FY 2004
PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REPORT

U.S. Department of Education
November 12, 2004

Contents

Introduction 1
Key to Legislation 1

Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement

APEB: American Printing House for the Blind 4
CRA: Training and Advisory Services 7
ERDDI: Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers 10
ERDDI: Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia 12
ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers 16
ESEA: Advanced Credentialing 21
ESEA: Advanced Placement 22
ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity 23
ESEA: Charter Schools Grants 24
ESEA: Comprehensive School Reform 26
ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities 29
ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development 31
ESEA: Early Reading First 34
ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians 37
ESEA: Educational Technology State Grants 39
ESEA: Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education 42
ESEA: English Language Acquisition 44
ESEA: Even Start 51
ESEA: Impact Aid Basic Support Payments and Payments for Children with Disabilities 55
Impact Aid Basic Support Payments
Impact Aid Payments for Children with Disabilities
ESEA: Impact Aid Construction 57
ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants 58
ESEA: Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies 60
ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries 64

Goal 2 (Continued)

ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance 66
ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships 67
ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program 69
ESEA: National Writing Project 76
ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program 77
ESEA: Parental Assistance Information Centers 81
ESEA: Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution 83
ESEA: Ready to Teach 84
ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television 86
ESEA: School Leadership 88
ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities 89
ESEA: Special Programs for Indian Children 91
ESEA: Star Schools Program 93
ESEA: State Assessments 96
ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs 101
ESEA: Teaching of Traditional American History 102
ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies 104
ESEA: Transition To Teaching 108
ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers 111
ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice 113
ESRA: Regional Educational Laboratories 114
HEA: High School Equivalency Program 116
HEA: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders 117
HEA: Teacher Quality Enhancement 119
IDEA : Special Education Grants for Infants and Families 121
IDEA: Special Education Grants to States 125
IDEA: Special Education Parent Information Centers 129
IDEA: Special Education Personnel Preparation 131
IDEA: Special Education Preschool Grants 134
IDEA: Special Education State Improvement 136

Goal 2 (Continued)

IDEA: Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination 139
IDEA: Special Education Technology and Media Services 143
MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths 147
VTEA: Occupational and Employment Information 150
VTEA: Vocational Education National Programs 151
VTEA: Vocational Education State Grants and Tech-Prep Education State Grants 154
Vocational Education State Grants
Tech-Prep Education State Grants

Goal 3: Develop Safe Schools and Strong Character

ESEA: Character Education 167
ESEA: Close-Up Fellowships 168
ESEA: Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners 169
ESEA : Safe and Drug-Free Schools Mentoring Program and Other National Programs 171

Goal 4: Transform Education into an Evidence-Based Field

ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination 175
ESRA: Statistics 185
IDEA: Special Education Research and Innovation 187
RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research 192

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

AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities 203
AEFLA : Adult Education State Grants 205
AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy 211
ATA: Assistive Technology 213
EDA: Gallaudet University 216

Goal 5 (Continued)

EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf 224
ESEA: Community Technology Centers 229
HEA: Aid for Institutional Development Title III & Title V 231
AID Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions
AID Minority Science and Engineering Improvement
AID Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions
AID Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities
AID Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions
AID Strengthening Institutions
AID Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities

HEA: Byrd Honors Scholarships 234
HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents in School 235
HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program 237
HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education 239
HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP) 241
HEA: Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) 245
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Programs 247
International Education and Foreign Language Studies Domestic Programs
International Education and Foreign Language Studies Institute for International Public Policy

HEA: Javits Fellowships 251
HEA: Student Financial Assistance Policy 252
SFA Federal Direct Student Loans
SFA Federal Family Education Loan Program & Liquidating
SFA Federal Pell Grants
SFA Federal Perkins Loans
SFA Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants
SFA Federal Work-Study
SFA Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnerships

HEA: Student Aid Administration 260
HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers 262
HEA: TRIO McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement 263

Goal 5 (Continued)

HEA: TRIO Student Support Services 264
HEA: TRIO Talent Search 266
HEA: TRIO Upward Bound 267
HEA: Underground Railroad Program 269
HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults 270
RA: Client Assistance State Grants 273
RA: Independent Living Centers and State Grants 275
Independent Living Centers
Independent Living State Grants
RA: Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals 279
RA: Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers 280
RA: Projects with Industry 281
RA: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights 284
RA: Supported Employment State Grants 285
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs 287
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Grants for Indians 292
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Recreational Programs 295
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants 296
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training 301
20 USC: Howard University 305
VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions 312

All Goals

DEOA: Office for Civil Rights 317

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 our programs serve them individually. We believe that our success as an agency can be measured in the results of better education for *all*. In the *FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report*, we report our latest results on Department-level measures specified in our Strategic Plan.

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. To effectively measure the success of our programs, we need measures that are more specific to the provisions of each particular program and to the audience it serves. In our *FY 2004 Program Performance Plan*, we established measures and targets for most of our programs. We report on results for these programs in this *FY 2004 Program Performance Report*. Additionally the *FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report* provides a summary of program results at the end of goals 2-5 in the performance details section.

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

The *FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report* is located on our Web site at http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2004report/index.html.

Key to Legislation:

APEB = Act for the Promotion of Education for the Blind
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
ERDDI = Educational Research, Development, Dissemination and Improvement Act
ESRA = Education Sciences Reform Act
HEA = Higher Education Act
HKNCA = Helen Keller National Center Act
IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
MVHAA = McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act
RA = Rehabilitation Act
VTEA = Vocational and Technical Education Act
999 = Target of setting a baseline or a target related to a baseline for which data are not yet available.

Goal 2

APEB: American Printing House for the Blind – 2004

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: Appropriate, timely, high-quality educational materials are provided to pre-college-level blind students to allow them to benefit more fully from their educational programs.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Customer satisfaction: The American Printing House's customers/consumers will agree that the educational materials provided through the Act are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.

Targets and Performance Data

Trustees-Percentage that agree

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	95	
1999	96	95
2000	96.50	96
2001	97	96
2002	99	96
2003	98.75	96
2004		96

Advisory Committees-Percentage that agree

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	100	100
2000	100	100

Assessment of Progress

Progress: In fiscal year 2003, the American Printing House's Ex Officio Trustees Advisory Committees, Consumers, and Teachers highly agree that the educational materials provided through the Act that authorizes the American Printing House are appropriate, timely, and of high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.

Explanation: The American Printing House worked with an independent Research Corporation this past summer (2003) in an effort to develop a survey that would obtain more reliable information from its Trustees, Advisory Committees, Consumers and Teachers.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Survey of Ex Officio Trustees; Input from Research and Publications Advisory Committees; Consumer surveys, and Teacher surveys.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: October 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by the American Printing House for the Blind. No formal verification procedure applied.

Improvements: A new

2001	100	100
2002	100	100
2003	100	100
2004		100

Consumers-Percentage that agree

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	90	
2000	100	95
2001	97	95
2002	96	95
2003	100	95
2004		95

Teachers - Percentage that agree

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	96	
2003	97	96
2004		96

Teacher survey was conducted in FY 2002 which provides further satisfaction with APH educational materials.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Student performance and participation: The percentage of American Printing House ex officio trustees who report that the performance of students and their participation in their educational programs improves as a result of the availability of educational materials provided through the Act will be maintained.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Trustees-Percentage that agree			**Progress:** In fiscal year 2003, a high percentage of the Ex Officio Trustees and Teachers agreed that the performance of students and their participation in their educational programs improved as a result of the availability of educational materials provided through the Act. **Explanation:** The American Printing House worked with an independent Research Corporation this past summer (2003) in an effort to develop a survey that would obtain more reliable information from its Trustees and from Teachers.	**Additional Source Information:** Survey of Ex Officio Trustees: Survey of Teachers. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by the American Printing House for the Blind. No formal verification procedure applied.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	98			
1999	98	98		
2000	97	99		
2001	97	99		
2002	100	99		
2003	99.50	99		
2004		99		
Teachers--Percentage that agree				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	93			
2003	95	95		
2004		95		

CRA: Training and Advisory Services – 2004

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:** 1. Status-Web-site visits- Exceeded target- In FY 2001-2002 there were more than 3.9 million hits on the web and this is approximately 1 million more hits than in the previous reporting period. 2. Status-Published materials and products - Target not met - In FY 2001-2002 there were 114 reported materials and products published and this was a decrease of 119 from the previous year. 3. Status - Conference/seminar/and other training events - Target not met - In FY 2001-2002, there were 829 reported events which shows a decrease of 58 events from the previous year. 4. Status - On-site consultations - Exceeded Target - In FY 2001-2002 there were 1000 on-site consultations which were 103	**Additional Source Information:** Equity Assistance Center Project Performance Reports, 2001-2002. **Frequency:** Monthly. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** January 2004 **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 more than in the previous year. 5. Status - Mailings or individual requests for information - Target not met - In FY 2001-2002, 1,045 mailings or requests were reported which is 103 less than in the previous year. 6. Status - Consultations by telephone or e-mail - Exceeded target -FY 2001-2002, 3,709 consultations were reported which is 548 more than in the previous year.

Explanation: Due to the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2002, EAC activities were realigned to meet the nature of the new requests from States, schools and school districts. The EACs refocused many of their activities to meet the needs of the new law. These changes have resulted in the development of new performance measures for this program.

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

ERDDI: Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.283A - Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers Program

Program Goal: To improve student achievement in low performing schools under the No Child Left Behind Act

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: Improved Reading for Students: Schools that receive and implement research-based reading strategies provided by CCs will show improved reading scores.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Average reading score for all CC served schools			**Explanation:** Note: that the data are reported as "percentages" rather than actual scores as stated in the table heading. Since this is the last year that the centers will be reporting data, we took a retrospective look and compared a sample of students in 2003 with a second sample of students in the same schools in 2004. Those sampled schools had students who benefited from TA provided by the Comprehensive Centers in 2004. We compared the percent of 3rd grade students in these low performing schools that reached proficiency level in reading on State assessments in both 2003 and 2004.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Average reading score	Average reading score		
2003	55			
2004	60	999		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Improve AYP Status: Schools in need of improvement that receive corrective action interventions by district staff who had direct assistance from Comprehensive Centers will have improved Annual Yearly Progress status.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Districts that reported CC served schools improved APY status			**Explanation:** 2004 data is baseline. This data is part of State report card which becomes available in late October of 2004.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		

ERDDI: Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia – 2004

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 assistance 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. In 2003, clients who were surveyed were those who received intensive services (i.e. 12 or more hours of training and technical assistance). Additionally; the Consortia has been collecting data on the impact of their services on student achievement. Data show positive student achievement at sites that received intensive 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:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	91			
1999	96	75		
2000		80		
2001	93.50	80		
2002	90	80		
2003	91	80		
2004		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	87	80
2004		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	95	80
2004		80

Collaboration leveraged resources and efforts for greater impact

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	80	
1999	87	75

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.

Limitations: 2003 data have not been subjected to external audit. 2000 data were not collected.

2000		80
2001	81.30	80
2002		80
2003	97	80
2004		80

Objective 8.2 of 2: Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia Internal Objective 2

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			**Explanation:** With the increasing costs of print dissemination, the Consortia expanded their electronic dissemination efforts resulting in a jump in electronic media contacts. 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:** March 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Common definitions and common data collection procedures established across
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	290,749	223,196		
2004		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	4,647,679	1,982,634
2003	6,922,349	2,180,898
2004		2,180,898

Usefulness

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	70	
1999	77	
2000		51
2001	93	51
2002		51
2003	76	51
2004		51

each Consortium. Statistical standards are applied. Data are subjected to Cross-Consortia's Eisenhower Network Evaluation Committee internal review and validation procedures.

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

ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers – 2004

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.													**Explanation:** Targets met only for some metrics. Improvement over 2002 performance for most metrics, except for Math/English grade improvement. New contract	**Additional Source Information:** 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003
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	42.70	45.20	35.50	37.40	40	42.10	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	5.10	4.30	3.70	4.40	4.50	4.40	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	77.70	73.40	76.60	75	75	75
2004				75	75	75

awarded in September 2003 to provide Technical Assistance to grantees for quality programming in content areas.

Data Available: January 2004
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							**Explanation:** According to teacher reports in 2003, 77.5 percent of the students who regularly participated in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs showed behavioral improvements (up from 76.3% in 2002).	**Additional Source Information:** 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** January 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.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall		
2000	62	57	59	70	70	70		
2001	73	75	74	75	75	75		
2002	76	76.90	76.30	75	75	75		
2003	77.60	76.10	77.50	75	75	75		
2004				75	75	75		

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	96.10	85
2004		85

Explanation: The vast majority of centers (96.1%) report an emphasis on a core academic area. This is up from 94.8% in 2002.

Additional Source Information: 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: January 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	81.30	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
2002	96	85
2003	95.90	85
2004		85

Explanation: The vast majority of the centers (96%) offer enrichment and support services with a significant proportion (81.3%) offering computer- or technology-related activities. This is up from 80.6% in 2001.

Additional Source Information: 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report.

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

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

ESEA: Advanced Credentialing – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.925 - Advanced Certification or Advanced Credentialing

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: To increase the numbers of National Board Certified Teachers.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The number of teachers awarded National Board Certification will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Cumulative number of teachers certified.			**Progress:** The actual number of National Board Certified Teachers is currently available for 2003. Data for each year normally will be available by early December. The target has been set at an increase of 5,000 NBCTs each year. Currently, 49 states and approximately 490 localities offer some kind of incentive for teachers to apply for National Board Certification; these incentives have helped to increase the number of applicants for National Board Certification. (These incentives include fee support, salary supplements, and license portability.) However, budget shortfalls in the states are having an impact on the incentives offered and thus the number of candidates.	**Additional Source Information:** Board reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	23,936			
2003	32,142			
2004		35,000		

ESEA: Advanced Placement – 2004

CFDA Numbers: 84.330B - .
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.			**Progress:** The data collected in FY 2003 requested a 20% increase over FY 2002. **Explanation:** Until FY 2003, the Department predicted 10% (beyond the baseline) growth in tests taken annually. In FY 2003, the performance indicators were re-written to state that: the numbers of exams taken by low-income students would increase annually. Up until FY 2003, the Department predicted 10% (beyond the baseline) growth in tests taken annually. In FY 2003, the performance indicators were re-written to state that: the numbers of exams taken by low-income students would increase annually. However, the 10% projection annually was dropped.	**Additional Source Information:** Educational Testing Service **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** November 2004 **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	166,649	154,629		
2004		170,092		

ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.356A - .

