approved for use by OMB until April 2005, resulting in States either (a) not collecting data or (b) having a backlog of data to enter.

Explanation: The target for FY 2004 was not met. However, this is likely due to incomplete data. FY2004 performance was calculated as number of loans per \$1 million in Federal and State funds cumulatively since the inception of the program rather than funds in FY2004 only. This change was necessary because no new funds were distributed in FY2004. This measure will be discontinued for FY2006.

ATA: Assistive Technology Programs - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.224 - Assistive Technology

Program Goal: To increase availability of, funding for, access to, and provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services.

Objective 1 of 1: *Facilitate the change of laws and policies to obtain increased availability or provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Outcomes-oriented measure: The percentage of grantees whose activities resulted in legislative and/or policy changes that are deemed to have increased the availability or provision of assistive technology devices and/or services

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of grantees whose activities resulted in legislative and/or policy changes that are deemed to have increased the availability or provision of assistive technology devices and/or services		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	95	
1998	95	
1999	88	95
2000	50	95
2001	78	95
2002	63	95
2003	63	95
2004	57	95
2005		95

Source: Web-based data collection system.

Date Sponsored: 12/31/2003.

Frequency: Annually.

Limitations: For FY 2004, only 54 of the 56 programs reported data. Two programs did not meet the reporting deadline. For FY 2005, the OMB approval of the data collection instrument expired, so no data were collected. RSA is developing a new data collection instrument to be consistent with the new program in the reauthorized AT Act.

Explanation: The target was not met for FY2004. The AT Act was reauthorized in Oct. 2004, creating a new grant program. Therefore, this systems-change measure will be discontinued and a new measure in place for FY 2006. No data were collected for FY 2005 because of the expiration of the data collection instrument.

EDA: Gallaudet University - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.910A - Gallaudet University Programs and Elementary and Secondary Education Programs
 84.910B - Gallaudet University Endowment Grant
 84.910D - Gallaudet University Construction Program

Program Goal: To challenge students who are deaf, graduate students who are deaf, and graduate students who are hearing, to achieve their academic goals and obtain productive employment, provide leadership in setting the national standard for best practices in education of the deaf and hard of hearing, and establish a sustainable resource base.

Objective 1 of 3: *The University Programs and the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School will optimize the number of students completing programs of study.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Enrollment at Gallaudet University: Maintain minimum enrollment numbers in Gallaudet's undergraduate, graduate, and professional studies programs, as well as the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School as established by Gallaudet University.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: University Enrollment						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional Studies	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional Studies
1998	1,339	714	92			
1999	1,300	628	70	1,250	700	70
2000	1,318	541	86	1,250	700	70
2001	1,321	625	93	1,250	700	70
2002	1,243	517	92	1,250	700	70
2003	1,243	617	154	1,250	700	70
2004	1,236	506	70	1,250	700	70
2005	1,207	451	176	1,250	650	70

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: Clerc Center Enrollment				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Model Sec. School	Kendall Elem. School	Model Sec. School	Kendall Elem. School
1998	224	137		

1999	209	117	225	140
2000	219	135	225	140
2001	205	148	225	140
2002	188	148	225	140
2003	190	152	225	140
2004	186	145	225	140
2005	182	142	225	140

Source: Collegiate Office of Enrollment Services, and Clerc Center student database, FY 2005 enrollment as of October 2004, summarized in Gallaudet's FY 2004 annual report, submitted in 2005.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: To improve the accuracy of student count information the University implemented a new calculation method for determining enrollment. Under the method of calculation a degree-seeking student or graduate student who is also enrolled in a Professional Studies Course is only counted once. This new method will be closely monitored to ascertain its validity. The university enrollment targets for 2005 were exceeded for professional studies, but not met for undergraduate or graduate. The Clerc Center targets were not met for MSSD. but exceeded for Kendall Elementary.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Student retention rate: Increase the undergraduate retention rate and increase or maintain the graduate student retention rate.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: University Student Retention Rates - %				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Graduate
1998	72			
1999	73		75	
2000	72	78	76	80
2001	71	82	76	82
2002	73	98	76	
2003	71	86	79	
2004	73	89	79	86
2005	76	93	79	86

Source: Collegiate Office of the Register records, summarized in the FY 2004 annual report, submitted in 2005.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The 2005 target for University undergraduates was not met; the graduate target was exceeded.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Student graduation rates: By 2008, the undergraduate graduation rate will reach 48 percent; the graduate student and Model Secondary School student graduation rates will be increased or maintained.

Measure 1.3.1 of 2: University Students' Graduation Rates - %				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Graduate
1998	41			
1999	42		41	
2000	41	82	42	80
2001	41	82	43	80
2002	42	82	44	
2003	42	82	45	
2004	42	84	45	82
2005	42	86	46	83
2006			47	
2007			47	
2008			48	

Measure 1.3.2 of 2: Clerc Center - Model Secondary School graduation rate - %		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	93	
1999	88	94
2000	98	94
2001	90	94
2002	80	94
2003	71	94
2004	71	94
2005	75	94

Source: Collegiate Office of the Registrar and the Clerc Center Office of Exemplary Programs and Research records, summarized in FY 2004 annual report, submitted in 2005.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Limitations: The Clerc Center (MSSD) graduation rates reported here give an incomplete picture of the graduation status of seniors from fiscal year 2001 onward. There is a need to reconceptualize how performance is assessed to make this indicator a more valid reflection of actual graduation rates. Graduation from MSSD is more than completion of required course work. Graduation signals that students have successfully met their

IEP goals, so that graduation becomes an IEP decision. Students may graduate at the end of their senior year, or they may make the decision, as part of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) process, to change their graduation so they may continue to pursue their IEP goals, or they may elect to take the fifth year option. Clerc Center personnel are currently in the process of redefining graduation outcomes and indicators at MSSD to reflect progress through school and changes in graduation requirements and program options. The Clerc Center will work with the Department in an effort to propose a revised indicator(s) and performance measure(s) to better show MSSD graduation rates.

Explanation: The undergraduate graduation rates are calculated as the number of graduates in one year over the number of entering students six years previously. The undergraduate target was not met, yet the rate has been holding steady for the past 4 years. The graduate target was exceeded. In fiscal year 2004, 71 percent of the Model School seniors completed all graduation requirements by the end of their senior year. An additional 11 students deferred graduation until 2005 in order to complete graduation requirements and IEP goals. Therefore, the total graduation rate for the fiscal year 2004 senior class has been revised to 87 percent, which did not meet the target. For FY 2005, 36 students graduated and 11 elected to return as 2nd-year seniors (to graduate in June 2006). Therefore the 2005 figure is preliminary, depending the results for the 11 2nd-year seniors.

Objective 2 of 3: *Gallaudet works in partnership with others to develop and disseminate educational programs and materials for deaf and hard-of-hearing students.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Use of the Demonstration Schools' expertise: Other programs and/or institutions adopting innovative curricula and other products, or modifying their strategies as a result of Model and Kendall's leadership, will be maintained or increased.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Numbers of programs adopting Model/Kendall innovative strategies/curricula		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	41	
1999	52	41
2000	62	41
2001	39	41
2002	56	41
2003	54	41
2004	91	50
2005	56	55

Source: Records of the Clerc Center Office of Training and Professional Development, summarized in the FY 2004 Annual Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The number of new programs adopting innovations from year to year will vary and depends in part on the number and type of strategies and curricula being disseminated by the Clerc Center and the financial and personnel resources available within other programs for training and implementation activities. The FY 2005 target was exceeded.

Objective 3 of 3: *Curriculum and extracurricular activities prepare students to meet the skill requirements of the workplace or to continue their studies.*

Indicator 3.1 of 2: Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the University: Gallaudet's bachelor's graduates will either find employment commensurate with their training and education or attend advanced education or training programs during their first year after graduation.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of graduates that are employed or in advanced education or training during first year after graduation				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Students Employed	Students in Advanced Education or Training	Students Employed	Students in Advanced Education or Training
2001	90	38	77	38
2002	89	49		
2003	79	40		
2004	73	38	80	40
2005	69	36	81	41

Source: University study on the status of graduates' employment and advanced studies

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: Gallaudet disaggregated this indicator to reflect the number of students who are employed (full or part time) and those in advanced education (master's or Ph.D. program) or training (vocational or technical program, or another type of program, e.g., law school or medical school) programs. The annual percentages may exceed 100 percent because some respondents were both employed and enrolled in advance education or training in the same year. Neither 2005 target was met.

Indicator 3.2 of 2: Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the Model Secondary School: A high percentage of the Model Secondary School graduates will either find jobs commensurate with their training or will attend postsecondary programs.

Measure 3.2.1 of 1: The percentage of Model Secondary School graduates that are in jobs or postsecondary programs during first year after graduation		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	74	
2001	72	80
2002	90	80
2003	82	80
2004	83	80
2005	83	81

Source: Clerc Center Exemplary Programs and Research.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The 2005 target was exceeded, and the performance held steady for a second year.

EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.908A - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Operations
84.908B - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Endowment Program
84.908C - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Construction Program

Program Goal: To provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate programs and professional studies with state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, undertake a program of applied research; share NTID expertise and expand outside sources of revenue

Objective 1 of 3: Provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate and professional studies with outstanding state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, complemented by a strong arts and sciences curriculum and supplemented with appropriate student support services.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Enrollment: Maintain a minimum student body of undergraduates, graduates, and educational interpreters as established by NTID.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Number of students						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Undergraduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.	Undergraduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.
1995	1,035	59	10			
1996	1,038	59	27			
1997	1,069	72	32			
1998	1,085	84	36			
1999	1,135	93	50	1,080	100	50
2000	1,084	77	59	1,080	100	50
2001	1,089	75	55	1,080	100	50
2002	1,125	53	60	1,080	100	75
2003	1,093	65	73	1,080	100	75
2004	1,064	92	114	1,080	100	75
2005	1,055	100	126	1,080	100	90

Source: National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office records.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The undergraduate program did not meet its 2005 targets, primarily due to more rigorous entrance

requirements. The Educational Interpreter program met its enrollment targets, and the Graduate/Masters in Special Education target was exceeded.

Objective 2 of 3: Maximize the number of students successfully completing a program of study

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Graduation rate: By 2008, the overall student graduation rate will be 60 percent.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Student graduation rates, in percent						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate
1997	50	50	51			
1998	51	50	57			
1999	53	50	61			
2000	53	50	63	53	51	61
2001	54	50	64	53	51	61
2002	57	54	66	53	52	61
2003	56	52	68	53	52	61
2004	56	51	68	57	52	69
2005	55	48	69	57	52	69
2006				58	53	70
2007				59	53	71
2008				60	54	72

Source: National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office Records.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The Sub-Baccalaureate target was not met in 2005. There was an unusually high first year withdrawal rate for the 1998 entering freshmen. It is unknown why the first year sub-bac persistent rate was 10 percentage points below the historical average of 70 percent. The target for the Baccalaureate students was met.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Student retention rate: The first-year student overall retention rate for students in sub-baccalaureate and baccalaureate programs will meet or exceed established targets.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: Student retention rates, in percent						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate
1997	76	85	84			
1998	74	73	81			

1999	74	69	84			
2000	74	69	85	74	73	84
2001	74	68	86	74	74	84
2002	77	72	87	74	74	84
2003	76	70	86	74	74	84
2004	75	70	86	74	74	84
2005	75	70	85	75	74	86

Source: NTID Registrar office records

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The targets for Sub-Baccalaureate and Baccalaureate retention rates were not met. The Sub-Bac rate has maintained over the last 3 years. The Baccalaureate rate declined from the previous year. It is only 1 percent below the 86 percent rate for hearing freshman entering the Rochester Institute of Technology.

