FY 2003
PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REPORT

U.S. Department of Education
November 14, 2003

This page left intentionally blank

Contents

Page

Introduction 1
Key to Program Legislation 1
Program Reports by Goal ..... 3 - 230

Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
CRA: Training and Advisory Services	Training and Advisory Services (Title IV of the Civil Rights Act: Equity Assistance Centers Program)	3
ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers	21st Century Community Learning Centers	6
ESEA: Advanced Placement Incentives	Advanced Placement Incentives Program	11
ESEA: Charter Schools Grants	Public Charter Schools	12
ESEA: Comprehensive School Reform	Comprehensive School Reform	14
ESEA: Educational Technology State Grants	Enhancing Education Through Technology Program	16
ESEA: English Language Acquisition: Competitive Grant Continuations	OELA Education Instructional Services Program	19
ESEA: English Language Acquisition: National Activities	OELA National Activities—Professional Development	22
ESEA: English Language Acquisition: State Grants	OELA Language Acquisition State Grants (Title III)	24

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
ESEA: Even Start	Even Start Family Literacy Program	26
ESEA: Impact Aid--Basic Support Payments	Impact Aid	28
ESEA: Impact Aid--Payments for Children with Disabilities	Impact Aid	28
ESEA: Impact Aid--Construction	Impact Aid	28
ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants	Improving Teacher Quality—State Grants	31
ESEA: Indian Education—Grants to Local Educational Agencies	Indian Education	33
ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance	Magnet Schools Assistance Program	36
ESEA: Migrant Education	Migrant Education	37
ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program	Programs for Children and Youth Who are Neglected or Delinquent (N or D)	43
ESEA: Parental Assistance Information Centers (FIE)	Parental Information and Resource Centers Program	47
ESEA: Reading First State Grants	Reading First State Grants	49
ESEA: Reading Is Fundamental/ Inexpensive Book Distribution (FIE)	Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution	52
ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television	Ready-to-Learn Television	53
ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities (FIE)	Smaller Learning Communities (Small, Safe and Successful High Schools)	54
ESEA: Star Schools Program (FIE)	Star Schools Program	56
ESEA: State Assessments	State Assessments	59
ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs	Innovative Education State Grants	61

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
ESEA: Teaching of Traditional American History	Teaching of Traditional American History	64
ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies	Title I Grants for Schools--ESEA	66
ESEA: Transition to Teaching	Transition to Teaching	69
ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers	Troops to Teachers	71
ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice	Voluntary Public School Choice	72
ESRA: National Assessment	National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and Assessment	73
ESRA: Regional Educational Laboratories	Regional Educational Laboratories	75
ESRA: Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers Program	Comprehensive Centers Program	80
ESRA: Eisenhower Regional Mathematics & Science Education Consortia	Eisenhower Regional Mathematics & Science Consortia	82
HEA: High School Equivalency Program	High School Equivalency Program	86
HEA: Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology	Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers To Use Technology	87
HEA: Teacher Quality Enhancement	Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants	89
IDEA: Grants for Infants and Families	IDEA Part C--Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities	95
IDEA: Grants to States	IDEA Part B—Grants to States & Preschool Grants	90
IDEA: Parent Information Centers	IDEA Part D—National Activities	98

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
IDEA: Personnel Preparation	IDEA Part D—National Activities	98
IDEA: Preschool Grants	IDEA Part B—Grants to States & Preschool Grants	90
IDEA: State Improvement	IDEA Part D—National Activities	98
IDEA: Technical Assistance and Dissemination	IDEA Part D—National Activities	98
IDEA: Technology and Media Services	IDEA Part D—National Activities	98
MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths	McKinney Vento Homeless Education Assistance Program	104
VTEA: Tech-Prep Education State Grants	Perkins Vocational and Technology Education (State Grants and Tech-Prep Indicators)	108
VTEA: Vocational Education State Grants	Perkins Vocational and Technology Education (State Grants and Tech-Prep Indicators)	108

Goal 3: Develop Safe Schools and Strong Character

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
ESEA: Character Education (FIE)	Character Education	115
ESEA: Elementary and Secondary School Counseling (FIE)	Elementary and Secondary School Counseling Program	116
ESEA: Physical Education Program – Carol M. White (FIE)	Carol M White Physical Education Program	117
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—Alcohol Abuse Reduction	Alcohol Abuse Reduction Grants	118
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—Federal Activities and Evaluation	Safe & Drug Free Schools National Programs	119

ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—Mentoring Program	Safe & Drug Free Schools National Programs	119
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—National Coordinator Program	Safe & Drug Free Schools National Programs	119
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—Project SERV	Safe & Drug Free Schools National Programs	119
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—State Grants	Safe & Drug Free Schools State Grants	121
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—State Grants for Community Services for Expelled or Suspended Students	Community Service Grants	124

Goal 4: Transform Education into an Evidence-Based Field

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination	Research, Development, and Dissemination	126
ESRA: Statistics	National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and Assessment	73
IDEA: Research and Innovation	IDEA Part D—National Activities	98
RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research	National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)	140

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

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
AEFLA: Adult Education State Grants	Adult Education State Grants and Knowledge Development	151
ATA: Assistive Technology	Assistive technology Program	157
EDA: Gallaudet University	Gallaudet University	159
EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf	National Technical Institute for the Deaf	166
ESEA: Community Technology Centers (FIE)	Community Technology Centers	170
HEA: AID – Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions	Institutional Development, Title III and Title V	171
HEA: AID – Minority Science and Engineering Improvement	Institutional Development, Title III and Title V	171
HEA: AID – Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions	Institutional Development, Title III and Title V	171
HEA: AID — Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities	Institutional Development, Title III and Title V	171
HEA: AID — Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions	Institutional Development, Title III and Title V	171
HEA: AID – Strengthening Institutions (Part A)	Institutional Development, Title III and Title V	171
HEA: AID – Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges & Universities	Institutional Development, Title III and Title V	171
HEA: Byrd Honors Scholarships	Byrd Honors Scholarship Program	174
HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents In School	Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program	175

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
HEA: Federal TRIO programs – McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement	TRIO Programs	176
HEA: Federal TRIO programs – Student Support Services	TRIO Programs	176
HEA: Federal TRIO programs – Upward Bound	TRIO Programs	176
HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education	179
HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP)	Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP)	181
HEA: Graduate Assistance In Areas of National Need (GAANN)	Graduate Assistance In Areas of National Need (GAANN) and Javits Fellowships	185
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies—Domestic Programs	International Education and Foreign Language Studies Program	188
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies—Institute for International Public Policy	International Education and Foreign Language Studies Program	188
HEA: Javits Fellowships	Javits Fellowships	193
HEA/ DEOA: SFA – Student Aid Administration	Student Financial Assistance—Policy	194
	Student Financial Assistance--Programs	200
HEA: SFA College Housing and Academic Facilities Loans (CHAFL) Federal Administration	Student Financial Assistance—Policy	194
	Student Financial Assistance--Programs	200
HEA: SFA Federal Direct Student Loans	Student Financial Assistance—Policy	194

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
	Student Financial Assistance--Programs	200
HEA: SFA – Federal Family Education Loan Program & Liquidating	Student Financial Assistance—Policy	194
	Student Financial Assistance--Programs	200
HEA: SFA – Federal Pell Grants	Student Financial Assistance—Policy	194
	Student Financial Assistance--Programs	200
HEA: SFA – Federal Perkins Loans	Student Financial Assistance—Policy	194
	Student Financial Assistance--Programs	200
HEA: SFA – Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants	Student Financial Assistance—Policy	194
	Student Financial Assistance--Programs	200
HEA: SFA – Federal Work-Study	Student Financial Assistance—Policy	194
	Student Financial Assistance--Programs	200
HEA: SFA – Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnerships	Student Financial Assistance—Policy	194
	Student Financial Assistance--Programs	200
HEA: SFA – Loan Forgiveness for Child Care Providers	Student Financial Assistance—Policy	194
	Student Financial Assistance--Programs	200

Program Legislation and Name	Cluster Name As It Appears on the Printed Plan	Page
Howard University	Howard University	202
RA: Independent Living–Centers	Independent Living Services Program	208
RA: Independent Living–Services for Older Blind Individuals	Independent Living Services Program	208
RA: Independent Living–State Grants	Independent Living Services Program	208
RA: Projects with Industry Program (PWI)	Projects with Industry (PWI)	212
RA: Supported Employment	State Vocational Rehabilitation and Supported Employment	215
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs	Demonstration and Training Programs	220
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants—Grants for Indians	American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services	223
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants—Grants to States	State Vocational Rehabilitation and Supported Employment	215
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training	Training Program	225
VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institute	Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions	229

INTRODUCTION

The strategic goals and objectives set forth in the Department of Education's *FY 2002-2007 Strategic Plan* form an overarching context of broad outcomes that we believe should characterize American education. We believe that if we are successful, as a whole, we will see increases in the related measures—measures that are in most cases for all children, whether or not they are individually served by our programs. We believe that our success as an agency can be measured in the results of better education for *all*.

However, this kind of information does not always provide us with the tools necessary to determine the success of each of our programs or the relationship between program-specific funding and results. For that, we need measures that are more specific to the provisions of each particular program and to the audience it serves. This, too, is part of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). Thus, in addition to the measures specified in our *FY 2002-2007 Strategic Plan*, we have established measures and targets for all of our major programs and many of our smaller programs. In some cases, we have set measures for a particular program individually. In other cases, we have grouped similar programs and set measures for that cluster of programs.

The Department's *FY 2003 Performance and Accountability Report (PAR)* reports on both the Department-level measures and program measures and is located on our Web site at http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2003report/index.html. To better link programs to the strategic goals, the Department identified the goal each program supports. A listing of the programs by goal can be found in the PAR at the end goals 2-5 in the performance details section.

This document is a compilation of the program performance reports containing the results on program measures arranged by goal.

Key to Legislation:

AEFLA = Adult Education and Family Literacy Act
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
HEA = Higher Education Act
IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
MVHAA = McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act
RA = Rehabilitation Act
VTEA = Vocational and Technical Education Act

Goal 2

Training and Advisory Services (Title IV of the Civil Rights Act: Equity Assistance Centers Program) - 2003

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

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Breadth of services: The number of services provided by the EACs will increase each year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Web site visits			**Progress:** In 2001, EACs improved their performance in all areas except "conference/seminar/other training events." Program budget constraints prohibited increases in this area. 2001-2002 EAC activities were interrupted by the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), January 2002. NCLB re-directed EAC activity and focused Centers' work on the requirements of the legislation. The shifting nature of requested technical assistance is reflected in what appears to be a reduction of services in some areas. New areas of TA include: increased access to English language literacy for ELL students in addition to bilingual education advocacy; disaggregated data; high-quality teacher professional development; and parent group assistance.	**Additional Source Information:** Equity Assistance Center Project Performance Reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	1,266,975			
2001	2,931,386			
2002	3,993,390	3,078,000		
2003		3,108,780		
2004		3,139,868		
Published materials and products				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	139			
2001	233			
2002	114	245		
2003		247		

2004		250

Conference/seminar/other training events

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	919	
2001	887	
2002	829	931
2003		940
2004		949

On-site consultations

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	732	
2001	897	
2002	1,000	942
2003		951
2004		961

Mailings or individual requests for information

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	1,038	
2001	1,326	
2002	1,045	1,392
2003		1,406
2004		1,420

Consultations by telephone or e-mail

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	2,292	
2001	3,161	
2002	3,709	3,319
2003		3,352
2004		3,386

21st Century Community Learning Centers - 2003

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

Program Goal: To enable public elementary and secondary schools to plan, implement, or expand extended learning opportunities for the benefit of the educational, health, social service, cultural, and recreational needs of their communities.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Center Programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Achievement: Students regularly participating in the program will show improvement in achievement through measures such as test scores, grades, and/or teacher reports.

Targets and Performance Data													Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of regular program participants whose Math/English grades improved from fall to spring.														**Additional Source Information:** 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**						**Performance Targets**							
	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle or High School Math	Middle or High School English	Overall Math	Overall English	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle or High School Math	Middle or High 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		
2002	41.10	44.20	37.20	39.40	39.40	42.30	45	45	45	45	45	45		
2003							45	45	45	45	45	45		
2004							45	45	45	45	45	45		

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 or High School Math	Middle or High School English	Overall Math	Overall English	Elementary Math	Elementary English	Middle or High School Math	Middle or High 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	6
2002	3.70	4 2	3.90	3.70	4.10		6	6	6	6	6	6
2003							6	6	6	6	6	6
2004							6	6	6	6	6	6

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				75	75	75
2004				75	75	75

Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees.

Indicator 8.1.2 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of students with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior		**Additional**

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				75	75	75
2004				75	75	75

Explanation: According to teacher reports in 2002, 76 percent of the students who regularly participated in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs showed behavioral improvements (up from 74% in 2001).

Source Information: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees.

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

Objective 8.2 of 2: 21st Century Community Learning Centers will show improvement through measures such as school attendance, classroom performance and decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Core educational services: Percent of centers that offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

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		85
2004		85

Additional Source Information: 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by grantees.

Improvements: Data collection for web-based system will be upgraded periodically.

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Enrichment and support activities: Percentage of centers that offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

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		85
2004		85

Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in other areas.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	97	85
2001	95	85

Explanation: The vast majority of the centers (96%) offer enrichment and support services with a significant proportion (81 percent) offering computer- or technology-related activities. This is up from 79% in 2001.

Additional Source Information: 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by grantees.

Improvements: Data collection for web-based system will be upgraded periodically.

2002	96	85		
2003		85		
2004		85		

Advanced Placement Incentives Program - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.330C - Advanced Placement Incentives Program

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: Encourage a greater number of low-income students to participate in the AP program.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Students served: The number of AP tests taken by low-income students.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of AP tests taken by low-income students.				**Additional Source Information:** Educational Testing Service **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
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		154,629		
2004		170,092		

Public Charter Schools Program - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.282 - Charter Schools

Program Goal: To support the creation of a large number of high-quality charter schools and to evaluate their effects.

Objective 8.1 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 8.1.1 of 2: State legislation: The number of states that have charter school legislation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of states with charter school legislation (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico)			**Status:** Target not met **Progress:** Several States will be considering legislation this year.	**Additional Source Information:** State Educational Agencies (SEA); state legislatures. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** January 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** There is variation in the definition of state charter school legislation.
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		44		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Charter operations: The number of charter schools in operation around the Nation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of charter schools in operation			**Status:** Target not met **Explanation:** There has been a positive trend toward meeting this objective. The number of charter schools in operation has dramatically increased from 100 in 1994 to 2,431 in 2002.	**Additional Source Information:** State Education Agencies; State legislatures. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** January 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **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 SEAs. There is sometimes disagreement about numbers of charter schools in operation among the agencies that do the counting.
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		3,000		

Comprehensive School Reform - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.332A - ESEA Comprehensive School Reform

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

Objective 8.1 of 2: Student achievement in core subjects generally will show marked improvement in comprehensive school reform (CSR) program schools.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: State assessments: By 2014 all students in schools that have received CSR funding will meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Reading								**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** 2003 **Limitations:** The data for this indicator were self-reported by State Educational Agencies.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	Elementary	Middle	High	Elementary	Middle	High		
2000	67	56	72					
2001	75	77	64					
2002				78	80	67		
2003				81	83	70		
Mathematics								
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	Elementary	Middle	High	Elementary	Middle	High		
2000	62	74	61					
2001	74	74	74					
2002				77	77	77		
2003				80	80	80		

Objective 8.2 of 2: The number of schools providing high-quality curriculum and instruction and improving student outcomes will increase each year.

Indicator 8.2.1 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.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of principals in Title I schools reporting that they are implementing a research-based school reform model			**Explanation:** Increasing numbers of Title I schools are implementing research-based school reform models to improve curriculum and instruction. The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program is meeting its purpose of increasing awareness of and support for comprehensive school reform among states, districts and schools, and acts as a catalyst for how Title I funds can be used in schoolwide programs to support the adoption of research-based comprehensive school reform programs	**Additional Source Information:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999(baseline)/2000. **Frequency:** Annually. **Data Available:** 2003 **Validated By:** NCES. **Limitations:** Data are taken from a nationally representative sample of Title I schools; no data are available on all Title I schools. Because data are based on self-reports, it is difficult to judge the extent to which reform programs are comprehensive and research-based. An examination of school documents on a subsample of Title I schools will allow some indication of the quality of comprehensive school reform efforts in Title I schools in general.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	31			
2000	46			
2001		55		
2002		60		
2003		70		

Enhancing Education Through Technology Program - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.318 - Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Grants

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

Objective 8.1 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 8.1.1 of 1: Curriculum Integration: The percentage of districts receiving substantial EETT funds that have effectively and fully integrated technology, as identified by States.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of districts receiving substantial EETT funds that have integrated technology.	**Explanation:** FY 2004 data will provide the baseline (the code for setting a baseline is 999); performance targets beyond 2004 will be set from the baseline.	**Source:** Other **Other:** National Evaluation. **Sponsor:** SRI - National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS).. **Date Sponsored:** 06/06/2003. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** November 2003

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999

Objective 8.2 of 3: To help ensure that students and teachers in high-poverty, high-need schools have comparable access to educational technology as students and teachers in other schools.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Internet access in high poverty schools: Internet access in high-poverty school classrooms will be comparable to that in other schools.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of classrooms with internet access.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Low-poverty schools	High-poverty schools	Low-poverty schools	High-poverty schools
1999	73	38		
2000	82	60	100	100
2001	90	79	100	100
2002			100	100
2003			100	100
2004			100	100

Explanation: The number of high-poverty schools with Internet access continues to rise. As high-poverty schools increasingly obtain access to the Internet, it is likely that their classroom connections will subsequently increase.

Source: NCES Survey/Assessment
Survey/Assessment: Fast Response Survey System.
References: NCES Survey - Internet Access in U. S. Schools and Classrooms: 1994-2002..

Additional Source Information: NCES Survey: Internet Access in U.S. Public Schools and Classrooms; National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS)

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: October 2003

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.

Objective 8.3 of 3: To provide professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and school administrators to develop capactiy to effectively integrate the use of technology into teaching and learning.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Professional Development: In districts that receive substantial funding from the State Grants program, the percentage of teachers that meet their state technology standards will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of teachers that meet state technology standards			**Explanation:** FY 2004 data will provide the baseline (the code for setting a baseline is	**Source:** Other **Other:** National Evaluation. **Sponsor:** SRI - National Educational Technology Trends
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		

	999); the performance target is baseline plus.	Study (NETTS).. **Date Sponsored:** 06/06/2003. **Additional Source Information:** State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA) Common Data Elements Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** November 2003

OELA Education Instructional Services Program - 2003

Program Goal: To help limited-English proficient (LEP) students reach high academic standards.

Objective 8.1 of 1: IMPROVE ENGLISH PROFICIENCY AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS SERVED BY TITLE VII OF THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: English proficiency: Students in the program will annually demonstrate continuous and educationally significant progress on oral or written English proficiency measures.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of projects in which three-quarters of student groups made gains in English proficiency

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Oral	Written	Oral	Written
1998	90	81		
1999	82	74	92	85
2000	75	89	93	88
2001	75	89	94	91
2002			94	91
2003			95	90
2004			95	90

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: Year 2002 and 2003 data are being analyzed and will be submitted December 5, 2003. Year 2004 data will be submitted in December, 2004. The tabular data report the percentages of projects, not the percentages of students. The program has funded at least six consecutive annual cohorts of student participants, each of which was funded or five years. Cohort data are aggregated across grantees to measure overall program performance. Cohorts provide comparisons of oral and written performance of approximately the same project groups of studetns over time. For example, Cohort 1 is the group of Comprehensive School projects initially funded in 1995. Cohort 1's first set of biennial reports was submitted in 1998, covering student outcome data of the first two years of operation (1995-1997). Subsequent data for Cohort 1 were reported in 2000 detailing student outcomes during the program's third and fourth years, and in 2002 covering its final program year. Cohort 2, therefore, is the group initially funded in 1996, submiting reports in 1999 ,

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Contracted synthesis of local project data.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Cohorts defined by program-year provide the best measure of Title VII, IASA, program impact, but have limitations. 1) ELL student groups are moving targets. The comparison of student groups changes between reports due to high mobility and reclassification (mainstreaming). 2) Operational definitions of ELL and requirements for time-in-program very by project. 3) Measures of progress vary by project. 4) The basis of reclassification is not always performance-based but determined by limited resources and the decision to incorporate

	2001 and 2003. Cohort 6 is the last group of grantees; they were funded in 2000 and report data through 2007.	new students by displacing others. 5) The quality and completeness of data varies among projects and cohorts of projects.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Other academic achievement: Students in the program will annually demonstrate continuous and educationally significant progress on appropriate academic achievement of language arts, reading, and math.

Percentage of projects in which three-quarters of student groups made gains in academic achievement in language arts, reading and math.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Language Arts	Reading	Math	Language Arts	Reading	Math
1998	69	66	70			
1999	44	53	58	65	65	66
2000	63	73	67	67	67	68
2001	83	67	60	70	70	70
2002				70	70	70
2003				70	70	70
2004				70	70	70

Explanation: Year 2002 and 2003 data are being analyzed and will be submitted December 5, 2003. Year 2004 data will be submitted in December, 2004. The tabular data report the percentages of projects, not the percentages of students. The program has funded at least six consecutive annual cohorts of student participants, each of which was funded or five years. Cohort data are aggregated across grantees to measure overall program performance. Cohorts provide comparisons of oral and written performance of approximately the same project groups of studetns over time. For example, Cohort 1 is the group of Comprehensive School projects initially funded in 1995. Cohort 1's first set of biennial reports was submitted in 1998, covering student outcome data of the first two years of operation (1995-1997). Subsequent data for Cohort 1 were reported in 2000 detailing student outcomes during the program's third and fourth years, and in 2002 covering its final program year. Cohort 2, therefore, is the group initially funded in 1996, submiting reports in 1999 ,

Additional Source Information: Annual contracted synthesis of biennial reports. Data analyses are fully reported. Planned improvements for addressing the limitations of source data and the limitations in data comparisons include uniform program monitoring and assessment guidance for all Title III projects (see "Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance on the Title III State Formula Grant Program, Standards, Assessment, and Accountability, Feb., 2003).

