

## Goal 1: Create a Culture of Achievement

### Key Measures

The Department's first strategic goal is to create a culture of achievement in education. Achievement can only be determined if measures are identified and tracked, and accountability for results is required. Accountability for results is the foundation for the other five goals. While this goal is the foundation for all Department programs and activities, no specified programs or funding streams directly support Goal 1. However, six key measures are identified that indicate progress in meeting the objectives of Goal 1.

#### State Accountability Systems in Compliance

The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* placed specific requirements on state accountability systems requirements that are designed to improve student achievement. The basic components of a state accountability system, as outlined in the law, are: standards and assessments, goals for adequate yearly progress for schools and districts to have all students meet state standards, public school choice, supplemental services, and teacher quality.

The Department originally measured states' progress on implementing state accountability systems by calculating the number of states with approved assessment systems in reading and mathematics, and the number of states that are field-testing reading and mathematics assessments. In FY 2006, the Department added a key measure that addressed the number of states that developed science assessments as required by *No Child Left Behind* by school year (SY) 2007–08. For FY 2007, the measures for assessment systems in reading and mathematics and the number of states that field-tested reading and mathematics assessments were no longer considered as key measures because the actual data for these measures were, for the most part, 100 percent.

**Analysis of Progress.** Under NCLB, states were required to have their reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in place by SY 2005–06. The state assessments for science are not required to be completed until the end of SY 2007–08. However, five states have administered science assessments.

1.1.A State Assessments.	Fiscal Year	Actual
The number of states that have science assessments that align with the state's academic content standards for all students in grades three through eight and in high school. [1203]	2007	Target is 25
	2006	Target is 15
	2005	NA
	2004	NA
New key measure in 2006; 2006 data expected Dec. 2007; 2007 data expected Dec. 2008.		

U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Reports, SEA Submissions

**Data Quality.** The universe for this measure is the 52 entities (50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) that are required by *No Child Left Behind* to develop science assessments for grades three through eight and high school by SY 2007–08.

**Target Context.** The targets for these measures represent the 52 entities that are required to have their standards and assessments peer-reviewed and approved. The 52 entities are required to have a science assessment plan in place by the end of SY 2007–08, and the targets represent the number of states that will have plans submitted and approved for FY 2006 and FY 2007.

**Additional Information.** Each state develops a schedule by which its science assessments will be developed, field-tested, and submitted to the Department for review and approval prior to implementation. States are required to complete field-testing of the assessments for science prior to the submission and approval of the state assessment plan. Field-testing is one of the initial phases of establishing statewide science assessments prior to the actual administration of the assessment. Field-testing helps ensure the validity and reliability of test items and permits states to omit those test items that are deemed biased, too difficult, or too easy, thus affecting the rigor of the test.

Note: This measure refers to states with assessment systems that have been approved by the Department as meeting the requirements of *No Child Left Behind*.



**Local Flexibility for Targeting Federal Funds**

A collection of federal provisions gives states, school districts, and schools the authority to target specified federal program funds toward unique local education needs. These provisions include the following:

- Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies.
- State Flexibility Demonstration Program.
- Local Flexibility Demonstration Program.
- Rural Education Achievement Program.

The Alternative Uses of Funds Authority under the Rural Education Achievement Program allows eligible local educational agencies the authority to combine funding under certain federal programs to carry out activities under other specified federal programs. Eligible districts are those that serve relatively small numbers of students and are located in rural areas (ESEA Section 6211(b) (1)).

The Department measured the use of flexibility authorities by collecting data on the percentage of eligible local educational agencies that used the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility (REAP-Flex) authority.

1.2.A Rural Education Program.	Fiscal Year	Actual
The percentage of eligible school districts utilizing the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority. [1473]	2007	<b>Target is 65</b>
	2006	60
	2005	56
	2004	59
	2003	61
2006 target of 65 not met; 2007 data expected Aug. 2008.		

U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report, SEA submissions.

**Analysis of Progress.** Only districts eligible for the Small Rural Schools Achievement (SRSA) Program are allowed to use the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority. In school year 2006-07, a total of 4,621 local educational agencies (LEAs) nationwide were eligible for REAP-Flex. The number of LEAs that made use of the REAP-Flex authority in school year 2006-07 will not be reported until February 2008 in the Consolidated State Performance Report, Part II. Despite outreach to states, professional education organizations, and districts, the Department has not been able to increase the percentage of eligible school districts utilizing the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority, indicating that there is not a need among non-participating districts.