Objective 3 of 3: Prepare graduates to find satisfying jobs in fields commensurate with the level of their academic training.

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Placement rate: Maintain a high percentage of graduates placed in the workforce.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: Placement rate, in percent		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995	94	
1996	96	
1997	97	
1998	95	
1999	94	95
2000	90	95
2001	92	95
2002	89	95
2003	93	95
2004	93	95
2005		95

Source: National Technical Institute for the Deaf Placement Records for FY 2003

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: Placement rate data are reported the year after graduation. The placement rates are calculated as the percentage of graduates who are employed among those who want to be employed. Those individuals who continue their education or who are not seeking employment, for whatever reasons, in the respective years are not included. This calculation is also used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The 2005 target was not met.

ESEA: Community Technology Centers - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.341 - Community Technology Centers

Program Goal: To provide disadvantaged residents of economically distressed urban and rural communities with increased access to information technology and related training.

Objective 1 of 1: Disadvantaged students within distressed communities receiving community technology centers grants will have greater access to services that helped them to improve their academic performance.

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Greater Access: Increasing numbers of disadvantaged students in high schools within distressed areas will have access to services that help them to improve their academic performance.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Number of disadvantaged students in high schools, within distressed areas, who have received instruction in reading and math and other academic support that helped them to improve their academic performance.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	33,840	999
2005		999

Source: Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: No data will be available for this indicator for FY 2005 because the focus of the CTC program changed with the funding of new projects on June 30, 2004.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Increasing numbers of grantees will provide adult education.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Number of grantees providing adult education.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	307	999
2005		999

Source: Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: No data will be available for this indicator for FY 2005 because the focus of the CTC program changed with the funding of new projects on June 30, 2004.

HEA: Aid for Institutional Development Title III & Title V - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.031 - Higher Education Institutional Aid
 84.031B - Strengthening HBCUs and Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions
 84.031N - Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions
 84.031S - Title V Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program
 84.031T - Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities
 84.120A - Minority Science and Engineering Improvement

Program Goal: To improve the capacity of Minority-Serving Institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.

Objective 1 of 3: *Improve the academic quality of participating institutions.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Academic Quality: The percentage of Title III and Title V project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that have been met or exceeded.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	88	75
2003	80	75
2004	76	75
2005		91
2006		91
2007		92
2008		92
2009		93
2010		93

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0764 Final Performance Report for Grants Under Title III - Institutional Aid Programs.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

These data are self-reported by grantees. Program staff employ data quality checks to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted. Project reports do not distinguish between the scope and/or effect of the project goals: small and large goals are both counted in the same manner, and institutions' goals change

dramatically from year to year.

Explanation: In FY 2003 and 2004, we exceeded our targets for meeting grantee project goals relating to academic quality. From FY 2002 to 2004, overall trends indicate a decrease in the percentage of Title III and Title V project goals that were met or exceeded. Such trends may reflect grantees making progress for a subset of the more easily achieved grantee goals. This would have the dual benefit of helping grantees build from a position of accomplishment, with a series of small wins, and allowing grantees to gain practice in the smaller and more manageable project goals before addressing the more complex and difficult goals. The Department has begun targeted technical assistance and training for project directors in the areas of institutional management and fiscal stability, student services and student outcomes, and academic quality, as well as performance management and the use of data to drive decisions, in order to begin to enhance grantee performance. The Department does not plan to continue this measure in FY 2006.

Objective 2 of 3: *Improve the institutional management and fiscal stability of the participating Institutions.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Institutional Management and Fiscal Stability: The percentage of Title III and Title V project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management and fiscal stability that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management or fiscal stability that have been met or exceeded.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	78	75
2003	72	75
2004	69	75
2005		81
2006		82
2007		83
2008		84
2009		85
2010		86

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0764 Final Performance Report for Grants Under Title III - Institutional Aid Programs.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

These data are self-reported by grantees. Program staff employ data quality checks to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted. Project reports do not distinguish between the scope and/or effect of the project goals: small and large goals are both counted in the same manner, and institutions' goals change dramatically from year to year.

Explanation: In FY 2003 and 2004 we did not meet grantee targets for meeting project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management and fiscal stability. Goals relating to fiscal stability are among the most important and most difficult to achieve for all institutions. Title III and V institutions, which target underserved populations, do not have large endowments or capital campaigns, but face the same financial pressures that all institutions of postsecondary education must address. The Department has realigned priorities to focus on building partnerships with these institutions; across the federal government, a variety of approaches are being

examined for partnerships and other vehicles to help these institutions maintain fiscal strength. From FY 2002 to 2004, overall trends indicate a decrease in the percentage of Title III and Title V project goals that were met or exceeded in institutional management and fiscal stability.

Objective 3 of 3: *Improve the student services and student outcomes of the participating Institutions.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Student Services and Student Outcomes: The percentage of Title III and Title V project goals relating to the improvement of student services and student outcomes that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Title III and Title V project goals relating to the improvement of student services or student outcomes that have been met or exceeded.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	86	75
2003	81	75
2004	77	75
2005		91
2006		91
2007		92
2008		92
2009		93
2010		93

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0764 Final Performance Report for Grants Under Title III - Institutional Aid Programs.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

These data are self-reported by grantees. Program staff employ data quality checks to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted. Project reports do not distinguish between the scope and/or effect of the project goals: small and large goals are both counted in the same manner and institutions' goals change dramatically from year to year.

Explanation: In FY 2003 and 2004, we exceeded our targets for meeting grantee project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality. From FY 2002 to 2004, overall trends indicate a decrease in the percentage of Title III and Title V project goals that were met or exceeded in academic quality. Such trends may reflect grantees making progress for a subset of the more easily achieved grantee goals. This would have the dual benefit of helping grantees build from a position of accomplishment, with a series of small wins, and allowing grantees to gain practice in the smaller and more manageable project goals before addressing the more complex and difficult goals. The Department has begun targeted technical assistance and training for project directors in the areas of institutional management and fiscal stability, student services and student outcomes, and academic quality, as well as performance management and the use of data to drive decisions, in order to begin to enhance grantee performance. The Department does not plan to continue this measure in FY 2006.

HEA: Byrd Honors Scholarships - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.185 - Byrd Honors Scholarships

Program Goal: To promote student excellence and to recognize exceptionally able students who show promise of continued excellence

Objective 1 of 1: *Byrd scholars will successfully complete postsecondary education programs at high rates.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Completion of postsecondary education programs: Byrd scholars will successfully complete postsecondary education programs within 4 years.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of Byrd scholars graduating within 4 years		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	98	90
2003	98	26
2004	92	26
2005		95

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0598 Robert C. Bryd Honors Scholarship Program Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by states, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Limitations: Data are based on grantee reports of varying quality and accuracy on the number of Byrd Scholars graduating. To improve the accuracy of the data, program staff developed a revised annual report and are working with the states, so that a more accurate calculation of data will be available to evaluate the program measure.

Explanation: The 2003 performance data of 98% for Byrd scholars graduating within 4 years was based only on those Byrd scholars who received program funding for four consecutive years. But in 2004, this calculation was revised to include all Byrd scholars, regardless of the number of years of grant funding. Therefore, the 92% four year graduation rate in 2004 does not necessarily represent a real decline in performance from 98%, but is the result of the new calculation. Based on actual performance for 2004, the target of 26% was revised for 2005. The program far exceeded its original performance target for 2004.

HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents in School - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.335 - Child Care Access Means Parents in School

Program Goal: To support the participation of low-income parents in the postsecondary education system through the provisions of campus-based child care services.

Objective 1 of 1: Increase access for low-income parents to postsecondary institutions.

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Persistence rate: The percentage of students receiving child care services who persist in postsecondary education.

Measure 1.1.1 of 4: Median percentage of persistence rate (1999 Cohort)		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	79	

Measure 1.1.2 of 4: Median percentage of persistence rate (2001 Cohort)		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	78	80
2004	74	80

Measure 1.1.3 of 4: Median percentage of persistence rate (2002) Cohort		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		80
2005		80

Measure 1.1.4 of 4: Median percentage of persistence rate (2005) Cohort		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2007		80
2008		80

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0763 18 and 36 months Performance Reports for the Child Care Access Parents in Schools Program.

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: September 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Data are supplied by child care centers with no formal verification procedure provided.

Explanation: For the 1999 cohort of students receiving child care services, performance data were collected through 18-month reports (covering the period Sept. 1999 through Feb. 2001) and 36-month reports (covering the period Sept. 1999 through Aug. 2002). Data are presented (as median percentages) under 2001 -- the end of the 18-month performance period. For the 2001 cohort of students receiving child care services, performance data were collected through 18-month reports (covering the period Oct. 2001 through Mar. 2003) and are presented under 2003, the end of the performance period. The 36-month performance report contained data through Sept. 2004. Data for the 2002 cohort of students have been collected for the 18-month performance report for the period Sept. 2002 through Mar. 2004, and for the 36-month performance report for the period ending Aug. 2005. However, these data will not be reported. Instead, the program has calculated the persistence rate for all program participants for 2004; data are presented for this measure beginning in 2006.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Completion rate: The percentage of students receiving child care services who complete postsecondary education.

Measure 1.2.1 of 4: Median percentage of completion rate (1999 Cohort)		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
- No Data -		

Measure 1.2.2 of 4: Median percentage of completion rate (2001 Cohort)		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	25	
2004		30

Measure 1.2.3 of 4: Median percentage of completion rate (2002 Cohort)		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		30
2005		30

Measure 1.2.4 of 4: Median percentage of completion rate (2005 Cohort)		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2007		30
2008		30

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0763 18 and 36 months Performance Reports for the Child Care Access Parents in Schools Program.

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: September 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Data are supplied by child care centers with no formal verification procedure provided.

Explanation: For the 2001 cohort of students receiving child care services, performance data were collected through 18-month reports (covering the period Oct. 2001 through Mar. 2003) and are presented (as median percentages) under 2003, the end of the performance period. The 36-month performance report contains data

through Sept. 2004. Data for the 2002 cohort of students have been collected for the 18-month performance report for the period Sept. 2002 through Mar. 2004 and for the 36-month performance report for the period ending Aug. 2005. However, these data will not be reported. Instead, the program has calculated the completion rate for all program participants for 2004; data are presented for this new measure beginning in 2006.

HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.149A - College Assistance Migrant Program

Program Goal: Assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students to successfully complete their first academic year of college and to continue at a postsecondary institution.

Objective 1 of 2: All CAMP students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: CAMP first year completion: Eighty-five percent of CAMP participants will successfully complete the first academic year of study at a postsecondary institution.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: CAMP participants completing the first year of their academic or postsecondary program.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	82	
2002	80	
2004		83
2005		85

Source: CAMP grantee annual performance reports

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Data were supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure has been applied.

Improvements: Improvements will be addressed in the Office of Migrant Education's 2004 data improvement plan.

Explanation: The measure of performance is developed by dividing the number of CAMP students who successfully completed the first year of college by the number of students that were funded to be enrolled in CAMP. The 2002-03 and 2003-04 data have been collected but have not yet been tabulated for all grantees.

Objective 2 of 2: A majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first year of college continue in postsecondary education.

Indicator 2.1 of 1: CAMP students continue in Postsecondary: A Majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first year of college will continue in postsecondary education.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of CAMP students who after completing first year continue their postsecondary education.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	78	
2002	75	
2004		79
2005		80

Source: CAMP grantee annual performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Data were supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure has been applied.

Explanation: The measure of performance is developed by dividing the number of CAMP students who continue to be enrolled in postsecondary education after completing their first year of college by the number of CAMP students who completed their first year of college. The 2002-03 and 2003-04 data have been collected but not tabulated for all grantees.