Frequency: Biennially.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

	2001 and 2003. C	

OELA National Activities - Professional Development - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.195N - ELA National Activities

Program Goal: Improve the academic achievement of LEP students

Objective 8.1 of 1: Improve the quality of teachers of LEP students.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Percentage of grantees that report program improvement related to K-12 state standards, scientifically-based research practices, or development of subject area competence.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of grantees that report program improvement related to K-12 state standards, scientifically-based research practices, or development of subject area competence	**Progress:** 35% (45 of 130) of National Professional Development Grantees reported information on improvement of their program related to k-12 state standards, scientifically based research or development of subject area competence. Information was reported through annual performance reports.	**Additional Source Information:** Grantee annual performance reports. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** April 2003

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	35	25
2004		50
2005		75

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Percentage of grantees that report effectiveness of graduates/completers in the instructional setting.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of grantees that report effectiveness of graduates/completers in the instructional setting	**Explanation:** A baseline will be set in 2006.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual Performance Reports. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** April 2003

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Of preservice teachers the rate of placement of graduates in an instructional setting serving LEP students, within one year of graduation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Of preservice teachers the rate of placement of graduates in an instructional setting serving LEP students, within one year of graduation			**Explanation:** A baseline will be set in 2007.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual Performance Reports.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2007		999		

OELA Language Acquisition State Grants (Title III) - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.365 - English Language Acquisition Grants

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: Improve English proficiency and academic achievement of students served by Title III.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: The percentage of states that have aligned English language proficiency standards and assessments in place.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Progress: (Performance Measurement Set 3 & 4) Projections are based on the current rate of progress made by the States in developing or revising their English language proficiency standards and assessments.	**Additional Source Information:** NCLB Biennial Evaluation Reports **Data Available:** May 2004

Percentage of states that have developed English language proficiency standards

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		70
2004		100

The percentage of states that have selected and administered English language proficiency assessments

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		95
2004		100

The percentage of states that have demonstrated the alignment of English language proficiency (ELP) standards with ELP assessments

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		10
2004		100

The percentage of states that have demonstrated how their English language proficiency standards are linked to academic content standards in English

language arts or reading		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003		10
2004		80

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: The percentage of students who attain English language proficiency.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Of limited English-proficient students who have received Title III services for three academic years, the percentage who have attained English language proficiency			**Progress:** Target is subject to adjustment based on the States' September 2003 submission.	**Additional Source Information:** NCLB Biennial Evaluation Reports **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** May 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2006		70		

Even Start Family Literacy Program - 2003

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 8.1 of 1: The literacy of participating families will improve.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Adult literacy achievement: Percentage of Even Start adults who achieve significant learning gains on measures of literacy and mathematics.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of adults showing learning gains on measures of literacy and mathematics.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Math	Reading	Math	Reading
1995	26	31		
1996	24	20		
2001			40	30
2002			41	31
2003			42	32

Explanation: 2001 The 3rd National Even Start Evaluation did not collect nationally representative data; instead provided data from only 18 subgrantees. Therefore, 2001 data is not available. 2002 data will be analyzed by December 2003, if data from the Consolidated Performance Report (CPR) can be re-formatted to allow for reporting on this indicator. The current version of the CPR does not collect data in a format that will allow for reporting on this indicator. 2003 data is dependent upon the format of the revised CPR.

Source: Other
Other: Record/File.
Sponsor: No Child Left Behind - Consolidated Performance Report (CPR).
Date Sponsored: 12/31/2003.

Frequency: Annually.

Limitations: Currently, the CPR does not appear to provide data in a format to report on performance for this indicator.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Adult educational attainment: Percentage of Even Start adults who earn their high school diploma or general equivalency diploma (GED).

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal or GED

Source: Other
Other: Record/File

attainment goal that earn a high school diploma or equivalent.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	18	
1997	19	
1999	18.40	
2000	17	
2001	17	25
2002		26
2003		27
2004		28

Explanation: 2002 data will be analyzed by December 2003, provided the data is able to be re-formatted in such a way to allow for reporting on this indicator. Since the current version of the CPR does not collect data in a format that will allow for reporting on this indicator, 2003 data is dependent upon the format of the revised CPR.

Sponsor: No Child Left Behind CPR..
Date Sponsored: 12/31/2003.

Frequency: Annually.

Limitations: Currently, the CPR does not appear to provide data in a format to report on performance for this indicator. Also, definitions of a high school diploma and Graduate Equivalency Diploma may vary across programs, and these data are obtained through grantee self-report.

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Children's language development and reading readiness: Percentage of Even Start children who achieve significant learning gains on measures of language development and reading readiness.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of children showing learning gains on a measure of language development.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	45	
1997	64	
2001		65
2002		66
2003		67
2004		68

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: 2001 The 3rd National Even Start Evaluation did not collect nationally representative data; instead provided data from only 18 subgrantees. Therefore, 2001 data is not available. 2002 data will be analyzed by December 2003, if data from the Consolidated Performance Report (CPR) can be re-formatted to allow for reporting on this indicator. The current version of the CPR does not collect data in a format that will allow for reporting on this indicator. 2003 data is dependent upon the format of the revised CPR.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Other
Other: Record/File.
Sponsor: No Child Left Behind CPR..
Date Sponsored: 12/31/2003.

Frequency: Annually.

Limitations: Currently, the CPR does not appear to provide data in a format to report on performance for this indicator.

Impact Aid - 2003

CFDA Numbers: 84.040 - Impact Aid_Facilities Maintenance
84.041 - Impact Aid
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 8.1 of 3: Make payments in a timely manner

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Timeliness of payments: The percent of eligible applicants who receive initial Basic Support and Children With Disabilities payments within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of applicants paid within 60 days of appropriation.			**Status:** Target exceeded	**Additional Source Information:** Program office files. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** April 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
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		90		
2005		90		

Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the quality of public school facilities used to educate federally connected children.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Construction: The percent of the schools in LEAs receiving Impact Aid Construction funds that report that the overall condition of their school buildings is adequate.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of LEAs reporting that the overall condition of their school buildings is adequate.			**Status:** Target not met	**Additional Source Information:** Data collected from LEA application for Impact Aid Section 8003 payments. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **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.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000		70		
2001	44	70		
2002	43	70		
2003	47	70		
2004		70		
2005		70		

Objective 8.3 of 3: Make accurate payments

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Overpayment forgiveness requests: The number of requests to forgive overpayments of Basic Support Payments, and payments for Children With Disabilities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of requests to forgive overpayments of Basic Support Payments			**Status:** Target exceeded	**Additional Source Information:** Program office files. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	5	10		
2000	2	10		
2001	10	10		
2002	4	10		
2003	3	10		

2004		10		
2005		10		

Improving Teacher Quality State Grants - 2003

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

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in Title I schools: Percentage of highly qualified teachers in Title I schools

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of highly qualified teachers in Title I elementary schools.	**Explanation:** FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported.	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI)

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999
2006		100

Percentage of highly qualified teachers in Title I middle and high schools.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999
2006		100

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in all schools: Percentage of highly qualified teachers in all elementary schools and in all middle and high schools.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of highly qualified teachers in all elementary schools.	**Explanation:** FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported.	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI)

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999
2006		100

Percentage of highly qualified teachers in all middle and high schools.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003		999
2006		100

Indian Education - 2003

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 8.1 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 8.1.1 of 3: Student achievement: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will meet or exceed the performance standards established by national assessments.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 4 who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP			**Explanation:** NAEP Assessment for reading and math are not administered annually. National trends indicate performance in reading and math are declining.	**Source:** NCES Survey/Assessment **Survey/Assessment:** National Assessment of Educational Progress. **Additional Source Information:** National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2000, 2002; Schools and Staffing Survey, 1997. **Frequency:** Biennially. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** NCES. Data validated by National Center for Education Statistics review procedures and National Center for Education Statistics statistical standards.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1994	59			
2000	63			
2002	51	60		
2004		62		
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**		
1994	58			
2001		64		
2002	61			
2004		66		

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	52	
2000	53	
2002		64
2004		66

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	52	
2000	42	
2002		62
2004		64

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.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will meet or exceed the performance standards established by states.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in schools who meet proficient and advanced performance levels in reading and math	**Explanation:** No data available	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** 1810-0503 Annual Performance Reporting Format for OIE Formula Grants to LEAs. **Additional Source Information:** Performance Consolidated State Reports, Title I Section. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** October 2004

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		34
2004		35

		Validated By: No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Substantial variation across states in their definitions of proficient student performance.

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Student promotion and graduation: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will graduate at rates comparable to all students.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Natives 20 to 24 years old who are high school graduates **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **1998** / 70 / **2000** / / 75 **2001** / / 80 **2003** / / 81 **2004** / / 82	**Explanation:** Projects are targeting services to reduce dropouts and increase the graduation rates of American Indian and Alaska Native students. Increased promotion and graduation completion are expected. Unable to locate any specific racial/ethnic data on educational attainment from 2000 census data on website. Only total U.S. data are reported.	**Additional Source Information:** OIE Annual Performance Report **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Census data validated by the Census Bureau review procedures and Census standards; OIE Annual Performance Report data supplied by grantee. No formal verification procedures applied. Validated by the National Center for Educational Statistics review procedures and National Center for Educational Statistics. **Limitations:** Participation in Census surveys varies by regions and location, resulting in undercount of population.

Magnet Schools Assistance Program - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.165 - Magnet Schools Assistance

Program Goal: To assist in the desegregation of schools served by local educational agencies.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Federally funded magnet programs eliminate, reduce, or prevent the incidence and the degree of minority student isolation in targeted schools.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Magnet schools will eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation according to their individual objectives by successfully attracting and enrolling students whose demographic composition is consistent with and furthers a school's specific objective for the reduction, prevention or elimination of minority group isolation.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

The percentage of Magnet schools that have met their objectives to reduce, prevent, or eliminate minority group isolation.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		50
2004		55
2005		60
2006		65
2007		70

Progress: Collecting data on minority group isolation and student achievement has posed challenges for the Department. The data on the performance reports are self-reported, and the objectives for reducing minority group isolation are set by the grantee. Few applications provided baseline data on student achievement. An evaluation to be completed in 2003 will report on the extent to which some magnet schools reduced minority group isolation and met their achievement objectives.

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

Additional Source Information: Magnet Study conducted by AIR. Data from this study are due November 2003.

Frequency: Annually.

Data Available: November 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Data in performance reports are self reported.

Migrant Education - 2003

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 8.1 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 8.1.1 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.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of States meeting performance target in Reading--Elementary							**Explanation:** 2002 data are not yet available.	**Additional Source Information:** NCLB Consolidated State Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** June 2003 **Limitations:** The States reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from one year to the next. States are also re-designing assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same States or measure from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children have been included in the assessment systems.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient		
1996	4	10	50					
1997	4	15	50					
1998	7	18	50					
1999	2	19	50					
2000	5	26	50					
2001	6	23	50					
2002				8	27	50		
2003				10	32	50		

2004				14	36	50

Improvements: It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.

Indicator 8.1.2 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.

Targets and Performance Data

Number of States meeting performance target in Reading--Middle

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient
1996	2	10	50			
1997	3	15	50			
1998	6	18	50			
1999	4	18	50			
2000	2	23	50			
2001	7	21	50			
2002				9	25	50
2003				11	29	50
2004				15	32	50

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: 2002 data are not yet available.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: NCLB Consolidated State Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: June 2003

Limitations: The States reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from one year to the next. States are also re-designing assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same States or measure from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children have been included in the assessment systems.

Improvements: It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems

		become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.

Indicator 8.1.3 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Number of States meeting performance target in Math--Elementary

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient
1996	4	10	50			
1997	5	15	50			
1998	9	18	50			
1999	6	19	50			
2000	7	25	50			
2001	10	23	50			
2002				12	27	50
2003				14	32	50
2004				18	36	50

Explanation: 2002 data are not yet available.

Additional Source Information: NCLB Consolidated State Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: June 2003

Limitations: The States reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from one year to the next. States are also re-designing assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same States or measure from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children have been included in the assessment systems.

Improvements: It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.

Indicator 8.1.4 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.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of States meeting performance target in Math--Middle							**Explanation:** 2002 data are not yet available.	**Additional Source Information:** NCLB Consolidated State Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** June 2003 **Limitations:** The States reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from one year to the next. States are also re-designing assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same States or measure from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children have been included in the assessment systems. **Improvements:** It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient		
1996	3	10	50					
1997	3	15	50					
1998	7	18	50					
1999	4	18	50					
2000	2	22	50					
2001	4	20	50					
2002				6	24	50		
2003				8	28	50		
2004				12	32	50		

Indicator 8.1.5 of 6: Reducing Dropout Rate: In an increasing number of states, a decreasing percentage of migrant students will dropout from secondary school (grades 7 - 12).

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Numbers of States Meeting Performance Target (of States reporting) -- Dropout Rate

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students who drop out of school	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students who drop out of school
2004				999	999	999

Explanation: [Note: This indicator is new. 2004 data will set baseline. As the data are not yet available, "999" is the code for baseline data that will be forthcoming.]

Additional Source Information: NCLB Consolidated State Report (proposed).

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 - 2004
Data Available: December 2004

Limitations: Data on the number of high school migrant dropouts is not available currently.

Improvements: An element of the forthcoming Consolidated State Performance Report will collect information on the number and percent of migrant students who drop out of school between the grades 7 through 12 annually.

Indicator 8.1.6 of 6: Achieving High School Graduation: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will graduate from high school.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Numbers of States Meeting Performance Target (of States reporting) -- High School Graduation

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students who graduate from high school	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students who graduate from high school

Explanation: [Note: This indicator is new. 2004 data will set baseline. As the data are not yet available, "999" is the code for baseline data that will be forthcoming.]

Additional Source Information: NCLB Consolidated State Report (proposed).

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 - 2004
Data Available: December 2004

Limitations: Data on the number of migrant who graduate from high school is not available currently.

2004		999	999	999		**Improvements:** An element of the forthcoming Consolidated State Performance Report will collect information on the number and percent of migrant students who graduate from high school annually.

Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) - 2003

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

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Progress and achievement: The percent of neglected or delinquent students obtaining a secondary school diploma, or its recognized equivalent, or obtaining employment will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of N or D students obtaining diploma, diploma equivalent, or employment	**Progress:** FY 2002-2003 data will come from a sample of states and State agencies capable of reporting data on this indicator. **Explanation:** This indicator is a new indicator for FY 2003 and represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success. The statutory requirement to report data for this program is every three years. Thus, there is no current mandate to require or request a collection from all participants.	**Additional Source Information:** Data will be collected through a sample State performance report which includes information from Subpart I State Agency awardees. Based on a study of the sample data the program will design a data collection instrument and request approval for an annual collection from all recipients of program funds. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Data from states and state agencies will be based on a voluntary sample of agencies

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999
2004		5
2005		5

		with data systems capable of producing reportable information. **Improvements:** Data collected for 2003 will provide a sample ot inform the development of a larger data collection. After 2003, the porgram office will request approval to collect data annually and set targets based on the baseline.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: High school course credits: The number of high school course credits earned by neglected or delinquent students will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Average number of high school course credits earned by N or D students. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2003** /	**Progress:** FY 2002-2003 data will be a sample of states and stae agencies capable of reporting data in this area. Any subsequent large-scale collections will require Department approval. **Explanation:** The indicator is a new indicator for FY 2003 and represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success. Data will be basedon a sample of States and state agencies	**Additional Source Information:** Data will be collected through a sample of State performance report which includes information from a sample of Subpart I State Agency awardees. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Data from state assessments will based on sampling methodology of States with agencies capable of accurately collecting and reporting data on this indicator. **Improvements:** Data collected for 2003 will provide a sample in order to develop a larger scale

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999
2004		5
2005		5

		assessment instrument. that, with Department approval will collect data annually and set targets based on an national baseline.

Indicator 8.1.3 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of N or D students with improved test scores. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2003** /	**Progress:** FY 2002-2003 data will serve as baseline data for this indicator. (Note: 999 is the code for setting baseline.) The performance targets for out years are set at a 5% increase to the baseline. The validity of out year targets will be re-examined following the determination of the baseline. **Explanation:** This indicator is a new indicator for FY 2003 and represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success.	**Additional Source Information:** State performance report of State Agency Activities under Title I, Part D, Subpart I. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **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. **Improvements:** Data collected for 2003 will provide a baseline. After 2003, the Department will collect data annually and set targets based on the baseline.

		999
2004		5
2005		5

Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Transition plan: The percent of students who have a high quality transition plan will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of N or D students with transition plan		**Additional Source Information:**

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999
2004		5
2005		5

Progress: FY 2002-2003 data will will be sampled from states with state agencies capable of producing this data.

Explanation: This is a new measure for FY 2003 and represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success.

Study of State Agency Activities under Title I, Part D, Subpart I will help to determine what elements need to be part of a national collection.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: December 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Data from state assessments will be part of a sample from state agencies.

Improvements: Data collected for 2003 will provide a information for future collection activities. After 2003, the program office will request approval to collect data annually and set targets based on the baseline.

Parental Information and Resource Centers Program - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.310 - Parental Assistance Centers

Program Goal: To increase information and options for parents.

Objective 8.1 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 8.1.1 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.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Increasing numbers of parents of children attending schools that are not making adequate yearly progress, who participate in PIRC activities, will receive information on their State Accountability systems, rights and opportunities for supplemental services and public school choice options.			**Progress:** This will be a new indicator based on a program priority. 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. In 2003, the number of parents of children attending schools that are notmaking adequate yearly progress reported to have received the information they need to understand their State Accountability systems and the options available to them under section 1116of the ESEA will establish the baseline for performance targets in succeeding years. For 2004, the target will be 5 percent above baseline. For 2005, the target will increase by 10 percent above baseline; and for 2006, the target will increase by 15	**Additional Source Information:** Project monitoring; audits **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2006 **Data Available:** November 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** Data are self-reported.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		999		
2004		5		
2005		10		
2006		15		

	percent above the baseline established in 2003. **Explanation:** Performance reporting requirements for the PIRC program are being revised to incorporate the collection of information needed to respond to this indicator.	

Reading First State Grants - 2003

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

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Reading Achievement in Reading First Schools: The percentage of grades 1-3 students reading 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, will increase.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of students in Reading First schools in grades 1-3 meeting or exceeding proficient level in reading.							**Explanation:** FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Additional Source Information:** Reading First Annual Performance Report. Recipients of Reading First grants, as required by statute, will submit Annual Performance Reports on reading results for students in grades 1, 2, and 3. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3		
2003				999	999	999		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Reading Achievement in Reading First Schools for At-Risk Students: The percentage of grades 1-3 at-risk Reading First students

reading at grade level or above, as measured by meeting or exceeding the proficient level of performance on state reading assessments, will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of at-risk RF students in grades 1-3 meeting or exceeding proficient level in reading.	**Explanation:** FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3
2003				999	999	999

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Reading Achievement Statewide: The percentage of students reading at grade level or above, as measured by meeting or exceeding the proficient level on the NAEP reading assessment.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of students at proficiency or above on NAEP 4th grade reading assessment.		**Source:** NCES Survey/Assessment **Survey/Assessment:** National Assessment of Educational Progress. **Frequency:** Biennially. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** NCES.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	29	
2002		30
2003		31
2005		32

Objective 8.2 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 8.2.1 of 1: Referrals to Special Education: Percentage of RF K-3 students referred for special education services based on their difficulties learning to read.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of RF K-3 students referred for special education services.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003		999

Explanation: FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported.

Source: Performance Report
Contractor Performance Report

Additional Source Information: Reading First Annual Performance Report. Recipients of Reading First grants, as required by statute, will submit an Annual Performance Report that includes data for this indicator.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: December 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Objective 8.3 of 3: To advance the success of the Reading First program by monitoring the progress of states in implementing their approved state plans.

Indicator 8.3.1 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%.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of States that demonstrate progress in implementing approved Reading First plans.			**Explanation:** FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		999		

Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution - 2003

Program Goal: To motivate low income children to read.

Objective 8.1 of 1: To distribute books and to provide reading strategies to low income children, their families, and service providers.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: RIF will provide books and scientifically based reading services to low income children at risk of educational failure due to delays in reading.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of low-income children who receive books and reading services through the Reading is Fundamental Program.	**Explanation:** 2003 establishes the baseline year. The target for 2004 is baseline plus 5 percent. The target for 2005 is the baseline plus 10 percent. The target for 2006 is the baseline plus 15 percent.	**Frequency:** Annually.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999

Ready-to-Learn Television - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.295 - Ready-To-Learn Television

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: Develop, produce, and distribute high-quality televised educational programming for preschool and elementary school children and their caregivers.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: High-quality programming and materials produced by Ready to Learn (RTL) programs will increase and provide accountability measures to yield a positive increase in readiness to learn in preschool and elementary children.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Explanation: 999 represents the baseline year. 60 percent of funds go for TV programming and the majority of the remainder to 144 Ready to Learn stations with coordinators who conduct workshops. Parents and Child Educators read one children's book to children each day. Baseline year is 2003. For the first measure, subsequent year targets will reflect a 5 percent increase over the preceding year. For the second measure, subsequent year targets will reflect a 10 percent increase over the preceding year.	**Additional Source Information:** Mathematica, first year research contractor. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003

Percentage of preschool children demonstrating expressive vocabulary skills and emergent literacy skills as a result of viewing literacy based Ready to Learn television shows.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Between the Lions	Sesame Street	Between the Lions	Sesame Street
2003			999	999

Percentage increase in the utilization of RTL skills among parents and child educators who attend workshops.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Parents or Child Educators	Parents or Child Educators
2003		999

Smaller Learning Communities (Small, Safe and Successful High Schools) - 2003

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 8.1 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 8.1.1 of 3: Academic achievement: Increasing percentages of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants will meet or exceed the basic and proficient levels of performance on state and local reading and math assessments.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
.					**Progress:** Status Explanation **Explanation:** Actual performance data is available in October 2003 and is not ready for this report.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
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			66.70	58.10		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Graduation: Increasing percentages of students in high schools receiving Small Learning Community grants will graduate from high school.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of students who graduated based on 9th grade enrollment.			**Progress:** Status Explanation. **Explanation:** Actual performance data is	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Frequency:** Annually
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Percentage Graduating	Percentage Graduating		

2001	59.20		available in October 2003 and is not ready for this report.	**Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
2003		60.20		

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Postsecondary Transition: Increasing percentages of students in high schools receiving Small Learning Community grants plan to attend a 2- or 4-year college.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
.			**Explanation:** Actual performance data is available in October 2003 and is not ready for this report.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Percentage planning to attend 2-4 year college	Percentage planning to attend 2-4 year college		
2001	69.90			
2003		70.90		

Star Schools Program - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.203 - Star Schools

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: Promote the delivery of challenging content in core subjects.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: The percentage of students participating in Star Schools courses and modules who demonstrate improved achievement in reading, math, or science.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of students demonstrating improved achievement in reading, math, or science.		**Additional Source Information:** FY 2003 annual performance and evaluation reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** October 2003 Based on program review of the data reported by the grantee(s). **Limitations:** Data is difficult to aggregate because the grantees use various forms of measures to determine improved achievement. **Improvements:** The indicator has been modified to measure student achievement data rather than numbers of courses and modules offered.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	69.30	
2004		5

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Challenging content: Challenging content aligned with standards at all academic levels (including high school credit, advanced placement, adult education, and Graduate Equivalency Diploma courses) through distance education.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Number of full credit courses or modules offering challenging content that is aligned with standards.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994	30	
1997	81	
1998	105	
1999	126	
2000	921	
2001	387	
2002	1,502	1,000
2003	1,338	1,600
2004		1,700

Additional Source Information: FY 2003 annual performance and evaluation reports

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: October 2003
Based on program review of the data reported by the grantee(s). The program evaluation liaison and the program officers' review includes: examining the procedures that grantees use to align the standards with all academic levels; reviewing the sources of standards, strategies and procedures utilized for alignment; and verifying the evidence provided for alignment.

Limitations: Data are self-reported by the projects. Evidence of alignment with standards has been particularly difficult to assess in previous years.

Improvements: Planned validation improvements on evidence of course alignment with standards include verifying whether projects utilize content experts to review and validate the extent to which: a) content is challenging, or b) standards are appropriate for the content delivered. In addition, the indicator has been modified as follows: a) expand data collection to include elementary and

		secondary courses and modules offered, and b) focus specifically on projects offering reading, math, or science courses or modules.

State Assessments - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.368 - Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: By the 2005-2006 school year, all states and entities will have assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics in grades three through eight and in high schools.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Annual assessments: All states will have annual assessments for all students in grades 3 through 8 and in high schools in reading/language arts and mathematics.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Explanation: States are required to have reading/language arts assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school by 2005-2006. The 2006 performance target of 52 is set to reflect the compliance of 50 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia.	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Application FY 2002 and NCLB Consolidated State Report; Peer Review, Title I review processes **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2005 - 2006 **Data Available:** September 2006

Number of states that have reading/language arts assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		21
2004		26
2005		39
2006		52

Number of states that have mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		21
2004		26
2005		39
2006		52

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: State assessments: All states and entities will have assessments in science in grades three through eight and high school.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Number of states and entities that have science assessments in grades 3-8 and high school.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
- No Data -		

Explanation: The performance target for this measure is set at 52 for FY 2008. States are not required to have science assessments in grades 3-8 and high school until 2007-2008. This performance measure reflects a long term goal based on requirements set up in NCLB.