**Data Quality.** In the Consolidated State Performance Report, states reported the number of eligible LEAs that notified the state of their intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding Authority under section 6211 during the 2006–2007 school year. As part of the OMB-approved annual Rural Education data collection, states provided data on their LEAs from which the Department calculated LEA eligibility.

**Target Context.** Despite outreach to states, professional education organizations, and districts, the Department has not been able to increase the percentage of eligible school districts utilizing the REAP-Flex authority, indicating that there is not an unmet demand among non-participating districts. Therefore, the Department is maintaining an ambitious and consistent annual target of 65 percent, and is continuing active outreach efforts targeting districts that could benefit from the REAP-Flex authority.



**Customer Satisfaction with the Department**

To measure how well the Department’s products and services meet the needs of the people we serve, we conduct several customer satisfaction surveys. The Grantee Satisfaction Survey queries the chief state school officers and nine groups of state-level education leaders who direct federal programs in their states. The questionnaire includes general questions about the Department’s performance in five areas: use of technology, online resources, documents, technical assistance provided by Department-funded providers, and technical assistance provided by Department staff. The questionnaire also includes customized questions for each group. In the final section of the survey, respondents are asked to answer three culminating questions that provide the score for the American Customer Satisfaction Index. The index score allows the Department to benchmark customer satisfaction against that of businesses and other federal agencies.

Other major Department surveys include a biennial customer survey conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics, and an annual survey conducted by Federal Student Aid. The results from the Federal Student Aid survey are reported in Goal 6, under Student Financial Assistance programs.

1.2.B The overall American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) as scored by Department grantees. [2200]	Fiscal Year	Actual
	2007	63
	2006	62
	2005	63
2007 target of 65 not met.		

U.S. Department of Education, Grantee Satisfaction Survey.

**Analysis of Progress.** Overall, there has been no statistically significant change in aggregate score across the three years in which the survey was done. For perspective on how to interpret the Department’s American Customer Satisfaction Index score of 63,

it is notable that the most recent average score for federal agencies was in the low 70s. It is important to note that federal agencies that serve grantees or interact in a regulatory role typically

score in the low 60s. A score of 63, while below the federal agency average, is on par with the typical scores of comparable grant-making agencies. The scores of grant-making agencies range from the high 50s to the low 60s. In response to survey results, Department program offices that participated in the survey identified areas of greatest impact, which will guide their direction for making improvements.

**Data Quality.** The CFI Group reports business and federal agency customer satisfaction indices quarterly in major news outlets, which allows for standardization of customer satisfaction information. Under contract with the Department, CFI Group conducted the 2007 survey using the methodology of the American Customer Satisfaction Index. The index was developed by the University of Michigan Business School, the CFI Group, and the American Society for Quality and meets their standards for data quality. Grantee Satisfaction Survey respondents included the chief state school officers and the state-level directors and coordinators of the Education Data Exchange Network, and the Early Intervention, Special Education, Career and Technical Education, Adult Education and Literacy, English Language Acquisition (ESEA Title III), Improving the Academic Achievement for Disadvantaged Students Grants to Local Educational Agencies (ESEA Title I), and Educational Technology Programs. There were 357 respondents to the survey out of 556 contacted, giving a response rate of 69 percent. Data were collected between June 20, 2007 and August 31, 2007. Twenty respondents indicated they had not been affiliated with one of the programs in the last 12 months and were, therefore, disqualified.

**Target Context.** The FY 2007 actual value of 63 is the American Customer Satisfaction Index score reported by our customer survey. It is not a percentage. Rather, the score is best thought of as a weighted scale based on multiple responses to questions in the survey. Survey scores are indexed on a 100-point scale. Agencies that score in the 80s are ranked as “world class.”



### Expansion of Choice Options for Parents

Parents of public school children who attend a Title I school that has been determined by the state to be in need of improvement have choices under the provisions of *No Child Left Behind*. They may send their child to another public school in the district, and, if the school’s status remains “in need of improvement” for more than one year, families whose children stay in the home school may enroll their children in supplemental educational services (i.e., tutoring). Parents’ options within the public school system have also increased with the growing numbers of public charter schools that create alternatives to the traditional public school.