HEA: Demonstration Projects to Ensure Quality Higher Education for Students with Disabilities - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.333 - Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive a Higher Education

Program Goal: To improve the quality of higher education for students with disabilities.

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that faculty and administrators in institutions of higher education increase their capacity to provide a high-quality education to students with disabilities.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Teacher Training: The percentage of professors at grantee institutions who have received training on teaching methods for students with disabilities.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of professors trained.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Grantee performance report.

Limitations: Data are self-reported by grantees

Explanation: The Department plans to discontinue this measure for FY 2006. A new measure will be established that more closely reflects the program's goals.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Instructional resources produced: The number of comprehensive instructional resources regarding college students with disabilities produced and disseminated by grantees

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Number of instructional resources produced and disseminated		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: Grantee performance report.

Frequency: Semi-Annually.

Limitations: Data are self-reported by grantees.

Explanation: The Department plans to discontinue this measure for FY 2006. A new measure will be established that more closely reflects the program's goals.

HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.116 - Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

Program Goal: To improve postsecondary education by making grants to institutions in support of reform and innovation.

Objective 1 of 2: *Promote reforms that improve the quality of teaching and learning and Postsecondary institutions.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Replication of projects: The percentage of projects that are adapted in full or in part, or whose materials are used by other institutions.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of FIPSE grantees reporting full project dissemination to others		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	92	
1999	100	
2000	83	100
2001	96	85
2002	94.50	95
2003	88	95
2004	88	95
2005		95
2006		95
2007		95

Source: Final Report Scorecard

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Similar results from annual reports and site visit scorecards.

Limitations: Data supplied by project directors through survey responses.

Improvements: Program staff have revised the data collection form to match indicators more closely, based on an external evaluation funded by PPSS.

Explanation: Target values for FY 2003 and 2004 were not met, in part due to difficulties in data collection. FIPSE has shifted to a new online data collection instrument that will allow for more accurate calculation of this measure. After undertaking an external evaluation of this measure through Policy and Program Studies Service (PPSS), FIPSE has revised the target for this measure for FY 2006 and 2007 to reflect results of the evaluation and the changes in data collection. FY 2005 data will be available in December 2005.

Objective 2 of 2: Institutionalization of FIPSE programs

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Projects sustained: The percentage of projects sustained beyond Federal funding.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of projects reporting institutionalization on their home campuses		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	93	
1999	96	
2000	94	100
2001	100	95
2002	96	95
2003	96	95
2004	90	95
2005		95
2006		95
2007		95

Source: Final Report Scorecard. Assessment of projects based on review of final report sent within 90 days after the completion of projects.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Similar results from annual reports and site visit scorecards.

Limitations: Data supplied by project directors through survey responses.

Improvements: Program staff have revised the data collection form to match indicators more closely, based on an external evaluation funded by PPSS.

Explanation: Target value for FY 2004 was not met, in part due to difficulties in data collection. FIPSE has shifted to a new online data collection instrument that will allow for more accurate calculation of this measure. After undertaking an external evaluation of this measure through PPSS, FIPSE has revised the target for this measure for FY 2006 and 2007 to reflect results of the evaluation and the changes in data collection. FY 2005 data will be available in December 2005.

HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP) - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.334 - Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs
 84.334A - GEAR-UP Partnership Grants
 84.334S - GEAR-UP State Grants

Program Goal: To significantly increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education.

Objective 1 of 3: Increase the academic performance and preparation for postsecondary education of GEAR-UP students.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Completion of academically challenging curricula: Percentage of GEAR-UP students who passed prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade and Algebra 1 by the end of the 9th grade.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of GEAR-UP students who passed prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade and the percentage of GEAR-UP students who passed Algebra 1 by the end of the 9th grade.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Prealgebra	Algebra 1	Prealgebra	Algebra 1
2001	18			
2002	18			
2003	22	30	19	19
2004	29	21	20	20
2005			25	50
2006			30	22
2007			35	23

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1875-0180 Annual Performance Reporting for the Gaining Early Awareness.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

GEAR-UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency, and to assess the extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.

Explanation: Historical performance data through 2002 show the percentages of GEAR-UP students who were enrolled in prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade. Data for 2003 reflect the percentage of GEAR-UP students who were enrolled in prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade and in Algebra 1 by the end of the 9th grade. Data beginning in 2004 are collected on successful completion of core academic subjects and other college

preparatory courses. Standards to enter and complete above grade-level math courses (such as prealgebra and Algebra I for 7th graders) are becoming more rigorous. This practice may limit the percentage of students, in many schools served by GEAR-UP, who are entering and completing such courses. Data for each year were obtained from the GEAR-UP annual performance reports. For example: data for year 2004 were obtained from the GEAR-UP Annual Performance Report covering April 2003 - March 2004. Data are pending and will be available December 2005.

Objective 2 of 3: Increase the rate of high school graduation and participation in postsecondary education of GEAR-UP students.

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Attendance and promotion: GEAR-UP students will have high rates of attendance in school and be promoted to the next grade level on time.

Measure 2.1.1 of 2: Percentage of GEAR-UP 7th graders with fewer than five unexcused absences in the first two quarters of the academic year.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Attendance	Attendance
2001	83	
2002	88	
2003	87	89
2004	83	90
2005		90
2006		91
2007		92

Measure 2.1.2 of 2: Percentage of GEAR UP 7th graders promoted to the next grade level.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Promotion	Promotion
2001	98	
2002	97	
2003	98	97
2004	91	97
2005		97
2006		98
2007		98

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1875-0180 Annual Performance Reporting for the Gaining Early Awareness.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

GEAR-UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency, and to assess the extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.

Explanation: Data reflect the percentages of GEAR-UP 7th graders with fewer than 5 unexcused absences in the first 2 quarters of the academic year and those promoted to the next grade level. In 2005 data was collected on school attendance and grade level promotions. Standards for promotion have become more rigorous in many school districts and states that have GEAR-UP programs. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in 2006.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: High school graduation and participation in postsecondary education: GEAR-UP students will have high rates of high school graduation and postsecondary education enrollment.

Measure 2.2.1 of 2: Percentage of GEAR UP students who have completed high school.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2008		70
2009		72
2010		73

Measure 2.2.2 of 2: Percentage of former GEAR UP students who are enrolled in college.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2008		60
2009		62
2010		65

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1875-0180 Annual Performance Reporting for the Gaining Early Awareness.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2008

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency, and to assess the extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.

Explanation: Data will be collected in future years on GEAR-UP students' high school completion and postsecondary education enrollment.

Objective 3 of 3: Increase GEAR-UP students' and their families' knowledge of postsecondary education options, preparation, and financing.

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Knowledge of postsecondary education: GEAR-UP students and their families reporting having

knowledge of available financial aid and necessary academic preparation for college.

Measure 3.1.1 of 2: Percentage of parents of GEAR-UP students that have knowledge of available financial aid.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Parents: Aid	Parents: Aid
2001	24	
2002	31	
2003	35	32
2004	34	33
2005		35
2006		37
2007		38

Measure 3.1.2 of 2: Percentage of GEAR-UP students and their families that have knowledge of necessary academic preparation for college.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Students: Prep	Parents: Prep	Students: Prep	Parents: Prep
2001	50	31		
2002	53	39		
2003	57	43	54	40
2004	62	42	56	42
2005			61	46
2006			64	47
2007			66	48

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1875-0180 Annual Performance Reporting for the Gaining Early Awareness.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

GEAR-UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency, and to assess the extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.

Explanation: Data reflect the percentages of GEAR-UP students and their parents who have talked to school counselors, advisors, or someone else about academic preparation for college and college entrance requirements, as well as the percentages of GEAR-UP students' parents who have talked to school counselors, advisors, or someone else about availability of financial assistance. Data are pending and will be available December 2005.

HEA: Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.200 - Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need

Program Goal: To increase the number of persons trained at the highest academic level

Objective 1 of 1: *To increase the number of students of superior academic ability completing the terminal degree in designated areas of national need in order to alleviate that need.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Graduate School Completion: Increase the percentage of GAANN fellows who obtain the terminal degree in an area of national need.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of GAANN fellows completing the terminal degree in the designated areas of national need.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	12	12
2002	28	12
2003	47	
2004	51	
2005		28
2006		29
2008		30
2009		30
2010		31

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0748 GAANN Final Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data are supplied by institutions, which certify its accuracy.

Explanation: The program office developed a database to collect this information. The 2002 information contained data from the 1997 cohort only. Successive years combined two or more cohorts: 2003 information contained data from the 1998 cohort and the final performance reports from those of the 2000 cohort that finished in 2003. The 1998 cohort had a large number of PhDs and successful students, and the 2000 cohort had a large number of successful students, as well. Data in 2004 included those in the 2000 cohort that finished, as well as those in the 2001 cohort that completed their degrees. No targets were set for 2003 and

2004. Based on actual performance, program targets for 2006 and forward have been revised upward. Data for 2005 will be available in June 2006.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Enrollment of Underrepresented Populations: The percentage of GAANN fellows from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds completing the terminal degree in the designated area of national need.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of GAANN fellows from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds completing the terminal degree in the designated areas of national need.										
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets				
	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Women	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Women
1999	1	10	7	4	37					
2001	0	7	7	7	39					
2002	1	11	10	5	38					
2003	0	6	7	2	35	999	999	999	999	999
2004	1	9	7	9	41	0	6	7	2	35
2005						1	8	7	6	39
2006						1	11	10	5	39
2007						1	11	10	5	39.50
2008						1	11	10	5	40
2009						1	11	10	5	40.50
2010						1	11	10	5	41

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0748 GAANN Final Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: The performance of the GAANN program is limited in that the authorizing legislation recommends, but does not mandate, that grantees seek individuals from traditionally underrepresented groups when awarding fellowships. However, in responding to the selection criteria, grantees must address plans to include students from underrepresented groups.

Explanation: The program developed a database in 2004 to collect this information. Data in 2002 were from the 1997 cohort only. Successive years combine two or more cohorts: data in 2003 were from the 1998 cohort and from those in the 2000 cohort that finished. Data in 2004 include those in the 2000 cohort as well as those in the 2001 cohort that finished. These targets have been revised slightly in the 2006 plan. Data for 2005 will be available in June 2006.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Time to completion.: The median duration of time from entering graduate school until degree completion will be less than that of comparable doctoral students as identified annually in the Survey of Earned Doctorates.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Time to Degree completion		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	6.50	
2003	7.10	
2004	5.92	
2005		6.45
2006		6.40
2007		6.40
2008		6.40
2009		6.40
2010		6.40

Source 1: NSF, Survey of Earned Doctorates

References: .

Web Site: <http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/ssed/start.htm>.

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0748 GAANN Final Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

Explanation: The program developed a database to collect this information. Actual performance during the data collection period was compared to the National Research Council's Survey of Earned Doctorates for 2001-02 in which the average time to degree for comparable degrees was 7.5 years. Since the baseline for this measure was established in May 2004, no target was set for that year. These targets have been revised slightly in 2006 plan. The data for 2005 are pending and will be available in June 2006.

HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Programs - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.015A - National Resource Centers Program
 84.015B - Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship Program
 84.016 - Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs
 84.017 - International Research and Studies
 84.018 - International: Overseas Seminars Abroad Bilateral Projects
 84.019 - International: Overseas Faculty Research Abroad
 84.021 - International: Overseas Group Projects Abroad
 84.022 - International: Overseas Doctoral Dissertation
 84.153 - Business and International Education Projects
 84.220 - Centers for International Business Education
 84.229 - Language Resource Centers
 84.269 - Institute for International Public Policy
 84.274 - American Overseas Research Centers
 84.337 - Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access

Program Goal: To meet the nation's security and economic needs through the development of a national capacity in foreign languages, and area and international studies.