Additional Source Information: No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Application FY 2002 and NCLB Consolidated State Report; Peer Review, Title I review processes

Innovative Education State Grants - 2003

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 8.1 of 2: To encourage states to use flexibility authorities in ways that will increase student achievement.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Improved student achievement: States that increase Title V funds 5% by transferring funds from other federal programs show greater increases in the number of students achieving proficiency on state assessments.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The difference in percent of students that demonstrate proficiency in states that increase Title V funds by 5% and states that do not.			**Explanation:** FY 2003 data will provide the baseline; the performance target for FY 2004 will show a 5% improvement in student proficiency in states where Title V funds are increased by 5% through flexibility authorities.	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; State notifications of use of Transferability authority; State Report Cards. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		999		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Improved student achievement: States that increase Title V funds 10% by transferring funds from other federal programs show greater increases in the number of students achieving proficiency on state assessments.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The difference in the percent of students that demonstrate proficiency in states that increase Title V funds by 10% and states that do not.			**Explanation:** FY 2003 data will provide the performance baseline; the performance target for FY 2004 will show a 10%	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; State notifications of use of transferability authority; State
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		999		

	improvement in student proficiency in states where Title V funds are increased by 10% through flexibility authorities.	Report Cards. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Objective 8.2 of 2: To support states in targeting Title V funds for activities that will improve instruction, reduce student dropout rates, and increase the number of high quality teachers.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: Improved student achievement: Difference in percentage of districts achieving AYP in states that targeted Title V funds for improved instruction and those that did not.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The difference in percentage of districts achieving AYP in states that targeted Title V funds for improved instruction and those that did not. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2003** /	/ 999	**Explanation:** FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported.	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Title V program monitoring; State Report Cards. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** 2004

Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: Improved student achievement: Difference in student dropout rates in states that target Title V funds to reducing student dropouts and states that did not.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Difference in the percentage of student dropouts in states that targeted Title V funds to reducing student dropouts and states that did not. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2003** /	/ 999	**Explanation:** FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported.	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; State Report Card; NCES CCD; Title V monitoring. **Frequency:** Annually

		Collection Period: 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** 2004

Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: Improved teacher quality: Difference in the percentage of highly qualified teachers in states that targeted Title V funds to increasing the number of highly qualified teachers and those that did not.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Difference in the percentage of highly qualified teachers in states that targeted Title V funds to increase the number of highly qualified teachers and those that did not.	**Explanation:** FY 2003 data will set the baseline; targets for FY 2004 and subsequent years will be determined after baseline data are reported.	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; State Report Cards; Title V monitoring.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999

Teaching of Traditional American History - 2003

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

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Teachers in a nationally representative sample of TAH projects will report improvement of their knowledge and skills as a result of professional development activities.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of teachers in a nationally representative sample of TAH projects who report improvement of their knowledge and skills.	**Explanation:** Baseline or interim data will be obtained in 2003. The 2004 target is 10 percent over the baseline.	**Additional Source Information:** SRI Evaluation survey and case study data and grantee evaluation data **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** 2004

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Students in randomized studies of educational effectiveness who are in classes taught by teachers in a TAH project will demonstrate higher achievement on course content measures and/or on statewide U.S. history assessments than students in control groups.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of students in randomized studies of educational effectiveness who demonstrate higher achievement than those in control groups.	**Explanation:** Baseline will be established in 2003 for the first cohort (up to 10 studies). Interim data for the first cohort will be obtained in 2004 and the target will be baseline plus 10 percent for 2005. Final data on the first cohort will be obtained in 2005. Baseline data for the second cohort	**Additional Source Information:** SRI Evaluation survey and case study data and grantee evaluation data. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2006 **Data Available:** 2004

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	First Cohort	Second Cohort	First Cohort	Second Cohort
2003			999	

2004		999	will be obtained in 2004. In 2005, interim data on the second cohort will be obtained and the target for 2006 will be baseline plus 10 percent. In 2006, final data for the second cohort will be obtained.	
2005		75		
2006		75		

Title I Grants for Schools--ESEA - 2003

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

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

Objective 8.1 of 2: Performance of the lowest-achieving students and students in high poverty public schools will increase substantially in reading and mathematics.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Student performance on national assessments: The reading performance of low-income 4th grade students on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of low-income 4th grade students scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels in reading on the NAEP.					**Explanation:** The NAEP reading test is administered biennially and is on a 2003, 2005, 2007 schedule.	**Additional Source Information:** National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) 4th grade Reading Report **Frequency:** Biennially. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** NCES.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Percentage at or above proficient	Percentage at or above basic	Percentage at or above proficient	Percentage at or above basic		
2000	13	39				
2002			14	40		
2003			15	41		
2005			16	42		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Student performance on national assessments: The mathematics performance of low-income 8th grade students on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of low-income 8th grade students scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels in mathematics on the NAEP.					**Explanation:** The NAEP mathematics for 8th grade students is administered biennially and is on a 2003, 2005, 2007 schedule.	**Additional Source Information:** NAEP scores posted on NCES website. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Percentage at or	Percentage at or	Percentage	Percentage		

	above proficient	above basic	at or above proficient	at or above basic
2000	10	42		
2003			11	43
2005			13	45
2007			18	50

Data Available: December 2004
Validated By: NCES.

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Student performance on state assessments: States with two years of assessment data and aligned content and performance standards will annually report an increase in the number of students in schools with at least 40 percent poverty who attain either proficient or advanced performance levels in reading on state assessments measures.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
States reporting increase in number of low-income students meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in reading on state assessments			**Explanation:** The long-range target for this indicator is that in five years (2009), 52 states will report an increase in the number of low income students who attain either proficient or advanced performance levels in reading on state assessments.	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI)
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002		999		
2004		30		

Objective 8.2 of 2: States and districts will implement standards-based accountability systems and provide effective support for school improvement efforts.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: Schools identified for improvement: The percentage of schools identified for improvement.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of schools identified for improvement.			**Explanation:** FY 2003-2004 data will be the baseline; 2004-2005 data will show a 10% decrease in schools identified for improvement. The number of schools identified for improvement will continue to decline at a 10% rate each year. By 2013,	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		

	no schools will be identified for improvement.	**Data Available:** 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: Highly qualified staff: The number of teachers working in programs supported by Title I funds who are highly qualified, as defined in NCLB.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of highly qualified teachers working in Title I programs. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2003** /	**Explanation:** FY 2002-2003 data will establish the baseline; subsequent years will show a 10 percent annual increase in highly qualified teachers working in programs supported by Title I funds. By the 2005-2006 school year, all teachers working in Title I supported programs will be highly qualified.	**Additional Source Information:** States report highly qualified teacher information in the No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** 2004

Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: State accountability plans: The number of states that fully implement their approved Accountability Plans as required in the ESEA.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of states with fully implemented Accountability Plan **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2003** /	**Explanation:** Data collected in 2003 established the baseline; the FY 2004 target is baseline plus 10. In five years (2009), all states will have fully implemented their approved Accountability Plans.	**Additional Source Information:** Title I Monitoring Activities **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** 2004

Transition To Teaching - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.350 - Transition to Teaching

Program Goal: To increase the number of mid-career professionals, highly qualified paraprofessionals, and recent college graduates who are hired to teach in high need schools and to teach high need subjects.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Objective 1

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Program participants will receive full teacher certification as a result of training and support provided by the program.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of program participants who receive full teacher certification as a result of training and support provided by the program.			**Explanation:** The 2002 target was to set a baseline. Those baseline data are not yet available. The 2003 target is 5 percent over the baseline. The 2004 target is 5 percent over the 2003 target.	**Additional Source Information:** Grantee Annual Performance Reports and Survey data. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2006 **Data Available:** 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002		999		
2006		75		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Program participants will have teaching positions in high need schools in high need school districts.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of program participants who have teaching positions in high need schools and school districts.			**Explanation:** The 2002 target was to set a baseline. Those baseline data are not yet available. The 2003 target is 5 percent over the baseline. The 2004 target is 5 percent over the 2003 target.	**Additional Source Information:** Grantee Annual Performance Reports and Survey data. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2006 **Data Available:** 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002		999		
2006		85		

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Program participants in Cohorts 1 and 2 will teach in high-need schools in high need school districts for three years or more.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of program participants in Cohorts 1 and 2 who teach in high-need schools in high need school districts for three years or more.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
2002			999	
2003				999
2006			75	75

Explanation: For Cohort 1, the target for 2002 was to set the baseline. The target for Cohort 1 is 5 percent over the baseline for 2003 and 5 percent over the 2003 target for 2004. For Cohort 2, the target for 2003 was to set the baseline. The target for Cohort 2 is 5 percent over the baseline for 2004 and over the 2004 target for 2005.

Additional Source Information: Grantee Annual Performance Reports and survey data.

Collection Period: 2002 - 2006
Data Available: 2004

Troops To Teachers - 2003

Program Goal: To increase the number of military personnel hired as public school teachers and the number who teach high need subjects through the Troops to Teachers Program.

Objective 8.1 of 1: To provide schools with highly qualified teachers who are former military personnel.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: The number of individuals who register for the Troops to Teachers Program as a result of outreach efforts in the U.S. and abroad.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of individuals who register for the Troops to Teachers Program as a result of outreach efforts in the U.S. and abroad.			**Explanation:** 2003 is the baseline year. The target for 2004 is baseline plus 33 percent. The target for 2005 is an additional 33 percent and the target for 2006 is 33 percent over that of 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual performance reports submitted by the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES). **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2006 **Data Available:** 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		999		
2004		33		
2005		33		
2006		33		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: The number of participants earning teacher certification in the high needs areas of math, science, and special education.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of participants earning teacher certification in the high needs areas of math, science, and special education.			**Explanation:** 2003 is the baseline year. The target for 2004 is the baseline plus 25 percent. The target for 2005 is an additional 25 percent increase and for 2006, an additional 25 percent increase over 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual performance reports submitted ty the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES). **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2006 **Data Available:** 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		999		
2004		25		
2005		25		
2006		26		

Voluntary Public School Choice Program - 2003

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 8.1 of 1: The Voluntary Public School Choice Program increases the number of students moving from low performing to higher performing schools.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The number of families who exercise public school choice will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of students exercising their choice to transfer from low performing to higher performing schools.	**Explanation:** A baseline will be set in FY 2003. The FY 2004 target is 10 percent over the baseline. Choosing not to transfer is considered exercising the option.	**Additional Source Information:** COSMOS Corporation, contractor secured through PPSS for the National Evaluation of the Voluntary Public School Choice Program. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** October 2003

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Statistics and Assessment - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.830 - Statistics
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 8.1 of 2: PROVIDES TIMELY, USEFUL, AND COMPREHENSIVE DATA THAT ARE RELEVANT TO POLICY AND EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Customer satisfaction: The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data are timely, relevant, and comprehensive.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Additional Source Information: NCES Customer Satisfaction Survey. **Frequency:** Biennially. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** 2004 **Validated By:** NCES. Data will be validated by using NCES review procedures and by applying NCES statistical standards.

Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES publications

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility
1997	88	72	86			
1999	91	77	89	85	85	85
2001	90	74	90	90	90	90
2003				90	90	90

Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES data files

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness
1997	82	52		
1999	87	67	85	85

2001	88	66	90	90
2003			90	90

Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES services

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility
1997	89			
1999	93	93	85	85
2001	83	88	90	90
2003			90	90

Objective 8.2 of 2: Timeliness of NAEP data for Reading and Mathematics Assessment in support of the President's No Child Left Behind initiative.

Indicator 8.2.1 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
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.		**Frequency:** Biennially. **Collection Period:** 2005 **Data Available:** 2005 **Validated By:** NCES. Data will be validated by using NCES review procedures and by applying NCES statistical standards.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		6
2005		6

Regional Educational Laboratories - 2003

Program Goal: To support knowledge-based educational improvement to help all students meet high standards through development, applied research, dissemination, and technical assistance conducted with local, state, and intermediate agencies.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Develop, adapt, and assess comprehensive education reform strategies in schools, districts, and states.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Number of development sites: An increasing number of local or state sites will be engaged in collaborative development and demonstration of comprehensive reform-related efforts.

Targets and Performance Data

Number school, district, intermediate agency, and state level sites

Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets			
	Site	Students	Teachers	Administrators	Parents	Site	Students	Teachers	Administrators	Parents
1997	494	83,147	5,899	512	14,437					
1998	615	93,788	6,950	749	16,062					
1999	606	538,865	37,550	5,169	13,697					
2000	630	545,612	34,923	5,029	13,024					
2001	359	37,847	5,869	1,801	183					
2002	206		4,316	1,055	268					
2003	252		4,838	1,398	611	206		4,316	1,055	268

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded

Progress: The 2003 data indicate increases in numbers of development sites and numbers of participants at those sites.

Explanation: A site is defined as a school, district, intermediate agency, or state in which "the Laboratory is engaged in collaborative field work that is: a) direct, face-to-face, long-term, and intensive; b) designed with the explicit goal to improve practice; and c) expected to produce outcomes that are measurable and indicative of improved practice." A participant is defined as "an individual directly involved in collaborative field work." Students do not collaborate directly with the Laboratories and are not included in the reported 2002 or 2003

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Laboratory records and quarterly reports, 2003.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: September 2003
Validated By: Experienced Public/Private Entity.
Each Laboratory utilized a standardized, cross-Laboratory quality assurance protocol to review the data provided. Data verification by an independent contractor was conducted in 2002. The findings indicate that "overall given that adequate procedures

	data.	and quality controls were in place, the REL Performance Indicator data for 2002 were found to be reliable, valid and accurately reported to OERI-IES." (source: OERI/IES Performance Indicator Data Verification Project for The Regional Educational Laboratories: Final Report, prepared on December 31, 2002 by C&A Technologies) **Limitations:** The Education Department relies on Laboratory records for these data. **Improvements:** Continued improvement in data collection procedures to ensure consistency in reporting data.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Student achievement: After 3 years of on-site development, sites will show increases in student achievement.

Targets and Performance Data									Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of schools showing increases in student achievement									**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** All development sites with 36 months or more of on-site development (6 of 6 sites, or	**Additional Source Information:** Laboratory records and quarterly reports, 2003.
Year	**Actual Performance**				**Performance Targets**					
	Less than 12 months	12-23 months	24-35 months	36 months or more	Less than 12	12-23	24-35	36 months		

					months or more
2001				41.40	
2002	4	54.80	91.70	0	
2003	27.70	29.20	50	100	80

100%) reported evidence demonstrating increases in student achievement. The previous year (2002) was a new baseline year; year 2001 was the first year of a new contract period and represents only 6 months of data collection.

Explanation: Of the 252 development sites reported previously (Indicator 8.1.1 of 2 above), 164 indicated a direct focus on the outcome/category of "increased student achievement." The other 88 sites are focused on research and development to enhance capacity to improve student achievement. Of these 164 sites with a direct focus on improving student achievement, 105 (64% of the total) collected and reported student achievement data, and 35 sites reported evidence showing increases in achievement, as follows: 13 of 47 sites (27.7%) with fewer than 12 months of on-site development; 14 of 48 sites (29.2%) with at least 12 but less than 24 months of on-site development; 2 of 4 sites (50.0%) with at least 24 but less than 36 months of on-site development; and 6 of 6 sites (100.0%) with 36 months or more of on-site development.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: September 2003
Validated By: Experienced Public/Private Entity. Each Laboratory utilized a standardized, cross-Laboratory quality assurance protocol to review the data provided.Data verification by an independent contractor was conducted in 2002. The findings indicate that "overall given that adequate procedures and quality controls were in place, the REL Performance Indicator data for 2002 were found to be reliable, valid and accurately reported to OERI-IES." (source: OERI/IES Performance Indicator Data Verification Project for The Regional Educational Laboratories: Final Report, prepared on December 31, 2002 by C&A Technologies)

Limitations: The Education Department relies on Laboratory

		records for these data. **Improvements:** Continued improvement in data collection procedures to ensure consistency in reporting data.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Provide products and services and develop networks and partnerships in support of state and local reform.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Customer Receipt of Products and Services: The circulation of products, receipt of services, and receipt of electronic material will increase annually from baseline levels.

Targets and Performance Data

Number of products, services, and electronic materials

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	# of Products to Clients	# of Face-to-face Services	Web Site Hits	# of Products to Clients	# of Face-to-face Services	Web Site Hits
1997	419,927	148,966	11,834,588			
1998	988,055	178,555	19,305,052			
1999	2,132,530	125,517	30,379,269			
2000	1,635,492	127,162	35,828,628			
2001	561,932	47,227	68,139,214			
2002	979,223	80,827	210,383,738			
2003	1,469,229	81,518	280,096,327	1,000	81,000	250,000

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded

Progress: The previous year (2002) is a baseline year. Year 2001 was the first year of a new contract period and represents 6 months of data collection.

Explanation: The total number of individual contacts with the Laboratories (adding together products, services, and website hits) increased by 33% (from 211,443,788 in 2002 to 281,647,074 in 2003) because of continued increase in the use of the Web for dissemination as access to the Laboratories' websites continued to grow.In this report, the number of web page views was also reported as a second measure of receipt of electronic materials. The term page views (impressions) refers to client access to entire pages, but does not include a site's supporting graphic files. Using this new measure, the total number of individual

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Laboratory records and quarterly reports, 2003.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: September 2003
.Validated By: Experienced Public/Private Entity. Each Laboratory utilized a standardized, cross-Laboratory quality assurance protocol to review the data provided.Data verification by an independent contractor was conducted in 2002. The findings indicate that “overall given that adequate procedures and quality controls were in place, the REL Performance Indicator data for 2002 were found to be reliable, valid and accurately reported to

	contacts with the Laboratories (adding together products, services, and web page views) increased by 13% (from 43,128,451 in 2002 to 48,835,287 in 2003).The web site hits and page views include the 10 laboratory web sites plus the REL web site. Please note that the performance targets for Number of products to clients and Web-site hits should have been displayed as 1 million and 250 million respectively. PPMD system will not allow access to correct these administrative errors.	OERI-IES." (source: OERI/IES Performance Indicator Data Verification Project for The Regional Educational Laboratories: Final Report, prepared on December 31, 2002 by C&A Technologies) **Limitations:** The Education Department relies on Laboratory records for these data. **Improvements:** Continued improvement in data collection procedures to ensure consistency in reporting data.

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Quality of products and services: At least 90 percent of clients sampled will report laboratory products and services to be of high quality.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of clients rating products and services to be of excellent or good quality	**Explanation:** By mutual agreement with IES, data relevant to quality of products and services will be collected and reported bi-annually. Because these data were last reported in 2002, no new data are being reported by the Laboratories for 2003.	**Frequency:** Biennially.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	90	90
1998	90.10	90
1999	88.30	90
2000	84.30	90
2001	93.20	90
2002	92.10	90

Comprehensive Centers Program - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.283A - Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers Program

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

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

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

Targets and Performance Data									Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Comprehensive Center customers (in percentages)									**Explanation:** In addition to these targeted schools, comprehensive Centers also serve other schools as well as support customers in State agencies, local school districts, and intermediate school units in implementing NCLB..	**Additional Source Information:** Comprehensive Centers (CC) performance reports, including Data Tables. **Frequency:** Semi-Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data are available semi-annually-June 2003 and October 2003. Data supplied by project's uniform reporting system. No formal verification procedure applied to data collection, but data analysis validated by outside contractor.
Year	**Actual Performance**				**Performance Targets**					
	Schoolwide Programs	High-poverty schools, non-schoolwide programs	BIA Schools	TOTAL	Schoolwide Programs	High-poverty schools, non-schoolwide programs	BIA Schools	TOTAL		
1998	50	12	4	66				80		
1999	44	30	3	77				80		
2000	59	26	2	89				80		
2001	44	43	3	89				80		
2002	52	34	1	87				80		
2003	51	41	1.50	94				80		

		Limitations: Self-reported project-level data have been analyzed with assistance of an outside contractor. Improvement in the uniform data collection system has resulted in more valid data being reported.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Showing impact with customers: Participants in center activities report that they have incorporated information or skills they have learned from the Centers activities into their work.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Status: Target met **Explanation:** Two customer sources impact data are used, with a common inquiry istrument. School-based respondents are primarily teachers and principals. State and local administrators include coordinators of specific federal programs (e.g., Title I, Migrant Ed, others).	**Additional Source Information:** Comprehensive Center Customer survey. **Frequency:** Biennially. **Collection Period:** - 2003 **Data Available:** September 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Improvements:** Customer surveys are legislatively required every two years.

Percentage of school-based participants

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	72	
2001	71	75
2003	76	75

Percentage of State and district administrators

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	82	
2003		83

Percent of State and district administrators.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	63	999

Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.319 - Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia

Program Goal: To improve mathematics and science education through technical assistance and dissemination

Objective 8.1 of 2: Provide high-quality technical assistance, including planning assistance, training, facilitation of collaboration and networking, and other technical assistance.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Technical Assistance: At least 80 percent of participants in Consortia technical asistance activities will report that information or assistance from the Consortia added value to their work.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Training improved instructional practice			**Explanation:** For all years that data are reported, the Actual Performance data are shown as the percent of respondents who found training and collaboration with the Consortia to be moderately or extensively useful. Data on collaboration will be collected every other year because there is a history of success with this indicator. When using the standard of a 95% confidence level, each Consortium would have to survey 1200-1400 clients to address this indicator. To do so annually would not be a beneficial use of limited resources. In 2002, clients who were surveyed were those who received intensive services (i.e. 12 or more hours of training and technical assistance).	**Additional Source Information:** Consortia/Clearinghouse Network Evaluation report. The primary sources for this report are the Consortia and Clearinghouse Descriptive Data System (CCDDS) and participant surveys. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Common definitions and common data collection procedures are established across each Consortium. Statistical standards are applied. Data are subjected to Cross-Consortia's Eisenhower Network Evaluation Committee internal review and validation procedures.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	91			
1999	96	75		
2000		80		
2001	93.50	80		
2002	90	80		
2003		80		
Training improved student engagement and performance				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	89			
1999	94	75		
2000		80		

2001	90.80	80
2002	89	80
2003		80

Collaboration strengthened relationships and access to resources

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	88	
1999	93	75
2000		80
2001	87.60	80
2002		80
2003		80

Collaboration leveraged resources and efforts for greater impact

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	80	
1999	87	75
2000		80
2001	81.30	80
2002		80
2003		80

Limitations: CCDDS and data for 2001 and 2002 have not been subjected to external audit.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Disseminate information about promising and exemplary practices in mathematics and science education.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Dissemination: The total number of Consortia contacts with customers, by print or by electronic media ("hits" on Web sites plus other electronic communications), will increase by 10 percent annually, and a majority of the recipients will report that the information contributed to improving their work.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Print

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	306,557	
1998	340,185	
1999	125,212	337,212
2000	129,901	306,167
2001	196,780	275,551
2002	233,267	247,996
2003		223,196

Electronic Media

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	1,354,167	
1998	1,465,259	
1999	3,328,846	1,489,583
2000	3,684,883	1,638,541
2001	2,820,197	1,802,395
2002		1,982,634
2003		2,180,898

Usefulness

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	70	
1999	77	
2000		51
2001	93	51

Explanation: With the increasing costs of print dissemination, the Consortia explanded their electronic dissemination efforts resulting in a jump in electronic media contacts with a concurrent drop in contacts by print in 1999-2001. The Consortia's strategy was successful both in practice and outcome as measured by 2001 data on Usefulness. Data on Usefulness of the information disseminated will be collected every other year because there is a history of success with this indicator. By using the standard of a 95% confidence level, each consortium would have to survey 1200-1400 clients to address this indicator. To do so annually would not be a beneficial use of limited resources. Beginning in 2001, data were collected using newer, more accurate, widely accepted techniques for representing the number of contacts that customers had with Web-based information. Shown for 2001 is the baseline of page views, not Web hits.