Program Goal: To assist Alaska Native population to achieve to challenging standards through supporting supplemental programs that meet their unique educational needs.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Support supplemental educational programs to benefit Alaska Natives.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Student achievement: Percentage of participants benefiting from the Alaska Native Education program will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
As appropriate an increased percentage of students participating in the program will meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science or reading.	**Explanation:** FY 2004 data will provide the baseline (the code for setting baseline is 999). The performance targets for FY 2005 and 2006 are set at an annual 5% increase to the baseline.	**Additional Source Information:** Additional Source Information: Grantee performance report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

As appropriate Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs will improve on measures of school readiness.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

ESEA: Charter Schools Grants – 2004

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)			**Progress:** While there has been positive growth to get to 41 States with charter schools laws, the remaining States have been reluctant to enact legislation. **Explanation:** Several States considered legislation this year, but only 1enacted legislation.	**Additional Source Information:** State Educational Agencies (SEA); state legislatures. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** January 2005 **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			**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:** SEAs; State legislatures. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** January 2005 **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		

ESEA: Comprehensive School Reform – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.332B - Comprehensive School Reform Quality Initiatives

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 demonstration (CSRD) 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							**Explanation:** CSR Data for 2002, 2003 was not collected. No evaluation was done, and CSR items were not included in the consolidated state report. 2004 data will be analyzed and summarized using information from state performance reports.	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** June 2005 **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		
2004				84	87	73		
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
2004				83	83	83

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:** CSR Data for 2002, 2003 was not collected. No evaluation was done, and CSR items were not included in the consolidated state report. 2004 data will be analyzed and summarized in early 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999(baseline)/2000. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** June 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data collected by Westat, Inc., and validated by internal procedures. **Limitations:** Data are taken from a nationally representative sample of Title I schools; no data are
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	31			
2000	46			
2001		55		
2002		60		
2003		70		
2004		72		

		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.

ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.354A - Charter Schools Facilities Program

Program Goal: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program Internal Goal

Objective 8.1 of 1: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities program Internal Objective 1

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Leveraging funds.: Leveraging funds.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, construction, or renovation of charter school facilities.			**Progress:** As of September 30, 2003, $99 million was leveraged for charter schools. **Explanation:** $98 million was leveraged to help charter schools acquire, build, or renovate school facilities and $1 million was leveraged to help charter schools lease facilities. The funds leveraged only include the funds leveraged by the FY 2001 grantees.	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** Charter School Facilities Grantee Performance Report. **Program:** Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities OMB #1855-0010. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** January 2005 Information in the performance report will be validated through the following means: obtaining loan documents from grantees, calling charter schools that have received services, and conducting site visits.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Funding in Millions	Funding in Millions		
2003	99			
2004		100		
2005		101		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Number of school facilities acquired, constructed, or renovated using program funds.: Number of school facilities acquired, constructed, or renovated using program funds.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of charter schools served through this indicator.	**Progress:** As of September 30, 2003, the program assisted 20 charter schools in acquiring, constructing, or renovating school facilities. **Explanation:** The program assisted 18 charter schools to buy, build, or renovate school facilities. It helped 2 charter schools lease facilities.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 Information in the performance report will be validated through the following means: obtaining loan documents from grantees, calling charter schools that are listed as receiving services, and conducting site visits.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	20	
2004		20
2005		20

ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.349A - .

Program Goal: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Program Internal Goal

Objective 8.1 of 2: Early childhood educators will more frequently apply research based approaches in early childhood instruction and child development and learning, including establish literacy rich classrooms.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Apply research based approaches to early childhood pedagogy and child development and learning, including establishing literacy rich classrooms: Average ELLCO score will improve.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
ECEPD teachers' scores on ELLCO will improve.			**Progress:** Teacher performance documentation; documented use of the Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO). 2004 is the baseline year. The target for FY 2005 is baseline +1% **Explanation:** Most of the programs in this cohort received a one-year no cost extension due to implementation delays. The projects are now current and we expect to receive enough data to report on this indicator.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Other. **Sponsor:** Documentation of application of research based approaches, as recorded by mentors or supervisors working with participating educators (i.e., logs or reports); pre and post evaluation of educator lesson plans; results of the ELLCO. **Date Sponsored:** 12/31/2005. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** May 2004 **Limitations:** Not all ECEPD grantees use the ELLCO literacy Environment Checklist. Data collected only represent the sample grantees who use the checklist.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		
2005		999		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language literacy and numeracy skills.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Demonstrated improved readiness for school: At the end of the last preschool year, children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy, and numeracy skills.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Improved readiness for school in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy, and numeracy skills.			**Progress:** Documented use of Get It Got It Go, the Developmental Indicators for the Assessment of Learning (DIAL-3) and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-III). 2004 is the baseline year. The target for FY 2005 is baseline +1%. **Explanation:** Most of the programs in this cohort received a one-year no cost extension due to implementation delays. The projects are now current and we expect to receive enough data to report on this indicator.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Record/File. **Sponsor:** Results of Get It Got It Go, DIAL 3 and PPVT III.. **Date Sponsored:** 12/31/2005. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** May 2004 **Improvements:** Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the PPVT and the Individual Growth Development Indicators available from Get It Got It Go. Not all ECEPD grantees use the PPVT or the Individual Growth and Development Indicators.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Social/Cognitive Emotional	Social/Cognitive Emotional		
2004		999		
2005		999		

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Demonstrated skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction: One year following instruction from a teacher who participated in an Early Childhood Educator Professional Development program, children will demonstrate that they have the skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction at the end of the kindergarten year.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Children will demonstrate they have the skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction at the end of the kindergarten year.	**Progress:** Documented use of the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). **Explanation:** 2005 is the baseline year. Most of the programs in this cohort received a one-year no cost extension due to implementation delays. The projects are now current and we expect to receive enough data to report on this indicator.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Other. **Sponsor:** Results of DIBELS. **Date Sponsored:** 12/31/2005. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 - 2005 **Data Available:** May 2005

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

ESEA: Early Reading First – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.359 - Early Reading First

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: Preschool-aged children will attain the necessary early language, cognitive and prereading skills to enter kindergarten prepared for continued learning, including the age appropriate development of oral language, and alphabet knowledge.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Language: The percent of children who demonstrate age appropriate development of receptive language.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percent of 4 year old children participating in ERF who achieve age-appropriate benchmarks on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.			**Progress:** Data from FY 2004 will provide the baseline. (The code for setting the baseline is 999.) The target for FY 2005 is baseline +1%. **Explanation:** The first full program year for Early Reading First grantees is 2003-2004. Early Reading First preschool children will take a Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III pre-test and a post-test after the year of Early Reading First intervention. Post-test scores of ERF preschool children will be compared to the national norms provided by the test publisher.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Other. **Sponsor:** Early Reading First Annual Performance Report.. **Date Sponsored:** 12/31/2003. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition (PPVT) is a nationally normed tests which has been validated internally and correlated with other
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		
2005		999		

		measures of cognitive development. **Limitations:** Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the PPVT. Not all Early Reading First grantees use the PPVT to measure cognitive development..

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Early Reading: Alphabet Knowledge: The score ERF children attain on the Letter Naming Task..

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of letters ERF children can identify measured by the Letter Naming Task. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2004** /	/ 999 **2005** /	/ 999	**Progress:** Data from SY 2004 will provide the baseline. (The code for setting baseline is 999.) The target for FY 2005 is baseline +1%. **Explanation:** FY 2003-2004 is the first program year for Early Reading First grantees. The first Early Reading First Performance Report will be due December 2004. The Letter Naming Task is a measure of alphabet knowledge that will be administered to ERF preschool children with scores reported in t he ERF Performance Report.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Record/File. **Sponsor:** The Early Reading First Performance Report. **Date Sponsored:** 12/31/2003. **Additional Source Information:** The PALS Pre-K tests the mastery of early developing reading skills. The Early Reading First Performance Report is submitted to the Department by ERF grantees as an annual performance report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005

		Validated By: No Formal Verification. On Site Monitoring by ED. The Letter Naming Task is a measure that has been normed using a national sample from the Head Start population. It has been demonstrated to have a strong positive correlation with the Woodcock-Johnson Letter-Word Identification test.. **Limitations:** Not all Early Reading First grantees use the Letter Naming Task to measure alphabet knowledge. Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the Letter Naming Task. **Improvements:** Early Reading First grantees will be encouraged to use the Letter Naming Task as the measure of alphabet knowledge.

ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians – 2004

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

Program Goal: Native Hawaiian Education Program Internal Goal

Objective 8.1 of 1: To support innovative projects that provide supplemental services that address the educational needs of Native Hawaiian children and adults.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Percentage of participants who will benefit from the Native Hawaiian Education program will increase

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
As appropriate the percentage of teachers involved with professional development activities that address the unique education needs of program participants will increase.			**Explanation:** Baseline will be established in FY 2004. The performance targets for FY 2005 and 2006 are set at an annual 5% increase to the baseline.	**Additional Source Information:** Grantee performance report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		
2005		999		
2006		999		

An increased percentage of Native Hawaiian children who participate in the early education program provided by Alu Like, Inc. will improve on measures of school readiness and literacy.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

As appropriate an increased percentage of student participating in the program will meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science or reading.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

ESEA: Educational Technology State Grants – 2004

CFDA Numbers: 84.318 - Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Grants
84.318X - .

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 schools receiving substantial EETT funds that have integrated technology.			**Explanation:** FY 2004 data will provide the baseline (the code for setting a baseline is 999); The performance targets for FY 2005 and 2006 are set at an annual 1% increase to the baseline.	**Source:** Other **Other:** National Evaluation. **Sponsor:** PPSS - National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS).. **Date Sponsored:** 06/06/2003. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** November 2005
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.					**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. Public Schools and Classrooms: 1994-2002.. **Additional Source Information:** PPSS - National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS). **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** December 2004 **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.
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						
2003			100	100		
2004			100	100		

Objective 8.3 of 3: To provide professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and school administrators to develop capacity 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 999).	**Source:** Other **Other:** National Evaluation. **Sponsor:** SRI - National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS).. **Date Sponsored:** 06/06/2003. **Additional Source Information:** Consolidated State Performance Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** November 2005
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		

ESEA: Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education – 2004

Program Goal: To improve the teaching and learning of all students through the provisions of high-quality instructional materials and information about effective programs, and through the expansion of a cadre of highly accomplished teachers.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide access to high quality instructional materials and information about exemplary programs in mathematics and science education for elementary and secondary schools.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Utility: At least 80 percent of customers who use clearinghouse products will report that the products meet their needs in terms of being easy to access, up to date, and valuable to their work.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of customers who report that products are:							**Progress:** The percentage of customers who reported that clearinghouse products were easy to access, up to date and added value to their work exceeded the targets which were established in 2000. **Explanation:** The Clearinghouse has placed increasing emphasis on customer satisfaction. The respondents in the performance table represent randomly selected clients who are subscribers to the ENC Focus periodicals and have accessed the ENC website.	**Source:** Non-NCES Survey/Research **Collecting Agency:** Eisenhower Clearinghouse. **Survey/Research Report Title:** Clearinghouse Data System. **Additional Source Information:** Consortia/Clearinghouse Network Evaluation Report 2003. Primary sources for this report are the Consortia and Clearinghouse Descriptive Data System and participants' surveys. **Frequency:** Annually.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	Easy to access	Up to date	Value to work	Easy to access	Up to date	Value to work		
2000	90	95.50	93.40	72	72	72		
2001	97	97	97	76	76	76		
2002	98	97	98	78	78	78		
2003	95.80	99.50	95	80	80	80		
2004				80	80	80		

		Collection Period: 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Statistical standards are applied. Data are subjected to Cross-Consortia's Eisenhower Network Evaluation Committee internal review and validation procedures. **Limitations:** Consortia and Clearinghouse Descriptive Data System and data have not been subjected to external audit.

ESEA: English Language Acquisition – 2004

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

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

Objective 8.1 of 3: 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
Percentage of states that have developed English language proficiency standards	**Progress:** The status of States' development of English language proficiency (ELP) standards was 1 of 6 elements evaluated in States' 9/1/03 submissions to Consolidated State Application (CSA). Under the September submission, 42 States submitted sufficient info. for mtg. requirement to establish ELP stds. This no. represents 80% of 52 States/eligible entities under the Title III State Formula Grant Prog.. The 10 States which did not meet requirements to establish ELP stds. rec'd Title III Attachment T conditions & were req'd to provide evidence of mtg. this requirement by 4/30/04. 6/04 OELA staff completed reviews of States' April submissions & determined all States	**Additional Source Information:** NCLB Consolidated State Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** September 2004

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	80	70
2004	100	100

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

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	100	95
2004	100	100

The percentage of states that have conducted studies and/or implemented procedures to assess the alignment of English language proficiency standards and assessments

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		10
2004		100

The percentage of states that have conducted studies and/or implemented procedures to ensure that English language proficiency standards are linked to academic content standards in English language arts and reading

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		10
2004		80

met requirement to develop State ELP stds. Of 7 States that rec'd Attachment T conditions based on 4/30/04 submissions, 0 rec'd conditions related to development of State ELP stds. Under Titles I & III of NCLB, each State is req'd to annually administer ELP assessments to all LEP students in the State. English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data was one of 6 elements evaluated in States' 9/1/03 submissions to the Consolidated State Application (CSA). See Explanation below to continue.