Objective 1 of 1: *Maintain a U.S. higher education system able to produce experts in less commonly taught languages and area studies who are capable of contributing to the needs of U.S. government, academic and business institutions.*

Indicator 1.1 of 7: Course Offerings: The number of foreign language course offerings by Title VI institutions.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of foreign language course offerings by Title VI institutions.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	24,737	
2005		20,000

Source: ,EELIAS

References: Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system.

Web Site: <http://www.eelias.org>.

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Program was on track to meet performance goal. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in FY 2006. FY 2005 data were not collected.

Indicator 1.2 of 7: Instructional Materials: The number of comprehensive instructional resources (assessments, publications, curricular materials, etc.) produced at Title VI institutions for higher education.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of comprehensive instructional resources produced at Title VI institutions for higher education.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	1,367	
2005		90

Source: ,EELIAS

References: Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system.

Web Site: <http://www.eelias.org>.

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Program was on track to meet performance goal. Target for 2005 underestimated the number of comprehensive instructional resources produced. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in FY 2006. FY 2005 data were not collected.

Indicator 1.3 of 7: Teacher Training: The number of K-12 teachers trained through the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays Programs.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The number of K-12 teachers trained through the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays Programs.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	528,543	
2005		5,000

Source: ,EELIAS

References: Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system.

Web Site: <http://www.eelias.org>.

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Program was on track to meet performance goal. Target for 2005 erroneously considered number of events instead of participants. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in FY 2006. Data for FY 2005 were not collected.

Indicator 1.4 of 7: Employment: The percentage of NRC and IIPP Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government service, and national security.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The percentage of NRC and IIPP Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government service, and national security.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	48.50	
2002	53.70	
2003	55	

2004	72	
2005		50

Source: ,EELIAS

References: NRC and IIPP Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system.

Web Site: <http://www.eelias.org>.

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Data for this measure reflected a combination of NRC and IIPP participants. Previously reported actual data for FY 2003 data were incorrectly reported (46%). FY 2003 data have been correctly recalculated for this measure.

NRC= National Resource Centers; IIPP= Institute for International Public Policy. See next indicator for transition to disaggregated data. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in FY 2006. Data for FY 2005 were not collected.

Indicator 1.5 of 7: Employment: The percentage of NRC Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government service, and national security.

Measure 1.5.1 of 1: The percentage of NRC Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government service, and national security.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		47.50

Source: ,EELIAS

References: NRC Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system.

Web Site: <http://www.eelias.org>.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: Data for this measure reflected only NRC graduates, and the measure was retained in FY 2006.

Indicator 1.6 of 7: Increase the percentage of critical languages taught.

Measure 1.6.1 of 1: The percentage of critical languages taught, as reflected by the list of critical languages referenced in the HEA Title VI program statute.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	56	
2004	56	
2005		74

Source: ,EELIAS

References: NRC and FLAS Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system.

Web Site: <http://www.eelias.org>.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: The measure was retained in FY 2006 under Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Program. Previously reported actual data for FY 2003 data were incorrectly reported (71%) and have been correctly recalculated and published for this measure.

Indicator 1.7 of 7: Increase the average competency score of Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship recipients.

Measure 1.7.1 of 1: The average competency score of Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship recipients at the end of one full year of instruction (post-test) minus the average competency score at the beginning of the year (pre-test).		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	1.30	
2004	1.20	
2005	1.20	1.20

Source: EELIAS

References: FLAS Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system.

Web Site: <http://www.eelias.org>.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2007

Explanation: Program appears on track to meet performance goal. Previously reported data for 2003 (1.2) were miscalculated and have been correctly recalculated and published for this measure.

HEA: Javits Fellowships - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.170 - Javits Fellowships

Program Goal: To provide financial assistance to graduate students who have demonstrated superior academic ability, achievement, and exceptional promise

Objective 1 of 1: *To enable students of superior ability in the arts, humanities, and social sciences to complete their terminal degree.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Graduate school completion: The percentage of Javits fellows who complete a terminal degree within 7 years.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Rates of doctorate attainment by Javits fellows 7 years from enrollment		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	30	
1999	26	
2003	31	29
2004	30	30
2005		31
2006		31
2007		32
2008		32
2009		33
2010		33

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0752 Performance Report for the Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Program.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Program data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Data for the cohort first receiving the fellowship in academic year 1997-98 are available for 2004, and show 30% of fellows completing the Ph.D. degree within 7 years. Data for FY 2005 will be available in December 2005.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Time to degree completion: Average time to degree completion for Javits fellows will be less than the national average.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Average time to degree completion for Javits fellows.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	6.30	
2004	6.30	
2005		6.30
2006		6.30
2007		6.20
2008		6.20

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0752 Performance Report for the Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Program.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Program data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: According to the most recent data provided by the 2003 Survey of Earned Doctorates, the median time to degree completion rate for all comparable graduate programs in the United States was 7.5 years in 2002. Javits Fellows are performing better than the average for all students. Data for FY 2005 will be available in December 2005.

HEA: Student Financial Assistance Policy - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.007 - Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants
 84.032 - Federal Family Education Loans
 84.033 - Federal Work-Study Program
 84.037 - Perkins Loan Cancellations
 84.038 - Federal Perkins Loan Program Federal Capital Contributions
 84.063 - Federal Pell Grant Program
 84.069 - Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership
 84.268 - Federal Direct Student Loans

Program Goal: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants, loans, and work-study in an efficient, financially sound and customer-responsive manner.

Objective 1 of 2: Ensure that low- and middle-income students will have the same access to postsecondary education that high-income students do.

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Percentage of unmet need: The percentage of unmet need considering all sources of financial aid, especially for low-income students.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: Percentage of Unmet Need for Undergraduates		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995	23	
1996	23	
1997	22	
1998	21.20	
1999	20.80	
2000	21.20	
2004	23.70	19.20
2008		18.70

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: Percentage of Unmet Need for Low-Income Undergraduates.				
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
	Dependent	Independent With Kids	Independent Without Kids	
1996	46.30	54.70	52.50	Independent Dependent With Kids Without Kids

1997	44.50	51.60	49			
1998	42.90	51.10	49			
1999	41.80	50.20	48.50			
2000	40.30	59.60	39.30			
2004	41.50	48.40	42.20	41.10	58.60	44.20
2008				40.10	57.60	43.20

Source: National Postsecondary Student Aid Study.

Date Sponsored: 01/31/2005.

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: August 2008

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: NPSAS data are collected only every four years.

Explanation: FY 2000 data were revised to reflect recalculation of National Postsecondary Student Aid Study data from (NPSAS:2000). Data from NPSAS 2008 are expected in August 2008 for FY 2008. FY 2004 data exceeded their target value. Beginning in FY 2006, this group of programs is presented individually.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: College enrollment rates: Postsecondary education enrollment rates for all students, and the enrollment gap between low- and high-income high school graduates.

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: The percentage of high school graduates aged 16-24 enrolling immediately in college - Total		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995	61.90	
1996	65	
1997	67	
1998	65.60	
1999	62.90	
2000	63.30	
2001	61.70	
2002	65.20	63.80
2003	63.90	64.10
2004		67
2005		67

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: The percentage of high school graduates aged 16-24 enrolling immediately in college by income.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Low	High	Difference	Low	High	Difference
1995	41.20	83.40	42.20			
1996	41.50	78	36.50			
1997	47.10	82	34.90			
1998	50.60	77.30	26.70			
1999	50.90	76	25.10			
2000	48.50	77.10	26.60			
2001	47.80	79.80	32			
2002	51	78.20	27.20			
2003	52.80	80.10	27.30	50	80	30
2004				52	81	29
2005				52	81	29

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Small subgroup sample sizes for low-income students lead to large yearly fluctuations in enrollment rates. Three-year weighted averages are used to smooth out these fluctuations; year-to-year differences should be interpreted with caution.

Explanation: The percentage of high school graduates aged 16 through 24 enrolling immediately in college has fluctuated since 1995, with recently available data for 2002 and 2003 indicating an increase in the percentage of high school graduates enrolled. In terms of meeting Departmental targets, results were mixed in 2002 and 2003, with the Department exceeding our target for 2002 and not meeting our target for 2003. This indicator reflects economic conditions, and so the slight fluctuations can be explained in part by changing economic conditions. These economic conditions vary for groups aggregated within the measure—students enrolling in two-year versus four-year institutions, and minority students versus the overall student population. To support increasing access to postsecondary education, the Department continues to simplify and integrate financial aid systems so as to increase the growth in the use of electronic applications and correspondingly decrease the number of paper applications for Federal Financial Aid, with the goal of making access to financial aid easier.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Targeting of Pell Grants: Pell Grant funds will continue to be targeted to those students with the greatest financial need: at least 75 percent of Pell Grant funds will go to students below 150 percent of poverty level.

<p>Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of Pell Grant funds going to students below 150 percent of the poverty line</p>
--

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	82	
1998	80	
1999	78	75
2000	78	75
2001	79	75
2002	78	75
2003	76	75
2004	76	75
2005		75

Source: Pell Grant Applicant/Recipient File..
Date Sponsored: 03/30/2004.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: Increases in the maximum award without other changes in the formulas used to award Pell Grants lowered the percentage of funds going to the neediest students. FY 2004 data exceeded the target value. Beginning in FY 2006, this group of programs is presented individually.

Objective 2 of 2: *Ensure that more students will persist in postsecondary education and attain degrees and certificates.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Completion rate: Completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in four-year and less-than-four-year programs; and the gap in completion rates between minority and nonminority students.

Measure 2.1.1 of 2: The percentage of full-time degree seeking students completing a four-year degree within 150 percent of the normal time required.							
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets
	Total	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference between Black and White	Difference between White and Hispanic	Total
1997	52.50	35.50	55.50	39.10	20	16.40	
1998	52.60	34.50	55.80	39.10	21.30	16.70	
1999	53	35.80	56	40.90	20.20	15.10	
2000	52.40	35.70	55.40	41.50	19.70	13.90	
2002	54.40	38.20	57.20	44.80	19	12.40	
2003	54.30	38.50	57.30	43.50	18.80	13.80	54

2004		55
2005		55

Measure 2.1.2 of 2: The percentage of full-time degree seeking students completing a less than 4-year program within 150% of the normal time required.							
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets
	Total	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference Between Black and White	Difference Between White and Hispanic	Total
1997	30.90	22.80	32.60	26.20	9.80	6.40	
1998	32.20	25.10	33.80	29.90	8.70	3.90	
1999	34.40	29.50	35.30	32.50	5.80	2.80	
2000	32.70	26.50	34	30.10	7.50	3.90	
2002	29.30	23.30	30.70	27	7.40	3.70	
2003	30.60	26.10	31.70	30.10	5.60	1.60	34
2004							35
2005							35

Source: Graduation Rate Survey (GRS)

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Data are subject to both Census and NCES validation procedures.

Limitations: Prior to the implementation of the Graduation Rate Survey (GRS), data were voluntarily submitted by institutions representing 87 percent of four-year students and 77 percent of two-year students; effective with school year (SY) 2003-04, data submission was mandatory.

Explanation: Previously published FY 2002 and 2003 data show a leveling off of completion rates, remaining relatively constant at 54.4 and 54.3 percent, respectively. The Department received Graduation Rate Survey data for this measure for FY 2001-03 as a single data set. The Department elected to process the most recent policy-relevant information first, so analysis and reporting began with FY 2003 and moved backwards to FY 2002 and then to FY 2001. FY 2001 data are the only previously unpublished data this year. A little over half of all full-time degree-seeking students completed a four-year degree within 150 percent of the normal time required in 2001. Trend data for this measure are consistent with data for FY 2001, indicating small fluctuations but small increases in postsecondary completion from 1997. There were no targets until 2003, when we exceeded our target of 54 percent. FY 2004 data are expected in March 2006. Beginning in FY 2006 this group of programs will be presented individually.