Additional Source Information: Consortia/Clearinghouse Network Evaluation report. The primary sources for this report are the Consortia and Clearinghouse Descriptive Data System (CCDDS) and participant surveys.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: December 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Common definitions and common data collection procedures established across each Consortium. Statistical standards are applied. Data are subjected to Cross-Consortia's Eisenhower Network Evaluation Committee internal review and validation procedures.

Limitations: Current data cannot be compared with data from the old system.

Improvements: Improved information technology has enabled more accurate assessment of the number of Web-based customer contacts.

2002		51		
2003		51		

High School Equivalency Program - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.141 - Migrant Education_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 8.1 of 1: An increasing percentage of HEP participants will complete the program and receive their GED.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: GED completion: The percentage of HEP participants who complete the program and receive the GED will continue to remain high, if not increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of HEP participants receiving a GED				**Additional Source Information:** HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** January 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data were supplied by grantees.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1996	70			
1997	66			
1998	72			
1999	73			
2000	58			
2001	53			
2003		60		

Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.342 - Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology

Program Goal: To improve the knowledge and ability of future teachers to use technology in teaching practices and student learning opportunities, and to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Strengthen teacher preparation programs so that they provide high-quality training in the use of technology for instructional purposes.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Curriculum redesign: The percentage of funded teacher preparation programs that redesign their curriculum to incorporate best practices in the use of technology in teacher education.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of programs

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Capacity Building Projects	Implementation Projects / Catalyst Projects	Capacity Building Projects	Implementation Projects / Catalyst Projects
2000	78	82		
2001	87	66	89	68
2002	84	68	89	68
2003			89	69

Explanation: Curriculum design is a priority for many Implementation projects, and some had completed redesign before this reporting period. The cumulative percent of Implementation projects that have redesigned curriculum as a grant activity since the beginning of the program is ninety-one percent (91%). Capacity Building Projects show no targets or actuals because they were terminated in school year 1999-2000.

Additional Source Information: Project Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: December 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Technology-proficient faculty: The percentage of faculty members in funded teacher preparation programs that effectively use technology in their teaching.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of faculty members

Additional Source Information: Project Performance Reports

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Capacity Building Projects	Implementation Projects	Catalyst Projects	Capacity Building Projects	Implementation Projects	Catalyst Projects
2000	56	53				
2001	61			63		
2002	62			63		
2003				63		

Explanation: Implementation projects are using various methods to assess technology proficiency, including self-assessment, observation, and other methods such as exams and portfolios. Catalyst grants do not involve faculty members in their activities. Capacity Building Projects were terminated in 1999-2000.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: December 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the technology skills and proficiency of new teachers for improved classroom instruction.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Technology-proficient new teachers: The percentage of new teachers who are proficient in using technology and integrating technology into instructional practices will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of students assessed that demonstrated proficiency in using technology

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Capacity Building Projects	Implementation Projects	Catalyst Projects	Capacity Building Projects	Implementation Projects	Catalyst Projects
2000	42	32				
2001	34		38	36		40
2002	29		19	36		40
2003				36		40

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: Implementation grants address teacher preparation program implementation. Fifty-nine percent (59%) of Implementation projects required preservice teachers to demonstrate technology as a grant activity during the reporting period and an additional thirty-one percent (31%) required proficiency but not as a grant activity. Catalyst grants assist, disseminate, and facilitate other activities for technology-centered teacher preparation. Capacity Building Projects were terminated in 1999-2000.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Project Performance Reports

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: December 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review.

Limitations: Performance report data are self-reported from program grantees.

Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants - 2003

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 8.1 of 1: IMPROVE THE SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE OF NEW TEACHERS BY FUNDING THE DEVELOPMENT OR STATE POLICIES THAT STRENGTHEN INITIAL LICENSING STANDARDS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF STATE OR LOCAL POLICIES/PROGRAMS THAT REDUCE THE NUMBER OF UNCERTIFIED TEACHERS.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Teacher certification/licensure: Percentage of teachers participating in the Partnership Program who meet their state's initial licensure or certification requirements.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of new teachers in districts with Partnership Programs who meet their state's certification requirements.			**Explanation:** FY 2003 data will determine the baseline for the percentage of teachers meeting the standard. (The code for setting a baseline is 999.) The program will set a target of the baseline + 1% for FY 2004.	**Additional Source Information:** Secretary's Report on the Quality of Teacher Preparation (Sec. 207). **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** April 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Secretary's Report will contain self-reported data from states. **Improvements:** Definitions of data elements are being refined to assure consistency with definitions contained in the No Child Left Behind legislation.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		999		

IDEA Part B -- Grants to States and Preschool Grants Program - 2003

CFDA Numbers: 84.173 - Special Education_Preschool Grants
84.181 - Special Education_Grants for Infants and Families with Disabilities

Program Goal: To assist State and local educational agencies in providing children with disabilities access to high quality education to help them meet challenging standards and prepare them for employment and independent living.

Objective 8.1 of 4: ALL PRESCHOOL CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES RECEIVE SERVICES THAT PREPARE THEM TO ENTER SCHOOL READY TO LEARN

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Inclusive settings (preschool): The percentage of preschool children with disabilities who are receiving special education and related services in inclusive settings (e.g., regular kindergarten, public preschool programs, Head Start, or child care facilities).

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of preschool children with disabilities receiving services in inclusive settings			**Explanation:** Data for actual performance were rounded to the nearest whole number.	**Additional Source Information:** Includes children in early childhood settings and home settings from 50 States, DC, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Virgin Islands, Northern Marianas, and BIA (57 entities). **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** September 2004 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. New State data collections typically take up to five years to achieve reliability.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	41			
2000	40			
2001	39			
2002	40	39		
2003		40		
2004		40		

Objective 8.2 of 4: ALL CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES HAVE ACCESS TO THE GENERAL CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENTS, WITH APPROPRIATE

ACCOMMODATIONS, SUPPORTS, AND SERVICES, CONSISTENT WITH HIGH STANDARDS.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Regular education settings (school age): The percentage of children with disabilities ages 6 to 21 who are reported by states as being served in the regular education classroom at least 80 percent of the day.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

The percentage of school age children with disabilities reported by states as being served in the regular education classroom at least 80 percent of the day

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	% of children	% of children
1997	46	
1998	46	
1999	47	48
2000	47	48
2001	47	49
2002	48	49
2003		48
2004		48

Percentage of students excluded from NAEP - 4th Grade

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
- No Data -		

Percentage of students excluded from NAEP-8th Grade

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
- No Data -		

Percentage of students excluded from NAEP-12th Grade

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
- No Data -		

Explanation: The percentage of children served in regular education classrooms at least 80 percent of the day increased from 47 percent in 2001 to 48 percent in 2002.

Additional Source Information: State-reported data required under IDEA. Numerator: Number served at least 80 percent of day in regular classroom. Denominator: All settings. 50 States, DC, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, Northern Marianas, and BIA (57 entities).

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 - 2004
Data Available: September 2004
Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: The percentage of students with disabilities scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels on the NAEP

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of 4th grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels on the NAEP			**Explanation:** For Math and Science the percentage excluded from NAEP includes public and private school students. For Reading the percentage includes only public school students. The percentage reported for 8th grade Math who met or exceeded basic levels has been corrected to 26.8 percent based on an error in reporting last year's data.	**Additional Source Information:** Analysis of data from National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2001 **Data Available:** January 2002 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Analysis of data from National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). **Limitations:** Data on children with disabilities who meet or exceed basic standards and those who do not meet basic standards are based on very small sample sizes, and, therefore, have a low level of reliability.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Reading	Reading		
2002		33		
2003		35		
2005		37		
2007		47		
The percentage of 8th grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels on the NAEP Mathematics Test.				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Math	Math		
2003		28		
2005		32		
2007		42		
The percentage of 12th grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the basic and proficient levels on the NAEP Reading Test.				

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
2002			39	
2003				30
2005			43	34
2007			53	44

Objective 8.3 of 4: SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES RECEIVE THE SUPPORT THEY NEED TO COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL PREPARED FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION OR EMPLOYMENT.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Graduation: The percentage of children with disabilities exiting school with a regular high school diploma, and the percentage who drop out.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

The percentage of children with disabilities that drop out or exit school with a regular high school diploma

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Graduation	Drop out	Graduation	Drop out
1996	52.60	34.10		
1997	53.50	32.70		
1998	55.40	31		
1999	57.40	28.90	56	31
2000	56.20	29.40	57	30
2001	57	29.40	59	27
2002	61	25.50	60	26
2003			57	29
2004			57	29

Explanation: Targets for 2002-2004 reflect a decrease from prior years due to the increased use of high-stakes testing among states. This factor may produce a drop in desired results at first, before instruction catches up to standards.

Additional Source Information: State-reported data required under IDEA for 50 States, DC, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, Virgin Islands, Northern Marianas, BIA (57 entities).

Frequency: Other.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: September 2004
Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

Limitations: Supplemental descriptive information will be provided by the National Longitudinal Study II. The Department is taking steps to reduce the amount of time for collecting and reporting data.

Objective 8.4 of 4: STATES ARE ADDRESSING THEIR NEEDS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONSISTENT WITH THEIR COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT (CSPD).

Indicator 8.4.1 of 1: Qualified personnel: The number of states and outlying areas where a high percentage of special education teachers are fully certified in the area in which they are teaching.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of States with at least 90 percent of special education teachers fully certified in the area in which they are teaching		**Additional Source Information:** State reported data required

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	No. of States Serving Ages 3-5	No. States Serving Ages 6-21	No. of States Serving Ages 3-5	No. States Serving Ages 6-21
1996	34	35		
1997	35	36		
1998	37	37		
1999	34	36	40	41
2000	36	36	41	42
2001	35	37	40	42
2002	34	33	40	42
2003			36	37
2004			36	37

Explanation: There is a clustering of states around the 90 percent goal in the indicator, which may result in unpredictable changes from year to year. However, evidence of a positive trend is expected to be evident over a 5- to 7- year period. The Department is examining the possible effects of the fully qualified personnel provisions in the *No Child Left Behind Act* on targets for this indicator. Once alignment and NCLB and IDEA is determined, this indicator may be revised. Actual data have been revised to eliminate the effect of rounding percentages upward to the nearest whole number.

under IDEA.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 200
Data Available: September 2003
Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

IDEA Part C -- Infants and Toddlers With Disabilities - 2003

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

Program Goal: To assist states in providing a comprehensive system of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families to enhance child and family outcomes.

Objective 8.1 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 8.1.1 of 2: Infants and toddlers served: The number of States that serve more than 2 percent of the general population of infants and toddlers birth through age 2, and more than 1 percent of infants under age 1.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of States that serve more than 2 percent of the general population of infants and toddlers birth through age 2, and more than 1 percent of infants under age 1.			**Explanation:** This indicator is intended to measure progress of states that increase services to children across the age range of Part C eligibility as opposed to only the lower or upper age ranges.	**Additional Source Information:** IDEA State-reported data and Bureau of Census data. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** September 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	8			
1999	9			
2000	9			
2001	14			
2002	18			
2003	20	20		
2004		21		
2005		23		
2006		24		
2007		26		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Service settings: The percentage of children receiving age-appropriate services primarily in home, in community-based settings, and in programs designed for typically developing peers.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of children receiving age-appropriate services primarily in home, in community-based settings, and in programs designed for typically developing peers.				**Additional Source Information:** IDEA State-reported data **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** September 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1996	56			
1997	58			
1998	63			
1999	67			
2000	73	67		
2001	76	69		
2002	82	71		
2003		78		
2004		79		
2005		80		
2006		81		
2007		82		

Objective 8.2 of 2: The functional development of infants is enhanced by early intervention services.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Functional abilities: The percentage of children participating in the IDEA Part C program who demonstrate improved and sustained functional abilities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of children participating in the IDEA Part C program who demonstrate improved and sustained functional abilities			**Explanation:** Targets and performance data are not yet available for this indicator	**Additional Source Information:** IDEA National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study (NEILS)
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		

2005		999

However, we are retaining this measure because of our emphasis on child outcome data and the continuing need to focus attention on efforts to develop appropriate measures for this indicator.

Baseline will be set based upon data from the National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study, expected in 2005.

Frequency: Biennially.
Collection Period: 2003 - 2004
Data Available: July 2005

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Family capacity: The percentage of families that report that early intervention services have increased their capacity to enhance their child's development.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of families that report that early intervention services have increased their capacity to enhance their child's development			**Progress:** Data for 2002 are not available as of September 2003.	**Source:** Non-NCES Survey/Research **Survey/Research Report Title:** National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study.. **Frequency:** Other. **Data Available:** 2002 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	72			
2001	73			
2002		80		
2003		80		
2004		80		
2005		80		
2006		80		
2007		80		

IDEA Part D -- National Activities - 2003

CFDA Numbers: 84.323 - Special Education_State Program Improvement Grants for Children with Disabilities
84.324 - Special Education_Research and Innovation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities
84.325 - Special Education_Personnel Preparation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities
84.325A - IDEA Part D National Activities
84.326 - Special Education_Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities
84.326R - IDEA Part D Assistance and Dissemination
84.327 - Special Education_Technology and Media Services for Individuals with Disabilities
84.328 - Special Education_Parent Information Centers
84.328M - IDEA Part D Parent Information Centers

Program Goal: To link scientifically based practices to states, school systems and families to improve results for infants, toddlers and children with disabilities

Objective 8.1 of 3: Programs respond to critical needs of children with disabiltiies and their families

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Responsive to critical needs: The percentage of program funding priorities that respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Additional Source Information: Published funding priorities. **Frequency:** Annually. **Data Available:** September 2003

The percentage of program funding priorities that respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families.

Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets			
	Research & Innovation	Technology	Media	Personnel Preparation	Research & Innovation	Technology	Media	Personnel Preparation
2001	82	79	82	85				
2002	72.10	73.80	70	69.80	85	85	85	85
2003	65.90	71.40	65	74.40	75	75	75	75
2004					75	75	75	75

2005		75	75	75	75
2006		75	75	75	75
2007		75	75	75	75

The percentage of program funding priorities that respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Technical Assistance	Parent Information	State Improvement	Technical Assistance	Parent Information	State Improvement
2001	75	90	80			
2002	67.40	85.40	80.50	85	85	85
2003	60.50	78	80.50	75	75	75
2004				75	75	75
2005				75	75	75
2006				75	75	75
2007				75	75	75

Objective 8.2 of 3: Projects use high-quality methods and materials

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Highest standards for methods and materials: The percentage of IDEA-funded projects use exceptionally rigorous quantitative or qualitative research and evaluation methods or current research-validated practices and materials, as appropriate.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that use exceptionally rigorous quantitative or qualitative research and evaluation methods or current research-validated practices and materials, as appropriate	**Explanation:** All successful applications under IDEA programs include high quality methods and materials, as judged by panels during the review process. This indicator	**Additional Source Information:** Project information. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:**

Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets			
	Research (from R&I)	Demonstration (from R&I)	Outreach (from R&I)	Technology & Media	Research (from R&I)	Demonstration (from R&I)	Outreach (from R&I)	Technology & Media

	R&I)		R&I)		R&I)		R&I)	
1998	60	12	20					
1999	50	70	20	50	65	20	25	
2000	77	13	11	50				
2001	69	67	50	16				
2002	73.30	57.10	40		75	70	55	40
2003					75	75	60	35
2004					75	75	65	45
2005					75	75	70	55
2006					75	75	75	65
2007					75	75	75	75

The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that use exceptionally rigorous quantitative or qualitative research and evaluation methods or current research-validated practices and materials, as appropriate

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Personnel Preparation	Technical Assistance	State Improvem.	Personnel Preparation	Technical Assistance	State Improvem.
2001	27	33	66			
2002	73.60	66.70	100	20	40	70
2003				45	45	75
2004				55	55	75
2005				65	65	75
2006				75	75	75
2007				75	75	75

Technology

applies a more rigorous standard to assess projects that have exceptionally high standards based on a standard measurement protocol. It takes at least three years to achieve stability in review and assessment process. Fluctuations in data are expected for several years while the data collection methodology is refined. The improvement in Demonstration and Outreach activities from 2000 to 2001 resulted after significant changes were made in the application requirements for these activities. Increased emphasis was placed on project evaluation, and limits on the length of applications were increased.

September 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	66.70	

Media Services

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	14.30	

Objective 8.3 of 3: Projects Communicate appropriately and products are used for children with disabilities and their families.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Practitioners use results: Expert panels determine that practitioners, including policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or others as appropriate, use products and practices developed through IDEA programs to improve results for children with disabilities.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

The percentage of expert panels that determine that practitioners, including policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or others as appropriate, use products and practices developed through IDEA programs to improve results for children with disabilities.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Research & Innovation	Technology	Personnel Preparation	Research & Innovation	Technology	Personnel Preparation
1998		78				
1999					89	
2000	53	47	55			
2001	58	62	55			
2002				65	65	65
2003				75	75	75
2004				75	75	70
2005				75	75	75
2006				75	75	75

Progress: A decision was made in early 2003 that because all of the strategies for IDEA - Part D are being revised in 2005, there will be no data on Objective 3

Explanation: Fluctuations in data are expected for several years while the data collection methodology is refined. To improve the quality of the evaluations the size of the review panel representing the variety of stakeholders in special education was increased from 5 persons in 2000 to 80 in 2001. This improvement has resulted in a much more robust and accurate measure of this indicator.

Additional Source Information: Project information.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: September 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

2007				75	75	75

The percentage of expert panels that determine that practitioners, including policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or others as appropriate, use products and practices developed through IDEA programs to improve results for children with disabilities.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Technical Assistance	Parent Information	State Improvement	Technical Assistance	Parent Information	State Improvement
1998	67					
1999				78		
2000	59					
2001	69	75	60			
2002				75	75	65
2003				75	75	75
2005				75	75	75
2006				75	75	75
2007				75	75	75

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Communication with target audiences

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that both (1) communicate high-quality products and information and (2) employ strategies to communicate with appropriate target audiences will increase.	**Explanation:** Experts review a sample of products submitted by project directors of a sample of funded projects that have ended. Raters use a scale of 0 to 2, with an overall mean rating of 1.5 considered appropriate communication with target audience.	**Additional Source Information:** Project information from products developed by grantees. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** September 2003 No formal verification. Project information is reviewed by a panel consisting of independent, third party reviewers who are

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Research (from R&I)	Demonstration (from R&I)	Outreach (from R&I)	Research (from R&I)	Demonstration (from R&I)	Outreach (from R&I)
2000	60	40	100			

2001	91	57	80			
2002				85	60	85
2003				75	65	75
2004				75	70	75
2005				75	75	75
2006				75	75	75
2007				75	75	75

The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that both (1) communicate high-quality products and information and (2) employ strategies to communicate with appropriate target audiences will increase.

Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	Technology	Personnel Preparation	Technical Assistance	Technology	Personnel Preparation	Technical Assistance
2000	40		100			
2001	80		71			
2002				85		80
2003				75		75
2004				75		75
2005				75		75
2006				75		75
2007				75		75

experts in the program content and trained in the review procedures. The panel results are analyzed by experts in evaluation research.

McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Program - 2003

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 8.1 of 1: Homeless children and youth will have greater access to a free and appropriate public education.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Public schools: Percentage of homeless children and youth that remain in their school of origin.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of homeless children and youth that remain in their school of origin, as reported by LEA subgrantees.	**Explanation:** This indicator is a new indicator for FY 2003-4 and represents a new statutory requirement Section 722(g)(3)(A). "Students remaining in their school of origin" is an outcome indicator that demonstrates equal access and continuity of educational services. 2004 data will be obtained through developing baseline data from States with districts that received subgrant funds and maintained school of origin data. The program office will request approval to obtain a collection from all states for 2003-2004. This collection is not a statutory requirement, however is permissible under Sections 722 and 724 of the McKnney-Vento Act. The validity of outyear targets will be established following the determination of the baseline from 2003-4 data.	**Additional Source Information:** The data to be collected from States are from LEAs that have received subgrantees and are capable of reporting such data. However, approximately only 10% of all school districts receive subgrant funds. This data is not a statutory requirement and no statutory required data on program improvement is required from States and available until 2006. Therefore, if the program office receives approval to have an OMB approved collection from all States and LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants this data period will cover the 2003-4 school year. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** November 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999

		Limitations: Data will be available if the program office receives approval to conduct a large scale collection. **Improvements:** If a collection is approved, data collected for 2004 will provide a baseline from data obtained from all states.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: State assessment participation: Percentage of homeless students that participate annually in the state assessments in reading and mathematics.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of homeless children and youth included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics as reported by LEA subgrantees. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2002** / 20 / 999	**Progress:** This is first-time baseline data reported by all States for LEAs with subgrants serving homeless students. LEAs reporting for 2001-2 school year serving 200,748 students and 40,538 students were included in Statewide Assessments. This is baseline information. This information will be a better bechmark for future data. **Explanation:** This indicator is a new indicator for FY 2003 and represents a new statutory requirement based on negociated regulations. "Students participating annually in the state assessments in reading and mathematics"is an outcome indicator that demonstrates equal access and continuity of educational services. FY2002-2003 will be obtained through sampling a few States with districts that received subgrant funds and maintained school of origin data. Once the sample data is analyzed the program	**Additional Source Information:** LEAs that are recipients of grant funds will report on the percentage of homeless students who participate in the state assessment in reading and mathematics. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** November 2004 The data to be collected from States are from LEAs that have received subgrantees and are capable of reporting such data. **Limitations:** This data is self-reproted by LEAs with subgrants and can be subject to not including all homeless students due to tracking porblems.

	office will subsequently set targets for improvement in outcomes. The validity of outyear targets will be re-examined following the determination of the baseline	

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: State assessment achievement: Percentage of homeless students meeting or exceeding state's proficiency level or standard in reading and mathematics.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of homeless students meeting or exceeding state proficiency standards. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2002** / 53 / 999	**Progress:** This is first-time baseline data for this population of students. This data was reported by all States for subgrantees in 2001-2. As a result of having all States report in 2001-2, this will be a better baseline indicator than a sample set of LEAs. States reported that of 40,538 who took State proficiency tests 21,643 or 53% were at the proficient level or above. **Explanation:** This indicator is a new indicator for FY 2003 and is not a statutory requirement. FY2002-2003 will be obtained through sampling a few States with districts that received subgrant funds and maintained student data. Once the sample data is analyzed the program office will subsequently set targets for improvement in outcomes. The validity of outyear targets will be re-examined following the determination of the baseline.	**Additional Source Information:** A sample of LEAs that are recipients of grant funds will report on the percentage of homeless students who meet or exceed proficiency standards on state assessments. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** November 2004 **Limitations:** However, approximately only 10% of all school districts receive subgrant funds. This data is not a statutory requirement and no statutory required data on program improvement is required from States and available until 2006. For 2003 we will sample States with subgrantee districts capable of reporting this data. Additional limitations: not all States broke out proficiency seperately by reading and math. **Improvements:** This is baseline data and future data will be measured against this bechmark. States will be asked to break out

		data by subject area.