Explanation: Progress cont'd: Under the September submission, all 52 States reported which ELP assessment(s) were administered in 02-03, and which assessment(s) would be administered in subsequent years. All 52 States reported that they had selected & administered ELP assessments. OELA staff is still working with States to ensure that States' policies for administration of ELP assessments meet all NCLB requirements, e.g., that all students k-12 are annually assessed in 4 domains of reading, writing, listening, & speaking & that all States are able to report on domain of comprehension for students served under Title III. 1. OELA must determine how States' demonstration of alignment is measured. 2. OELA must also determine how data on alignment will be collected in a consistent manner. 3

	The majority of States 80% + are members of consortia funded by the Dept. to develop ELP assessments. These consortia have their own timelines, approved by Title I, for the development, field testing, pilot testing, and administration of assessments & for alignment of new assessments to ELP standards, and linking of stds. to State content stds.	

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:** 1. The data on this indicator will be most reliable if extracted from the 12/06 biennial evaluation reports. The target date should then be changed to 2007, in order to allow sufficient time for analysis. 2. States develop their own definitions of “proficient” in English and “making progress in English.”. These definitions vary greatly across States & are linked to State ELP standards & assessments. 3. States' progress on this indicator is highly dependent on both student background characteristics and State Title III accountability systems. Some of the LEP student background characteristics which may impact States' attainment of these targets include: the number & percentage of LEP students at each level of ELP in the State; the educational background	**Additional Source Information:** NCLB Consolidated State Report **Collection Period:** - 2006 **Data Available:** January 2007

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		70

	of these students; the type of language instruction educational program in which these students are enrolled. Some of the components of State Title III accountability systems which may impact States' **Explanation:** (Progress above cont'd): attainment of these targets include: State definitions attainment of these targets include: State definitions of cohort and full academic year; States' policies and practices for exiting students from language instruction educational programs; & the integration of States' ELP standards, assessments, and curriculum.	

Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the quality of teachers of LEP students.

Indicator 8.2.1 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				**Additional Source Information:** NCLB Consolidated State Report **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** September 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003	35	25		
2004		50		
2005		75		

Indicator 8.2.2 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 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** NCLB Consolidated State Report **Collection Period:** 2005 - 2006 **Data Available:** September 2006
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2005		999		

Indicator 8.2.3 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 2006.	**Additional Source Information:** NCLB Consolidated State Report **Collection Period:** 2006 - 2007 **Data Available:** September 2007
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2006		999		

Objective 8.3 of 3: Improve English proficiency and academic achievement of students served by Title VII of the Bilingual Education Act

Indicator 8.3.1 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					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of projects in which three-quarters of student groups made gains in English proficiency						**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:** Operational definitions of LEP students vary; the amount of missing data varies greatly across
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

projects and cohorts of projects. Prior year data has been updated from previous reports to reflect more complete information.

Indicator 8.3.2 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.

Targets and Performance Data

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

Assessment of Progress

Sources and Data Quality

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.

ESEA: Even Start – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.314 - Even Start_Statewide Family Literacy Program

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 and mathematics achievement and English language acquisition: Percentage of adults who achieve significant learning gains on measures of literacy and mathematics and Limited English proficient (LEP) adults who achieve significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition.

Targets and Performance Data						Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of Even Start Adults showing significant learning gains on measures of literacy and mathematics and Even Start LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition.						**Explanation:** The baseline for this measure will be set with the 2003 data. The performance targets for 2004 and 2005 are set at an annual 1% increase to the baseline.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Other. **Sponsor:** NCLP State Consolidated Performance Report (CPR). **Date Sponsored:** 12/31/2003. **Additional Source Information:** Performance Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI). **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** January 2005
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**			
	Reading	Math	English Language Acquisition	Reading	Math	English Language Acquisition	
2003				999	999	999	
2004				999	999	999	
2005				999	999	999	

		Limitations: Currently, the CPRs and PBDMI do not provide data in format to report on performance for this indicator. Data for 2003 is dependent upon the format of the revised CPR and additions to the PBDMI.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Adult educational attainment: Percentage of Even Start school age parents who earn a high school diploma and the percentage of non-school age parents who earn a high school diploma or a general equivalency diploma.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal or GED attainment goal that earn a high school diploma or equivalent.					**Explanation:** Baseline for this measure will be set with the 2003 data. The 2004 target is baseline +1%.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Other. **Sponsor:** NCLB State Consolidated Performance Report (CPR). **Date Sponsored:** 12/31/2003. **Additional Source Information:** Second and Third National Even Start Evaluation: Universe Study (1996-2000). **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** January 2005 **Limitations:** Currently, the CPRs and PBDMI do not provide data in a format to report on performance for this indicator. Data for 2003 is dependent upon the format of the revised CPR and additional to the PBDMI. Definitions of high school diploma and GED may vary across programs.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	School Age Adults HS Diploma	Non-School Age Adults HS Diploma/GED	School Age Adults HS Diploma	Non-School Age Adults HS Diploma/GED		
2003			999	999		
2004			999	999		

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

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of Even Start children that are entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development and reading readiness.					**Explanation:** Baseline for this measure will be set with the 2003 data. The 2004 and 2005 targets are baseline +1%.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Other. **Sponsor:** NCLB State Consolidated Performance Report (CPR). **Date Sponsored:** 12/31/2003. **Additional Source Information:** Performance Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI). **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** January 2005 **Limitations:** Currently the CPRs and PBDMI do not provide data in a format to report on performance for this indicator. Data for 2003 is dependent upon the format of the revised CPR and additions to the PBDMI.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Language Development	Reading Readiness	Language Development	Reading Readiness		
2003			999	999		
2004			999	999		
2005			999	999		

ESEA: Impact Aid Basic Support Payments and Payments for Children with Disabilities – 2004

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

Objective 8.1 of 2: 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.			**Progress:** The Impact Aid Program continues to exceed the performance target in making timely payments to eligible applicants. **Explanation:** Program managers have implemented performance standards for Impact Aid Program staff that support this performance target, supporting continued successful performance.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2004 **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	95	90		
2005		90		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Make accurate payments

Indicator 8.2.1 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			**Progress:** The Impact Aid Program continues to improve payment accuracy, resulting in a reduced number of requests for overpayment forgiveness **Explanation:** Review procedures have been implemented in recent years that have reduced the number of payment errors.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 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		

ESEA: Impact Aid Construction – 2004

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: Improve the quality of public school facilities used to educate federally connected children.

Indicator 8.1.1 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.			**Progress:** The data show a trend of steady progress in improving the condition of school facilities in LEAs that receive Impact Aid Construction funds. **Explanation:** The Impact Aid Program continues to make annual formula construction payments to eligible applicants, but the amounts of these payments are generally insufficient to meet the facilities improvement needs for these school districts. The Impact Aid Discretionary Construction Program is not in the third year of awards, and these discretionary construction grants should help to address the most serious facilities conditions in a small number of school districts.	**Additional Source Information:** Data collected from LEA application for Impact Aid Section 8003 payments. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** January 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	54	70		
2005		70		

ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants – 2004

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 is the baseline.	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 - 2005 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Limitations:** Data for 2003-2004 not available

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	80	999
2004		85
2006		100

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

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	75	999
2004		81
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
	Explanation: FY 2003 is the baseline.	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 - 2005 **Data Available:** December 2004

Percentage of highly qualified teachers in all elementary schools.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	85	999
2004		89
2006		100

Percentage of highly qualified teachers in all middle and high schools.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	80	999
2004		85
2006		100

ESEA: Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies – 2004

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:** The schedule for testing is being revised to correspond with the No Child Left Behind Act's requirements. Assessments in reading and math for grades four and eight will be administered in all states every other year.	**Additional Source Information:** National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2000, 2002, 2003; Schools and Staffing Survey, 1997. **Frequency:** Biennially. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2005 **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	48			
1998	47			
2000	43	58		
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	63	
1998	61	
2000	53	62
2001		64
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	
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	60
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:** The 1994 Elementary and Secondary School Act requires, by 2000-01, disaggregation of achievement data submitted by states to reflect American Indian and Alaska Native proficiency levels on state assessments. Data are not reported due to states not meeting the disaggregation of achievement data requirement under the NCLB act. Indicator is being revised for FY2005.	**Additional Source Information:** NCLB Consolidated State Reports **Frequency:** Biennially. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** January 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Verified by Department attestation process and Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** Substantial variation across states in their definitions of proficient student performance.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		34		
2004		35		

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			**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. Data are not reported due to difficulty in acquiring actual data due to small sample size of the American Indian and Alaska Native population. Indicator is being revised in FY 2005 to align with the NCLB act.	**Additional Source Information:** NCES Transcript Data, 2000-01. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** January 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Census data validated by the Census Bureau review procedures and Census standards; OIE Annual Performance Report data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedures applied; National Center for Educational Statistics Transcript data. Validated by the National Center for Educational Statistics review procedures and National Center for Educational Statistics statistical standards. **Limitations:** Participation in Census surveys varies by regions and location, resulting in undercount of population.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	70			
2000		75		
2001		80		
2003		81		
2004		82		

ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.364 - Literacy through School Libraries

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

Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the literacy skills of students served by the Improving Literacy Through School Libraries program.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: School/District/State Reading Assessments: The percentage of schools/districts served by Improving Literacy Through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of schools/districts served by Improving Literacy through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students.			**Explanation:** The first program year for grantees receiving funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries is 2003-2004. Data collected for this school year will provide the baseline. (The code for setting a baseline is 999.)	**Additional Source Information:** Improving Literacy through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; Program Evaluation of 2005 by Department of Education. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Enhance the school library media collection at grantee schools/districts to align with curriculum.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: School library media collection: The comparison between the rate at which the school library media collection is increased at schools participating in the grant program and non-participating schools.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Difference in rate of increase between participating schools and non-participating schools.			**Explanation:** The first program year for grantees receiving funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries is 2003-2004. Data collected for this school year will provide the baseline. (The code for setting a baseline is 999.)	**Additional Source Information:** Improving Literacy through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; Program Evaluation of 2005 by Department of Education. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data collected by Westat, Inc and validated by Internal procedures
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		

ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance – 2004

CFDA Numbers: 84.165 - Magnet Schools Assistance
84.165A - .

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.				**Additional Source Information:** MSAP Performance Reports **Frequency:** Annually. **Data Available:** June 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** Data are self reported.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		50		
2004		55		
2005		60		
2006		65		
2007		70		

ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.366A - Mathematics and Science Partnership program

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

Objective 8.1 of 2: To increase the number of highly qualified mathematics and science teachers in schools participating in Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) programs.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in MSP schools: the number or percentage of elementary certified teachers who significantly increase their knowledge of mathematics and science.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of K-5 teachers who significantly increase knowledge of mathematics and science.			**Explanation:** The FY 2004 target is to set a baseline. (The code for setting a baseline is 999.) The performance target for FY 2005 is a 1% increase to the baseline.	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Report; MSP Project Performance Reports **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2005
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		
2005		999		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in MSP schools: the percentage of mathematics and science middle and high school teachers who are not highly qualified upon beginning participation in the program who become highly qualified upon completion of the program.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of highly qualified middle school (Grades 6-8) teachers.	**Explanation:** The FY 2004 target is to set a baseline. (The code for setting a baseline is 999.) The target for FY 2005 is baseline +1.	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Report; MSP Project Performance Reports **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2005

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

Percentage of highly qualified high school (Grades 9-12) teachers.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

Objective 8.2 of 2: To increase the percentage of students in schools participating in Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) programs who score at the proficient or advanced level in mathematics and science on state assessments.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Student achievement in MSP schools: the percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced on State mathematics assessments.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced in mathematics.	**Explanation:** Data from SY 2003-2004 will set the baseline. The target for FY 2005 is baseline +1.	**Additional Source Information:** NCLB Consolidated State Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** January 2005

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program – 2004

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:** December 2004 **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
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

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 8.1.2 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							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of States meeting performance target in Reading--Middle							**Explanation:** 2002 data are not yet available.	**Additional Source Information:** NCLB Consolidated State Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Limitations:** The States
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

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

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

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: December 2004

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

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

Explanation: 2002 data are not yet available.

Additional Source Information: NCLB Consolidated State Report

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: December 2004

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 8.1.5 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	**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

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

		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	**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. **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.

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
2004				999	999	999

ESEA: National Writing Project – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.928 - National Writing Project (OII)

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: To support and promote the establishment of teacher training programs designed to improve the writing skills of students and teachers. NWP sites will develop methods to assess student writing.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Students taught by NWP teachers will show improved student writing skills.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of students of NWP trained teachers who achieve effectiveness in major areas of writing competence such as persuasive and rhetorical and those students who demonstrate clear control of the writing conventions of usage, mechanics, and spelling will increase.			**Progress:** Data will be available annually by 2004. Progress will be reported each June. 2004 data will be used as baseline data and succeeding years will be used to measure progress.	**Additional Source Information:** Sites will determine assessment instruments to be used (possible examples are Academy for Educational Development-derived tests and the NAEP Test of Writing) in cooperation with the NWP Research Division. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** January 2005 **Limitations:** NWP sites are using a number of different assessments. It is not clear how comparable these measures are.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		

ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program – 2004

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 will increase.			**Progress:** This is a pilot test of a new measure for 2003. We pilot tested this measure with a small sample of five states. States were most able to report GED attainment, which are presented here. Students attaining diplomas or jobs are not presented because very few states had this information. We are working with states to improve the measure for next year. **Explanation:** This is a new measure for 2003.	**Additional Source Information:** Study of State Agency Activities Under Title I, Part D, Subpart I. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** April 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** Another data limitation is that the denominator differed by state. For example, some states used all enrolled students, some selected out those who were GED-eligible. We are working with states to develop common data definitions.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003	8	999		
2004		8.40		
2005		8.80		

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 will increase.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	78.40	999
2004		82.32
2005		86.24

Progress: This is a pilot test of a new measure for 2003. We pilot tested this measure with a small sample of five states. States were not able to report the number of credits earned by students, but were able to report the numbers and percent of students earning credits; the percent of students earning high school credit, for those states that collect the data and are aligned with schools, is reported here.