HEA: Student Aid Administration - FY 2005

Program Goal: Student Aid Administration

Objective 1 of 1: Student Aid Administration

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Reduce or maintain FSA business process unit cost

Measure 1.1.1 of 5: Unit Cost of Application Processing		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost
2004		999
2005		999

Measure 1.1.2 of 5: Unit Cost of Origination and Disbursement		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost
2004		999
2005		999

Measure 1.1.3 of 5: Unit Cost of Direct Loan Repayment		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost
2004		999
2005		999

Measure 1.1.4 of 5: Unit Cost of Direct Loan Consolidation		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost
2004		999
2005		999

Measure 1.1.5 of 5: Unit Cost of Default Collections		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost
2004		999
2005		999

Source: FSA Activity-Based Cost Model will be used to collect data.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: FSA has completed defining and validating the ABC methodology that it will use. In addition, reporting has been redesigned to address GAO concerns as well as the current needs of FSA. However, additional work is required from FSA subject matter specialists to allocate baseline resource data prior to using the ABC information. This effort will continue in FY 2005 and will be accomplished by the end of the calendar year. We will develop baseline unit costs for the business processes referenced. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2005 target is to maintain the level of the baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Pell Grant overpayments

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of Pell grant overpayments		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	3.40	
2002	3.30	3.40
2003	3.10	3.10
2004	2.80	3.10
2005		3.10

Source: Analysis of sampled Internal Revenue Service (IRS) income data compared to data reported on the Department of Education's Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) reported by the Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) and the Common Origination and Disbursement (COD) system.

Next Data Available: July 2006

HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.066A - TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers

Program Goal: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.

Objective 1 of 1: Increase postsecondary enrollment rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of EOC participants enrolling in college.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers' participants enrolling in college.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	57	
2003	57	
2004		57
2005		57.50
2006		58
2007		58.50

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0561 Talent Search and Education Opportunity Centers Programs Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Explanation: In 2003, more than half of all TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers participants program participants enrolled in college. Increasing targets reflect the aim of the TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers Program to increase the percentage of adult participants enrolling in college. There was no target for 2003, and data for 2004 and 2005 are pending. FY 2004 data are expected in December 2005. FY 2005 data are expected to be available in December 2006.

HEA: TRIO McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.217A - TRIO - McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement

Program Goal: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.

Objective 1 of 1: Increase postsecondary persistence and completion rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Graduate school enrollment and persistence: Percentages of McNair participants enrolling and persisting in graduate school.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of TRIO McNair participants enrolling in and persisting in graduate school.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Enrollment	Persistence	Enrollment	Persistence
1999	35	48		
2000	35	75	35	48
2001	40	66	35	48
2002	39	65	35	48
2003	36	78	36	75
2004			36	75
2005			36	70

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0640 Performance Report for the Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement Program.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Limitations: The primary data source is the annual performance report that comprises self-reported data.

Explanation: In 2003, McNair postbaccalaureate achievement exceeded the target; while the 38 percent enrollment rate was a decline from the previous year, it is still above the level of three and four years previous. Graduate school enrollment is in part influenced by economic conditions, and so the slight fluctuations in trend data can be explained by changing economic conditions. The 78 percent persistence rate for McNair in 2003 is

not comparable to previous years' persistence rates. The rate for 2003 is a one-year rate that assesses the percentage of McNair recipients who were enrolled at the end of their first year in graduate school in school year 2001-02 (1,407), and who were still enrolled at the end of school year 2002-03 (1,102). The previous years' persistence rates were cumulative persistence rates. This change from a cumulative persistence rate to an one-year rate was made to bring the persistence calculation for McNair more in line with the persistence calculations of other OPE programs. The targets for FY 2004-05 were based on 1999 performance; data for 2001-03 were not available when 2004-05 targets were set.

HEA: TRIO Student Support Services - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.042A - TRIO Student Support Services

Program Goal: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.

Objective 1 of 1: Increase postsecondary persistence and completion rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Postsecondary persistence and completion: Percentages of Student Support Services participants persisting and completing a degree at the same institution.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of TRIO Student Support Services participants persisting and completing a degree at the same institution.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	College Persistence	College Completion	College Persistence	College Completion
1999	67	29		
2000	67		67	29
2001	70		67	29
2002	72		67	29
2003			68	29.50
2004			68.50	30
2005			69	30.50
2006			69.50	30.50
2007			70	31

Source: Evaluation, Higher Education.

Section: [The National Evaluation of Upward Bound: Summary of First-year Impacts and Program Operations \(1997\)](#).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

The baseline data from the National Study of the Student Support Services Program met the data collection standards of the Department of Education. The persistence rate is calculated by measuring the average fall to spring one-year persistence for undergraduate students. The annual performance report comprises self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Explanation: Trend data indicate that persistence rates for TRIO Student Support Services participants have increased from FY 1999-02. Data from the national study of the Student Support Services Program provided the baseline (1999 actual performance). The re-designed Student Support Services' annual performance report was used to determine if the performance targets for college persistence were met. The six-year college completion baseline of 29% included only SSS students who remained at the same school through graduation. It was set at this level because the annual performance reports only reported the academic progress of SSS participants that remained at the grantee institution. Preliminary data showed that the graduation rate of SSS participants who were college freshmen in 2001-02 was 12%. This rate was calculated after four years (not six years as with the baseline data) and did not include those SSS participants who completed an associate's degree within four years. Thus, we expected the graduation rate to increase as additional years of data became available. The first year for which completion data will be available is FY 2003-04.

HEA: TRIO Talent Search - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.044 - TRIO Talent Search

Program Goal: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.

Objective 1 of 1: Increase postsecondary enrollment rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of Talent Search participants enrolling in college.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of TRIO Talent Search participants enrolling in college.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	73	
2001	77	
2002	78	
2003	73	
2004		73.50
2005		74
2006		74.50
2007		75

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0561 Talent Search and Education Opportunity Centers Programs Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

The annual performance report comprises self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Explanation: From 2001-03, an increasing percentage of Talent Search participants enrolled in college. Over three-fourths of program participants enrolled in college for these years, significantly above the national average (see measure 5.1). No targets were set for this measure until 2004. The increases in the number of Talent Search participants enrolling in college, despite their disadvantaged backgrounds, reflect lessons gained from earlier cohorts of program participants. Effective communications mechanisms and targeted technical assistance has spread from sharing best practices to improvements in program outcomes. FY 2000 data established the baseline. Data for 2003-04 are expected to be available in December 2005.

HEA: TRIO Upward Bound - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.047 - TRIO Upward Bound
84.047M - TRIO Upward Bound Math/Science

Program Goal: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.

Objective 1 of 1: Increase postsecondary enrollment rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of Upward Bound participants enrolling in college.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of TRIO Upward Bound participants and higher-risk participants enrolling in college.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Overall Enrollment	High-Risk Enrollment	Overall Enrollment	High-Risk Enrollment
2000	65	34		
2002			65	
2003			65	35
2004			65	35.50
2005			65	36
2006			65	36.50
2007			65	37

Source: Evaluation, Higher Education.

Section: [A Study of the Talent Search Program \(1995\) Analysis and Highlights.](#)

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1840-0762 Annual Performance Report for the Upward Bound, Upward Bound Math/Science, and Veterans Upward Bound Programs.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

The baseline data from the National Evaluation of the Upward Bound Program meet the data collection standards of the Department of Education. The annual performance report comprises self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Limitations: It takes roughly 5 years from the point of service for enrollment data to reflect the program's impact because the program offers services to high school students beginning in the freshman year, and grantees frequently do not submit their final performance report until a year after the student enrolls in college. The national evaluation is a longitudinal study of program participants and a comparison group selected by random assignment. Data from this study have provided the baseline on college enrollment rates. Since this

longitudinal evaluation cannot be used to measure program improvements annually, the annual performance reports will be used to determine if targets are met with the 2002-03 and 2003-04 data, which should be available in September 2005. It should also be noted that the definition of higher-risk student used in the national evaluation is somewhat different than the criteria used by Upward Bound projects funded under the Upward Bound Initiative.

Explanation: The 65 percent of Upward Bound participants enrolled in college in 2000 represents a rate higher than the national average for the same year of 16- to 24-year-old high school graduates enrolling immediately in college (see measure 5.1). Also in 2000, 34 percent of higher-risk Upward Bound participants enrolled in college. These measures were new for FY 2004 and it is the first year for which grantees will be required to report on these measures. New annual performance reports were created to capture the data for this measure. Data for these measures were not collected for FY 2001-03, but data for 2000 are available from a national evaluation of the Upward Bound Program. The national evaluation of the Upward Bound Program found the program has significant effects on higher-risk students. Since proportionately more participants are higher-risk students, maintaining the enrollment rate of 65% requires continual program improvements. The program's effectiveness with higher-risk students is expected to increase by one-half of one percent.

HEA: Underground Railroad Program - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.345 - Underground Railroad Educational and Cultural Program

Program Goal: To provide grants to support research, exhibition, interpretation, and collection of artifacts related to the history of the Underground Railroad

Objective 1 of 1: To support research and education related to the history of the Underground Railroad.

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Fundraising initiatives: Private sector support will increase by 5 percent each year (old measure).

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Private sector support (in dollars)		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	33,717,762	
2002	35,000,000	
2003	39,000,000	
2004	57,000,000	41,000,000
2005		62,000,000
2006		72,000,000

Source: Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The Department plans to replace this measure for FY 2006 with a measure (shown below) that reports the percentage of projects sustained beyond their federal funding. Data will be collected for FY 2004 and subsequent years for the new measure and will no longer be collected for the fundraising measure. Data for FY 2005 will not be collected.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Projects sustained: The percentage of projects sustained beyond federal funding (new measure).

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of projects sustained beyond federal funding.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Annual Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Data for 2005 will not be collected. The 2006 target is to establish a baseline. FY 2006 data will be available in October 2006.

HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.904A - Helen Keller National Center

Program Goal: Individuals who are deaf-blind will become independent and function as full and productive members of their local community.

Objective 1 of 2: ENSURE THAT INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE DEAF-BLIND RECEIVE THE SPECIALIZED SERVICES AND TRAINING THEY NEED TO BECOME AS INDEPENDENT AND SELF-SUFFICIENT AS POSSIBLE.

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Services to consumers at headquarters: By 2008, the training program at headquarters will increase the number of adult consumers who have achieved successful employment to 45% or less restrictive setting outcomes to 75%.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percent of adult consumers placed in employment and those in less restrictive settings.						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Adult consumers	% in Less Restrictive Settings	% Placed in Employment Settings	Adult consumers	% in Less Restrictive Settings	% Placed in Employment Settings
1999	75		45	85		38
2000	82		52	90		45
2001	87	71	38	90	59	45
2002	85	80	27		59	45
2003	100	70	42.50			
2004	98	69	46	95	70	45
2005	100	95	42	95	70	45
2006				95	70	45
2007				95	75	45
2008				95	75	45

Source: Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Each consumer's final transition plan will include information on employment and living situation to which he/she is returning.

Limitations: Data are based upon self-reported data from the grantee and are not independently verified. Follow-up services are limited due to budgetary restraints.

Explanation: The 2005 targets for "adult consumers" and "percent in less restrictive settings" were met; the target for "percent placed in employment settings" was not met.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Services to consumers at headquarters: To increase the percentage of training goals achieved by consumers participating in the training program.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of identified training goals successfully achieved by participants		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	92	86
2002	90	
2003	88	
2004	90	88
2005	89	88
2006		88
2007		90
2008		90

Source: Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006
Review of consumer Individualized Training Plans (ITP)

Limitations: Data is based upon self-reported data from the grantee and is not independently verified.