Perkins Vocational and Technology Education (State Grants and Tech-Prep Indicators) - 2003

CFDA Numbers: 84.048 - Vocational Education_Basic Grants to States
84.243 - Tech-Prep Education

Program Goal: Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen education achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.

Objective 8.1 of 3: Ensure that vocational concentrators, including special populations, will achieve high levels of proficiency in mathematics, science, and English.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Academic Attainment: An increasing percentage of vocational concentrators, including special populations, will meet state established academic standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of vocational concentrators meeting state-established academic standards			**Status:** Target not met **Explanation:** Progress was made by States, although the performance target was not met. This may have occurred as many States have increased the rigor of their academic standards in an effort to assure that all students, including those who pursue vocational education, are prepared for postsecondary education and/or employment.	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** May 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Attestation and Audit -- State Directors for Career and Technical Education attest to the accuracy of their data. Data also are checked for accuracy and completeness through a data auditing process by ED staff and
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		74		
2004		76		

		an outside contractor. **Limitations:** States use different measures and strategies to report data on academic achievement so that State-by-State comparisons are not possible. **Improvements:** ED is working with States through regional and national meetings to improve their data quality.

Objective 8.2 of 3: Ensure that secondary and postsecondary concentrators, including special populaltions, will achieve high levels of proficiency in core curriculum areas, including mathematics, science, and English.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Skills Proficiencies: An increasing percentage of secondary and post secondary vocational concentrators, including special populations, will meet state recognized skill standards.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of secondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally adopted skill standards, using state recognized approaches	**Status:** Target not met **Explanation:** It is not clear why progress was not made on this indicator. Greater progress is expected in the upcoming years, however, given the Department's College and Careers Transition Initiative (CCTI) which will focus on building the academic and technical skills of all students, including those who pursue vocational education.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** May 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Attestation and Audit -- State Directors for Career and Technical Education attest to the accuracy of their data. Data also are checked for accuracy and completeness through a data auditing process by ED staff and an outside contractor. **Limitations:** States use different measures and strategies to report data on technical skill

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	National or State Assessment	Program Completion	Other Approaches	National or State Assessment	Program Completion	Other Approaches
1998	61.33					
1999	63.40	29.80	84.10			

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		65
2004		70

Percentage of Post secondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally-adopted skill standards, using state recognized approaches

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	State Assessment	Completion	Other	State Assessment	Completion	Other
1998	59.30	87.30	65.10			
1999	73.90	76.70	62.60			

Percentage of Post secondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally-adopted skill standards, using state recognized approaches

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	76	
2001	76	
2002	76	77
2003		78
2004		80

attainment so that State-by-State comparison are not possible.

Improvements: ED is working with States through regional and national meetings to improve their data quality.

Objective 8.3 of 3: Ensure that concentrators, including special populations, make successful transitions to further education and employment.

Indicator 8.3.1 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of vocational concentrators who have completed high school and transitioned to	**Status:** Target not met	**Source:** Performance

postsecondary education or employment

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or Employment Adm. Record Exchange	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or Employment Survey	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or Employment Adm. Record Exchange	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or Employment Survey
1998	83.80	62.50	80			
1999	77.40	72.70	82.20			

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			86	86
2004			88	87

Explanation: Progress held steady on both of these indicators. Further, it is important to note that the completion rate for vocational contentrators exceeded the national average for all students of 80%.

Report
Grantee Performance Report: 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: May 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification. Attestation and Audit -- State Directors for Career and Technical Education attest to the accuracy of their data. Data also are checked for accuracy and completeness through a data auditing process by ED staff and an outside contractor.

Limitations: States use different measures and strategies to report data on on high school completion and transition to postsecondary education and employment following graduation.

Improvements: ED is working with States through regional and

		national meetings to improve their data quality.

Indicator 8.3.2 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

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 Administrative Data	Placement in Military Employment Adm. Record Exchange	Placement in Military or Employment Survey	Postsecondary Degree/Certificate/ Completion Administrative Data	Placement in Military Employment Adm. Record Exchange	Placement in Military or Employment Survey
1998	55.90	81.90	87.70			
1999	32.80	86.20	78.10			

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			42	85

Status: Target exceeded

Explanation: Progress on these indicators may have been made as postsecondary institutions have focused on implementing programs and initiatives to increase the numbers of students who enter postsecondary education and persist to completion.

Source: Performance Report
Grantee Performance Report: 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: May 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification. Attestation and Audit -- State Directors for Career and Technical Education attest to the accuracy of their data. Data also are checked for accuracy and completeness through a data auditing process by ED staff and an outside contractor.

2004		45	86		**Limitations:** States use different measures and strategies to report data on postsecondary outcomes so that State-by-States comparisons are not possible. **Improvements:** ED is working with States through regional and national meetings to improve their data quality.

Goal 3

Character Education - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.215S - Partnerships in Character Education Program

Program Goal: To help promote the development of strong character among the Nation's students

Objective 8.1 of 1: Support the development and implementation of high-quality character education programs

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Partnership in Character Education Program grantees will demonstrate substantial progress toward achieving the results-based goals and objectives established in their applications.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of grantees meeting their measurable goals and objectives.			**Progress:** Performance reports have been solicited from current grantees. **Explanation:** Requirements for measuring progress toward goals and objectives will be incorporated into applications for Character Education Program direct grants.	**Additional Source Information:** Data will be available in November 2003 for first year of FY 2002 grant cohort. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** November 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		75		
2004		80		
2005		85		

Elementary and Secondary School Counseling Program - 2003

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 8.1 of 1: Support the hiring of qualified personnel to expand available counseling services for elementary school students.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Increasing percentages of ESSC grantees will meet grant goals related to changes in student behavior.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of ESSC grantees will meet grant goals related to changes in student behavior	**Progress:** Grant performance reports have been solicited for FY 2001 and 2002 cohorts. Analysis of reports will be completed by November 2003.	**Additional Source Information:** Grant performance reports **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** November 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		50
2004		75

Carol M. White Physical Education Program (PEP) - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.215F - Carol M. White Physical Education Program

Program Goal: To promote physical activity and healthy lifestyles for students.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Support the implementation of effective physical education program and strategies.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: PEP grant recipients will close gaps between existing physical education program and State standards for physical education.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of grantees that have successfully addressed gaps in existing physical education program to align program with State standards			**Progress:** Performance reports will be provided at the end of the grant period. **Explanation:** These are single year grants. Targets reflect different cohorts.	**Additional Source Information:** Final grant reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** December 2005
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		75		
2004		75		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Percentage of PEP grant recipients will demonstrate improvements in student fitness as defined in grant goals.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of PEP grant recipients will demonstrate improvements in student fitness as defined in grant goals			**Explanation:** These are single year grants. Targets reflect different cohorts.	**Additional Source Information:** Final grant reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** 2003 Final grant reports.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		75		
2004		75		

Alcohol Abuse Reduction Grants - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.184A - Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse Program

Program Goal: To help reduce alcohol abuse among secondary school students.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Support the implementation of research-based alcohol abuse prevention programs in secondary schools.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Alcohol Abuse Reduction Grant recipients will meet their goals for reduction of student alcohol use.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of grantees meeting their goals for reduction of student drug use	**Progress:** Performance reports for the FY 2002 cohort have been solicited from grantees.	**Additional Source Information:** Grant performance reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** Indicators were developed after grants were awarded (awarded in FY 2002).

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		50
2004		75

Safe and Drug-Free Schools National Programs - 2003

CFDA Numbers: 84.184 - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities_National Programs
84.184B - ESEA Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Mentoring Program
84.184K - Safe And Drug Free Schools and Communities National Coordinator Program
84.184L - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Safe Schools/Healthy Students Program

Program Goal: To help ensure that all schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high quality drug and violence prevention programs.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase the percentage of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities grantees that achieve results-based goals.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: National Programs grantees will demonstrate substantial progress toward achieving their results-based goals and objectives that they establish for their programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of grantees meeting their measurable goals and objectives.			**Progress:** Performance reports for grant programs supported with SDFSCA National Programs funds have been requested. An analysis of grantee progress toward established goals and objectives will be available in November 2003. **Explanation:** Requirements for measuring progress toward goals and objectives have been incorporated into all applications for National Programs direct grants.	**Additional Source Information:** Review of program files. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** November 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	84	75		
2002		85		
2003		85		
2004		85		
2005		85		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grantees will demonstrate substantial progress toward achieving their results-based goals and objectives that they establish for their programs.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of grantees meeting their measurable goals and objectives.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003		75
2004		80
2005		85

Explanation: Requirements for measuring progress toward goals and objectives have been incorporated into all applications for Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grants.

Additional Source Information: Review of program files.

Frequency: Other.
Collection Period: 2003 - 2004
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grants Program - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.186 - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities_State Grants

Program Goal: To help ensure that all schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug and violence prevention programs.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Reduce the use and availablility of alcohol and drugs in schools.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Drug use in schools: By 2001, rates of alcohol use in schools will decline for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders, and rates of annualmarijuana use in schools for the same time period will decline for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Rate of annual use of alcohol in school (in percentage)					**Explanation:** Data requires a special analysis. No contract is currently available to purchase that special analysis.	**Additional Source Information:** Monitoring the Future **Frequency:** Annually. **Validated By:** NCES. **Limitations:** According to NCES calculations, from 1976 to 1996 the total annual response rate for this survey varied between 46 percent and 67 percent. MTF does not release its data on in-school use; special runs for these data are generally not available until the spring of the year following the December release of other MTF data. MTF does not collect data for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders on drug use in school in a way that allows data to be compared across the three
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	8th Graders	12th Graders	8th Graders	12th Graders		
1994	5	8				
1995	5	7				
1996	6	8				
1997	5	8				
1998	5	8				
1999	4	7	5	8		
2000			5	8		
2001			4	7		
2002			4	7		
2003			4	7		

Rate of annual use of marijuana and other drugs in school (in percentage)						grades.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	8th Graders	12th Graders	8th Graders	12th Graders		
1994	4	8				
1995	5	9				
1996	6	10				
1997	5	10				
1998	5	8				
1999	4	8	5	10		
2000			4	8		
2001			3	7		
2002			3	7		
2003			3	7		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Reduce number of criminal and violent incidents in schools.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Violent incidents in schools: By 2003, the proportion of high school students in a physical fight on school property will decrease, and the annual rate of students agest 12 to 18 who report experiencing serious violent crime, in school or going to and from school, will decrease.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of high school students who reported being involved in a physical fight on school property in the past year			**Explanation:** Year 2003 data will not be released until November 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 2001, National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), 2000. **Frequency:** Biennially. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1995	16			
1997	15			
1999	14			
2001	12.50	12		
2003		12		

Rate of students ages 12 to 18 who reported experiencing serious violent crim in schools or going to and from schools (per 1000 students)		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1994	13	
1995	9	
1996	9	
1997	8	
1998	9	
1999	7	8
2000	5	8
2001		7
2002		7
2003		7

Agencies.

Limitations: YRBS data are collected biennially and reported in the year after collection; the 2003 data will be reported in 2004. While most NCVS data are reported the year after collection, in-school victimization data is a special analysis with a delayed release. The data collected in 2001 will be released in 2004.

Community Service Grant Program - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.184C - Community Service Grants for Expelled and Suspended Students

Program Goal: To promote community service for suspended or expelled students.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Support the implementation of projects designed to expand the number or quality of community service opportunities available to students that have been suspended or expelled.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Number of available community service opportunities

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of available community service opportunities			**Explanation:** 999 represents the baseline year. The baseline for this measure with be established in 2003.	**Additional Source Information:** NCLB State consolidated reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		999		

Goal 4

Research, Development and Dissemination - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.305 - Education Research

Program Goal: Transform education into an evidence-based field.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Raise the quality of research funded or conducted by the Department.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: The percentage of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that are deemed to be of high-quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

The percentage of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that are deemed to be of high-quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	36	
2002	50	50
2003	70	65
2004		80
2005		95

Status: Target exceeded

Progress: For 2003, 20 IES proposals were reviewed by a panel of 10 reviewers. The external reviewers who served this year also served as external reviewers from the previous years.

Additional Source Information: IES selects a random sample of newly funded research proposals from IES. These proposals are distributed to senior scientists in education for evaluation. Data will be collected annually. This evaluation is separate from the peer review panels used to evaluate applications submitted for research funding.

Frequency: Annually.

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.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: The percentage of new research and evaluation publications by IES that are deemed to be of high-quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of new research and evaluation publications by IES that are deemed to be of high-quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.	**Progress:** No new research/evaluation publications were issued in 2003.	**Additional Source Information:** IES selects a random sample of new research and evaluation publications from IES. Publications are distributed to senior scientists in the field for review. Data will be collected annually. **Frequency:** Annually. 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.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	100	50
2003	0	70
2004		95
2005		95

Indicator 8.1.3 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs	**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** For 2003, there were 38 new IES proposals; all included causal	**Additional Source Information:** IES researchers evaluate all newly funded research and evaluation proposals by IES to

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	32	32
2002	100	75
2003	97	75
2004		75
2005		75

questions; 37 used a randomized experimental design to answer causal questions.

identify projects that address causal questions and of those projects, those that utilize 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.

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 2 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 is (a) an experimental (treatment) group and one or more comparison

		groups and (b) random assignment of either participants to treatment and comparison groups or 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 8.1.4 of 4: Of new research and evaluation publications funded by IES that address causal questions, the percentage of publications that employ randomized experimental designs.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Of new research and evaluation publications funded by IES that address causal questions, the percentage of publications that employ randomized experimental designs.	**Progress:** No new research/evaluation publications were issued in 2003.	**Additional Source Information:** IES researchers evaluate all newly funded research and evaluation publications by IES to identify projects that address causal questions and of those projects, those that utilize 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. Evaluations are only as good as

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	100	75
2003	0	75
2004		75
2005		75

		the qualifications of the proposal reviewers. Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as a check of inter-rater agreement in which the 2 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 is (a) an experimental (treatment) group and one or more comparison groups and (b) random assignment of either participants to treatment and comparison groups or 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.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the relevance of our research in order to meet the needs of our customers.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 4: The percentage of new research projects funded by IES that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational practice as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of new research projects funded by IES that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational practice as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.	**Progress:** 2003 data not yet available (10/2003). We don't expect the data will be available before December 2003.	**Additional Source Information:** 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. 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.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	25	25
2003		37
2004		50
2005		62
2006		75

Indicator 8.2.2 of 4: The percentage of K-16 policymakers and administrators who report routinely considering evidence of effectiveness before adopting educational products and approaches.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of K-16 policymakers and administrators who report routinely considering evidence of effectiveness before adopting educational products and approaches	**Progress:** Data to be collected in 2005	**Additional Source Information:** Survey of education decision-makers and policymakers. Data

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	42	42
2005		66

will be collected every 3 years.

Frequency: Other.

Data are valid to the extent that sample includes education decision-makers across high-, low-, and average-achieving districts and states, across urban and rural areas, and from all regions of the country. The sample included district superintendents, chief state school officers, and state higher education executive officers across all of these dimensions.

Indicator 8.2.3 of 4: The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse web site.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse web site.	**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** Actual web hits for 2003 registered over 150% of the target 1 million hits. Note: 2004 target has been revised to 2,000,000 and is in the process of being corrected in the data base.	**Additional Source Information:** What Works Clearinghouse. Baseline data for number of annual hits is FY 2003. Web-based program will automatically count hits on web site.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	1,522,922	1,000,000
2004		4,000,000

Indicator 8.2.4 of 4: Percent of What Works Clearinghouse web site users surveyed randomly who responded to the question, " Would they recommend the WWC web site to a colleague or friend" (by checking "agree" or "strongly agree")

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of What Works Clearinghouse web site users surveyed randomly who		**Additional Source Information:** What Works Clearinghouse

responded to the question, " Would they recommend the WWC web site to a colleague or friend" (by checking "agree" or "strongly agree").			**Progress:** Data will be collected in 2004.	Baseline data for web site users who would recommend it is FY 2004.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		60		
2005		70		

IDEA Part D -- National Activities - 2003

CFDA Numbers: 84.323 - Special Education_State Program Improvement Grants for Children with Disabilities
84.324 - Special Education_Research and Innovation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities
84.325 - Special Education_Personnel Preparation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities
84.325A - IDEA Part D National Activities
84.326 - Special Education_Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities
84.326R - IDEA Part D Assistance and Dissemination
84.327 - Special Education_Technology and Media Services for Individuals with Disabilities
84.328 - Special Education_Parent Information Centers
84.328M - IDEA Part D Parent Information Centers

Program Goal: To link scientifically based practices to states, school systems and families to improve results for infants, toddlers and children with disabilities

Objective 8.1 of 3: Programs respond to critical needs of children with disabiltiies and their families

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Responsive to critical needs: The percentage of program funding priorities that respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families.

Targets and Performance Data									Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of program funding priorities that respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families.										**Additional Source Information:** Published funding priorities. **Frequency:** Annually. **Data Available:** September 2003
Year	**Actual Performance**				**Performance Targets**					
	Research & Innovation	Technology	Media	Personnel Preparation	Research & Innovation	Technology	Media	Personnel Preparation		
2001	82	79	82	85						
2002	72.10	73.80	70	69.80	85	85	85	85		
2003	65.90	71.40	65	74.40	75	75	75	75		
2004					75	75	75	75		
2005					75	75	75	75		

2006		75	75	75	75
2007		75	75	75	75

The percentage of program funding priorities that respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Technical Assistance	Parent Information	State Improvement	Technical Assistance	Parent Information	State Improvement
2001	75	90	80			
2002	67.40	85.40	80.50	85	85	85
2003	60.50	78	80.50	75	75	75
2004				75	75	75
2005				75	75	75
2006				75	75	75
2007				75	75	75

Objective 8.2 of 3: Projects use high-quality methods and materials

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Highest standards for methods and materials: The percentage of IDEA-funded projects use exceptionally rigorous quantitative or qualitative research and evaluation methods or current research-validated practices and materials, as appropriate.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that use exceptionally rigorous quantitative or qualitative research and evaluation methods or current research-validated practices and materials, as appropriate	**Explanation:** All successful applications under IDEA programs include high quality methods and materials, as judged by panels during the review process. This indicator applies a more rigorous standard	**Additional Source Information:** Project information. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** September 2003

Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets			
	Research (from R&I)	Demonstration (from R&I)	Outreach (from R&I)	Technology & Media	Research (from R&I)	Demonstration (from R&I)	Outreach (from R&I)	Technology & Media

1998	60	12	20					
1999	50	70	20	50	65	20	25	
2000	77	13	11	50				
2001	69	67	50	16				
2002	73.30	57.10	40		75	70	55	40
2003					75	75	60	35
2004					75	75	65	45
2005					75	75	70	55
2006					75	75	75	65
2007					75	75	75	75

The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that use exceptionally rigorous quantitative or qualitative research and evaluation methods or current research-validated practices and materials, as appropriate

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Personnel Preparation	Technical Assistance	State Improvem.	Personnel Preparation	Technical Assistance	State Improvem.
2001	27	33	66			
2002	73.60	66.70	100	20	40	70
2003				45	45	75
2004				55	55	75
2005				65	65	75
2006				75	75	75
2007				75	75	75

Technology

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

to assess projects that have exceptionally high standards based on a standard measurement protocol. It takes at least three years to achieve stability in review and assessment process. Fluctuations in data are expected for several years while the data collection methodology is refined. The improvement in Demonstration and Outreach activities from 2000 to 2001 resulted after significant changes were made in the application requirements for these activities. Increased emphasis was placed on project evaluation, and limits on the length of applications were increased.

Validated By: No Formal Verification.

2002	66.70	

Media Services

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	14.30	

Objective 8.3 of 3: Projects Communicate appropriately and products are used for children with disabilities and their families.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Practitioners use results: Expert panels determine that practitioners, including policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or others as appropriate, use products and practices developed through IDEA programs to improve results for children with disabilities.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of expert panels that determine that practitioners, including policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or others as appropriate, use products and practices developed through IDEA programs to improve results for children with disabilities.	**Progress:** A decision was made in early 2003 that because all of the strategies for IDEA - Part D are being revised in 2005, there will be no data on Objective 3 **Explanation:** Fluctuations in data are expected for several years while the data collection methodology is refined. To improve the quality of the evaluations the size of the review panel representing the variety of stakeholders in special education was increased from 5 persons in 2000 to 80 in 2001. This improvement has resulted in a much more robust and accurate measure of this indicator.	**Additional Source Information:** Project information. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** September 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Research & Innovation	Technology	Personnel Preparation	Research & Innovation	Technology	Personnel Preparation
1998		78				
1999					89	
2000	53	47	55			
2001	58	62	55			
2002				65	65	65
2003				75	75	75
2004				75	75	70
2005				75	75	75
2006				75	75	75
2007				75	75	75

The percentage of expert panels that determine that practitioners, including policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or others as appropriate, use products and practices developed through IDEA programs to improve results for children with disabilities.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Technical Assistance	Parent Information	State Improvement	Technical Assistance	Parent Information	State Improvement
1998	67					
1999				78		
2000	59					
2001	69	75	60			
2002				75	75	65
2003				75	75	75
2005				75	75	75
2006				75	75	75
2007				75	75	75

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Communication with target audiences

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that both (1) communicate high-quality products and information and (2) employ strategies to communicate with appropriate target audiences will increase.	**Explanation:** Experts review a sample of products submitted by project directors of a sample of funded projects that have ended. Raters use a scale of 0 to 2, with an overall mean rating of 1.5 considered appropriate communication with target audience.	**Additional Source Information:** Project information from products developed by grantees. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** September 2003 No formal verification. Project information is reviewed by a panel consisting of independent, third party reviewers who are experts in the program content

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Research (from R&I)	Demonstration (from R&I)	Outreach (from R&I)	Research (from R&I)	Demonstration (from R&I)	Outreach (from R&I)
2000	60	40	100			
2001	91	57	80			

2002		85	60	85
2003		75	65	75
2004		75	70	75
2005		75	75	75
2006		75	75	75
2007		75	75	75

The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that both (1) communicate high-quality products and information and (2) employ strategies to communicate with appropriate target audiences will increase.

Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Personnel Technology	Technical Preparation Assistance	Personnel Technology	Technical Preparation Assistance
2000	40	100		
2001	80	71		
2002			85	80
2003			75	75
2004			75	75
2005			75	75
2006			75	75
2007			75	75

and trained in the review procedures. The panel results are analyzed by experts in evaluation research.

National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) - 2003

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 8.1 of 4: Conduct high-quality research

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: The percentage of grantee research that is deemed to be good to excellent as reflected in the appropriateness of the designs used and the rigor with which accepted standards of scientific and/or engineering methods are applied.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of research is deemed to be good or excellent in the appropriateness and rigor of experiment design and the rigor with which accepted standards of scientific and/or engineering methods are applied.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	68	65
2003		70
2004		70
2005		75
2006		75
2007		80

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded

Progress: Actual performance for FY 2002 exceeded the revised performance target of 65% by 3%, indicating improvement in expert reviewers' ratings of "quality of research This target was revised from 70% to 65% in response to refinements in measurement aimed at eliminating the previous "double-barreled" measure, based on the average of ratings for "scientific rigor"'and "usefulness of research," which tended to result in inflated scores. This occurred because "usefulnesss" typically was rated higher than "rigor." Given this improvement in measurement, and additional changes to the program review process focused on emphasizing accountability for results (i.e., outcomes), it is difficult to compare performance on this indicator for 2002 to previous years.