New evidence shows that more families are choosing charter schools and voucher programs to meet the educational needs of their children. According to data gathered by the National Alliance of Public Charter Schools, more families are making choices about what school to attend. More than 1.25 million students nationwide will be enrolled in charter schools as of September 2007.

Department data collected from the Center for Education Reform indicate that the number of charter schools in operation around the nation has increased from 3,997 in September 2006 to 4,147 in September 2007. To help inform parents, the Department created a listserv whereby interested parents can automatically receive periodic notification of relevant charter school information posted on the Department’s Web site, [www.ed.gov](http://www.ed.gov).

As of May 2007, state lists posted online included 3,234 approved supplemental service providers, compared to 3,168 in May 2006. Of the 3,685,241 eligible students for the SY 2005-06, the number of students nationwide receiving services under the Supplemental Educational Services Program

grew from 245,267 in SY 2003-04 to 515,522 by SY 2005-06, resulting in a participation rate of 14 percent.

In a 2006 letter to all chief state school officers, the Secretary directed states to help their districts become fully compliant with supplemental educational services in SY 2006-07 through monitoring and the provision of technical assistance.

Additionally, the Department has assigned to the Comprehensive Center on Innovation and Improvement the task of providing technical assistance to regional centers and states in the area of supplemental educational services. This includes assistance to help states with the approval, monitoring, and evaluations of providers, as well as to help states and districts with outreach to parents.

<b>1.3.A Charter Schools Grants.</b> The number of charter schools in operation. [1146]	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	<b>4,147</b>
2006	3,997
2005	3,344
2004	2,996
2003	2,700
2002	2,431
2001	2,110
2000	1,700
1999	1,100
1998	790
1997	428
1996	255
2007 target of 3,900 exceeded.	
Center for Education Reform	

**Analysis of Progress.** The number of charter schools continues to grow steadily at a rate of approximately 10-12 percent, meeting Department goals. The Department's Charter Schools Grants program will continue to enhance national awareness of the charter schools model by funding national leadership activities that result in the dissemination of successful charter schools practices and policies. In addition, the Charter Schools Program has conducted case studies and disseminated information through a series of coordinated publications about highly successful charter elementary, middle, and high schools with demonstrated results in closing the achievement gap and bringing all students closer to proficiency.

**Data Quality.** Data are verified by Department program staff through data collections, research, and studies conducted by the National Alliance of Public Charter Schools, National Association of Charter School Authorizers, the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, and the Center for Education Reform. Additional data are verified through site-monitoring visits, technical assistance activities, and reviews of the Government Accountability Office and Office of Inspector General reports.

There are substantial differences in the definition of charter schools among states in average per pupil funding and facilities provisions. Some states count a single charter with multiple sites as a single charter school, while other states count a single charter with multiple sites as multiple charter schools, causing variability in the counts reported by state educational agencies. Reported data are based on each state's definition of charter schools and the enactment of state charter law and policies.

**Target Context.** Targets are set based on previous growth trends. The Education Commission of the States compiles statistics, policy reviews, and case studies on charter schools as part of its public education issues data collection.

**Additional Information.** Growth in the number of charter schools is largely under the control of state legislatures, which maintain the 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 laws, other states have amended their statutes to allow for multiple authorizers and, therefore, greater flexibility. Twenty-nine communities including New Orleans, Louisiana, Detroit, Michigan, Dayton, Ohio, Washington, D.C., and Kansas City, Missouri have at least 20 percent of

their student populations enrolled in charter schools. In addition, some states have used *No Child Left Behind* provisions that allow local educational agencies to convert low-performing Title I schools into charter schools.

<b>1.3.B Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities.</b> The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, construction, or renovation of charter school facilities. [1208]	Fiscal Year	Actual
	2007	<b>Target is \$120 million</b>
	2006	\$160 million
	2005	\$109 million
	2004	\$74 million
	2003	\$66 million
2006 target of \$100 million exceeded; 2007 data expected March 2008.		

U.S. Department of Education, Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities Program Performance Reports.

**Analysis of Progress.** The Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program helps charter schools with their facility needs typically by guaranteeing debt and some leases used to obtain their facilities.

**Data Quality.** Data are self-reported annually by grantees. Department program staff verify these data during site visits to grantees and to the schools that grantees serve. The number of dollars leveraged consists of the

dollar amount raised as a direct result of the guarantee.