Explanation: The 2005 target was met. These measurable instructional objectives are mutually developed by the consumer and his/her instructors.

Objective 2 of 2: ENSURE THAT DEAF-BLIND CONSUMERS AND THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS RECEIVE THE SERVICES THEY NEED TO FUNCTION MORE INDEPENDENTLY IN THE HOME COMMUNITY.

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Regional services to consumers and families: Helen Keller National Center will maintain or increase the number of consumers and family members served through its regional offices.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Number served through Helen Keller National Center				
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
	Consumers	Families	Organizations	Consumers Families Organizations

1999	1,336	368	976	1,250	400	
2000	1,340	461	995	1,300	400	950
2001	1,727	484	913	1,400	425	1,000
2002	1,932	487	1,090	1,500	400	1,050
2003	1,982	611	1,288			
2004	2,031	512	1,042	1,700	450	1,050
2005	1,621	495	1,066	1,700	450	1,050

Source: HKNC Annual Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

HKNC regional reps maintain client case summary files that indicate activity with individual consumers, family members, professionals, organizations and agencies.

Limitations: Client case summary reports do not measure the level of service provided or impact of the services on the lives of the consumers and family members.

Explanation: The 2005 target for "adult consumers" was not met; targets for "families" and "organizations" were met. The number of consumers, families, professionals, and organizations/agencies served fluctuates from year to year. In establishing the targets, trend data were used from prior years.

NLA: Literacy Programs for Prisoners - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.255 - Literacy Programs for Prisoners

Program Goal: Literacy Programs for Prisoners (Adult Education and Literacy Act)

Objective 1 of 1: Literacy Programs for Prisoners (Adult Education and Literacy Act)

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Prisoner Life Skills Attainment: The proportion of prisoners who attain measurable gains of enhanced life skills in one or more of the life skills domains taught under these projects.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of prisoners from the cohort of grant program projects who attain measurable gains of enhanced life skills in one or more of the life skills domains (e.g., self-development, communication skills, job and financial skills development, education, interpersonal and family relationship development, stress and anger management, or others) taught under these projects.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	949	
2005		996
2006		1,046

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: No target was established for FY 2004. The 2004 data are the first data that were collected for this measure.

RA: Client Assistance State Grants - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.161 - Rehabilitation Services Client Assistance Program

Program Goal: To provide assistance and information to help individuals with disabilities secure the benefits available under the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants program and other programs funded under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended

Objective 1 of 2: Resolve cases at lowest possible level

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Alternative dispute resolution (ADR): Through FY 2008, the percentage of cases resolved through the use of ADR will be maintained at a rate of 84%.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of cases resolved through ADR		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	84	
2002	85	
2003	82	
2004	82	84
2005		84
2006		84
2007		84
2008		84

Source: CAP performance report, RSA-227.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialists. Onsite reviews of individual programs are conducted when resources permit, and random sampling of onsite files is cross-checked with reported data for verification.

Explanation: Targets are established based on actual data from FY 2001 through 2004. FY 2004 data demonstrates that 5467 of the 6646 (82%) cases closed were resolved through ADR techniques., although the 2004 target was not met.

Objective 2 of 2: Accurately identify problem areas requiring systemic change and engage in systemic activity to improve services under the Rehabilitation Act.

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Effects of systemic change: By FY 2008, the percentage of CAPs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will increase to a rate of 55%.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of CAPs that reported that their systematic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	50.90	
1999	43	
2000	44	44
2001	45	45
2002	54	46
2003	48	47
2004	57	49
2005		50
2006		52
2007		54
2008		55

Source: CAP performance report, RSA-227, narrative section.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialists. Onsite reviews of individual programs are conducted when resources permit, and random sampling of onsite files is cross-checked with reported data for verification

Explanation: Performance percentage is based on the reporting of successful systemic change activity by 32 of 56 CAPs for FY 2004. Performance trends are based on actual data reported for FY 2000 through 2004. The 2004 target was exceeded.

RA: Independent Living Centers and State Grants - FY 2005

CFDA Numbers: 84.132 - Centers for Independent Living
84.169 - Independent Living State Grants

Program Goal: Support individuals with significant disabilities, including older blind individuals served by Independent Living programs, in the achievement of their independent living goals.

Objective 1 of 2: *Increase the number of individuals with disabilities who live independently in community-based housing.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Increase the number of individuals who leave long-term care facilities and other institutions for community-based living due to independent living services provided by a CIL.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Number of individuals who leave long-term care facilities and other institution for community-based living due to services provided by a CIL.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	1,372	850
2001	1,777	900
2002	2,012	900
2003	1,996	
2004	2,864	
2005		2,677

Source: RSA Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2006

Improvements: The instructions contained in the 704 reports have been revised to ensure that reporting for this measure is valid across grantees.

Explanation: Trend data from FY 2000-2003 suggest that CILs have been successful in increasing by about 10 percent per year the number of individuals moved from long-term care facilities or other institutions to community-based housing. The 2004 data show a larger increase in successful relocations. The IL unit has been working closely with ILRU to improve training in this area.

Objective 2 of 2: *Improve the efficiency and transparency of the IL Title VII, Part B Independent Living Program.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Make Title VII, Part B data available to the public.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Number of months from data due date to the release of data to the public.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005	7	5

Source: Review of data received and office files.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2006

Explanation: The IL unit had the data collected from grantees ready to distribute to the public within 7 months of the data collection due date. The 2005 target was not met. IL will continue to improve the process for collecting and analyzing data this year.

RA: Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.177 - Rehabilitation Services Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who are Blind

Program Goal: Support individuals with significant disabilities, including older blind individuals served by Independent Living programs, in the achievement of their independent living goals.

Objective 1 of 2: *Through the provision of services (either directly or through contracts), increase the percentage of consumers receiving services funded through OB Title VII, Chapter 2 funds who report having access to services needed to improve their ability to live more independently and participate fully in their communities.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Increase the percentage of Title VII, Chapter 2 consumers who report having access to previously unavailable assistive technology aids and devices, and increase the percentage of Title VII, Chapter 2 consumers who report improved ADL skills.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Title VII, Chapter 2, consumers who report having access to previously unavailable assistive technology aids and devices; and the percentage of Title VII, Chapter 2, consumers who report improved ADL skills.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	AT	ADL	AT	ADL
2005			999	999
2006			999	999

Source: Annual 7-OB reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006
Review of 7-OB reports by regional staff.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. This is a new measure for the OB program in 2005. The FY 2006 target is the baseline plus 1 percent.

Objective 2 of 2: *Improve the efficiency and transparency of the IL Title VII, Chapter 2 Older Blind Program.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Make Title VII, Chapter 2 data available to the public.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Number of months from data due date to the release of data to the public.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		7
2006		5

Source: Annual 7-OB report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Limitations: Data are self-reported.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

RA: Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.128G - Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Program

Program Goal: To increase employment opportunities for migrant and seasonal farmworkers who have disabilities

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that eligible Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers with disabilities receive Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) services and achieve employment.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Individuals who achieve employment outcomes: Within project-funded states, the percentage of migrant or seasonal farmworkers with disabilities served by VR and the projects, who achieve employment outcomes is higher than those who do not access the project.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of individuals served who were placed in employment.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	VR & Project	VR Only	VR & Project	VR Only
2002	65	53.10		
2003	66	59		
2004	60	65	62	53
2005			65	53

Source: Rehabilitation Services Administration agency state data from the RSA-911

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Limitations: Program staff is currently developing a data collection package for OMB approval to complement the RSA 911 report

Explanation: Thirteen grantees operated in FY 2004. They served 2,852 clients and placed 450 clients. The target for "VR & Project" was not met; the target for "VR only" was exceeded.

RA: Projects with Industry - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.234 - Projects with Industry

Program Goal: Projects with Industry Program (PWI) Internal Goal

Objective 1 of 2: *Ensure that PWI services (through partnerships with business and industry) result in competitive employment, increased wages, and job retention for individuals with disabilities.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Placement rate of individuals with disabilities into competitive employment: The percentage of individuals served who are placed in competitive employment will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of individuals served who were placed in competitive employment		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	59	
1998	49	
1999	59	61
2000	61.90	61
2001	62.40	62
2002	63.20	62.20
2003	54.20	62.40
2004	61.50	62.70
2005		63

Source: Compliance Indicator and Annual Evaluation Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Web-based automatic edit checks. In addition, staff check data for "reasonableness."

Limitations: The primary limitation of the data is that they are self-reported. Technical assistance and regular monitoring is provided to grantees in order to receive updated reports from the grantee regarding progress toward meeting project goals.

Explanation: After reporting a significant decrease in FY 2003, FY 2004 data have almost recouped the previous year's decline, but did not meet the target.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Change in earnings of individuals who are placed in competitive employment: By FY2008, Projects with Industry projects will report that participants placed in competitive employment increase earnings by an

average of at least \$250 per week.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Average increase in weekly earnings, in dollars.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	207	
1998	209	
1999	226	209
2000	252	218
2001	236	218
2002	234	226
2003	242	231
2004	247	233
2005		238
2006		242
2007		245
2008		250

Source: Compliance Indicator and Annual Evaluation Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Web-based reporting system conducts automatic edit checks. In addition, staff check data for "reasonableness."

Limitations: Same as Indicator 1.1. In addition, performance data on this indicator are further limited because grantees submit an average aggregate figure of participants' wages.

Explanation: In FY 2004, the target was exceeded.

Objective 2 of 2: *Ensure that PWI services are available for individuals with the most need.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Percentage of individuals served who were unemployed for 6 months or more prior to program entry who are placed in competitive employment: The percentage of previously unemployed individuals served who are placed into competitive employment will increase.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of previously unemployed individuals served who were placed in competitive employment		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	60	

RA: Projects with Industry

1998	48	
1999	58	62
2000	60.80	60
2001	67.20	61
2002	64.70	61.20
2003	54	63
2004	65.60	64
2005		65

Source: Compliance Indicator and Annual Evaluation Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Limitations: Same as Indicator 1.1

Explanation: The actual performance in FY 2004 exceeded the target and has increased substantially since the last year of reporting, recouping the FY 2003 losses and exceeding the 2004 target.

RA: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.240 - Program of Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights

Program Goal: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) Internal Goal

Objective 1 of 1: *Identify problem areas requiring systemic change and engage in systemic activities to address those problems.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Policy changes: By FY 2008, the percentage of PAIRs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will increase to a rate of 82 percent.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of PAIRs that reported that their systemic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	54	
2001	68	
2002	81	
2003	75	
2004	86	77
2005		79
2006		80
2007		81
2008		82

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 1820-0627 Annual Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) Program Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialist. Onsite reviews of individual programs are conducted when resources permit, and random sampling of onsite files is cross-checked with reported data for verification.

Explanation: Actual performance, based on 49 out of 57 PAIRs reporting successful systemic change activities in FY 2004, exceeded the target. Performance trends are based on actual data reported for FY 2000 through 2004. These data demonstrate significant annual increases in the percentage of PAIRs achieving changes in policies and practices.

RA: Supported Employment State Grants - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.187 - Supported Employment Services for Individuals with Severe Disabilities

Program Goal: Individuals with disabilities served by the Supported Employment State Grant program will achieve high-quality employment.

Objective 1 of 1: Increase the number of individuals with the most significant disabilities who have received supported employment services but achieve competitive employment outcomes.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal achieving competitive employment: Increase the percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieve a competitive employment outcome (including supported employment outcomes in which the individual receives the minimum wage or better).

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieve a competitive employment outcome.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	69.60	
1998	69.10	
1999	73.30	71
2000	77.30	71.50
2001	79.20	77.40
2002	90.50	77.60
2003	92.70	77.80
2004	92.80	78
2005		93

Source: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees.