Explanation: These data are from a very limited number of grantees and do not necessarily reflect the overall status of grantees. Another data limitation is that the denominator differed by state. For example, some states used all enrolled students, some selected out those who were high-school-credit-eligible. We are working with states to develop common data definitions. We are now improving the measure for next year.

Additional Source Information: Study of State Agency Activities under Title I. Part D, Subpart I.

Frequency: Other.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: April 2005
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

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 that improve academic skills as measured on approved and validated measures.			**Progress:** This is a pilot test of a new measure for 2003. We pilot tested this measure with a small sample of five states. No state was able to report these data. Therefore, baseline will be repeated in 2004. We are working with states on how to get these data for next year. **Explanation:** The target for 2004 and 2005 is baseline +5%. The performance targets for 2004 and 2005 are set at an annual 5% increase to the baseline.	**Additional Source Information:** Study of State Agency Activities under Title I, Part D, Subpart I. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** April 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		999		
2004		999		
2005		999		

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 plans to return to local school programs.	**Progress:** This is a pilot test of a new measure for 2003. We pilot tested this measure with a small sample of five states. During our pilot test of this new measure, we discovered that states are currently not able to report this information. Therefore, we are reporting the number of states in our pilot test whose State Education Agencies report a written transition plan requirement. We are working with states to improve this measure. **Explanation:** This is a new measure for 2003. The target for 2004 is baseline +5%.	**Additional Source Information:** Study of State Agency Activities under Title I, Part D, Subpart I. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** April 2005

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	40	999
2004		42
2005		44

ESEA: Parental Assistance Information Centers – 2004

CFDA Numbers: 84.310 - Parental Assistance Centers
84.310A - .

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 2004, the number of parents of children attending schools that are not making adequate yearly progress reported to have received the	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** Parent Information Resource Grantee Performance Report. **Additional Source Information:** Annual Performance Reports **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		

	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. **Explanation:** Performance reporting requirements for the PIRC program are being revised to incorporate the collection of information needed to respond to this indicator.	Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** Data are self-reported

ESEA: Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution – 2004

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 established the baseline year. The performance targets for FY 2004,2005, and 2006 are set at an annual 5% increase to the baseline.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003	3,713,541	999		
2004		999		
2005		999		
2006		999		

ESEA: Ready to Teach – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.286 - Ready to Change

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: To use multiple digital technologies to develop and deliver digital courses and classroom content, and to provide training to teachers using these materials.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Students participating in Ready to Teach will demonstrate enhanced academic achievement.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Students who participate in Ready To Teach programs and demonstrate enhanced academic achievement.			**Explanation:** The performance target for FY 2005 is set at an annual 5% increase to the baseline. The following data may be collected: test scores, participation in more rigorous course-taking, or any other established measure of achievement. Materials developed under Ready To Teach are intended for distribution beyond the project period, although the support resources needed to maximize the resources may not be available without continued funding. During the Ready To Teach pilot phase in 2003, more than 7000 educators were impacted by Ready To Teach. As this program	**Additional Source Information:** Outside contractors' evaluation reports and projects' annual performance reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 Validated by outside contractors for evaluation and by Department staff. **Limitations:** Due to limited resources for evaluation, sample sizes are appropriate
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		
2005		999		

	approaches national dissemination, it is expected that this number will increase substantially in coming years and thereby will impact the enhanced academic achievement of an increasing number of students.	for the level of funding and the scope of these projects. Because of shifting demographics, some students may not remain in the assigned school district, but every effort will be made to track these students.

ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television – 2004

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
Percentage of preschool children demonstrating expressive vocabulary skills and emergent literacy skills as a result of viewing literacy based Ready to Learn television shows.					**Explanation:** The performance targets for FY 2004 and 2005 are set at an annual 5% increase to the baseline. Sixth 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.	**Additional Source Information:** 2003/Baseline: Face-to-face parent interviews and phone interviews with child educators, Ready To Learn National Evaluation, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., research contractor.2004: Survey (paper and pencil, Internet, and telephone) of parent and child educator workshop attendees including retrospective pretest items. Ready To Learn federal performance indicator research project, WestEd, research contractor.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Between the Lions	Sesame Street	Between the Lions	Sesame Street		
2003			999	999		
2004			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
2004		999

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: December 2004
WestEd and reviewed by staff of PBS Ready To Learn and Department of Education.

Limitations: 2003/Baseline: Self-reported data from 583 parents and 304 child educators who attended Ready To Learn workshops at a non-random sample of 20 Ready To Learn stations. 2004: Self-report data from 143 parents and 131 educators who attended a Ready To Learn workshop from a random sample of workshops.

ESEA: School Leadership – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.363A - School Leadership Program

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: To recruit and train teachers and individuals from other fields to become assistant principals and principals who will serve in high-need school in high-need LEAs.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The percentage of new participants recruited and trained to become qualified assistant principals and principals to serve in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of all new recruits who enroll and complete training programs to become assistant principals or principals in high-need schools in high-need LEAs. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2004** /	**Progress:** For measures (a), (b) and (c): Data will be analyzed in October 2004 for reports that will be available in November.	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** School Leadership Grantee Performance Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** November 2004 **Limitations:** Each grantee uses its own method of recording and reporting data and inconsistencies exist.
The percentage of new assistant principals or principals receiving full certification/licensure will increase. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2004** / 999		
The percentage of fully certified/licensed assistant principals and principals who apply for positions in high-need schools in high-need LEAs will increase. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2004** / 999		

ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities – 2004

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
Percentage of students meeting or exceeding basic and proficient levels on state and local reading and math assessments.						**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Contractor:** Contractor Performance Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** February 2005 **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	54.90	50.45	66.70	58.10		
2004			70	60		

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 in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants who graduate from high school based on 9th grade enrollment.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	59.20	
2003	56.60	60.20
2004		63

Source: Performance Report
Contractor Performance Report

Contractor: Contractor Performance Report.

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

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

Percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants planning to attend a 2 -or 4 year college.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	69.90	
2003	66.50	70.90
2004		74

Source: Performance Report
Contractor Performance Report

Contractor: Contractor Performance Report.

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

ESEA: Special Programs for Indian Children – 2004

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: Discretionary programs will focus on improving educational opportunities and services for American Indian and Alaska Native children and adults

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Increasing percentages of the teacher and principal workforces serving American Indian and Alaska Native students will themselves be American Indian and Alaska Native.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of principals and teachers in public schools with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students					**Explanation:** Data are not reported due to the small sample size of American Indian and Alaska Native teachers and principals reported in the Schools and Staffing survey and the national longitudinal survey of schools population. Indicator is being revised in FY 2005 to align with the NCLB act and the LEA's annual performance reports.	**Additional Source Information:** Schools and Staffing Survey, 1999; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools (1998-99 and 2000-01). **Frequency:** Biennially. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** NCES. **Limitations:** Sample size is small, and it is costly to add supplemental samples to data collection programs. National sample results in an under-
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Principals	Teachers	Principals	Teachers		
1994	13	15				
2001			18	20		
2004			20	22		

		representation in sample count. **Improvements:** Monitor the number of American Indian and Alaska Native students through LEA's reporting on program effectiveness in their Annual Performance Report.

ESEA: Star Schools Program – 2004

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.			**Progress:** .A total of 1,726 students participated in pre-post matched assessments in reading, mathematics or science during the year. Of those participating, 1,120 students demonstrated improvement. Of particular note, 209 out of the known 257 American Indian students or 81% demonstrated improvement and 144 of the 194 known Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander students or 74% showed improvement. Data regarding other ethnic populations was not as readily reported by the grantees, however, of the known 345 English language learners, 267 or 77% evidenced improvement from pre-	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 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**		
2004	64.89	999		
2005		999		

	assessment to post-assessment. In addition, 472 of the 624 students identified as living in high poverty conditions or 76% demonstrated improvement in the Star Schools courses or modules. **Explanation:** This was a new indicator in 2003. Insufficient data was reported in 2003 to establish baseline. Therefore 2004 will become our new baseline. The performance target for 2005 is set at an annual 5% increase to the baseline.	

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.			**Progress:** This total exceeds our 2003 results but does not meet our target.	**Additional Source Information:** FY 2004 annual performance and evaluation reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 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
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	1,373	1,700		

		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.

ESEA: State Assessments – 2004

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

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: By the 2005-2006 school year, all states, DC & Puerto Rico, will have rigorous assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics in grades three through eight and in high school and will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (grades 3-5, 6-8, & high school) in science, all on which are aligned with their content specific academic content standards.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Annual assessments: All states, DC & Puerto Rico, will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades 3 through 8 and in high schools in reading/language arts that align with the state's academic content standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of states (including DC & PR) that have reading/language arts assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school.			**Progress:** As required by NCLB, the Department must use a peer review process to review and approve State assessment systems under NCLB. States are required to have reading/language arts assessments in each of grades 3-8 and at the high school level that are aligned to State content and achievement standards by the 2005-2006 school year, In April 2004, the Department released the Peer Review instrument. The Department is scheduled to provide training on this instrument to peer	**Additional Source Information:** Title I review processes (Standards & Assessments external peer review process) **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** September 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		
2005		18		
2006		52		

	reviewers and State Departments of Education in November 2004. Peer reviews of State assessment systems under NCLB are scheduled to begin in school year 2004-2005. **Explanation:** For this indicator, States are only considered to have an approved assessment system in reading/language arts for each of grades 3-8 and for the high school level after having completed a successful peer review that demonstrates that the State has met all of the NCLB assessment requirements. 2004 is the baseline year. As explained above, no peer reviews were conducted in 2003-2004. Therefore, there are no data to report. The performance target for this measure is set at 52 for FY 2006 since States are required to have reading/language arts assessments in grades 3-8 and high school that meet NCLB assessment requirements in 2005-2006. While not yet peer reviewed or approved, in SY 2003-2004, 12 States administered standards-based reading/language arts assessments in each of grades 3-8 and at the high school level.	

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Annual assessments: All states, DC & Puerto Rico, will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades 3 through 8 and in high schools in mathematics that align with the state's academic content standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
All states, DC & Puerto Rico, will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades 3 through 8 and in high schools in mathematics that align with the state's academic content standards.			**Progress:** As required by NCLB, the Department must use a peer review process to review and approve State assessment systems under NCLB. States are required to mathematics assessments in each of grades 3-8 and at the high school level that are aligned to State content and achievement standards by SY 2005-2006. In April 2004, the Department released the Peer Review instrument. The Department is scheduled to provide training on this instrument to peer reviewers and State Departments of Education in November 2004. Peer reviews of State assessment systems under NCLB are scheduled to begin in SY 2004-2005. **Explanation:** For this indicator, States are only considered to have an approved assessment system in mathematics for each of grades 3-8 and for the high school level after having completed a successful peer review that demonstrates that the State has met all of the NCLB assessment requirements. 2004 is the baseline year. As explained above, no peer	**Additional Source Information:** Title I review processes (Standards & Assessments external peer review process) **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2005
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		
2005		18		
2006		52		
2007		52		
2008		52		

	reviews were conducted in 2003-2004. Therefore, there are no data to report. The performance target for this measure is set at 52 for FY 2006 since States are required to have mathematics assessments in grades 3-8 and high school that meet NCLB assessment requirements in 2005-2006. While not yet peer reviewed or approved, in SY 2003-2004, 11 States administered standards-based mathematics assessments in each of grades 3-8 and at the high school level.	

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Annual assessments: All states, DC & Puerto Rico, will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (grades 3-5,6-8, & high school) in science that align with the state's academic content standards.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
All states, DC & Puerto Rico, will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (grades 3-5,6-8, & high school) in science that align with the state's academic content standards.	**Progress:** As required by NCLB, the Department must use a peer review process to review and approve State assessment systems under NCLB. States are required to have science assessments for all students at least once in grades 3-5, once in grades 6-9, and once in grades 10-12 that are aligned to State content and achievement standards by SY 2007-2008. States must adopt and implement science standards for these same grade spans by SY 2005-2006. In April 2004, the Department released the Peer Review instrument. The	**Additional Source Information:** Title I review processes (Standards & Assessments external peer review process) **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2005

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		18
2006		21
2007		25
2008		52

	Department is scheduled to provide training on this instrument to peer reviewers and State Departments of Education in November 2004. Peer reviews of State assessment systems under NCLB are scheduled to begin in SY 2004-2005. **Explanation:** For this indicator, States are only considered to have an approved assessment system in science that assesses students at least once in grades 3-5, once in grades 6-9, and once in grades 10-12 after having completed a successful peer review that demonstrates that the State has met all of the NCLB assessment requirements. 2004 is the baseline year. As explained above, no peer reviews were conducted in 2003-2004. Therefore, there are no data to report. The performance target for this measure is set at 52 for FY 2008 since States are required to have science assessments that meet NCLB assessment requirements in 2007-2008.	

ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs – 2004

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

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Improved student achievement: School districts that direct Title V funds to activities designated as strategic priorities by U. S. Department of Education will be more likely to achieve adequate yearly progress than those that use funds for all other activities. Strategic priorities include: (1) Those that support student achievement, enhance reading and math, (2) Those that improve the quality of teachers, (3) Those that ensure that schools are safe and drug free, (4) Those that promote access for all students.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of LEAs targeting Title V funds to strategic activities.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	88	999
2004		999

The percentage of LEAs meeting AYP

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	LEAs that target Title V funds	LEAs that do not target Title V funds	LEAs that target Title V funds	LEAs that do not target Title V funds
2003	65	55	999	999
2004			999	999

Explanation: For the 2003 baseline year, 65% of LEA's that targeted Title V funds met AYP. This was compared to the sample of LEA's that did not target Title V funds, which showed only 55% of LEA's meeting AYP requirements. In FY 2004 we expect an increase 5% in the % of LEA's meeting AYP.