Some grantees under the Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities Program have loan pools through which they work with a number of lenders to raise a given amount of funds for charter school facility loans. If the grantee received a non-Department of Education grant (such as a New Markets Tax Credit allocation<sup>1</sup>) and is using it to provide additional leveraging for a school served by the federal grant, such leveraging 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. Likewise, grantees may count subordinate debt toward the total amount of funds leveraged if they only use grant funds to credit-enhance senior debt.

The Department originally computed the dollars pledged by lenders as the amount of dollars leveraged in the year the loan pool closed. After learning that these pledges have contingencies, the Department revised the methodology to reflect only the funds in loans that have closed. Trend data shown in the table reflect this revised approach.

**Additional Information.** Grantees for this program receive multiyear funding at the beginning of the first project period. The federal funds and earnings on those funds remain available until they have been expended for the grant’s purposes or until financing facilitated by the grant has been retired, whichever is later. Most of the Department’s grantees are required to report midyear performance data to qualify for continuation awards, but, because there are no continuation awards for this program, we allow these grantees to report after the end of each fiscal year to give them a full year of performance before reporting data.

<sup>1</sup> The U.S. Treasury Department provides New Markets Tax Credits on a competitive basis. These tax credits are used to attract development in low-income communities. The credit provided to the investor totals 39 percent of the cost of the investment and is claimed over a seven-year credit allowance period. In each of the first three years, the investor receives a credit equal to 5 percent of the total amount paid for the stock or capital interest at the time of purchase. For the final four years, the value of the credit is 6 percent annually. Investors may not redeem their investments prior to the conclusion of the seven-year period.

**Evidence-Based Approaches to Instruction**

The *No Child Left Behind* goal that all students be proficient in reading and mathematics by SY 2013–14 has the best chance of being met if classroom instruction is built around what works. The What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) was established in 2002 by the Department’s Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. The WWC can be found at <http://www.whatworks.ed.gov>.

The WWC provides education consumers with high-quality reviews of the effectiveness of educational interventions including programs, products, practices, and policies that are designed to improve student outcomes. The WWC promotes informed education decision-making through a set of easily accessible databases and user-friendly reports that provide education consumers with high-quality reviews of the effectiveness of replicable educational interventions. To do this, the WWC uses standards for reviewing and synthesizing research. The WWC is currently conducting systematic reviews of existing research, and producing intervention and topic reports. Topics being explored include character education, dropout prevention, early childhood education, English language learning, mathematics and reading interventions.

1.4. A The proportion of school-adopted approaches that have strong evidence of effectiveness compared to programs and interventions without such evidence. [2201]	Fiscal Year	Actual
	2007	Target is baseline + 10%
	2006	Establish baseline
2006 and 2007 data will not be collected.		

**Analysis of Progress.**

Although the WWC released a large number of intervention and topic reports during FY 2007, very few reports were available during FY 2006. Given when adoption decisions are made, it is still too soon for WWC reports to have influenced schools’ adoption of particular

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Research survey.

approaches. Data have not been collected on this measure. Data on the use of evidence-based interventions cannot be collected until the WWC has released more information on such interventions. Because reports from the WWC take significant time to affect schools’ adoption of identified scientifically proven approaches to learning, this measure will be dropped for FY 2008.

**Discontinued Strategic Measures**

The following measures were discontinued after FY 2006 and data were reported as pending in the *FY 2006 Performance and Accountability Report*. The information below reports the results of the 2007 established targets.

Measure		Fiscal Year	Target	Actual	Status
1.1.B	The number of states that have reading/language arts assessments that align with the state’s academic content standards for all students in grades three through eight and in high school. [1201]	2007	52	52	Target met

Measure		Fiscal Year	Target	Actual	Status
1.1.C	The number of states that have mathematics assessments that align with the state's academic content standards for all students in grades three through eight and in high school. [1202]	2007	52	52	Target met
1.1.D	The number of states that have completed field-testing of the required assessments in reading/language arts. [1204]	2007	52	52	Target met
1.1.E	The number of states that have completed field-testing of the required assessments in mathematics. [1205]	2007	52	52	Target met
1.1.F	The number of states that have completed field-testing of the required assessments in science. [1206]	2007	20	26	Exceeded target