Explanation: Data are from the FY 2002 series of summative program reviews

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Other
Other: Expert Panel.
Sponsor: NIDRR.
Date Sponsored: 09/30/2002.

Additional Source Information: Data are based upon ratings obtained from expert panels during reverse site visits.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: December 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: The data for this indicator are limited to expert panelists' ratings from the two largest program mechanisms within the NIDRR portfolio -- i.e., RERCs and RRTCs. Within these two programs, the data are further limited to the subset of centers

	conducted with a total of 28 centers (9 RERCs and 19 RRTCs). To satisfy this indicator, grantees must receive an average rating of 4 or greater, indicating "good to excellent," based on a five-point Likert-type scale. Ratings were completed by expert panels of 10-12 reviewers selected from key stakeholder groups, including other researchers and engineers, practitioners, policy analysts, industry representatives, disability advocates and consumers with disabilities. Specific areas of performance are taken from NIDRR's "centers of excellence" model and include the rigor and feasibility of scientific methods, appropriateness of research tools, and adequacy and diversity of sample size. Among the centers reviewed, the % rated good to excellent in research varied from a high of 86% and 78% for Health & Function RRTCs and RERCs, respectively, to 50% for Employment and Community Integration RRTCs. This variability, in part, reflects differences in the research designs and methods utilized by sub-areas of disability and rehabilitation resear	who were funded initially in 1998 and scheduled for summative program review in 2002. **Improvements:** Extensive efforts are being made to ensure that centers being rated and experts serving as reviewers are conversant with the evidence based and outcomes oriented approaches to the review process. To improve the measurement of this indicator in future years NIDRR is planning to: (1) augment the data source to include information from the web-based annual performance reporting (APR) system and expand the sample of centers and projects assessed for "quality of research;" and (2) refine the "centers of excellence' (CoE) criteria upon which the ratings of research quality are based. These improvement are scheduled to go into effect in FY 2005 based upon a redesign of the web-based performance reporting system and psychometric analysis of the CoE criteria.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: A significant percentage of new studies funded by NIDRR assess the effectiveness of interventions using rigorous and appropriate methods.		
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of new studies funded by NIDRR assess the effectiveness of interventions using rigorous and appropriate methods	**Explanation:** In FY 2004 NIDRR will set a	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** 1820-0642 Annual Performance

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999

baseline for this new indicator based on analyses of FY 2003 data from the web-based annual reporting (APR) system and judgements of expert panelists. The 2005 Target will be the baseline + 5%.

Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTCs, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utillization Projects).
Program: NIDRR.

Additional Source Information: Triangulation of data from the RTI web-based annual performance reporting (APR) system & program review -type meetings with expert panels.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: June 2004
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Review of expert panel representing key stakeholder groups

Improvements: To reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of collecting qualitative judgements from expert panels, in 2004 NIDRR will experiment with using Internet-based alternatives to face-to-face program review-type meetings.

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: The number of publications based on NIDRR-funded research in refereed journals

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of publications based on NIDRR-funded research in refereed journals	**Progress:** See explanation below	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** 1820-0642 Annual Performance

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999
2004		8
2005		10
2006		10
2007		10

Explanation: The performance target for 2003 was converted to Baseline to allow NIDRR to conduct a comprehensive empirical analysis of what the targets should be for grantees from large centers as well as from other program mechanisms. This analysis will be conducted in 2004 using FY 2003 data from the web-based Annual Performance Report (APR) system and expert judgements of outside reviewers. The analysis will also evaluate the merits of developing sub-measures of this indicator to reflect different expectations for publication in peer-reviewed journals associated with different subfields of rehabilitation and disability research. Targets for 2005 will be the Baseline + 5%.

Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTCs, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utillization Projects).
Program: NIDRR.

Additional Source Information: Triangulation of data from RTI web-based annual reporting (APR) system and program review-type meetings with expert panels

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: June 2004
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Verified by scrutiny of reported publications by Dept. of Education staff.

Limitations: At present, data on numbers of publications in refereed journals are based upon self-reports of grantees from NIDRR's large centers only -- i.e., RRTCs, RERCs and model systems. Concerns have been raised about the representativeness of these centers for all of NIDRR's portfolio and the potential for under reporting. Methods to expand the sample of grantees to include other program mechanisms and to independently confirm publications are planned. The number of publications using the

		strict definitions of refereed journals are likely to fairly represent the productivity of grantees in areas related to engineering and medicine. However, these definitions may not fully represent the productivity of grantees in other areas. **Improvements:** NIDRR is evaluating methods of assessing productivity that fairly represent all parts of the NIDRR grant portfolio (for more details see Explanation above).

Objective 8.2 of 4: Disseminate and promote use of information on research findings, in accessible formats, to improve rehabilitation services and outcomes.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Grantees deemed to be implementing a plan for widespread dissemination and utilization of validated research findings, developed with stakeholder input and based on measurable objectives, that is producing products and services at sufficient levels and in accessible formats and reaching targeted customers in sufficient numbers, including those from diverse and underserved populations

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of grantees deemed to be implementing a plan for widespread dissemination and utilization of validated research findings, developed with stakeholder input and based on measurable objectives, that is producing products and services at sufficient levels and in accessible formats and reaching targeted customers in sufficient numbers, including those from diverse and underserved populations	**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** Actual performance for FY 2002 exceeded targeted performance by 18%, indicating significant improvement in expert reviewers' ratings of dissemination activities and potential outcomes. However, given major refinements to the program review process between aimed at clarifying the "centers of excellence" model and emphasizing accountability for results (i.e.outcomes), it is difficult to directly compare performance for 2002 to previous	**Source:** Other **Other:** Expert Panel. **Sponsor:** NIDRR. **Date Sponsored:** 09/30/2002. **Additional Source Information:** Data are based upon ratings obtained from expert panels during reverse site visits. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	68	50
2003		50
2004		55
2005		60

2006		65
2007		70

years.

Explanation: Data are from the FY 2002 series of summative program reviews conducted with a total of 28 centers (9 RERCs and 19 RRTCs). To satisfy this indicator, grantees must receive an average rating of 4 or greater, indicating "good to excellent," based on a five-point Likert-type scale. Ratings were completed by expert panels of 10-12 reviewers selected from key stakeholder groups, including other researchers and engineers, practitioners and service providers, policy analysts, industry representatives, disability advocates and consumers with disabilities. Specific areas of performance rated are taken from NIDRR's "centers of excellence" (CoE) criteria for Relevance, Productivity & Dissemination and include "implementation of systematic dissemination plan to reach diverse audiences" and "demonstrates that research results are contributing to improved rehabilitation outcomes' The % of centers rated good to excellent in this domain varied from a high of 74% for RERCs to 65% for RRTCs. This variability, in part, reflects differences in the nature of the dissemination products and services produced by RERCs and RRTCs.

Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Review by expert panels representing key stakeholder groups

Limitations: The data for this indicator are limited to the two largest program mechanisms within the NIDRR portfolio -- i.e., RERCs and RRTCs. Within these two programs, the data are further limited to the subset of centers who were funded initially in 1998 and scheduled for summative program review in 2002.

Improvements: To improve the future measurement of this indicator NIDRR is planning to: (1) augment the data source to include information from the web-based annual performance reporting (APR) system and an expanded sample of centers and projects from a range of funding mechanisms; and (2) refine the "centers of excellence' (CoE) criteria upon which the ratings of dissemination are based. These improvement are scheduled to go into effect in FY 2005 based upon a redesign of the APR and psychometric analysis of the CoE criteria.

Objective 8.3 of 4: Ensure Utility of Research Problems and Products to End-Users

Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Research and development projects conducted by NIDRR grantees deemed to be addressing problems or issues of "high relevance" to consumers and other end-users

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Published Papers and Presentations by NIDRR trainees and fellows that contribute to the study of rehabilitation			**Explanation:** A baseline will be set in FY 2004 based on analyses of data from the FY 2003 web-based annual performance reporting (APR) system and judgements of expert panels. The FY 2005 target is 5 percent over the baseline. Out year targets will increase by five percentage points up to 80 percent.	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** 1820-0642 Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTCs, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utillization Projects). **Program:** NIDRR. **Additional Source Information:** Triangulation of RTI web-based annual performance reporting (APR) system and program review-type meetings with expert panels **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Review by expert panel representing key stakeholder groups **Improvements:** Extensive efforts are being made to ensure that centers being rated and experts serving as reviewers are conversant with the evidence based and outcomes oriented approaches to the review process. To reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of collecting qualitative judgements
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		999		

		from expert panels, in 2004 NIDRR will experiment with using Internet-based alternatives to face-to-face program review-type meetings.

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Consumer-oriented products and information disseminated by grantees based on NIDRR-funded research that is deemed to be of "high utility" by individuals with disabilities and other end-users

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Successful completion of planning tasks and conduct of capacity building and outreach conference. Participation of at least 25 individuals from currently funded entities and individuals from other eligible entities. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2003** /	**Explanation:** A baseline will be set for FY 2004 using FY 2003 data from the web-based annual performance reporting (APR) system and judgements of expert panels. The FY 2005 target will be 5 percent over the baseline. Out year targets will increase by five percentage points up to 80 percent.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Other. **Additional Source Information:** Qualitative ratings by a panel of consumers and other end-users of consumer-oriented products and materials developed by grantees for dissemination. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Review by expert panel representing key stakeholder groups. **Improvements:** Extensive efforts are being made to ensure that centers being rated and experts serving as reviewers are conversant with the evidence based and outcomes oriented approaches to the review process. To reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999

		collecting qualitative judgements from expert panels, in 2004 NIDRR will experiment with using Internet-based alternatives to face-to-face program review-type meetings.

Objective 8.4 of 4: Conduct performance evaluation to ensure program improvement and accountability for results

Indicator 8.4.1 of 1: The percentage of projects that are deemed to have an evaluation plan that is conducted on an ongoing basis and is tied to measurable objectives for assuring quality of implementation and efficient project management, and for assessing the relevance of products and services produced and the extent to which anticipated outcomes are being achieved

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of projects that are deemed to have an evaluation plan that is conducted on an ongoing basis and is tied to measurable objectives for assuring quality of implementation and efficient project management, and for assessing the relevance of products and services produced and the extent to which anticipated outcomes are being achieved.	**Explanation:** A baseline will be set in FY 2004 based on analyses of data from the FY 2004 series of Formative Program Reviews and the judgements of expert panelists. The targets for FY 2005 will be 5 percent over the baseline. Out year targets will increase by five percentage points up to 70 percent.	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** 1820-0642 Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTCs, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utillization Projects). **Program:** NIDRR. **Additional Source Information:** Triangulation of data from RTI web-based annual performance reporting (APR) system and program review-type meetings with expert panels. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Review by expert panels

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999

		representing key stakeholder groups **Improvements:** Extensive efforts are being made to ensure that centers being rated and experts serving as reviewers are conversant with the evidence based and outcomes oriented approaches to the review process.

Goal 5

Adult Education: State Grants and Knowledge Development - 2003

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 8.1 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 8.1.1 of 5: Basic skill acquisition: The percentage of adults in Adult Basic Education programs who aquire the level of basic skills needed (validated by standardized assessments) to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
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.			**Explanation:** Indicator has been changed to require validation of basic skills acquisition through standardized assessment. Because of change to the indicators, new performance target/baseline has been established. 2001 is the baseline year. Data reflect percent of Adult Education Learners (Adults With Limited Basic Skills) who demonstrated a level of basic skill proficiency needed to advance to the next educational functioning level. Educational functioning levels range from beginning literacy through high school. Revised indicators require validation of basic skill proficiency through standardized assessment. New targets reflect new standard.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** March 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** As a third tier recipient of this 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. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection
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		41		
2004		42		

		methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review. **Improvements:** The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Indicator 8.1.2 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
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. 2001 is the new baseline.	**Explanation:** Indicator has been changed to require validation of basic skill acquisition through standardized assessment. Because of change to the indicator, new performance target/baseline has been established. Data reflect percent of English Literacy learners (adults with minimal English language skills) who demonstrated a level of English language proficiency needed to advance to the next educational functioning level. Educational functioning levels range from beginning-level English Literacy through advanced-level English Literacy. Revised indicators requires validation of English proficiency through standardized assessment. New targets reflect new standard.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** March 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** As a third tier recipient of this 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. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the (OVAE) implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	30	
1997	28	
1998	28	
1999	49	
2000	20	40
2001	31	40
2002	34	42
2003		44
2004		45

		data quality review. **Improvements:** The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Indicator 8.1.3 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.	**Explanation:** Because of change to the indicator, new performance benchmark targets have been established. 2001 is the baseline year. The performance data reflect % of adult learners with a goal to complete high school in secondary level programs of instruction, who, upon exit earned their high school diploma or GED credential within the reporting period.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** March 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** As a third tier recipient of this 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. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting. **Improvements:** The OVAE is

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		41
2004		42

		developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Indicator 8.1.4 of 5: Transition to post-secondary 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

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				26
2004				27

Explanation: Because of the change to the indicator new performance benchmarks/targets have been established. 2001 is the baseline year. The new performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners with a goal of further education or training, who, upon exit from adult education, enrolled in a postsecondary education or training program.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: March 2004
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: As a third tier recipient of this 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. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and a data quality review.

Improvements: The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the

		Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Indicator 8.1.5 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

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
2004				38

Explanation: Because of the change to the indicator, new performance benchmark targets have been established. 2001 is the baseline year. The 2001 performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners with an employment goal, who, upon exit from an adult education program obtain a job.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: March 2004
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: As a third tier recipient of this 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. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and a data quality review.

Improvements: The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the

		Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Assistive Technology Program - 2003

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 8.1 of 2: Through systemic activity, improve access to an availability of assistive technology (AT) for individuals with disabilities who require assistive technology

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Barrier reduction: Annually, grantees activities will result in legislative and policy changes that reduce barriers.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of grantees responsible for legislative and policy change resulting in barrier reduction				**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	95			
1998	95			
1999	88	95		
2000	50	95		
2001		95		
2002		95		
2003		95		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Individuals who receive loans: The number of individuals with disabilities who receive loans per $1 million invested.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Approved Loans				**Additional Source Information:** Annual web-based reporting system
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		

2000	229			**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Through protection and advocacy, increase access to and funding of assistive technology deveices and services for persons with disabilities.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Funding sources: The number of individuals receiving protection and advocacy services resulting in AT device and/or service will increase 5 percent annually.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
- No Targets And Performance Data -		**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Gallaudet University - 2003

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 8.1 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 8.1.1 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.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Undergraduate enrollment			**Explanation:** Gallaudet has established minimum enrollment numbers of 1,250 undergraduates, 700 graduates, 70 professional studies students, as well as 225 Model Secondary School and 140 Kendall School students. The total undergraduate enrollment held steady at 1,243, very near its target. The graduate enrollment, while not meeting its target, increased considerably over the fiscal year 2002 enrollment. Implementation of key strategies for increasing graduate and professional studeis enrollments has resulted in substantial increases in both	**Additional Source Information:** Collegiate Office of Enrollment Services, and Clerc Center student database, FY 2003 enrollment as of October 2002, summarized in Gallaudet's FY 2002 annual report, submitted in 2003. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	1,339			
1999	1,300	1,250		
2000	1,318	1,250		
2001	1,321	1,250		
2002	1,243	1,250		
2003	1,243	1,250		
2004		1,250		

Graduate enrollment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	714	
1999	628	700
2000	541	700
2001	625	700
2002	517	700
2003	617	700
2004		700

Professional studies

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	92	
1999	70	70
2000	86	70
2001	93	70
2002	92	70
2003	154	70
2004		70

Model Secondary School enrollment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	224	
1999	209	225
2000	219	225
2001	205	225

enrollment figures. While the Model Secondary School did not reach its target enrollment, it slightly increased enrollment over the fiscal year 2002 level. The Kendall School enrollment increased approximately 3 percent over the fiscal year 2002 level, again exceeding its target. Gallaudet has established minimum enrollment targets based on longstanding enrollment targets and historical trends recognizing that actual figures vary from year to year.

No formal verification procedure applied.

2002	188	225
2003	190	225
2004		225

Kendall School enrollment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	137	
1999	117	140
2000	135	140
2001	148	140
2002	148	140
2003	152	140
2004		140

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Student retention rate: Increase the undergraduate retention rate and maintain a minimum retention rate at the Model School/Kendall School.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Undergraduate retention rate

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	72	
1999	73	75
2000	72	76
2001	71	76
2002	73	76
2003		76
2004		76

Explanation: The percentage of students returning to the University increased 2 percent from fiscal year 2001, making performance very close to the target. Increased focus on retention of students and particular attention to the success of first year students have contributed to the increase. Gallaudet has established a minimum retention rate of 90 percent for the Clerc Center. The fiscal year 2002 Clerc Center retention rate of 86 percent is nearly at the same level reported for fiscal year 2001, but still slightly below the target.

Additional Source Information: Collegiate Office of the Register and Clerc Center (Model and Kendall Schools) Office of Exemplary Programs and Research records, summarized in the FY 2002 annual report, submitted in 2003.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: - 2003
Data Available: October 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by Gallaudet

Clerc Center: Model School and Kendall School rate		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1998	85	
1999	92	90
2000	82	90
2001	88	90
2002	86	90
2003		90
2004		90

University and the Clerc Center.

Limitations: Gallaudet plans to refine the retention rate indicator for the Clerc Center students and how progress toward its target is calculated so that it more validly reflects the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to Clerc Center students. The concepts of retention and persistence at the postsecondary level do not translate appropriately to elementary and secondary special education.

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Student graduation rate: The undergraduate graduation rates at the university will increase. The Model School graduation rate will be maintained.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Undergraduate graduation rate		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1998	41	
1999	42	41
2000	41	42
2001	41	43
2002	42	44
2003		45
2004		45

Model School graduation rate		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

Explanation: The University's performance increased slightly from fiscal year 2001, but fell short its target. The University has instituted a number of strategies to improve its undergraduate graduation rate. The Model School 80 percent graduation rate reflects those students who completed all graduation requirement by the end of their senior year. An additional 5 percent deferred graduation pending completion of course work, and 13 percent changed their graduation date and will return for the fifth year option. Therefore, the total projected graduation rate for fiscal year 2002 senior class is expected to be 98 percent.

Additional Source Information: Collegiate Office of the Registrar and the Clerc Center Office of Exemplary Programs and Research records, summarized in FY 2002 annual report, submitted in 2003.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: - 2003
Data Available: October 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center.

Limitations: Gallaudet plans to reconceptualize how performance

1998	93	
1999	88	94
2000	98	94
2001	90	94
2002	80	94
2003		94
2004		94

is assessed for the Model School graduation rate to make this indicator a more valid reflection of what really occurs with a given senior class. 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.

Objective 8.2 of 3: Gallaudet works in partnership with others to develop and disseminate educational programs and materials for deaf and hard-of-hearing students.

Indicator 8.2.1 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.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Programs adopting Model/Kendall Innovative strategies/curricula			**Explanation:** Fifty-six new programs adopted innovative Clerc Center strategies or curricula in FY 2002, representing an increase over fiscal year 2001 and exceeding its target in fiscal year 2002. Again, it should be noted that 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 to participate in training and implementation	**Additional Source Information:** Records of the Clerc Center Office of Training and Professional Development, summarized in the FY 2002 Annual Report, submitted in January 2003. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** - 2003 **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	41			
1999	52	41		
2000	62	41		
2001	39	41		
2002	56	41		
2003		41		
2004		41		

	activities.	

Objective 8.3 of 3: Curriculum and Extra-Curricular activities prepare students to meet the skill requirements of the workplace or to continue their studies.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the University: Gallaudet's Bachelor graduates will either find employment or attend graduate school during their first year after graduation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Graduates in jobs or graduate school during first year after graduation (%)			**Explanation:** The 90 percent figure for Bachelor degree graduates either employed or in graduate school continues to represent a high degree of success and normal fluctuation for the approximately one-third of graduates who respond to the survey each year. It is likely that the present economy was a factor in the decrease.	**Additional Source Information:** University study on the status of graduates' employment and advanced studies, February, 2001 **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** - 2003 **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	95			
1999	98	95		
2000	97	95		
2001	100	95		
2002	90	95		
2003		95		
2004		95		

Indicator 8.3.2 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.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Model Secondary School graduates in jobs or postsecondary programs during first year after graduation (%)			**Explanation:** In fiscal year 2002, 90 percent of the Model Secondary School graduates were engaged in productive activities, including postsecondary education, work, or Vocational Rehabilitation evaluation or training four months after June graduation. The other 10 percent of graduates reported that they	**Additional Source Information:** Clerc Center Exemplary Programs and Research. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** - 2003 **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	74			
2001	72	80		
2002	90	80		
2003		80		

2004		80	were actively involved in looking for work.	University.

National Technical Institute for the Deaf - 2003

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 8.1 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 8.1.1 of 1: Enrollment: Maintain a minimum student body of undergraduates, graduates, and educational interpreters as established by NTID.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of students							**Explanation:** NTID's goal is to maintain a student body of 1,080 undergraduates, 100 Education Interpreters, and 75 Graduate/Master's in Special Education. The Education Interpreter Program enrollment has not met it's target for the last several years primarily due to more rigorous entrance requirements since the program was elevated to a bachelor's level program. With more aggressive recruitment, the institute is confident that the Educational Interpreter Program enrollment will increase, but more slowly than originally anticipated	**Additional Source Information:** National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office records, FY 2003 as of October 2002. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** October 2003 Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification applied.
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				1,080	100	75

Objective 8.2 of 3: Maximize the number of students successfully completing a program of study

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Graduation rate: The graduation rate for students in sub-baccalaureate and baccalaureate programs will be maintained or increased.

Targets and Performance Data

Student graduation rates

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				53	52	61
2004				53	52	61

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: The Institute's goal is to maintain the rate for students in sub-baccalaureate programs at 52 percent in FY 2003 and maintain the rate for students in baccalaureate programs above 60 percent.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office Records.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: October 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Student retention rate: The first-year student overall retention rate will be maintained; sub-baccalaureate will increase; and baccalaureate will be maintained.

Targets and Performance Data

Student retention rates

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: Although the overall retention rate exceeded or met its target in

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: NTID Registrar office records

Frequency: Annually

	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				74	74	84
2004				74	74	84

recent years, the sub- baccalaureate performance, although it has increased, it has not met its target. Improvements in recent year performance makes NTID confident that current and new retention strategies will help achieve the target of 74 percent in 2003 or 2004.

Collection Period: 2003 -
Data Available: October 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by NTID. No formal verification proceedure applied.

Objective 8.3 of 3: Prepare graduates to find satisfying jobs in fields commensurate with the level of their academic training.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Placement rate: Maintain a high percentage of graduates placed in the workforce.

Targets and Performance Data

Placement rate

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995	94	
1996	96	
1997	97	
1998	95	
1999	94	95
2000	90	95
2001	92	95
2002		95
2003		95

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: Placement rate data is reported the year after graduation. NTID has established a minimum placement rate of graduates entering the workforce at 95 percent. The Institute believes that a 95 percent placement rate represents an appropriate ongoing target, but economic conditions have deteriorated to a point where it is affecting students' ability to find permanent placement. The placement rates are calculated as the percentage of graduates who are employed amoung 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

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: National Technical Institute for the Deaf Placement Records.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: - 2003
Data Available: October 2003
Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.

2004		95	are not included. The Bureau of Labor Statistics uses this same methodology.	