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

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

Limitations: These percentages were based upon information from 36 states who provided data in all categories needed to compute the statistics.

ESEA: Teaching of Traditional American History – 2004

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 2004. The 2005 target is 10 percent over the baseline.	**Additional Source Information:** SRI Evaluation survey and case study data and grantee evaluation data **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** January 2005
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		999		
2004		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 2004 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 2006. Baseline data for the second cohort 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.	**Additional Source Information:** SRI Evaluation survey and case study data and grantee evaluation data. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	First Cohort	Second Cohort	First Cohort	Second Cohort		
2003			999			
2004				999		
2005			999			
2006				999		

ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies – 2004

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:** 2004 - 2005 **Data Available:** November 2006 **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	16	46	14	40		
2003	15	44	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 2005 and 2007 schedule.	**Additional Source Information:** NAEP scores posted on NCES website. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 - 2005 **Data Available:** November 2006 **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	10	42				
2003	11	47	11	43		
2005			13	45		
2007			18	50		

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 baseline year is 2002. 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) **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002		999		
2004		30		
2009		52		

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:** School Year (SY) 2003-2004 (FY2004) data will be the baseline; SY 2004-2005 data (FY 2005) 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, no schools will be identified for improvement.	**Additional Source Information:** No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

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.	**Progress:** Title II is now responsible for the implementation of this area of NCLB and monitoring progress towards the 2005-2006 goal. **Explanation:** FY 2002-2003 data will	**Additional Source Information:** States report highly qualified teacher information in the No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report. **Frequency:** Annually.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999
2004		999

	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. Data will be available in March 2005.	**Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005

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	51	999
2004	52	999
2009		52

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. All 52 states are implementing their approved Accountability Plans.

Additional Source Information: Title I Monitoring Activities

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2004 - 2005
Data Available: June 2005

ESEA: Transition To Teaching – 2004

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.			**Progress:** Grantees far exceeded the target of a 5% yearly increase over the baseline (17%). The percent increase was 194% over the baseline in year 2 and 32% over the 2003 target in year 3. **Explanation:** The 2002 target was to set a baseline. The 2003 target is 5 percent over the baseline. The 2004 target is 5 percent over the 2003 target. This measure is discontinued for FY 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** Grantee Annual Performance Reports and Survey data. **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Data represent 34 out of 41 grantees (approximately 90% of all participants based on year 1 participant numbers). A small number of grantees did not have data available for 2004. **Improvements:** Grants were funded for a three year period. Data collection is complete
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	17			
2003	50	18		
2004	66	19		
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.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	27	
2003	55	28
2004	26	29
2006		85

Progress: The year 2 increase of 104% far exceeds the 5% expected yearly increase over the baseline (27%). Year 3 shows a significant drop in performance. There are two probable reasons. 1: Some teachers may have left their position, particularly since they were not required to commit to teaching for a specific length of time. 2: Several programs did not have teaching data from the state when they submitted their most recent report.

Explanation: The 2002 target was to set a baseline. The 2003 target is 5 percent over the baseline. The 2004 target is 5 percent over the 2003 target. This measure is complete for the first cohort of Transition grantees (FY 2001). Measure will continue for FY 2002 grantees and beyond.

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

Limitations: Data represent 34 out of 41 grantees (approximately 90% of all participants). A small number of grantees did not have data available for 2004.

Improvements: Grants were funded for three year period. Data collection is complete.

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				
2003			999	999
2004	9		999	999
2005				999
2006				999

Progress:
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.

2001 TTT grants were for 1 cohort, thus all data are reported under cohort 1. 2004 was the third year of the grant and thus the first year that TTT program participants could have taught for 3 years. The baseline should be set at 9%.

Explanation: Grant applications were for 1 cohort only so Cohort 2 data is not available. For Cohort 1, the target for 2004 was to set the baseline. 2004 is the third year of the program, and thus the first year that a program participant could have taught for 3 years. For these cohorts, there was no requirement to teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for at least three years. This measure has been modified for the FY 2002 grantees and beyond. Reported in FY 2005.

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

Frequency: Other.
Collection Period: 2004 - 2005
Data Available: November 2006

Limitations: Data represent 34 out of 41 grantees (approximately 90% of participants). A small number of grantees did not have data available for 2004.

Improvements: Grants were funded for three year period. Data collection is complete

ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.815 - Troops to Teachers

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. The 2004 data are incomplete, but are expected within the month. DANTES, located in Pensacola, FL, requested an extension on the 9/30/04 data report due to effects of the September hurricanes. Additionally, there has been a decline in registrations in the Troops program due to high deployment levels of active duty and reserve forces.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual performance reports submitted by the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES). **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** November 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003	3,281	999		
2004	2,679	4,364		
2005		5,446		
2006		6,529		

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 by the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES). **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** November 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003	375	999		
2004		469		
2005		563		
2006		656		

ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice – 2004

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.	**Progress:** During the first year, 7 of 13 projects planned and designed a public school choice program. Therefore the baseline will be repeated in 2004 to reflect complete program implementation. As a result, full progress cannot be assessed. **Explanation:** Choosing not to transfer is considered exercising the option. For measure B, the final evaluation summary report is currently undergoing departmental review. Data from this report will be provided when it has completed the final review phase.	**Additional Source Information:** Secured through PPSS, COSMOS Corporation (contractor) is performing the National Evaluation of the Voluntary Public School Choice Program. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** November 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data will also be verified by information submitted in annual performance reports (August 2004) and COSMOS evaluation report (Fall 2004).

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	784	999
2004		862

ESRA: Regional Educational Laboratories – 2004

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide high-quality, relevant, useful products and services for making policy decisions and improving educational practice.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Quality of products and project designs: The percentage of new evidence-based products and project designs 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 evidence-based products and project designs with average reviewer ratings for quality of "high and above" and "very high and above." If there is a large number of new evidence-based products and project designs, a random sample may be assessed.	**Explanation:** Performance in FY 2004 will become the baseline for future targets.	**Additional Source Information:** Report of independent review panel **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2005

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Relevance of products and project designs: The percentage of new evidence-based products and project designs that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of new evidence-based products and project designs with average reviewer ratings for relevance of "high and above" and "very high and above." If there is a large number of new evidence-based products and project designs, a random sample may be assessed.	**Explanation:** Performance in FY 2004 will become the baseline for future targets.	**Additional Source Information:** Report of independent review panel. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2005

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Usefulness of products and services: The percentage of all products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice by target audiences.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
On a field survey, the percentage of a random sample of all products and services with average audience ratings for usefulness of "high and above" and "very high and above."	**Explanation:** Performance in FY 2004 will become the baseline for future targets.	**Additional Source Information:** Field survey of target audiences. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2005 Data collected biennially or triennially.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999

HEA: High School Equivalency Program – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.141A - High School Equivalency Program

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

Objective 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			**Explanation:** We exceeded our target for 2003. The relatively higher performance of 1997 through 2000 reflect a single, experienced cohort of grantees demonstrating steady progress. Subsequent (post 2000) performance reflects multiple cohorts of grantees not starting off with timely grant awards, nor having adequate program expertise until the third year of operating.	**Additional Source Information:** HEP/CAMP Grant Performance Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data were supplied by grantees.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	70			
1998	66			
1999	72			
2000	73			
2001	58			
2002	53			
2003	63	60		
2004		60		
2005		65		

HEA: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders – 2004

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

Program Goal: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders Goal

Objective 8.1 of 1: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders Objective 1

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Improved vocational and academic achievement: By Fall 2002, increasing percentages of students participating in vocational and academic programs will complete a degree or certificate.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Students completing a postsecondary education certificate, associate of arts or bachelor's degree in the facility during the program year			**Progress:** Positive pattern established. Although data have been collected for years 2002 and 2003, they are not available for reporting at this time; they will be available in April 2005. **Explanation:** In 1999, program performance data was impacted by program start up issues and issues with reporting. As the program has matured, completion rates above 50% are becoming more normative. Given issues of maturity and mobility, these rates seem fairly positive.	**Additional Source Information:** Sole source is the annual grantee performance reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** April 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. No independent validation. **Limitations:** Data is based on continuous enrollment. Therefore, the current enrollment is being compared to the outcome of graduates, including individuals served in the prior year and those still enrolled at year end. This
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Percentage of Students Completing	Percentage of Students Completing		
2000	25.50	25		
2001	59.60	30		
2002		50		
2003		50		
2004		50		

		distorts the numbers when the program is either growing or contracting. Programs differ in objectives and degrees/certificates offered, so very different outcomes are being combined. Reporting is inconsistent from State to State. Some data being combined may not be reliable.

HEA: Teacher Quality Enhancement – 2004

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. FY 2003 and FY 2004 data will be collected on a new performance report that has not yet been finalized but which is expected to be in place before the end of 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** Secretary's Report on the Quality of Teacher Preparation (Sec. 207). **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** December 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Secretary's Report will contain self-reported data from states.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		999		
2004		999		

		Improvements: Definitions of data elements are being refined to assure consistency with definitions contained in the No Child Left Behind legislation.

IDEA : Special Education Grants for Infants and Families – 2004

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

Program Goal: To enhance the development of infants and toddlers with disabilities and the capacity of families to meet the special needs of their child by assisting States in providing a comprehensive system of early intervention services.

Objective 8.1 of 2: The functional development of infants will be enhanced by early intervention services.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: FUNCTIONAL ABILITIES: By 2013, all infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in Part C will exhibit improved and sustained functional abilities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of infants and toddlers demonstrating improved and sustained functional abilities			**Explanation:** Baseline data are not yet available. The IDEA Early Childhood Outcomes Center is developing data collection methods for this indicator. The target for 2013 is 100 percent.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 - 2005 **Data Available:** July 2005
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2005		60		
2006		65		
2007		70		
2008		75		
2009		80		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: FAMILY CAPACITY: By 2013, all families served through Part C will 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
Percentage of families reporting increased capacity.			**Progress:** Data for years after 2001 are not available. OSEP is determining mechanisms to collect these data starting in 2006-2007. **Explanation:** Data for 1998 and 2001 were obtained from the IDEA National Early Intervention Study (NEILS). The IDEA Early Childhood Outcomes Center is developing data collection methods for future data collections. The target for 2013 is 100 percent.	**Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2006 - 200 **Data Available:** September 2007 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	72			
2000	73	67		
2001	73			
2002		80		
2003		80		
2004		80		
2005		80		
2006		80		
2007		80		
2008		83		
2009		87		

Objective 8.2 of 2: All infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families will receive early intervention services in natural environments that meet their individual needs.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: INFANTS SERVED: The numbers if States that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under the age of 1 through Part C will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of States serving at least 1 percent			**Progress:** As of 9/24/04, OSEP is awaiting U.S. Census population data to calculate this measure.	**Additional Source Information:** IDEA section 618 State-reported data and U.S. Census data. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** September 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	21			
2002	23			
2003				
2004		37		
2005		43		
2006		48		
2007		54		
2008		57		

Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: INFANTS AND TODDLERS SERVED: The number of States that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age2, through Part C will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of States serving at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers birth through age two			**Progress:** As of 9/30 04, OSEP is awaiting U.S. Census data to calculate this measure.	**Additional Source Information:** Part B, section 619 State-reported data and U.S. Census data. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** September 2005
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	25			
2002	28			
2003		35		
2004		40		

2005		45		**Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
2006		50		
2007		55		
2008		57		

Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: 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, will increase

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, will increase			**Progress:** The number of infants and toddlers receiving services in settings with typically developing peers increased from 82 percent in 2001-2002 to 83 percent in 2002-2003, exceeding the target of 78 percent.	**Additional Source Information:** IDEA section 619 State-reported data **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** September 2005 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1996	56			
1997	58			
1998	63			
1999	67			
2000	73	67		
2001	76	69		
2002	82	71		
2003	83	78		
2004		79		
2005		83		
2006		84		
2007		85		
2008		86		
2009		87		

IDEA: Special Education Grants to States – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.027 - Special Education_Grants to States

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 3: All children with disabilities have access to the general curriculum and assessments, with appropriate accommodations, supports, and services, consistent with high standards.

Indicator 8.1.1 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			**Progress:** The percentage of children served in regular education classrooms at least 80 percent of the day increased from 48 percent in 2002-2003 to 50 percent in 2003-2004, exceeding the target of 48 percent. **Explanation:** No target is provided for future years because the indicator is being revised to more accurately measure the number of children with disabilities who are served outside of the regular classroom. Targets for the new indicator will be included in the FY 2005 Performance Plan.	**Additional Source Information:** 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:** 2004 - 2005 **Data Available:** September 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
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	48		
2004	50	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 -		

Indicator 8.1.2 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

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	6	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 8.2 of 3: Secondary school students with disabilities receive the support they need to complete high school prepared for postsecondary education or employment.

Indicator 8.2.1 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					**Progress:** In 2003 the data collection methodology for this measure was revised to remove from the numerator the category of students who moved and whose services were not known to continue. This resulted in about a 10 percentage point change in the trend line for both graduation and dropout data. In subsequent performance plans, the targets for 2003 and later years were revised to account for this change. **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	**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:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** September 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Graduation	Drop out	Graduation	Drop out		
1996	42	47				
1997	43	46				
1998	45	44				
1999	47	42	56	31		
2000	46	42	57	30		
2001	48	41	59	27		
2002	51	38	60	26		

2003	52	34	57	29	produce a drop in desired results at first, before instruction catches up to standards.	
2004			57	29		

Objective 8.3 of 3: States are addressing their needs for professional development consistent with their comprehensive system of personnel development (cspd).