Improvements: RSA staff have worked with grantees to improve the accuracy and timeliness of RSA-911 data. The FY 2004 database was available six months after the close of the fiscal year, a significant improvement over previous years.

Explanation: With this indicator, RSA examines state agency performance regarding supported employment for individuals with the most significant disabilities. Individuals in supported employment can achieve competitive employment (with wages at or above the minimum wage), although not all individuals in supported employment do achieve these competitive wages. In FY 2004, state VR agencies surpassed their targets for this indicator, and therefore the FY 2005 target was adjusted accordingly.

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.235 - Rehabilitation Services Demonstration and Training Special Demonstration Programs

**Program Goal: To expand, improve, or further the purposes of activities
authorized under the Act**

Objective 1 of 1: EXPAND AND IMPROVE THE PROVISION OF REHABILITATION SERVICES THAT LEAD TO EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES.

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Expansion: Projects will be judged to have successfully implemented strategies that contribute to the expansion of services for the employment of individuals with disabilities according to the percentage of individuals served and placed into employment by the projects.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of individuals who were provided employment services through projects and who were placed into employment.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Percent of individuals placed into employment	Percent of individuals placed into employment
2001	14.20	
2002	27.86	
2003	38.62	
2004	35.97	
2005		24

Source: Web-based Annual Performance Reports

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting.

Explanation: FY 2001 data established the baseline. Actual Performance Data was re-calculated for FY 2001 through 2004 to include only projects with employment outcomes. The FY 2004 data is based on 1,018 placed and 2,830 served from 26 grantees.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Improvement: It is anticipated that the impact of interactions, presentations, and information made to and by state VR agencies will increase referral of individuals to or from VR agencies, thereby expanding service provision.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of referrals to and from VR and projects.				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Referrals to VR from Projects	Referrals from VR to Projects	Referrals to VR from Projects	Referrals from VR to Projects
2001	17.50	35.64		
2002	17.47	37.34	10	58
2003	11.22	27.55	10	60
2004	9.22	31.44	10	62
2005			13	33

Source: Web-based Annual Performance Reports

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting.

Explanation: FY 2001 data established the baseline. Actual Performance Data was recalculated for FY 2001 through 2004, to capture a true value for those projects with an employment outcome goal. In FY 2004, data reflect information provided by 26 projects that are funded through the Special Demonstrations program and use the Web-based reporting system. The percentage for referred to VR is based on 2,830 served and 261 referred to VR. The percentage for referred from VR is based on 2,830 served and 890 from VR. The 2004 targets were not met.

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Grants for Indians - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.250 - Rehabilitation Services American Indians with Disabilities

Program Goal: To improve employment outcomes of American Indians with disabilities who live on or near reservations by providing effective tribal vocational rehabilitation services.

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that eligible American Indians with disabilities receive vocational rehabilitation services and achieve employment outcomes consistent with their particular strengths, resources, abilities, capabilities, and interests.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Percentage of individuals who leave the program with employment outcomes: By the end of FY 2008, at least 65 percent of all eligible individuals who exit the program after receiving services under an individualized plan for employment will achieve an employment outcome.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of individuals who leave the program with employment outcomes.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	58	
1999	61	
2000	62	61
2001	65	62
2002	64	62
2003	66	64.10
2004	62	64.50
2005		65
2006		65
2007		65
2008		65

Source: Web-based Annual Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Limitations: RSA staff must contact grantees regarding missing or apparently inconsistent data.

Improvements: The data collection was revised to improve clarity and to address PART recommendations.

Explanation: FY 2003 was the first year that a Web-based system was used to collect annual data for this program. The 2004 target was not met. The 2004 data are based on 69 projects operating in FY 2004.

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Recreational Programs - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.128J - Recreational Programs

Program Goal: Recreational Programs Internal Goal

Objective 1 of 1: Recreational Programs Internal Objective 1

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Project Continuation: The percentage of recreation programs sustained after federal funding ceases.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of projects in operation 1, 2, and 3 years after federal funding ceases.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	66	
2002	80	
2003	75	
2004	83	66
2005		66

Source: Telephone monitoring

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2005

Limitations: Contacting past grantees.

Explanation: This measure indicated the cumulative number of programs in existence 1, 2, and 3 years following the end of federal funding. Number of programs being tracked after federal funding ceases: 2000 (N=8); 2001(N=6); 2002 (N=9); 2003 (N=6); 2004 (N=10); 2005 (N=8). Nineteen of the 23 projects continued after Federal funding ceases. The 2004 target was exceeded.

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.126A - Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants

Program Goal: Individuals with disabilities served by the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants program will achieve high-quality employment.

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that individuals with disabilities who are served by the vocational rehabilitation (VR) state grants program achieve employment consistent with their particular strengths, resources, abilities, capabilities, and interests.*

Indicator 1.1 of 4: Employment Outcomes: Increase the percentage of (a) general and combined state VR agencies that assist at least 55.8% of individuals who receive services to achieve employment outcomes and (b) state VR agencies for the blind that assist at least 68.9% of individuals who receive services to achieve employment outcomes.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies that assist at least 55.8 percent of individuals receiving services to achieve employment.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	75	
2002	75	
2003	66	
2004	66	83
2005		75

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: Percentage obtaining employment for VR agencies for the blind		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	75	
2002	75	
2003	58	
2004	63	83
2005		75

Source: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees.

Improvements: RSA staff have worked with grantees to improve the accuracy and timeliness of RSA-911 data. The FY 2004 database was available six months after the close of the fiscal year, a significant improvement over previous years.

Explanation: This indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on Indicator 1.2 in Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve employment of all individuals whose cases were closed after receiving services. In order to pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 55.8 percent while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 68.9 percent. The 2003 and 2004 declines can be attributed to two facts: (1) beginning FY 2002 extended employment has not been considered an employment outcome in the VR program; and (2) there were challenging labor market conditions. Therefore the FY 2005 target was adjusted. The 2004 targets were not met.

Indicator 1.2 of 4: Competitive Employment: Increase the percentage of (a) general and combined state VR agencies that assist at least 72.6 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment and (b) state VR agencies for the blind that assist at least 50 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment.

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: Percentage obtaining competitive employment for general and combined VR agencies		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	96	
2003	96	
2004	98	93
2005		94

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: Percentage obtaining competitive employment for VR agencies for the blind.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	79	
2003	87	
2004	92	85
2005		87

Source: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: Accuracy/consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees.

Improvements: RSA staff have worked with grantees to improve the accuracy and timeliness of RSA-911 data. The FY 2004 database was available six months after the close of the fiscal year, a significant improvement over previous years.

Explanation: This indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on Indicator 1.3 in Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve competitive employment of all individuals who achieve employment. To pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 72.6 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 35.4 percent. For

purposes of this GPRA indicator, we felt that 35.4 percent was too low a target, therefore, beginning with the 2004 report, we used 50 percent for the agencies for the blind instead. FY 2001 served as the baseline year for this measure and was used to establish its targets. In FY 2004, State VR agencies exceeded targets established for this indicator, demonstrating the strong program emphasis on assisting individuals with disabilities to achieve high quality employment outcomes.

Indicator 1.3 of 4: Competitive Employment for Individuals with significant disabilities: Increase the percentage of (a) general and combined state VR agencies for which at least 65 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities and (b) state VR agencies for the blind for which at least 89 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities.

Measure 1.3.1 of 2: Percentage with significant disabilities for general and combined VR agencies.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	96	
2003	100	
2004	96	89
2005		100

Measure 1.3.2 of 2: Percentage with significant disabilities for VR agencies for the blind.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	92	
2003	96	
2004	100	89
2005		96

Source: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees.

Improvements: RSA staff have worked with grantees to improve the accuracy and timeliness of RSA-911 data. The FY 2004 database was available six months after the close of the fiscal year, a significant improvement over previous years.

Explanation: This indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on Indicator 1.4 in 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals achieving competitive employment who have significant disabilities. To pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 62.4 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 89 percent. For purposes of this GPRA indicator, we felt that 62.4 percent was too low a target for general/combined agencies, and therefore, beginning with the 2004 report, we used 65 percent instead. FY 2001 was the year that served as the baseline for this measure and for establishing its targets. In FY 2004, State VR agencies exceeded their targets, demonstrating the continued strong program emphasis on serving individuals with significant disabilities. Therefore, the FY 2005 targets were adjusted.

Indicator 1.4 of 4: Competitive Employment: By 2008, (a) 91 percent of general and combined state VR agencies will assist at least 85 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment; and (b) 60 percent of state VR agencies for the blind will assist at least 65 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment.

Measure 1.4.1 of 2: Percentage of general and combined state VR agencies assisting at least 85% of individuals to achieve competitive employment		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	62.50	
2002	88	
2003	93	
2004	95	67
2005		89
2006		89
2007		91
2008		91
Measure 1.4.2 of 2: Percentage of state VR agencies for the blind assisting at least 65 percent of individuals to achieve competitive employment		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	41.70	
2002	50	
2003	54	
2004	71	48
2005		54
2006		54
2007		57
2008		60

Source: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluation Program Performance Data.

Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees.

Improvements: RSA staff have worked with grantees to improve the accuracy and timeliness of RSA-911 data. The FY 2004 database was available six months after the close of the fiscal year, a significant improvement over previous years.

Explanation: This long-term indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on Indicator 1.3 in Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve competitive employment of all individuals who achieve employment. To pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 72.6 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 35.4 percent. For purposes of this long-term GPRA indicator, we felt that these rates were too low. Therefore, beginning with the 2004 report, we set a rate of 85 percent for general/combined agencies and 65 percent for agencies for the blind. In FY 2004, State VR agencies exceeded their targets for this long-term indicator. Therefore, the targets for FY 2005 and beyond were adjusted accordingly.

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.129 - Rehabilitation Long-Term Training

Program Goal: To provide existing staff of public VR sector with continuing education to maintain and upgrade skills and knowledge.

Objective 1 of 2: To provide graduates who work within the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) system to help individuals with disabilities achieve their goals.

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Numbers trained: The number of students supported by RSA scholarships and the number of RSA scholars graduating will remain stable per constant \$1 million invested.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: The number of scholars supported by RSA scholarships		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	1,600	
1998	1,550	
1999	1,665	1,473
2000	2,390	2,000
2001	2,540	2,000
2002	2,232	2,000
2003	2,378	2,050
2004	1,789	2,050
2005		2,100

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: The number of scholars graduating		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	800	
1998	817	
1999	832	729
2000	764	688
2001	841	700
2002	817	700
2003	802	725
2004	598	725

2005	725
-------------	-----

Source: Annual grantee reporting

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: After peaking in 2001, target performance decreased as college tuitions are rapidly increasing, while program funds are either level or decreasing. For the graduating scholars, the count represented the number of RSA scholarship recipients who graduated between Sept 1, 2002 and Aug 31, 2003, as reported in the 2003 grantee report. The 2003 targets were exceeded.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Percentage working: The percentage of graduates fulfilling their payback requirements through acceptable employment will increase annually.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of graduates fulfilling their payback requirements through acceptable employment.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	72	70
2001	71	71
2002	85	72
2003	82	72
2004		74
2005		73

Source: Annual granteed reporting form

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Limitations: We are using a new reporting system, which is being refined. Same as indicator 1.1.

Explanation: The 2003 target was exceeded.

Objective 2 of 2: *Maintain and upgrade the knowledge and skills of personnel currently employed in the public VR system.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Qualified personnel: The percentage of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their State's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standard will increase annually.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their state's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standards		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training

2000	69	
2001	71	70
2002	65	75
2003	67	77
2004		79
2005		70

Source: Annual Evaluation. Ongoing collection could be through the In-Service Training program's annual performance report.