Community Technology Centers - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.341 - Community Technology Centers

Program Goal: Provide access to computers and Internet services to adults and children in economically distressed urban and rural communities.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Increase the number of new and expanded access points (locations) that provide opportunities for individuals to become computer literate and to use the Internet

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The number of new and expanded access points

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of new and expanded access points				**Additional Source Information:** Feedback forms submitted by grantees. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	562			
2002	920			
2003		1,288		

Objective 8.2 of 2: To increase the number of children receiving supplementary educational opportunities and the number of adults improving their basic education, English language proficiency skills and earning a high school credential through the use of technology.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: The number of adults enrolled in adult education activities at CTC sites.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of adults enrolled				**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		800		

Institutional Development, Title III & Title V - 2003

CFDA Numbers: 84.031 - Higher Education_Institutional Aid
84.031B - Strengthening HBCU's and Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions
84.031N - Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaaiian-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, that 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 8.1 of 3: Improve the academic quality of participating Institutions.

Indicator 8.1.1 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.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that have been met or exceeded.			**Explanation:** In order to better measure the success of these programs new GPRA indicators were developed in 2002 based on the new Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR was designed with extensive consultation with the grant community. These indicators provide program success information across the diverse types of institutions as well as across the seven different programs within this one GPRA program report. February 2003 will be the first time that data will be available for these indicators.	**Additional Source Information:** Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees. **Frequency:** Annually. **Data Available:** February 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data. **Limitations:** Data are self-reported.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002		75		
2003		75		
2004		75		

Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the institutional management and fiscal stability of the participating Institutions.

Indicator 8.2.1 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.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management or fiscal stability that have been met or exceeded.			**Explanation:** In order to better measure the success of these programs new GPRA indicators were developed in 2002 based on a new Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR was designed with extensive consultation with the grant community. These indicators provide program success information across the diverse types of institutions as well as across the seven different programs within this one GPRA program report. February 2003 will be the first time that data will be available for these indicators.	**Additional Source Information:** Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees. **Frequency:** Annually. **Data Available:** February 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data. **Limitations:** Data are self-reported.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002		75		
2003		75		
2004		75		

Objective 8.3 of 3: Improve the student services and student outcomes of the participating Institutions.

Indicator 8.3.1 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.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
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.			**Explanation:** In order to better measure the success of these programs new GPRA indicators were developed in 2002 based	**Additional Source Information:** Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002		75		

2003		75	on the new Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR was designed with extensive consultation with the grant community. These indicators provide program success information across the diverse types of institutions as well as across the seven different programs within this one GPRA program report. February 2003 will be the first time that data will be available for these indicators.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Data Available:** February 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data. **Limitations:** Data are self-reported.
2004		75		

Byrd Honors Scholarships Program - 2003

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 8.1 of 1: BYRD SCHOLARS WILL SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT HIGH RATES.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Completion of postsecondary education programs: Byrd scholars will successfully complete postsecondary education programs within 4 years.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of Byrd scholars graduating within 4 years			**Explanation:** Prior to 2002, we collected data that show receipt of four years of funding or graduation. As of 2002, we changed the definition of data collected to report only four-year graduation rates. Therefore, in 2002, there is a significant decline in the performance measure.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual Performance Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** March 2004 **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.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	22	90		
2003		26		
2004		26		

Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program - 2003

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 8.1 of 1: Increase access for low-income parents to postsecondary institutions.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Persistence/Completion rate: The percentage of students receiving child care services who persist in and complete postsecondary education.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Median percentage of Retention Rate **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2001** / 79 / 80 **2003** /	**Explanation:** Performance data will be collected through 18 month Performance Reports. One year of retention rate data is available, and no completion rate data is available. It will be Fall 2004 before the completion rate measure will be meaningful.	**Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** April 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied by child care centers with no formal verification procedure provided. **Limitations:** Most grantees reported retention data in their first year reports. Unsure of the percentage of child care centers that will be able to obtain completion data.

TRIO Programs - 2003

CFDA Numbers: 84.042 - TRIO_Student Support Services
84.044 - TRIO_Talent Search
84.047 - TRIO_Upward Bound
84.047M - TRIO - Upward Bound Math/Science
84.066 - TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers
84.217A - TRIO - McNair Post-baccalaurate Achievement

Program Goal: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.

Objective 8.1 of 2: INCREASE POSTSECONDARY ENROLLMENT RATES OF LOW-INCOME, FIRST-GENERATION INDIVIDUALS IN THE ACADEMIC PIPELINE.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of Upward Bound participants enrolling in college.

Targets and Performance Data

Upward Bound (UB): College Enrollment (percent)

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Overall Enrollment	High-Risk Enrollment	Overall Enrollment	High-Risk Enrollment
2000	65	34		
2001			65	
2002			65	
2003			65	35
2004			65	35.50

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: Data from the national evaluation of Upward Bound provides the baseline data. The Upward Bound performance reports are and will be used to determine if the performance targets are met. The long-term goals for UB are to maintain the current overall enrollment rate while increasing the percentage of higher-risk students who are served, and to increase the enrollment rate of higher-risk students to 37% by 2007.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Performance Reports

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
No formal verification of performance report data The data are self-reported

Limitations: The national evaluation has provided baseline data for UB and also provides data on appropriate comparison groups. However, the evaluation

		cannot be used to measure program improvements on an annual basis.

Objective 8.2 of 2: INCREASE POSTSECONDARY PERSISTENCE AND COMPLETION RATES OF LOW-INCOME, FIRST-GENERATION INDIVIDUALS IN THE ACADEMIC PIPELINE.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Postsecondary persistence and completion: Percentages of Student Support Services participants persisting and completing a degree at the same institution.

Targets and Performance Data

Student Support Services (SSS): College persistence (percent) and completion (percent)

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	College Persistence	College Completion	College Persistence	College Completion
1999	67	29		
2000	67		67	29
2001			67	29
2002			67	29
2003			68	29.50
2004			68.50	30

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: Data from the national evaluation of Student Support Services provides the baseline data. The performance reports are and will be used to determine if the performance targets are met. The long-term goals for SSS are to increase the persistence and completion rates to 70% and 31%, respectively, by 2007. The college completion baseline of 29% includes only SSS students who remain at the same school through graduation. It has been set at this level because the annual performance reports will only report the academic progress of SSS participants that remain at the grantee institution. The national evaluation indicates that 68% of SSS participants complete at least an Associates degree at any college within 6 years. The long-term goal is intended to increase this rate to 70%.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Performance reports

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: January 2004
No formal verification of performance report data. The data are self-reported.

Limitations: The national evaluation provided baseline data for SSS and also provides data on appropriate comparison groups. However, the evaluation cannot be used to measure program improvements on an annual basis.

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Graduate school enrollment and persistence: Percentages of McNair participants enrolling and persisting in graduate school.

Targets and Performance Data | Assessment of Progress | Sources and Data Quality

McNair: Graduate school enrollment (percent) and persistence (percent)				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Enrollment	Persistence	Enrollment	Persistence
1999	35	48		
2000	35	75	35	48
2001			35	48
2002			35	48
2003			36	75
2004			36	75

Explanation: The 1998-99 annual performance reports provide the baseline data for the McNair program. The McNair performance reports are and will be used to determine if the performance targets are met. Performance targets for 2003 and 2004 have been increased to reflect expected program outcomes.

Additional Source Information: Performance reports

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
The data are self reported.

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education - 2003

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 8.1 of 2: Promote reforms that improve the quality of teaching and learning and Postsecondary institutions.

Indicator 8.1.1 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.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of FIPSE grantees reporting full project dissemination to others			**Explanation:** FIPSE considers itself successful on this measure if 90% or more projects result in project models being adapted on other campuses.	**Additional Source Information:** Final Report Scorecard **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** January 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Similar results from site visit scorecard. **Limitations:** Data supplied by project directors in response to survey instruments. Have revised form to match indicators more closely. Planning an external evaluation of the Comprehensive Program through PES around these indicators.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	92			
1999	100			
2000	83	100		
2001	96	85		
2002	94.50	95		
2003		95		
2004		95		
2005		96		
2006		96		
2007		97		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Institutionalization of FIPSE programs

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Projects sustained: The number of projects sustained at least 2 years beyond Federal funding.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of Projects reporting institutionalization on their home campuses			**Explanation:** FIPSE's emphasis on institutional contributions to projects and development of long-term continuation plans are designed to embed projects within campus structures. Expect the rate of institutionalization to be in the 90-100% range, but not 100% each year.	**Additional Source Information:** Final Report Scorecard. Assessment of projects based on review of final reports sent in at the completion of projects. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** January 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Similar Data from Site Visit Score Card. Assessment of project drawn from on-site visitation and evaluation of projects). **Limitations:** Data supplied as a result of the assessment of project final reports submitted by project directors. **Improvements:** Planning modification of assessment to work with planned on-line assessment for 2003. External evaluation of the Comprehensive Program is currently underway.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	93			
1999	96			
2000	94	100		
2001	100	95		
2002	96	95		
2003		95		
2004		95		
2005		96		
2006		96		
2007		97		

Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP) - 2003

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 8.1 of 3: Increase the academic performance and preparation for postsecondary education of participating students.

Indicator 8.1.1 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.

Targets and Performance Data

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	Prealgebra	Algebra 1
2001	18		
2002	18		
2003		19	19
2004		20	20
2007		35	70

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: Historical performance data through 2002 show the percentages of GEAR UP students who passed prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade. Target data beginning in 2003 continue to reflect the percentage of GEAR UP students who pass prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade, and the Algebra 1 standard will now be measured via GEAR UP student passage rates by the end of the 9th grade. Data will continue to be collected on successful completion of core academic subjects and other college preparatory courses. Note that standards to enter and complete above grade level math courses (such as prealgebra and Algebra I for 7th graders)

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: December 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency; and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.

	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. Also Note that data for Year 2001 were obtained from the GEAR UP Annual Performance Report covering April 2000 - March 2001. Data for Year 2002 were obtained from the GEAR UP Annual Performance Report covering April 2001 - March 2002.	

Objective 8.2 of 3: Increase the rate of high school graduation and participation in postsecondary education of participating students.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Attendance and promotion: Program participants will have high rates of attendance in school and be promoted to the next grade level on time.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentages of participating 7th graders with fewer than five unexcused absences in the first two quarters of the academic year.	**Explanation:** Data reflect the percentages of participating 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. Data will continue to be collected on school attendance and grade level promotions, and in future years on high school completion and postsecondary education enrollment. Note that standards for promotion have become more rigorous in many school districts and states that have GEAR UP programs.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency; and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Attendance	Attendance
2001	83	
2002	88	
2003		89
2004		90
2007		92

Percentages of participating 7th graders promoted to the next grade level.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Promotion	Promotion
2001	98	
2002	97	

2003		97
2004		97
2007		98

Objective 8.3 of 3: Increase educational expectation for participating students and students and family knowledge and postsecondary education options, preparation, and financing.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Knowledge of postsecondary education: Program participants and their families reporting having knowledge of available financial aid and necessary academic preparation for college.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of parents of program participants that have knowledge of available financial aid.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Parents: Aid	Parents: Aid
2001	24	
2002	31	
2003		32
2004		33
2007		45

Percentage of program participants 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			54	40

Assessment of Progress

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 will continue to be collected on students and parents' knowledge of postsecondary education entrance requirements, costs of attendance, and financial aid opportunities.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: December 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency; and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.

2004		56	42		
2007		75	50		

Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) - 2003

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 8.1 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 8.1.1 of 2: Years of Support for Academic Study Provided to GAANN Fellows: The average number of years of additional support, beyond the 2 years of mandated institutional match to the 3-year grant period, provided to GAANN fellows by grantee programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Average number of additional years of support being provided to GAANN fellows by grantee programs.			**Explanation:** This is a new indicator for the program and requests grantees to go above and beyond the commitment currently required in the program regulations. As such the program office will need to publish the intent of this indicator for public comment and has not yet had an opportunity to implement the indicator. The baseline will be established in FY 2004. The competitive points will be offered beginning with the FY 2005 applications and the results will be available in December 2006.	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** 1840-0748 GAANN Final Performance Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** - 2004 **Data Available:** December 2006 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Grantees are currently not required to submit performance reports beyond the 3-year grant period. Therefore, there is no method of formally validating that additional years of support are provided. This means that the only way to collect consistent data is in the application stage. Because GAANN grantees will usually apply year-after-year and
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		

		therefore have an incentive to live up to their commitments, we believe that until regulatory changes can be put into place, years promised in an application is a reliable proxy for years of support actually provided. **Improvements:** The program office will seek to include in the program regulations a requirement that grantees must submit status updates for all years in which student support is attributable to the GAANN grant. This includes the 3-year grant period, 2-year required match, and any additional years committed to by the grantee in its application.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Enrollment of Underrepresented Populations: The percentage of GAANN fellows from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds compared to the national average of individuals from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds enrolled in programs leading to the terminal degree in the designated areas of national need.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The difference between the percent of GAANN fellows from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds and the national average of individuals from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds enrolled in programs leading to the terminal degree in the designated areas of national need.	**Explanation:** This is a new indicator for the program and the first data will be available in December 2003. Baseline will be established in 2003. 2004 data will be baseline data established in 2003 + 1%. The long-term goal for this measure is the 2003 baseline + 5%.	**Source 1:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** 1840-0748 GAANN Final Performance Report. **Source 2:** NCES Survey/Assessment **Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. **Frequency:** Annually.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999

		Collection Period: 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **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.

International Education and Foreign Language Studies Program - 2003

CFDA Numbers: 84.015 - National Resource Centers and Fellowships Program for Language and Area or Language and International Studies
84.269 - Institute for International Public Policy

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 8.1 of 2: Maintain a US Higher Education system able to produce experts in less commonly taught languages and area studies who are capable of contributing to the needs of US Government, academic and business institutions.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Language Enrollments: NRC supported institutions provide the majority of the instruction in foreign languages, especially the less commonly taught languages.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of total national undergraduate language enrollments that are at NRC/FLAS funded institutions.			**Explanation:** While Title VI-supported institutions account for less than 3 percent of all higher education institutions, most recent data show that they enroll 56 percent of the graduate enrolled students and 21 percent of the undergraduate enrollment in less commonly taught languages. If you count only the “least” commonly taught languages, they account for 64 percent of the graduate enrolled students and 40 percent of the undergraduate enrollments.	**Source:** Non-NCES Survey/Research **Collecting Agency:** . **Survey/Research Report Title:** MLA Study of Foreign Language Enrollments. **References:** Modern Language Association (MLA) and Associations of Departments of Foreign Languages "Study of Foreign Language Enrollments." This study has been funded since 1958 through the Title VI: International Research and Studies program.. **Web Site:** http://www.mla.org/adfl/projects/index.htm. **Additional Source Information:** Modern Language Association (MLA) conducts language enrollment survey once every three to five years. This study has been funded since 1958 through the International Research and Studies
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
1995	21			
2000	21	20		
2001		20		
2002		20		
2003		22		
2004		22		
Percentage of total national graduate language enrollments that are at NRC/FLAS funded institutions.				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		

	%	%
1995	55	
1999	56	55
2000	56	55
2001		55
2002		55
2003		56
2004		58

program.

Frequency: Other.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: October 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. NRC and FLAS performance reports through the EELIAS system will be checked against the data from the MLA study. The MLA data has been collected long before the Department's standards for evaluating program performance data were developed. Now that data can be validated by university enrollment figures reported in annual NRC performance reports this will provide tangible secondary validation.

Limitations: MLA studies are conducted once every 3 to 4 years, and therefore data for the out years must be extrapolated from annual performance reports.

Improvements: The MLA summary datasets will be integrated into the EELIAS system to provide a performance baseline for years when MLA study is not conducted.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Percentage of graduates of Title VI supported programs who report that they found employment that utilizes their language and/or area skills.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of Ph.D. graduates of NRC institutions with positions where they use their expertise.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

Explanation: NRC Ph.D. graduates become the experts that ensure

Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research
Survey/Research Report Title: EELIAS.
References: National Resource Center Annual and Final Reports from the

	%	%
1996	76	
2000	80	76
2001	71	76
2002		76
2003		76
2004		78

Percent of M.A. graduates of NRC institutions with positions where they use their expertise.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	%	%
1996	44	
2000	54	44
2001	52	44
2002		44
2003		44
2004		78

Percentage of M.A. graduates continuing their graduate studies and pursuing Ph.D.s.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	%	%
1996	24	
2000	26	24
2001	34	24
2002		24

national capacity in language and area studies is maintained. Data shows that the Ph.D. graduates primarily select fields where their expertise linguistic and area is best utilized. Ph.D. graduates who enter into K-12 education, foreign government, state/local government or who are unemployed or whose status is unknown are not counted toward using their expertise. M.A. graduates entering the professions help to fulfill the needs of companies, organizations and government with their area and international expertise. Many M.A. recipients continue their graduate study thus becoming the future experts. The data from the EELIAS performance reporting system showed that of the 1,782 Ph.D. graduates for 2001 no employment data was available for 343 of these graduates. IEGPS will work with grantees to develop strategies for better tracking program graduates. M.A. placement data is consistent with projected targets. M.A. continuing education data is consistent with projected targets.

EELIAS performance reporting system.
Web Site: http://www.eeliasonline.net.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: November 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: NRCs have difficulty tracking program graduates. Currently, most graduate tracking is the responsibility of a universities alumni association. NRCs will work toward collaborating better with these associations to get better data on graduate placements.

Improvements: Collection of the data via the EELIAS reporting system has improved the ability of Program staff to conduct analyses of performance data. Once three years of data are available in the EELIAS system, long term projections and performance targets will be easier to measure.

2003		32
2004		34

Objective 8.2 of 2: To establish an Institute for International Public Policy (IIPP) to conduct a program to significantly increase the numbers of underrepresented minorities in the international service.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Graduate Placement: The number of IIPP program graduates who are employed in the international service.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of IIPP program graduates employed in international service.			**Explanation:** The IIPP comprehensive program of study is a 5-year program with six components. It currently consists of the following: (1) sophomore summer policy institute; (2) junior year abroad; (3) junior year summer policy institute; (4) post-senior-year intensive language instruction; (5) post-baccalaureate internships at international affairs agencies and organizations; and (6) Master's degree in international relations. Fellows from the first cohort completed the comprehensive program in June 2000. The number of fellows graduated should become more consistent as the program matures. As the IIPP program graduates students more consistently, a greater pool of students with international competency becomes available for government and international organizations to draw upon. The goal of the program is to develop a positive reputation for IIPP graduates, such that they become a sought after commodity for internationally focused organizations.	**Additional Source Information:** Previously, graduate data was collected through paper-based annual performance reports. Beginning in 2002, data will be collected through the EELIAS performance reporting system. This data will provide more information on the status of IIPP program graduates and alumni. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** April 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** The data on program graduates is being provided by the grantee, with little opportunity for the Department to double-check the data. As the number of fellows employed in international service increases, tracking all of these individuals will become more difficult. **Improvements:** EELIAS system will provide greater tools for the
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Graduates	Graduates		
2000	10	5		
2001	13	7		
2002		9		
2003	25	13		
2004		15		

		electronic analysis of report data. This will prove useful for conducting longitudinal studies on the IIPP program graduates.

Javits Fellowship Program - 2003

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 8.1 of 1: To enable students of superior ability in the arts, humanities, and social sciences to complete their terminal degree.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Graduate school completion: The percentage of Javits fellows who complete a terminal degree within 7 years.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Rates of doctorate attainment by Javits fellows 7 years from enrollment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	30	
1999	26	
2003		29
2004		30

Explanation: The Survey of Earned Doctorates collects only information on attainment of a doctorate degree. Some Javits fellows pursue programs in fields for which the terminal degree is below the doctorate level; their attainment is not accounted for.

Additional Source Information: Program performance reports, 2002; Survey of Earned Doctorates, 1999.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: May 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: The new Annual Performance Report will require grantees to report completion data on their fellows (thus obtaining completion information on both doctoral programs and those programs where the Master of Fine Arts is the terminal degree).

Student Financial Assistance Policy - 2003

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 8.1 of 3: Ensure that low- and middle-income students will have the same access to postsecondary education that high-income students do.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Percentage of unmet need: The percentage of unmet need considering all sources of financial aid, especially for low-income students.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

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	
2003		19.20
2004		19.20

Percentage of Unmet Need for Low Income Undergraduates.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Dependent	Independent With Kids	Independent Without Kids	Dependent	Independent With Kids	Independent Without Kids
1996	46.30	54.70	52.50			
1997	44.50	51.60	49			
1998	42.90	51.10	49			

Source: Other
Other: Record/File.
Sponsor: National Postsecondary Student Aid Study.

Data Available: January 2005
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: NPSAS data are collected only every four years.

1999	41.80	50.20	48.50			
2000	43.10	60.60	46.20			
2003				41.10	58.60	44.20
2004				41.10	58.60	44.20

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: College enrollment rates: Postsecondary education enrollment rates for all students, and the enrollment gap between low- and high-income high school graduates.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

The percentage of high school graduates ages 16-24 enrolling immediately in college - Total

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994	61.90	
1995	61.90	
1996	65	
1997	67	
1998	65.60	
1999	62.90	
2000	63.30	
2001	61.70	
2003		65
2004		67

The Percentage of high school graduates ages 16-24 enrolling immediately in college by income.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Low	High	Difference	Low	High	Difference
1994	44	78.40	34.40			

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: April 2003
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.

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	28.60			
2001	47.80	79.80	32			
2003				50	80	30
2004				52	81	29

Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

The percentage of Pell Grant funds going to students below 150 percent of the poverty line.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	82	
1998	80	
1999	78	75
2000	78	75
2001		75
2002		75
2003		75
2004		75

Explanation: Increases in the maximum award without other changes in the formulas used to award Pell grants will tend to lower the percentage of funds going to the neediest students.

Source: Other
Other: Record/File.
Sponsor: Pell Grant Applicant/Recipient File.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: March 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Federal debt burden: The median Federal debt burden (yearly scheduled payments as a percentage of annual income) of borrowers in their first full year of prepayment will be less than 10 percent.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

The median federal debt burden of students in their first full year of repayment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1998	7.10	
1999	6.48	
2000	6.38	
2003		9.90
2004		9.90

Explanation: As a general rule, it is believed that an educational debt burden of 10 percent or greater will negatively affect a borrower's ability to repay his or her student loan and to obtain other credit such as a home mortgage. We expect the 2001 and 2002 median debt burden rate to remain well below 10 percent.

Additional Source Information: National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS) and Internal Revenue Service (IRS) records.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2000 - 2001
Data Available: August 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: To overcome limitations with the data from the Social Security Administration (SSA) that were previously used, we switched to IRS data on household income for 1998 and future years. The IRS data may slightly understate debt burden for married borrowers where both individuals have student loans.

Objective 8.2 of 3: Ensure that more students will persist in postsecondary education and attain degrees and certificates.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Completion rate: Completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in 4-year and less-than-4-year programs; and the gap in completion rates between minority and non-minority students.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of full-time degree seeking students completing a 4-year degree within 150% of the normal time required.				**Additional Source Information:** Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** March 2006 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Difference between Black and White and Difference between	Total		

				White	Hispanic		
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	
2003							54
2004							55

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 betwen 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	
2003							34
2004							35

Limitations: Postsecondary institutions are not required to report graduation rates until 2002. However, data were voluntarily submitted by institutions representing 87 percent of 4-year students and 77 percent of 2-year students. Investigating whether a proxy for graduation rates for student aid recipients can be obtained from administrative records.