Indicator 8.3.1 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					**Progress:** The number of States meeting the 90 percent threshold for teachers of children ages 6-21 decreased from 33 in 2002 to 30 in 2003. **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 multi-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.	**Additional Source Information:** State reported data required under IDEA. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** September 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
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	32	30	36	37		
2004			36	37		

IDEA: Special Education Parent Information Centers – 2004

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 2: Programs respond to critical needs of children with disabilities 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. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	90			
2002	85.40	75		
2003	78	75		
2004		75		
2005		75		
2006		75		
2007		75		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Projects Communicate appropriately and products are used for children with disabilities and their families.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: 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.			**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**		
2001	75			
2002		75		
2003		75		
2004		75		
2005		75		
2006		75		
2007		75		

IDEA: Special Education Personnel Preparation – 2004

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 disabilities 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. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	85	75		
2002	69.80	75		
2003	74.40	75		
2004		75		
2005		75		
2006		75		
2007		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 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.	**Additional Source Information:** Project information. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	27			
2002	73.60	35		
2003		45		
2004		55		
2005		65		
2006		75		
2007		75		

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

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: 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.			**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. **Limitations:** Data not collected for 2002-2004. **Improvements:** Data not collected for 2002-2004.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	55			
2001	55			
2002		65		
2003		75		
2004		70		
2005		75		
2006		75		
2007		75		

IDEA: Special Education Preschool Grants – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.173 - Special Education_Preschool Grants

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 1: 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			**Progress:** According to State-reported data on preschool children with disabilities, the percentage of children receiving services in inclusive settings decreased from 38 percent in 2002-2003 to 37 percent in 2003-2004. **Explanation:** Targets for future years will be included in the FY 2005 Performance Plan with the revised indicator and data collection assumptions.	**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:** 2004 - 2005 **Data Available:** September 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Improvements:** OSEP is
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	41			
2000	40			
2001	39			
2002	40	39		
2003	38	40		
2004	37	40		

		planning to improve the accuracy of the data collection under this measure. The current data collection identifies where a child receives special education services, not where a child spends most of his time.

IDEA: Special Education State Improvement – 2004

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 disabilities 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. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	80			
2002	80.50	75		
2003	80.50	75		
2004		75		
2005		75		
2006		75		
2007		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 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.	**Additional Source Information:** Project information. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	66			
2002	100	70		
2003		75		
2004		75		
2005		75		
2006		75		
2007		75		

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

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: 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.			**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. **Limitations:** Data not collected for 2002-2004.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	60			
2002		65		
2003		75		
2004		75		
2005		75		
2006		75		
2007		75		

IDEA: Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination – 2004

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 disabilities 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. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	75			
2002	67.40	75		
2003	60.50	75		
2004		75		
2005		75		
2006		75		
2007		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 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	**Additional Source Information:** Project information. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	33			
2002	66.70	35		
2003		45		
2004		55		
2005		65		
2006		75		
2007		75		

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.			**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. **Limitations:** Data not collected for 2002-2004.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	67			
2000	59			
2001	69			
2002		75		
2003		75		
2004		75		
2005		75		
2006		75		
2007		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 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Project information is reviewed by a panel consisting of independent, third party reviewers who are experts in the program content and trained in the review procedures. The panel results are analyzed by experts in evaluation research.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	100			
2001	71			
2002		75		
2003		75		
2004		75		
2006		75		
2007		75		

IDEA: Special Education Technology and Media Services – 2004

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 disabilities 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. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Technology (from T&M)	Media (from T&M)	Technology (from T&M)	Media (from T&M)		
2001	79	82				
2002	73.80	70	75	75		
2003	71.40	65	75	75		
2004			75	75		
2005			75	75		
2006			75	75		
2007			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 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.	**Additional Source Information:** Project information. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	50			
2000	50			
2001	16			
2002		25		
2003		35		
2004		45		
2005		55		
2006		65		
2007		75		

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.			**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. **Limitations:** Data for 2002-2004 were not collected.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	78			
1999		89		
2000	47			
2001	62			
2002		65		
2003		75		
2004		75		
2005		75		
2006		75		
2007		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 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Project information is reviewed by a panel consisting of independent, third party reviewers who are experts in the program content and trained in the review procedures. The panel results are analyzed by experts in evaluation research.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	40			
2001	80			
2002		75		
2003		75		
2004		75		
2005		75		
2006		75		
2007		75		

MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths – 2004

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 will increase.

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.			**Progress:** This indicator is being replaced in 2005 with a measure more closely aligned with NCLB. **Explanation:** Status Closed	**Frequency:** Other. **Data Available:** November 2007 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003		999		
2004		999		

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

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.	**Progress:** FY 2003 data were not collected. **Explanation:** There was a one-time collection in 2002 which serves as the baseline. Homeless students are required under NCLB to be included in statewide assessments. The performance targets for outyears are set at a 5% increase to the baseline. Although the program's 2003 target was to set a baseline, no data were collection and the program determine to use the 2002 data as the baseline	**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 Data collected by state assessments are validated by the individual state's data quality standards procedures.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	20	
2003		999
2004		21

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: State assessment achievement: Percentage of homeless students meeting or exceeding state 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.	**Progress:** FY 2003 data were not collected. Program determined that 2002 will be used as baseline. **Explanation:** This indicator reflects a new statutory requirement. Homeless students are required under NCLB to be included in statewide assessments. The performance targets for outyears are set at a 5% increase to the baseline. The validity of outyear targets will be re-examined following the determination of the baseline. Although the program's 2003 target was to set a baseline, no data were collection and the program determine to use the 2002 data as the baseline	**Additional Source Information:** 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:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** November 2004 **Limitations:** Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the LEA level by schools that receive McKinney-Vento subgrants.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	53	
2003		999
2004		56

VTEA: Occupational and Employment Information – 2004

Program Goal: To provide support to career guidance and academic counseling programs.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase access to and improve career and academic guidance and counseling services.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Provide Quality Resources: Increasing numbers of customers will receive technical assistance by their states on the availability and use of America's Career Resource Network career development resources, and increasing numbers of career development products will be disseminated to customers through America's Career Resource Network.

Targets and Performance Data

Number of customers receiving technical assistance and number of products disseminated to customers (students, parents, teachers, counselors, administrators, and others) through America's Career Resource Network.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Number of Customers	Number of Products	Number of Customers	Number of Products
2001	25,910	8,540,106	20,000	8,000,000
2002	39,404	5,573,349		
2003	55,081	8,041,241		
2004	72,730	8,284,464	20,000	8,527,748

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: We provided a low estimate for the number of products to be disseminated to customers in the first year of the Career Resource Network because we thought only a few states would be able to fully implement their programs. However, more States than anticipated implemented programs and disseminated more products than expected.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: America's Career Resource Network Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Semi-Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: September 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by states on an OMB-approved report form

Limitations: The number of products is a duplicated count; that is, it accounts for multiple copies of the same product being disseminated to one or more customers.

VTEA: Vocational Education National Programs – 2004

Program Goal: Increase access to and improve programs at the high school, and community and technical college levels that raise academic achievement, strengthen workforce preparation, promote economic development and lifelong learning.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Increase the use of rigorous research findings to inform program direction and improve state and local practices, through the identification of research-based education practices and communicating what works to practitioners, parents and policy makers.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Conduct quality research: By 2004, all research studies conducted by the National Center for Research in Career and Technical education will represent rigorous design as defined by the Department's definition of evidence based research.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of research studies with rigorous designs			**Explanation:** Baseline and targets established in 2002, progress toward future targets likely. Studies of the center are being designed in alignment with the Department's increased emphasis on rigorous methodology and scientifically-based approaches. The center will be judged successful when the results of its research are rapidly and readily available and feed, as appropriate, into educational practice, policy development or use by the private sector, and judged by an independent, external peer review panel.	**Additional Source Information:** Independent review panel assessments. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** January 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	71			
2003	83			
2004		100		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Disseminate quality research: BY 2004, increasing numbers of customers will be using the products and services of the National Centers for Research and Dissemination in Career and Technical Education.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Customers receiving electronic and print materials or information from the Centers

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Electronic	Print	Total	Electronic	Print	Total
2000	273,546	273,546				
2001	1,569,999	131,254	1,701,253			
2002	3,004,898	219,729	3,224,627			
2003	6,054,535	13,567	6,068,102			
2004				2,300,000	100,000	2,400,000

Explanation: Baseline established; progress toward future target likely. Actual performance for 2001 includes only information disseminated through the Center's web site since studies begun under the current Center will not yield publishable results in print from until 2001. Progress has been substantial given the Department's increased emphasis on disseminating high quality research products and related services through the newly funded National Research Centers.

Additional Source Information: National Centers Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2004
Data Available: January 2005
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: The number of customers does not represent an unduplicated count of individuals receiving information through the Centers.

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Promote quality research: By 2004, the percentage of customers who are "very satisfied" with products and services received from the National Center for Research and Dissemination in Career and Technical Education will be at least 85%.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Customers responding to a customer satisfaction survey indicated that they were "very satisfied" with the products and services received from the Center.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Percent of customers	Percent of customers
2001	85	
2002	80	

Explanation: The Center has a program improvement and quality assurance process that enable it to address the needs of the field, and results in high customer satisfaction.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2004
Data Available: January 2005
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

2003	80	
2004		85

Objective 8.2 of 2: Improve and expand the use of accountability systems and effective program strategies at the high school and postsecondary levels that promotes student achievement, performance and successful transition.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: By fall, 2004, all states will have improved, high quality data systems that include information from all school systems, school districts and community colleges.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of states			**Explanation:** Approximately 40% of states currently have full data collection capability for high school and postsecondary reporting. Performance reporting relies on state accountability reports, as specified in the 1998 Perkins Act. States started using new measures, negotiated in 1999-2000 to report 2000-01. Although state data is collected annually, local data are not received by the states until 4-6 months after completion of the school year, resulting in a substantial lag in receiving and being able to use data for performance. States are at different levels of expertise and capacity in their ability to address data and reporting requirements, and to use data for program improvement. The Data quality Initiative will streamline data collection and verification, and promote greater consistency in measurement and reporting approaches.	**Additional Source Information:** State Combined Annual Performance Reports - Data and Narrative **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** February 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. OVAE verified data by internal electronic consistency via instrumentation checks, experts staff analysis, and requiring data by state directors. State data is also checked independently by ED/OVAE during on-site monitoring and state audit reviews.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Percentage of Performance	Percentage of Target		
2001	92			
2002	97			
2003	98			
2004		100		

VTEA: Vocational Education State Grants and Tech-Prep Education State Grants – 2004

CFDA Number: 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 6: 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			**Explanation:** While states use different strategies for measuring academic attainment, they all use students (concentrators) as the unit of analysis and identify the percentage of students meeting state established standards. Performance data developed by states is reported to OVAE 90 days after termination of the grant, i.e., the 2003 data was reported by December 31, 2003.	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports. **Additional Source Information:** State performance is reported in the Consolidated Annual Performance, Accountability, and Financial Status Report for State-Administered Vocational Education Programs.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	33			
1999	45			
2000	44			
2001	70			
2002	71	72		
2003	75	74		
2004		76		

		Frequency: Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. States are asked to attest to their data quality at the time of their submissions. **Limitations:** There is no interstate comparability. **Improvements:** ED will continue to provide technical assistance to the states to improve their program quality.

Objective 8.2 of 6: Ensure that secondary and postsecondary concentrators, including special populations, will achieve high levels of proficiency in core curriculum areas, including mathematics, science, and English.

Indicator 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			**Progress:** Considerable progress was made by states toward achieving the secondary performance target, although they fell just short. **Explanation:** While states use	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** 1830-0503 Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.
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	64	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	77	78
2004		80

different strategies for measuring skill proficiencies, they all use students (concentrators) as the unit of analysis and identify the percentage of students meeting state established standards. Performance data developed by states is reported to OVAE 90 days after termination of the grant, i.e., the 2003 data was reported by December 31, 2003.

Additional Source Information: State performance data are reported in the Consolidated Annual Performance, Accountability and Financial Status Report For State-Administered Vocational Education Programs.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: March 2005
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
States are asked to attest to their data quality at the time of their submissions.

Limitations: There is no interstate comparability.

Improvements: ED will continue to provide technical assistance to the states to improve their program quality.

Objective 8.3 of 6: 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 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		

Progress: The states performance did not meet the performance target, although the performance held steady.

Explanation: States used various measurement approaches for postsecondary completion and placement, such as, UI wage record exchanges, administrative record exchanges and surveys to indicate completion and placement performance. Performance data developed by states is reported to OVAE 90 days after termination of the grant, i.e., the 2003 data was reported by December 31, 2003.

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

Additional Source Information: State performance data are reported in the Consolidated Annual Performance, Accountability, and Financial Status Report For State-Administered Vocational Education Programs.

2002	84	84	85	85
2003	84	84	86	86
2004			88	87

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: April 2005
Validated By: No Formal Verification. States are asked to attest to their data quality at the time of their submissions.

Limitations: There is no interstate comparability.

Improvements: ED will continue to provide technical assistance to the states to improve their program 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	41	83	42	85
2004			45	86

Progress: The states performance held steady on postsecondary degree completion, although performance dropped for placement.

Explanation: States used various measurement approaches for postsecondary completion and placement, such as, UI wage record exchanges, administrative record exchanges and surveys to indicate completion and placement performance. Performance data developed by states is reported to OVAE 90 days after termination of the grant, i.e., the 2003 data was reported by December 31, 2003.

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

Additional Source Information: State performance was reported in the Consolidated Annual Performance, Accountability, and Financial Status Report For State-Administered Vocational Education Programs.

		Frequency: Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. States are asked to attest to their data quality at the time of their submissions. **Limitations:** There is no interstate comparability. **Improvements:** ED will continue to provide technical assistance to the states to improve their program quality.