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data would be supplied through an external RSA contractor.

Explanation: There is an insufficient pool of qualified candidates to replenish the staff positions. We anticipate a leveling off in performance as staff turnover is at an all-time high due to retirements. The 2003 target was not met.

20 USC: Howard University - FY 2005

Program Goal: To assist Howard University with financial resources needed to carry out its educational mission.

Objective 1 of 3: *Maintain and strengthen academic programs and achievement by (1) recruiting better students, (2) improving student retention, (3) improving graduation rates, and (4) promoting excellence in teaching.*

Indicator 1.1 of 4: Better students: The average SAT scores of incoming freshmen will increase by 1 percent per year.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Average SAT score of incoming freshmen								
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets			
	Math	Verbal	Total	% Change	Math	Verbal	Total	% Change
1997	494	513	1,007					
1998	506	519	1,025	2				
1999	517	533	1,050	2			1,035	
2000	525	537	1,062	1			1,061	2.50
2001	516	530	1,046	-2			1,073	1.10
2002	534	545	1,079	3			1,065	0.50
2003	537	544	1,081	0			1,080	1.40
2004	539	544	1,083	0			1,082	0.20
2005							1,083	0.10

Source: Howard University.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: Actual performance in FY 2004 exceeded target value. Beginning with FY 2006, the performance measures for Howard University will be changed to measures of enrollment, persistence, and completion. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in FY 2006. The FY 2005 data are expected in March 2006.

Indicator 1.2 of 4: Student retention: Decrease attrition for undergraduate FTIC (first time in college) students by 2 percent until national average is bettered.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Attrition rates for undergraduate FTIC students			
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	% National Rate	% HU Rate	%
1997	26.70	19.60	

1998	26.40	17.60	
1999	25	16	
2000	20	15.10	15
2001	20.20	12.90	14
2002	21	14.90	13
2003	19.60	15.20	13
2004	31.70	12.80	13
2005			7

Source: The Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange. Howard University.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Howard University's attrition rate has consistently been lower than the national average for attrition. Howard University exceeded the target value in 2004. Beginning with FY 2006, the performance measures for Howard University will be changed to measures of enrollment, persistence, and completion. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in FY 2006. FY 2005 data are expected in March 2006.

Indicator 1.3 of 4: Graduation rates: The undergraduate and graduate graduation rates will increase by 2 percent per year until the national average is reached or exceeded.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: 6-year graduation rate			
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets
	Consortium Rate	HU Rate	
1997		49	
1998		40.90	
1999	54.20	46.10	43
2000	54.10	48.70	48
2001	54.90	51.30	50
2002	54	48.80	52
2003	56.10	50.20	52
2004	46.20	56.20	55
2005			58

Source: Howard University.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: The reported six-year national rate comes from the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange at the University of Oklahoma. Howard University is a member of the institution.

Explanation: The consortium rate is defined as the average retention rate for the 500+ institutions in the Consortium for Student Retention. The 46.2 percent graduation rate for the consortium in 2004 is a five-year rate. No six-year rate was available for the consortium. For comparative purposes, Howard University's five-year rate was 51.6 percent. Actual performance for Howard University exceeded the target value. Beginning with FY 2006, the performance measures for Howard University will be changed to measures of enrollment, persistence, and completion. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in FY 2006. The FY 2005 data are expected in March 2006.

Indicator 1.4 of 4: Excellence in teaching and scholarship: The number of faculty in activities of the Fund for Academic Excellence will increase.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: Number of proposals					
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets	
	Submitted	Funded	Number of Participants	Funded	Number of Participants
1998	258	153	189		
1999	218	152	200		
2000	149	128	173	125	210
2001	154	130	160	140	200
2002	258	163	292	150	225
2003	222	169	160	160	240
2004	241	165	275	160	240

Source: Howard University.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The principal goals for the Fund for Academic Excellence include (1) serving as a catalyst for increasing extramural research, (2) improving the quality of teaching and learning, and (3) encouraging new and junior faculty to participate in seeking institutional focused research. Actual performance in 2004 exceeded target value. Beginning with FY 2006, the performance measures for Howard University will be changed to measures of enrollment, persistence, and completion. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in FY 2006.

Objective 2 of 3: To promote excellence in research.

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Grants received: The number of grant proposals that are funded will increase.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Number of grant proposals		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

1997	232	
1998	279	
1999	299	
2000	252	301
2001	261	260
2002	250	270
2003	313	275
2004	384	

Source: Howard University.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Actual performance in 2003 exceeded the target value. Although no target was provided for 2004, actual performance in 2004 increased significantly over the 2003 level. Beginning with FY 2006, the performance measures for Howard University will be changed to measures of enrollment, persistence, and completion. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in FY 2006.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Grant funding: The total funds received through research grants will increase.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: Amount of funds received through research grants				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Value of Grants Received	% Change	Value of Grants Received	% Change
1997	45,268,427			
1998	44,057,827	-2.70		
1999	47,533,841	7.90		
2000	50,294,706	5.80	48,009,180	20
2001	53,416,128	6.20	51,700,000	
2002	63,000,000	17.90	53,800,000	
2003	65,900,000	4.60	65,000,000	
2004	71,400,000	8.30		

Source: Howard University.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Although no target was provided for 2004, actual performance increased over the 2003 level. Beginning with FY 2006, the performance measures for Howard University will be changed to measures of

enrollment, persistence, and completion. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in FY 2006.

Objective 3 of 3: Increase Howard University's financial strength and independence from federal appropriations.

Indicator 3.1 of 4: Endowment: The value of the endowment each year will increase.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: Market value of endowment (in millions)		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	211.20	
1998	252.90	
1999	297	
2000	329.30	320
2001	340.90	346
2002	326.50	
2003	315.60	
2004	371.80	

Source: Howard University and the *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Audited Financial Statements.

Explanation: No performance target was provided for 2004. However, actual performance for 2004 increased significantly over the 2003 level. Beginning with FY 2006, the performance measures for Howard University will be changed to measures of enrollment, persistence, and completion. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in FY 2006.

Indicator 3.2 of 4: Outside support: The funds raised from all private sources will increase.

Measure 3.2.1 of 1: Alumni contributions (in millions)		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	11.80	
1998	8.40	
1999	9.20	
2000	13.90	11
2001	18.40	14.50
2002	18.30	18
2003	17.40	20

2004	40.10	35
2005		35

Source: Howard University.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Audited Financial Statements.

Explanation: Actual performance in 2004 exceeded target. FY 2005 data are expected in March 2006. Beginning with FY 2006, the performance measures for Howard University will be changed to measures of enrollment, persistence, and completion. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in FY 2006.

Indicator 3.3 of 4: Outside support--alumni: The participation rate of alumni who contribute to the school will increase.

Measure 3.3.1 of 1: Participation rate		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	11.40	
1999	9.40	
2000	12.20	25
2001	15	30
2002	18	32
2003	20	20.50
2004	20	23
2005		23

Source: Howard University.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Actual performance in 2004 did not meet the target. FY 2005 data are expected in March 2006. Beginning with FY 2006, the performance measures for Howard University will be changed to measures of enrollment, persistence, and completion. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in FY 2006.

Indicator 3.4 of 4: Cost savings at the Howard University Hospital: The difference between the hospital's net revenue (excluding federal appropriations) and total expenses will decrease.

Measure 3.4.1 of 2: Net Revenue		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	170 084 807	

1998	183,789,977	
1999	204,360,845	
2000	213,879,600	184,510,111
2001	216,598,823	193,735,617
2002	225,252,566	203,422,397
2003	214,206,000	226,394,000
2004	214,714,000	234,522,000

Measure 3.4.2 of 2: Total Expense		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	209,761,348	
1998	211,689,178	
1999	234,841,266	
2000	246,819,944	225,813,215
2001	242,028,727	237,103,876
2002	252,072,279	248,959,070
2003	258,656,000	234,286,000
2004	243,565,000	233,695,000

Source: Howard University.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Although revenues and expenses did not meet 2004 targets, the gap between the hospital's net revenue and total expenses expenses was reduced by almost \$16 million. Beginning with FY 2006, the performance measures for Howard University will be changed to measures of enrollment, persistence, and completion. The Department plans to discontinue this measure in FY 2006.

VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions - FY 2005

CFDA Number: 84.245 - Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions

Program Goal: To increase access to and improve vocational education that will strengthen workforce preparation, employment opportunities, and lifelong learning in the Indian Community.

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that vocational students served in tribally controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institutions make successful transitions to work or continuing education.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Postsecondary outcomes: An increasing percentage of vocational education students in the TCPVIP will receive an AA degree or certificate.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of vocational students in the TCPVIP who earn an AA degree or certificate.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Percentage of students	Percentage of students
1999	23	
2000	57	25
2001	82	59
2002	46	65
2003	48	47
2004	44	49
2005	49	52

Source: Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Calculations of completions are based on degree completers relative to all students available to graduate (i.e.; students in their final semester).

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was not met.

Goal 6: Establish Management Excellence

DEOA: Office for Civil Rights - FY 2005

Program Goal: To ensure equal access to education and promote educational excellence throughout the nation through the vigorous enforcement of civil rights.

Objective 1 of 2: *To provide high-quality customer service throughout the case-resolution process.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Customer Response: Percentage of satisfied customers.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of respondents satisfied with OCR's customer service.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights, customer satisfaction survey.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Explanation: OCR will establish a customer satisfaction baseline using survey data from customers whose complaints have gone through the case resolution process in FY 2005. Data for the entire fiscal year will be available at the end of the first quarter of FY 2006.

Objective 2 of 2: *To obtain results by the efficient management of civil rights compliance activities.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Resolution of Complaints: Percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days of receipt.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days.		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	80	
1998	81	
1999	80	80
2000	78	80
2001	84	80
2002	89	80
2003	91	80
2004	92	80
2005	92	80

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights, case management system. Data are collected in OCR's Case Management System throughout the fiscal year (October 1- September 30).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was exceeded. The actual percentage of cases that were resolved in 180 days exceeded the FY 2005 target by 12 percent. OCR attributes its efficiency to various methods used to streamline the investigative process, e.g., case planning and casework tools. OCR is planning to increase the FY 2006 performance target for this indicator. The data for this performance indicator are current as of September 30, 2005.

DEOA: Office of Inspector General - FY 2005

Program Goal: FY 2002 OIG Performance Report

Objective 1 of 1: *To Improve the Department's Programs and Operations*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Percentage of significant recommendations implemented within one year of acceptance by the Department

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of significant recommendations implemented within one year of acceptance by the Department		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005	78	70

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Inspector General, audit and inspection reports. Reports will be tracked principally in the OIG Audit Tracking System (ATS). There may be additional tracking information available from the department's Audit Accountability and Resolution System (ARTS).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: The measure includes only recommendations from audit and inspection reports. Recommendations from other OIG services, as quick response projects and advice and technical assistance, are not included in this measure.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Percentage of written reports that meet OIG timeliness standards

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of written reports that meet OIG timeliness standards		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005	67	75

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Inspector General, audit and inspection reports. Reports will be tracked principally in the OIG Audit Tracking System (ATS) and the Education Investigative Tracking System (EDITS).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: This is the initial baseline year for this measure. The results are being reviewed to validate the goal.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Amount of OIG monetary recoveries will exceed the OIG annual budget by an average of 125% over a five-year period

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The amount of OIG monetary recoveries will exceed the OIG annual budget by an average of 125% over a five-year period		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005	120	125

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Inspector General, semiannual report to Congress (Audit Tracking System, Investigative Case Tracking System, and the Department of Justice).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: This is the initial baseline year for this measure. The returns for FY 2004 and FY 2005, which averaged over 200%, were offset by low returns in FY 2001 and FY 2002.