Objective 8.3 of 3: Ensure that taxpayers will have a positive return on investment in the federal student financial assistance programs.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Return on investment: The benefits of the student aid programs, in terms of increased tax revenues, will continue to exceed their costs.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Return on Investment		**Source:** Non-NCES

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Low	Best	High	Low	Best	High
1996	1.30	2.90	6.70			
1997	1.30	2.80	6.50			
1998	1.30	2.90	6.70			
1999	1.40	3.10	7.10			
2000	1.50	3.30	7.70			
2001	1.60	3.40	8			
2003				1.60	3.40	8
2004				1.60	3.40	8

Explanation: The column titles are defined as follows. Low: A pessimistic set of assumptions leading to a low-end estimate of the return on investment. Best: The set of assumptions that we believe best captures the return on investment. High: An optimistic set of assumptions leading to a high-end estimate of the return on investment. The estimated return on investment is calculated in the following manner: 1) The discounted present value of tax revenue and welfare benefits is calculated for different educational attainment levels. 2) Under the "best" scenario, 90 percent of the revenue differential calculated in step 1 is assumed to be caused by obtaining more education.

Survey/Research

Additional Source Information: March Current Population Survey (CPS) and Beginning Post Secondary (BPS) study with imputations from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) and High School and Beyond (HS&B). Behavioral assumptions were derived, where feasible, from meta-analyses conducted by Leslie and Brinkman in their 1988 book, *The Economic Value of Higher Education*.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: March 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: A number of assumptions and imputations are required to estimate the return on investment. By providing high and low estimates, one can assess the sensitivity of the results to the assumptions used. Prior year data has been updated from previous reports to reflect more complete information.

Student Financial Assistance Programs - 2003

CFDA Numbers: 84.007 - Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants
84.033 - Federal Work-Study Program
84.037 - 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: Student Financial Assistance Programs Internal Goal

Objective 8.1 of 1: Student Financial Assistance Programs Internal Objective 8

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Reduce or Maintain FSA Business Process Unit Cost

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Unit Cost of Application Processing			**Status:** Target not met **Progress:** FSA did not meet its goal to have baseline unit costs defined for the business processes referenced. 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 specialist to allocate baseline resource data, prior to using the ABC information. This effort will continue in FY 2004 and will be accomplished by the end of the year. **Explanation:** By the end of FY 2004, we will develop baseline unit cost measures for the business processes referenced. (In the table, the code 9999 represents setting a baseline and setting a target for FY 2005	**Additional Source Information:** FSA Activity-Based Cost Model will be used to collect data. The model is currently under construction with a target date of Sept 2004. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** September 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	$ Unit Cost	$ Unit Cost		
2003		9,999		
Unit Cost of Origination and Disbursement				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	$ Unit Cost	$ Unit Cost		
2003		9,999		
Unit Cost of Direct Loan Repayment				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	$ Unit Cost	$ Unit Cost		
2003		9,999		

Unit Cost of Direct Loan Consolidation **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** / $ Unit Cost / $ Unit Cost **2003** / / 9,999 *Unit Cost of Default Collections* **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** / $ Unit Cost / $ Unit Cost **2003** / / 9,999	which is to maintain the baseline.)	

Howard University - 2003

Program Goal: To assist Howard University with financial resources needed to carry out its educational mission.

Objective 8.1 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 8.1.1 of 4: Better students: The average SAT scores of incoming freshmen will increase by 1 percent per year.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Additional Source Information: Howard University **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Average SAT score

Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets			
	Math	Verbal	Total	% Change	Math	Verbal	Total	% Change
1997	494	513	1,007					
1998	506	519	1,025	1.80				
1999	517	533	1,050	2.40			1,035	
2000	525	537	1,062	1.10			1,055	2
2001	516	530	1,046	-1.50			1,060	.50
2002	534	545	1,079	3.20			1,065	.50
2003							1,080	1.40
2004							1,082	.20

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Student retention: Decrease attrition for undergraduate FTIC (first time in college) students by 2 percent until national average is bettered.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Additional Source Information: The Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange

Attrition rates

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			13
2004			13

Howard University.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Indicator 8.1.3 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

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			52
2004			55

Additional Source Information: Howard University

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: The reported 6-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.

Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Excellence in teaching and scholarship: The number of faculty in activities of the Fund for Academic Excellence will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

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				160	240
2004				160	240

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.

Additional Source Information: Howard University

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Objective 8.2 of 3: TO PROMOTE EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Grants received: The number of grant proposals that are funded will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

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		275

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: Targets for 2004 remain to be determined.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Howard University.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Grant funding: The total funds received through research grants will increase.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Funds received through research grants					**Explanation:** Targets for 2004 remain to be determined.	**Additional Source Information:** Howard University. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
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		51,700,000			
2002	63,000,000		53,800,000			
2003			65,000,000			

Objective 8.3 of 3: INCREASE HOWARD UNIVERSITY'S FINANCIAL STRENGTH AND INDEPENDENCE FROM FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 4: Endowment: The value of the endowment each year will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Market value of endowment (in millions)			**Explanation:** This indicator is not a measure for 2003 or 2004.	**Additional Source Information:** Howard University & the Chronicle of Higher Education. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Audited Financial Statements.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	211.20			
1998	252.90			
1999	297			
2000	329.30	320		
2001	340.90	346		
2002	323.70			

Indicator 8.3.2 of 4: Outside support: The funds raised from all private sources will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Alumni contribution (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		20
2004		35

Additional Source Information: Howard University.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Audited Financial Statements.

Indicator 8.3.3 of 4: Outside support—alumni: The participation rate of alumni who contribute to the school will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Participation rate

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	11.40	
1999	9.40	
2000	12.20	25
2001	15	30
2002	18	32
2003		20.50
2004		23

Additional Source Information: Howard University.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Indicator 8.3.4 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

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		226,394,000
2004		234,522,000

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		234,286,000
2004		233,695,000

Additional Source Information: Howard University

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Independent Living Services Program - 2003

CFDA Numbers: 84.132 - Centers for Independent Living
84.169 - Independent Living_State Grants
84.177B - Services for Older Blind Individuals

Program Goal: Individuals with significant disabilities served by Title VII, Chapter 1, programs will achieve consumer determined independent living goals, and Independent Living Services will be provided and activities will be conducted to improve or expand services to older individuals who are blind.

Objective 8.1 of 4: Increase the number of individuals with significant disabilities who are served by and benefit from the Title VII, Chapter 1, programs.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Number of goals set and achieved by consumers: The number of consumer goals set and achieved in all service areas measured.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of consumer goals set and achieved in all service areas measured				**Additional Source Information:** RSA - 704 Annual Performance Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	62.30			
1998	65			
1999	67	62.50		
2000	63	63		
2001	64	63		
2002	64.40	75		
2003		80		
2004		80		

Objective 8.2 of 4: Improve access to personal assistance services (PAS), housing, transportation, and community-based living

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Individuals who leave nursing homes and other institutions for community-based housing

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

The number of individuals who leave nursing homes and other institutions for community-based housing

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	74	
1998	1,671	
2000	1,372	850
2001	1,777	900
2002	2,012	900
2003		

Additional Source Information: Examination by staff of RSA 704 Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: December 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Grantees may interpret definitions differently. We are providing training and technical assistance.

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: The number of individuals at risk of entering nursing homes and other institutions who are receiving IL services and can remain at home.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

The number of individuals at risk of entering nursing homes and other institutions who are receiving IL services and can remain at home.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999		8,500
2000	18,306	8,500
2001	23,983	9,000
2002	21,439	9,500
2003		

Additional Source Information: RSA - 704 Annual Performance Report.

Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: December 2003

Objective 8.3 of 4: Increase the amount of funds in addition to title VII that support chapter 1 grantees.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Increased funding from alternative sources: A high number of CILs will have greater than 25 percent of their budget from sources other than Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B, and a high percentage of states will contribute more than the required minimum match for Title VII, Chapter 1,

Part C.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of CILs that have greater than 25 percent of their budget from sources other than Title VII, Chapter 1, Part A, and percentage of states that contribute more than the required minimum match for Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B.						**Additional Source Information:** Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who Are Blind (7-OB Report) **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 Program staff visually scan data for errors and compare to prior year's data.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Number of CILS	Percent of States Overmatch Part B	Number of CILS	Percent of States Overmatch Part B		
1997	74	80				
2000	66	95	75	80		
2001	88	93	76	80		
2002	84	97	76	80		
2003			76	80		
2004			80	80		

Objective 8.4 of 4: Provide chapter 2 services to increasing numbers of individuals who are older and severely visually impaired, and increase consumer satisfaction

Indicator 8.4.1 of 1: Increased number of individuals served:: The number of older and severely visually impaired individuals served will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Individuals receiving services				**Additional Source Information:** Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who Are Blind (7-OB Report), 1997. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1994	14,968			
1995	22,103			
1996	26.846			

1997	31,460			By ED. Research and Training Center and program staff review data **Limitations:** Targets based on estimates of program funding level.
1998	36,280			
1999	38,150	28,500		
2000	47,596	35,000		
2001	58,436	40,000		
2002		41,000		
2003		63,000		
2004		68,000		

Projects with Industry Program (PWI) - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.234 - Projects with Industry

Program Goal: Projects with Industry Program (PWI) Internal Goal

Objective 8.1 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 8.1.1 of 2: Placement rate of individuals with disabilities into competitive employment: The percentage of individuals served who are placed in competitive employment will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

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	63.19	62.20
2003		62.40

Additional Source Information: Grantee performance indicator data.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
The sources and data quality are validated by checking to see if the data are reasonable. On site compliance reviews are also conducted on at least 15 percent of grant recipients annually to (a) determine whether that grant is managed in accordance with Federal requirements; (b) identify areas where the project can be improved; and (c) assess the project's mission as it relates to the Department's mission.

		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.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Change in earnings of individuals who are placed in competitive employment: Projects With Industry projects will report that participants placed in competitive employment increase earnings by an average of at least $218 per week.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Average increase in weekly earnings in dollars		**Additional Source Information:** Grantee performance indicator data. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** January 2004 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. Same as 1.1 **Limitations:** Same as Indicator 1.1. In addition, performance data on this indicator are further limited because the national average is calculated based on self-reported project averages.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	207	
1998	209	
1999	226	209
2000	252	218
2001	236	218
2002	231	226
2003		231

Objective 8.2 of 2: ENSURE THAT PWI SERVICES ARE AVAILABLE FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH THE MOST NEED.

Indicator 8.2.1 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.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of previously unemployed individuals served who were placed in competitive employment			**Explanation:** The overall number and percent of previously unemployed persons who were placed in competitive employment has increased annually since 1998. In addition, both the number and percentage of persons served who were previously unemployed has increased. However, we have raised the FY 2002 target only slightly above the FY 2001 target because this population faces greater challenges in obtaining competitive employment.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** January 2004 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. Grantee performance indicator data. **Limitations:** Same as Indicator 1.1
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	60			
1998	48			
1999	58	62		
2000	60.80	60		
2001	69	61		
2002	70.82	61.20		
2003		63		

State Vocational Rehabilitation Services and Supported Employment - 2003

CFDA Numbers: 84.126 - Rehabilitation Services_Vocational Rehabilitation Grants to States
84.187 - Supported Employment Services for Individuals with Severe Disabilities

Program Goal: Individuals with disabitlities served by the Vocational Rehabilitaton State Grant program will achieve high quality employment.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Ensure that individuals with disabilities who are served by the vocational rehabilitation (vr) state grant program achieve employment consistent with their particular strengths, resources, abilities, capabilities, and interests.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 5: Number achieving employment: The number of individuals with disabilities who achieve employment will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

The number of individuals who achieved an employment outcome

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Number of Individuals	Percent Increase	Number of Individuals	Percent Increase
1997	211,503			
1998	223,668	5.80		
1999	231,714	3.60	215,770	
2000	236,220	1.90	234,040	
2001	233,687	-1	238,582	
2002	222,247	-4.90	238,582	
2003			240,968	
2004			243,378	

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target not met

Progress: There was a decrease in the number of employment outcomes during FY 2002 because of the weak economy and because individuals placed in extended employment are no longer considered to have achieved an employment outcome in this program.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: RSA state agency data from the RSA-113.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: April 2004
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Perfomance Data.

Limitations: Appropriate crosschecks and edits to verify and validate the quality of these data are currently being implemented.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 5: Percentage of individuals obtaining employment: The percentage of all persons served who obtain employment will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage obtaining employment.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	61.20	
1998	62.20	
1999	62.50	61
2000	62.50	62.70
2001	60.70	63
2002	60.20	63
2003		63.20
2004		63.20

Status: Target not met

Progress: There was a decrease in the percentage of individuals achieving an employment outcome during FY 2002 because of the weak economy and because individuals placed in extended employment are no longer considered to have achieved an employment outcome in this program.

Additional Source Information: RSA state agency data from the RSA-113.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: April 2004
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Perfomance Data.

Limitations: Appropriate crosschecks and edits to verify and validate the quality of these data are currently being implemented.

Indicator 8.1.3 of 5: Percentage of individuals obtaining competitive employment: Of individuals obtaining employment, the percentage who obtain competitive employment will increase. Among individuals with significant disabilities obtaining employment, the percentage obtaining competitive employment will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of all individuals with disabilities who obtained competitive employment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	81.20	
1998	80	
1999	83.10	82.30
2000	86	82.50
2001	87.60	86.20

Explanation: The second part of this indicator previously read "Among individuals with significant disabilities obtaining employment, the percentage obtaining competitive employment will increase." The second part of this indicator was amended to read "Of individuals obtaining competitive employment, the percentage who are individuals with significant disabilities will increase." This

Additional Source Information: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: October 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Accuracy/consistency of reporting

2002		86.40
2003		86.60
2004		86.80

Percentage of individuals obtaining competitive employment who are individuals with significant disabilities.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	78.40	
1998	81.10	
1999	83.80	
2000	86.50	
2001	87.40	86.70
2002		86.90
2003		87.10
2004		87.30

indicator was modified to parallel a similar indicator developed by RSA under section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. GPRA indicators reflect aggregate performance of the program at the national level; section 106 indicators reflect state-by-state performance. We wanted to bring the GPRA indicators in line with the section 106 indicators, and, hence, RSA made this change.

is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.

Indicator 8.1.4 of 5: Improved earnings: Among individuals exiting the program in competitive employment, the median ratio of their average hourly wage to the state's average hourly wage for all individuals in the state who are employed will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Median ratio for state agencies				**Additional Source Information:** RSA state data from the R-911. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** Same limitations and planned improvements reported under 1.3 apply to this indicator. In addition, the data for
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	.56			
1998	.56			
1999	.56	.57		
2000	.57	.57		
2001	.56	.57		
2002		.58		

2003		.58
2004		.59

this indicator are limited by the fact that the required comparison involves numbers reported from two different sets of state-reported data.

Indicator 8.1.5 of 5: Own income as primary support: The percentage of individuals who report upon obtaining employment that their own income is their primary source of support will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of individuals who report upon obtaining competitive employment that their own income is their primary source of support.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	84.10	
1998	82.60	
1999	82.50	
2000	84.60	
2001	84.60	84.80
2002		85
2003		85.20
2004		85.40

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: The indicator previously read "Percentage of individuals who report upon obtaining employment that their own income is their primary source of support." This indicator was amended to read "Percentage of individuals who report upon obtaining competitive employment that their own income is their primary source of support." This indicator was modified to parallel a similar indicator developed by RSA under section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. GPRA indicators reflect aggregate performance of the program at the national level; section 106 indicators reflect state-by-state performance. We wanted to bring the GPRA indicators in line with the section 106 indicators, and hence, RSA made this change. As a result, the performance data for recent years is higher for this new indicator.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: October 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Same as discussed under Indicator 1.3.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the number of individuals with the most significant disabilities who have received supported employment services but achieve competitive employment outcomes.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal achieving competitive employment: 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) will continue to increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieved 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		77.60
2003		77.80
2004		78

Additional Source Information: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: October 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: Same as discussed under Indicator 1.3.

Demonstration and Training Programs - 2003

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 8.1 of 2: EXPAND AND IMPROVE THE PROVISION OF REHABILITATION SERVICES THAT LEAD TO EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Expansion: A high percentage of projects will be judged to have successfully implemented strategies or yielded results that can contribute to the expansion of services for or the employment of individuals with disabilities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of projects will be judged to have contributed to the expansion of services for the employment of individuals with disabilities.			**Explanation:** Analysis by RSA staff of data received in the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees will be used to determine progress. Data analyzed by RSA staff based on information received from the web-based Unified Data Collection Forms Annual Performance Report was used to establish a baseline.	**Additional Source Information:** Web-based Annual Performance Reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations:** The web-based system has been transferred from a contractor to the Department. A number of errors have shown up in this process, which are in the process of being corrected.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	95.60			
2000	100			
2001		80		
2002		82		
2003		85		
2004		90		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Impact: The percentage of projects reporting an impact on rehabilitation service providers including state VR agencies, community

rehabilitation service providers, and other providers of rehabilitation services.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of Grantees that Interacted and Presented to State VR Agencies

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	83	
2001		85
2002		85
2003		87
2004		89

Percentage of Consumers Referred by State VR to Projects

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	56	
2001		58
2002		58
2003		60
2004		62

Percentage of Consumers Referred by Projects to State VR

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	8	
2001		10
2002		10
2003		10
2004		10

Explanation: Baseline data based on information obtained in the FY 2000 reporting year when 83% of the grantees interacted with and made presentations to their State VR Agencies, with 56% of the consumers referred by VR and 8% of the consumers referred by the Demonstration projects to VR.

Additional Source Information: Web-based Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: November 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations: Grantees may have difficulty in reporting on their impact to an external agency. Numerous external factors may change the provision or methods of rehabilitation services, and grantees may not be able to pinpoint their impact in the process. Increased contact/interaction with State VR and other rehabilitation service agencies should increase the impact.

Objective 8.2 of 2: DISSEMINATE INFORMATION ABOUT SUCCESSFUL NEW TYPES OR PATTERNS OF SERVICES OR DEVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES AND REPORT THE IMPACT OF THE PROJECTS.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Dissemination: Funded projects that disseminate information to state VR agencies and other funded projects and disability-related organizations and the number of presentations.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Funded projects that disseminate information to state VR agencies and other funded projects and disability-related organizations and the number of presentations.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Grantee Presentations	Grantee Presentations
2000	83	
2001	83	85
2002		85
2003		87
2004		89

Explanation: Data from FY 2000 was used to establish a baseline. FY 2000 was the first year of using the web-based reporting system to establish baseline figures.

Additional Source Information: Web-based Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: December 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations: Goals, objectives and activities are diverse among grantees, and can range from direct consumer services, systems change, technical assistance, etc. This makes comparison of data difficult, since no one data element can be used as a measure of performance.

Improvements: Data will be reported in categories that use the format of the web-based system to give a more complete picture of the accomplishments of the program.

American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services - 2003

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 8.1 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 8.1.1 of 3: Number of eligible individuals who receive services under the program: The number of American Indians with disabilities who receive services under the American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services program will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of individuals who received vocational rehabilitation services under an individualized plan for employment				**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Data are self-reported and not standardized. Prior to the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1998, the Department did not have clear authority to collect routine performance data and very limited information was available on the operation and performance of these projects.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	2,617			
1998	3,243			
1999	3,186	3,750		
2000	4,148	3,730		
2001	4,473	4,350		
2002	5,003	4,500		
2003		5,010		
2004		5,100		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Number of eligible individuals who achieve employment outcomes:: The total number of American Indians with disabilities who exit the program after receiving vocational rehabilitation services under an individualized plan for employment and achieve an employment outcome will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of individuals who achieved an employed outcome			**Explanation:** Continual growth in the numbers of projects in operation in recent years has contributed to the program assisting more American Indians with disabilities to achieve more employment outcomes. In addition, cross-training and resource coordination through annual conference and cluster training sessions have added to program effectiveness. RSA monitoring and technical assistance have reinforced the projects' abilities and expertise in provision of vocational rehabilitation services to Am. Indians.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data are supplied by project grantees and no formal verification procedure has been applied. **Limitations:** Same limitations as reported under Indicator 1.1.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	530			
1998	598			
1999	678	715		
2000	951	765		
2001	1,088	980		
2002	1,311	1,000		
2003		1,315		
2004		1,355		

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Percentage of individuals who leave the program with employment outcomes: By the end of FY 2001, at least 61 percent of all eligible individuals who exit the program after receiving services under an individualized plan for employment will achieve an employment outcome.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
.				**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data are supplied by project grantees and no formal verification procedure has been applied. **Limitations:** Same limitations as reported under Indicator 1.1.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	57.90			
1999	61.10			
2000	62.20	61		
2001	64.60	61.50		
2002	64	62		
2003		64.10		
2004		64.50		

Training Program - 2003

CFDA Number: 84.129 - Rehabilitation Long-Term Training

Program Goal: To provide the public vocational rehabilitation (VR) sector with well-trained staff and to maintain and upgrade the skills of current staff.

Objective 8.1 of 2: To provide graduates who work within the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) system to help individuals with disabilities achieve their goals.

Indicator 8.1.1 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.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Explanation: Since FY 2000, data are based on actual numbers using the new electronic reporting system. Previous numbers were based on estimates made from a small number of prospects. For FY 2001 data, the system has been refined to collect more accurate data.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual grantee reporting **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - **Data Available:** March 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.

Scholars supported

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		2,000
2003		2,050
2004		2,050

Scholars supported per $1 million

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	101	

1998	96	
1999	94	93
2000	172	170
2001		170
2002		170
2003		165
2004		165

Scholars graduating

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	800	
1998	817	
1999	832	729
2000	764	688
2001	841	700
2002		700
2003		725
2004		725

Scholars graduating per $1 million

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	50	
1998	50.50	
1999	47	47
2000	54.90	46
2001		44

2002		44
2003		42
2004		42

Investment (in thousands)

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	15,835	
1998	16,181	
1999	16,933	14,585
2000	13,874	13,771
2001	14,143	13,500
2002	13,657	13,500
2003		17,000

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Percentage working: The percentage of graduates fulfilling their payback requirements through acceptable employment will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	72	70
2001	71	71
2002		72
2003		72
2004		74

Explanation: 2002 data will be reported by grantees in December 2003.

Additional Source Information: Annual grantee reporting form.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001 -
Data Available: March 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by grantees.

Limitations: We are using a new reporting system, which is being refined. Same as indicator 1.1

Objective 8.2 of 2: Maintain and upgrade the knowledge and skills of personnel currently employed in the public VR system.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Qualified personnel: The percent of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their State's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standard will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their State's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standards			**Explanation:** 2002 data provided our first comprehensive and systematic approach to collecting this information. Previous performance data were estimates based on partial data.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual Evaluation. Ongoing collection could be through the In-Service Training program's annual performance report. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** August 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data would be supplied through external RSA contractor. No formal verification procedure applied.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	69			
2001	71	70		
2002	65	75		
2003		77		
2004		79		

Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions - 2003

Program Goal: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions Internal Goal

Objective 8.1 of 2: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions Internal Objective 1

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary outcomes: By Fall 2002, 60 percent of vocational students will receive an AA degree or certificate. See Limitations for definition of student base.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of vocational students earning an AA degree or certificate			**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** . **Explanation:** Data for 2004 will available in June of 2004.	**Additional Source Information:** Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions Performance Reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** June 2003 Examination of graduation lists supplied by two funded institutions. ED is working to verify. **Limitations:** Calculations of completion are based on degree completers relative to all students 'available to graduate' (ie, students in their final semester). **Improvements:** Planned improvements for data collection include investigating whether a single cohort of students can be selected and tracked to more effectively calculate completions over time.
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		49		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions Internal Objective 2

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: The percentage of vocational students who go on to continuing education will increase - see Obj. 7.2 for definition of students: % of vocational students going on to continuing education		
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
- No Targets And Performance Data -	**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Grantees have not yet been asked specifically to provide ED with this data.	