Objective 8.4 of 6: Vocational Education State Grants - Native Hawaiian Vocational and Technical Education Program

Indicator 8.4.1 of 2: An increasing number of vocational education students will attain high school diplomas.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of vocational students attaining high school diplomas			**Explanation:** The grantee has been provided with the indicators and are collecting data now that will be reported with the performance report due October 2003. The 2003 data will be used as baseline data for establishing performance targets. The performance targets for 2004 and 2005 are set at an annual 1% increase to the baseline.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** November 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003				
2004		999		
2005		999		

Indicator 8.4.2 of 2: An increasing number of vocational students will become employed, enter postsecondary or advanced programs, or enter military service.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of vocational students who obtained employment.			**Explanation:** The grantee has been provided with the indicators and are collecting data now that will be reported with the performance report due October 2003. The 2003 data will be used as baseline data for establishing performance targets. The performance targets for 2004 and 2005 are set at an annual 1% increase to the baseline.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** November 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003				
2004		999		
2005		999		
Number of students entering postsecondary or advanced programs.				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003				
2004		999		

2005		999

Number of students entering military service.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		
2004		999
2005		999

Objective 8.5 of 6: Vocational Education State Grants—Pacific Vocational Education Improvement Program

Indicator 8.5.1 of 2: An increasing number of vocational students will obtain a high school diploma.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Frequency: Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Percentage of vocational students obtaining a high school diploma.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	87.20	
2004		89
2005		90

Indicator 8.5.2 of 2: An increasing number of professional development opportunities will be provided to vocational education teachers in the Pacific outlying areas each year.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Explanation: Significantly more teachers received professional development due to the grantees' emphasis on meeting the Administration's and Department's	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Percent of vocational education teachers in Pacific outlying areas offered professional development.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002		
2003	56	

2004		5	priorities surrounding teacher quality.	
2005		35		

Objective 8.6 of 6: Vocational Education State Grants - Native American Vocational and Technical Education

Indicator 8.6.1 of 2: Improved enrollment rate: An increasing number of students will enroll in NAVTEP projects that offer vocational and technical education programs

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Students enrolled in NAVTEP projects.			**Progress:** The number of Native American and Alaskan Native students in NAVTEP programs continued to increase in 2003. **Explanation:** The new indicator reflects the total number of students served in the NAVTEP rather than only those in community colleges.	**Additional Source Information:** Program performance reports] **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Data is self-reported by grantee through a performance, statistical and evaluation report. **Improvements:** Data will be checked by staff during on-site monitoring of projects. ED will continue to request increased enrollment numbers during clarification conferences with grantees for new and continuation awards.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	6,067			
2003	6,381			
2004		6,400		
2005		6,500		

Indicator 8.6.2 of 2: An increasing percentage of Native American and Alaska Native students in the NAVTEP will have positive outcomes in one or more of the following categories: attaining a vocational and technical education postsecondary certificate or degree, or placement in employment or the military services.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of NAVTEP students attaining a certificate or degree.			**Progress:** The number of students, enrolled in NAVTEP projects, who attained a certificate, earned a degree or were placed in employment or joined the military, continued to increased in 2003.	**Additional Source Information:** Grantee performance, statistical and evaluation reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. ED program officers review data through NAVTEP grantee performance, statistical and evaluation reports. **Limitations:** Data is self-reported by grantee through a performance, statistical and evaluation report.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	664			
2003	728			
2004		725		
2005		761		
Number of NAVTEP students placed in employment or military services				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	1,606			
2003	1,690			
2004		1,715		
2005		1,800		

Goal 3

ESEA: Character Education – 2004

CFDA Numbers: 84.215S - Partnerships in Character Education Program
84.215V - .

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 target for 2003 was exceeded. **Explanation:** Out of an aggregate total of 34 goals reported by 5 grantees, 65% (n=22) were fully met and 35% (n=12) were partially met. N.B.: The actual performance measure used for 2003 is the following: "The percentage of measurable goals that were partially or fully met by the oldest cohort (excepting no-cost extensions) submitting a performance report in the performance year." Goal completion is considered partial when the grantee has made significant progress in reaching their goal without actually meeting the performance target. Requirements for measuring progress toward goals have been incorporated into applications for Character Education Program direct grants.	**Additional Source Information:** Source: Grantee performance reports. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** April 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003	100	75		
2004		80		
2005		85		

ESEA: Close-Up Fellowships – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.927A - Close-Up Fellowship Program

Program Goal: To improve participants' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding the three branches of government.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Make progress toward full financial independence from federal funding

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Increased private funding: An increasing amount of grantees' funding that is allocated for teachers and economically disadvantaged students will come from non-Federal sources.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Amount of funding (in dollars)			**Explanation:** Data for 2003 is not available, because the indicator was dropped then reinstated in the Fall of fiscal year 2003. The next available data will be reported in 2004.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual audit and grantee's analysis of Internal financial documents, 2001. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. Data from audited program records.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	865,000			
2000		906,000		
2001	1,047,340	955,000		
2002	1,137,975			
2004		970,000		

ESEA: Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.215Y - .

Program Goal: To develop innovative culturally based educational programs, cultural exchanges and internships and apprentice programs to assist Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and children and families of Massachusetts linked by history and tradition, to learn about their shared culture and tradition.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Grantees will demonstrate increased capacity to produce and disseminate educational programs (including internships) that highlight the historical trading and whaling patterns and cultural themes among partner museums and the communities they serve (including schools and other institutions).

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Number/percent of shared products, resources (including collections) and technical staff exchanges that result in new or enhanced capabilities among partner institutions that address programmatic goals.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number/ percentage of partnership exchanges.			**Explanation:** The performance targets for FY 2004 and 2005 are set at an annual 5% increase to the baseline.	**Additional Source Information:** Performance Reports (Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners) **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Limitations:** Data is self-reported by grantee.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003				
2004		999		
2005		999		
Number of new partner capabilities.				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003				
2004		999		

2005		999

Number/ percent of individual participants involved in educational and cultural enrichment activities (including online participants).

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		
2004		999
2005		999

Number/ percentage of schools, community groups, and family programs involved in educational and cultural enrichment activities.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		
2004		999
2005		999

Number/ percent of participants in a culturally based youth internship program involving career awareness, leadership and job skills development.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		
2004		999
2005		999

ESEA : Safe and Drug-Free Schools Mentoring Program and Other National Programs – 2004

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 8.2 of 2: Increase the percentage of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities grantees that achieve results-based goals.

Indicator 8.2.1 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:** All performance targets were exceeded in years 2001, 2002, and 2003. **Explanation:** In 2002, out of an aggregate total of 43 goals reported by 17 grantees, 18.6% (n=8) were fully met, 67.4% (n=29) were partially met, and 14% (n=6) were not met. In 2003, out of an aggregate total of 50 goals reported by 13 grantees, 52% (n=26) were fully met, 44% (n=22) were partially met, and 4% (n=2) were not met. N.B.: The actual performance measure used for 2002 and 2003 is the following: "The percentage of measurable goals that were partially or fully met by the oldest cohort (excepting no-cost extensions) submitting a performance report in the performance year." Goal completion is considered	**Additional Source Information:** Source: Grantee performance reports. Individual National Programs represented in data for years 2002 and 2003 are the following: The Challenge and the Grant Competition to Prevent High-Risk Drinking and Violent Behavior Among College Students. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** April 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** Data for the following National programs
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	84	75		
2002	86	85		
2003	96	85		
2004		85		
2005		85		

	partial when the grantee has made significant progress in reaching their goal without actually meeting the performance target. All National Programs discretionary grantees are required to report progress on goals and objectives in year-end performance reports.	are not available at this time: Mentoring, Discretionary Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse, and Drug Prevention and School Safety Program Coordinators.

Indicator 8.2.2 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.	**Progress:** The performance target for 2003 was exceeded. **Explanation:** In 2003, out of an aggregate total of 121 goals reported by 22 grantees, 33.9% (n=41) were fully met, 65.3% (n=79) were partially met, and 0.8% (n=1) were not met. N.B.: The actual performance measure used for 2003 is the following: "The percentage of measurable goals that were partially or fully met by the oldest cohort (excepting no-cost extensions) submitting a performance report in the performance year." Goal completion is considered partial when the grantee has made significant progress in reaching its goal without actually meeting the performance target. Requirements for measuring progress toward goals and objectives have been incorporated into all applications for Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grants.	**Additional Source Information:** Source: Grantee performance reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** April 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	99.20	75
2004		80
2005		85

Goal 4

ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination – 2004

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.			**Explanation:** The scores of one reviewer were extreme outliers - greater than 3.8 standard deviations below the average ratings of the other 12 reviewers. If these scores were removed, the percentage of new projects deemed to be of high quality would be 70 percent. In the future, if the average ratings of a reviewer constitute extreme outliers, these scores will be removed.	**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. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** September 2004 Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel. Inclusion of only eminent senior scientists who
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	36			
2002	50	50		
2003	70	65		
2004	60	80		
2005		95		

		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 or 2004.	**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. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 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	0	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.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	32	32
2002	100	75
2003	97	75
2004	90	75
2005		75

Progress: This is the third year that targets have been exceeded.

Additional Source Information: IES researchers evaluate all newly funded research and evaluation proposals 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 for 2002-2005 recognizes that some high quality research addressing causal questions will not be able to employ randomized experimental designs.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: September 2004
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 or 2004.	**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. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 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
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	100	75		
2003	0	75		
2004	0	75		
2005		75		

		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.				**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. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** September 2004 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	60	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.	**Explanation:** Next data collection is scheduled for 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** Survey of education decision-makers and policymakers. Data 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.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	42	42
2005		66

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.			**Progress:** Actual hits were more than double the target level.	**Additional Source Information:** What Works Clearinghouse. Baseline data for number of annual hits is FY 2003. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** September 2004 Web-based program will automatically count hits on web site.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003	1,522,922	1,000,000		
2004	4,249,668	2,000,000		

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 responded to the question, " Would they recommend the WWC web site to a colleague or friend" (by checking "agree" or "strongly agree").	**Progress:** Note that about two-thirds of respondents found the WWC website useful in 2004 even though the WWC began releasing its reports only during the last 3 months of fiscal year 2004. The number of reports released at this stage is small though growing. **Explanation:** Note that the performance measure/indicator being tracked was changed in July 2003 to the following: The percentage of WWC website users surveyed randomly who responded to the following statement, 'Evidence provided on the WWC website is useful in making decisions about education programs and practices," by checking "agree" or "strongly agree".	**Additional Source Information:** What Works Clearinghouse. Baseline data for the indicator, as revised July 2003, is FY2004 actual. Subsequent targets will be adjusted. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** September 2004

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	67	60
2005		70

ESRA: Statistics – 2004

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 1: Provide 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

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
2004	90	78	90	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

Progress: 8.1.1 Publications-Ninety percent of NCES customers were satisfied or very satisfied with NCES publications in terms of comprehensiveness and utility. These same customers were slightly less satisfied with the timeliness of these publications. We did not meet our goal of 90% for timeliness. Data files-Eighty-eight and seventy eight percent of NCES customers were satisfied with the comprehensiveness and timeliness of data files. This was slightly below our target of 90%. Services-satisfaction with overall NCES services exceeded our target with a 92 % customer satisfaction rate. Customer satisfaction with the timeliness of

Additional Source Information: NCES Customer Satisfaction Survey.

Frequency: Biennially.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: August 2004
Validated By: NCES. Data will be validated by using NCES review procedures and by applying NCES statistical standards.

2001	88	66	90	90
2004	88	78	90	90

overall service was slightly below the target at 84 %.

Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES services

Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness
1997		89		
1999	93	93	85	85
2001	83	88	90	90
2004	92	84	90	90

IDEA: Special Education Research and Innovation – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.324 - Special Education_Research and Innovation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

Program Goal: To produce and advance the use of knowledge to improve services provided under IDEA and results for children with disabilities.

Objective 8.1 of 3: Improve the quality of research and development projects

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: HIGH QUALITY PROJECTS: By 2013, all research and development projects will be deemed to be of high quality

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
RESEARCH -- Percentage of high quality projects				**Source:** Non-NCES Survey/Research **Collecting Agency:** OSERS/OSEP. **Survey/Research Report Title:** Independent Annual Evaluation of IDEA Part D.. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	73			
2003				
2004		75		
2005		82		
2006		84		
2007		86		
2008		88		
2009		90		
MODELS -- Percentage of high quality projects				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	57			

2003		
2004		75
2005		72
2006		73
2007		74
2008		77
2009		80

OUTREACH -- Percentage of high quality projects

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	73	
2003		
2004		65
2005		57
2006		58
2007		61
2008		68
2009		68

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: RANDOMIZED DESIGNS: By 2013, all projects that address causal questions will employ randomized experimental designs

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of employ randomized experimental designs

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	50	
2003		

Source: ED Evaluation
Evaluation: Other.

Additional Source Information: Department/IES review of funded research

2004		69
2005		73
2006		76
2007		79
2008		83
2009		86

projects

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

Limitations: Awaiting IES review of OSEP research projects (10/04)

Objective 8.2 of 3: Increase the relevance of research and development projects to the needs of children with disabilities

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: RELEVANCE JUDGED BY SCIENTISTS: By 2013, scientists will judge all research and development projects to be of high relevance to the needs of children with disabilities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
ALL PROJECTS -- percent of all R&D projects judged by scientists to be of high relevance			**Progress:** This is a new indicator. Baseline data will be obtained in 2005. The target for 2013 is 100 percent of projects deemed to be of high relevance by scientists.	**Source:** ED Evaluation **Evaluation:** Other. **Additional Source Information:** Independent evaluation of funded projects **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2005		999		
LONG-TERM STRATEGIES -- Of projects that address the long-term program strategies, the percent judged by scientists to be of high relevance				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2005		999		

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: RELEVANCE JUDGED BY STAKEHOLDERS: By 2013, stakeholders will judge all research and development projects to be of high relevance to the needs of children with disabilities.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
ALL PROJECTS -- percent of all R&D projects judged by stakeholders to be of high relevance **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2005** /	**Progress:** Targets for this indicator will be set in 2004 after baseline data are obtained. The target for 2013 is 100 percent of projects deemed to be of high relevance by stakeholders.	**Source:** ED Evaluation **Evaluation:** Other. **Additional Source Information:** Independent evaluation of program **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 - 2005 **Data Available:** September 2005 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies.
LONG-TERM STRATEGIES -- Of projects that address the long-term program strategies the percent judged by stakeholders to be of high relevance. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2005** /		

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005		999

Objective 8.3 of 3: Produce high quality products and communicate information for appropriate audiences.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: HIGH QUALITY PRODUCTS: By 2013, the percentage of projects that produce high quality products appropriate for the target audience will increase to 95 percent (all projects) and 85 percent (projects addressing long-term strategies).

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
AL PROJECTS. Percent of all R&D projects that produce high quality products for a target audience. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2004** /	**Explanation:** By 2013, 95 percent of all projects, and 85 percent of projects addressing long-term strategies, will produce high quality products appropriate for target audience.	**Source:** ED Evaluation **Evaluation:** Other. **Additional Source Information:** Independent annual evaluation of program **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies.
PROJECTS ADDRESSING STRATEGIES. Of R&D projects addressing long-term strategies (listed under indicator 8.2.2), percent that produce high quality products appropriate for target audience **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2005** / 999		

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: PUBLISHED FINDINGS: By 2013, the percentage of research projects that have findings published in peer-refereed journals will increase to 90 percent (all projects) and 85 percent (projects addressing long-term strategies).

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
- No Targets And Performance Data -		**Limitations:** Data not collected for 2002, 2003, or 2004.

RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research – 2004

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 3: 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			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of grantee research and development activity rated 4 or greater in appropriateness of study designs, the rigor with which accepted standards of scientific and/or engineering methods are applied, and the degree to which the research and development activity builds on and contributes to the level of knowledge in the field, based on a 5-point Likert-type scale.			**Progress:** To date, only 20 of the 47 formative reviews slated for calendar 2004 have been conducted, and these were focused exclusively on TBI and Burn Model Systems projects. The remaining reviews involve 13 RERCs and 14 RRTCs and are planned for the Fall of 04. Preliminary data from the first set of reviews indicate that only 53% of the Model Systems projects were deemed by constituent reviewers to be conducting "high-quality" research and demonstration projects. Actual performance on this measure for 2004 will be based on all 47 formative reviews conducted in calendar year 2004 and will be available in March 2005. **Explanation:** In 2004 NIDRR changed the assessment of this measure from	**Additional Source Information:** Program review-type meetings (i.e., reverse site-visits) with expert panels representing the following key stakeholder groups: researchers and other scientists, practitioners, service providers, policy analysts, industry representatives, and individuals with disabilities. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Improvements:** Extensive efforts have been made to
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	54	65		
2003	67	70		
2004		70		
2005		75		
2006		75		
2007		80		

	summative review, which is conducted late in a five-year funding cycle, to formative review, which is typically conducted during the first 15-18 months. This change was made in anticipation of replacing summative review of individual centers with a more comprehensive portfolio assessment process and to better align review of scientific rigor to a stage in the funding cycle when recommendations can be acted upon more readily. Scores on this measure are based on constituent reviewers' ratings of “good to excellent” on six indicators of scientific rigor taken from NIDRR's “centers of excellence” model. The specific areas rated include: levels and appropriateness of expertise and history of relevant publications of investigators; evidence conducting innovative program of basic or applied R&D, use of appropriate and rigorous methods, appropriateness of research tools, adequacy of sample size, and potential contribution to advancement of knowledge or product development.	ensure that centers being rated and experts serving as reviewers are conversant with the evidence based and outcomes oriented approaches to the review process.

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.	**Progress:** This is a new measure that was added in 2004 in anticipation of the establishment of NIDRR's new portfolio assessment process based on expert panels. Due to delays in implementing the new panels, the measure was revised in the FY 2005PM plan and re-numbered 7.1.1 to give the agency more time to design the portfolio assessment process, which will replace the current system of summative program reviews. The next data collection period for measure 7.1.1 will be 2005 with results available in 2006. **Explanation:** In 2004 and 2005 NIDRR will develop and test strategies for deriving this measure using information from the web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and preliminary data from the initial round of portfolio review panels. A baseline will be established in 2007 using data from the previous two years.	**Additional Source Information:** Triangulation of data from the web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and the planned Portfolio Review Expert Panels. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2005 **Data Available:** February 2006 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999

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 average number of publications per award based on NIDRR-funded research and development activities in refereed journals.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	2.74	
2003	2.84	8
2004		5
2005		5
2006		10
2007		10

Progress: The average number of peer-reviewed journal articles published in calendar 2003 by NIDRR-funded RRTCs, RERCs, and Model Systems is 2.84 per award. Although this represents a slight increase over the previous year's average of 2.74, it falls significantly short of the original performance target, which was determined to be ill-founded. In the 2005PM plan the performance target for 2002 was converted to Baseline to give NIDRR time to work out significant data management problems associated with the web-based annual project performance reporting system (APPR) and to establish a trend line. The data problems were resolved in July 2004 allowing NIDRR to report accurate and verifiable averages for both 2002 and 2003 publications for the three program funding mechanisms required to provide citation data in the existing APPR. NOTE: To capture all the refereed publications that are published in a given calendar year, but which may not have come out in time to be included in the APPR for that year, the data collection period must span two years of performance reporting (i.e., data on 2004 publications will be based on both the 2004 and 2005 APPRs and will be available in September 2005).

Source: Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report**

Program: NIDRR.
Contractor: Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.

Additional Source Information: The web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2004 - 2005
Data Available: September 2005
The peer-reviewed status of self-reported journal articles cited in the APPR system by individual grantees are verified by the National Education Library based on the International Scientific Index.

Limitations: (1) Data on peer reviewed publications are based on self-reported citations by grantees in the web-based annual project and performance reporting (APPR)

	Explanation: The total number of refereed articles published in 2003 by active centers and projects was 253, ranging from a high of 183 for the SCI, TBI and Burn Models Systems (n=37) to 48 for the RRTCs (n=29) and 22 for the RERCs (n=23). The average number of refereed publications per award also varied from 4.95 for Model Systems to 1.66 for RRTCs and .99 for RERCs. The same ordering was observed for 2002 publications, although the numbers are different. Average peer-reviewed journal articles increased approximately 1.5 for Models Systems (3.48 to 4.95), whereas RRTCs declined by almost the same amount (2.89 to 1.66) and RERCs remained virtually the same (1.1 vs. 99). Variations in this measure by program type are most likely due to differences in the nature of research and demonstration activities conducted (i.e., medical/clinical rehabilitation research for Model Systems vs. psychosocial research for RRTCs, and engineering design and development for RERCs). Whereas, differences over time probably have more to due with variations in the topic and the number of awards funded and terminating in a given year. A new baseline will be set in 2005 using data from 2002-2004 publications.	systems. Concerns have been raised about the potential for over reporting. Methods to independently confirm publications are planned. (2) In the current version of the APPR only three program funding mechanisms are required to report citation data. (3) To date, this measure does not include peer-reviewed journal articles published during the final year of an award. **Improvements:** NIDRR is evaluating methods of assessing productivity that fairly represent all parts of the NIDRR grant portfolio.

Objective 8.2 of 3: 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 undeserved populations			**Progress:** No data are reported for this measure for 2004 because the decision was made to drop it from NIDRR's set of performance measures. **Explanation:** The decision to drop this measure was based on several factors, including: (1) development of NIDRR's new Draft Logic Model and the changing view of the role of "Dissemination' reflected in the model; and (2) plans to conduct a Comprehensive Evaluation of NIDRR's Knowledge Dissemination and Utilization portfolio in 2005, the results of which will be used to inform strategic planning in this area. A new “developmental” measure has been defined under Goal 7 to replace the deleted one, which reflects NIDRR's new strategic goal for the primary outcome arena of “Knowledge Translation and Dissemination” depicted in the Logic Model. This new measure emphasizes the utility of grantee outputs rather than the quality of dissemination plans.	**Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	68	50		
2003	55.50	50		
2004		55		
2005		60		
2006		65		
2007		70		

Objective 8.3 of 3: Ensure Utility of Research Problems and Products to End-Users

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Outcomes-Oriented Measure of Results of R&D Investment: The number of new or improved assistive and universally-designed technologies, devices and systems developed by grantees that are deemed to improve rehabilitation services and outcomes and/or enhance opportunities for full participation, and are successfully transferred to industry for potential commercialization.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of new or improved assistive and universally-designed technologies, devices and systems developed by grantees that are rated "good to excellent" in ability to improve rehabilitation services and outcomes and/or to enhance opportunities for full participation, and are successfully transferred to industry for potential commercialization.	**Progress:** This is a new measure that was added to NIDRR's set of Goal 8 performance measures in the plan for the 2005PM. The wording of the measure was subsequently revised in the 2006PM plan based on recommendations from the PART review, follow up negotiations with the Department's Budget and Strategic Accountability Services, and the development of NIDRR's new Draft Logic Model. **Explanation:** Preliminary data on this measure will be collected from a sampling of NIDRR grantees in the summer of 2005 based on the pilot version of the revised web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) form for 2004-2005. The first official data will be collected from all grantees in the spring and summer of 2005 based on the 2005-2006 performance period and the first official data will be available in November 2006. A baseline will be established in 2007 using both pilot and official data from 2004-2005 and 2005-2006.	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** 1820-0642 Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTCs, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utilization Projects). **Program:** National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research.. **Additional Source Information:** Triangulation of data from the web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and program review-type meetings with expert panels. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2005 - 2006 **Data Available:** November 2006 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004		999
2005		999

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

Goal 5

AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities – 2004

Program Goal: National Programs (Adult Education and Literacy Act) (new-2002) - 2002

Objective 8.1 of 1: To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: The National Reporting System (NRS), that supports performance-based reporting, will be fully implemented in all states to consistently provide high quality learner assessment data.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of States yielding high quality learner assessment data.			**Progress:** Approximately 50% of states currently have assessment policies that yield quality data. **Explanation:** Performance reporting is largely on learner assessment data. The NRS requires greater validity and reliability of this data. OVAE policies are requiring continuous improvement of state level assessment data. States are at various levels of expertise and capacity to collect high quality assessment data.	**Additional Source Information:** State Annual Performance Reports - Data and Narrative **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** March 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Program monitoring and data review and analysis by ED and Data Quality Certification Process. Data will be verified by electronic checks, expert staff analysis, and by requiring confirmation and attestation of data by state directors. State data is also checked independently by ED/OVAE during on-site monitoring and state audit reviews.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	50			
2003	65	75		
2004		95		

		Limitations: Total data quality and full systems development is dependent on investments of staff and resources by states to adopt and adapt the models developed and promoted by ED/OVAE; and supported by the technical assistance and expertise provided by ED.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: By 2004, provide online curriculum, virtual learning resources and professional development to support the use of technology-based instruction in adult education through 9 demonstration labs and field sites, and 1 clearinghouse.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Labs, Field Sites, Clearinghouse

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Actual Performance	Performance Target
2002	3	
2003	9	9
2004		10

Progress: Labs, including a "hands-on" demonstration lab in Washington, DC, are being established, together with nation-wide, program-based field sites. In each site, learners and educators will use and participate in the development of IT-based models for learning, instruction and professional development.

Explanation: While the adult education field has made considerable progress in meeting the variety of skill needs of US adults, less than seven percent of eligible adults are served annually. New instructional strategies and mechanisms are needed to provide greater access to programs and services. By 2003, the 9 labs and field sites will be fully operational. In 2004, the clearinghouse will be operational.

Additional Source Information: Quarterly progress reports and annual reports.

Frequency: Quarterly.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: March 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Electronic monitoring, on-site monitoring; production of materials; professional development offerings/participation.

AEFLA : Adult Education State Grants – 2004

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 acquire 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. The baseline year is 2001. 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 a new standard.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2003 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, OVAE implemented new data
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Percentage of adults	Percentage of adults		
1997	40			
1998	31			
1999	44			
2000	26	40		
2001	36	40		
2002	37	40		
2003	38	41		
2004		42		

		collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review. **Improvements:** OVAE has developed 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	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2003 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** As a third tier recipient of this data, 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, OVAE implemented new data

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	30	
1997	28	
1998	28	
1999	49	
2000	20	40
2001	31	40
2002	34	42
2003	36	44

2004		45	validation of English proficiency through standardized assessment. New targets reflect new standard.	collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review. **Improvements:** OVAE has developed 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 a change to the indicator, new performance benchmark targets have been established. The baseline year is 2001. The performance data reflect the % 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:** 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2003 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** As a third tier recipient of this data, the 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, OVAE implemented new data collection protocols,
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Percent of adults	Percent of adults		
1996	36			
1997	37			
1998	33			
1999	34			
2000	34	40		
2001	33	40		
2002	42	40		
2003	44	41		
2004		42		

		including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting. **Improvements:** OVAE has developed 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
	Explanation: Because of the change to the indicator, new performance benchmarks/targets have been established. The baseline year is 2001. 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:** 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2003 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** As a third tier recipient of this data, 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, OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection

Percentage of adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults	Number of adults	Percentage of adults
1996	175,255			
1997	178,520			
1998	158,167			
1999	148,803			
2000	161,650		300,000	
2001		25		
2002		30		25
2003		30		26
2004				27

		methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and a data quality review. **Improvements:** OVAE has developed 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		37
2004				38

Explanation: Because of the change to the indicator, new performance benchmark targets have been established. The baseline year is 2001. 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: 2004
Data Available: March 2005
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
The 2003 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: As a third tier recipient of this data, 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, OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards

		for automated data reporting and a data quality review. **Improvements:** OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy – 2004

Program Goal: To provide the literacy field and related fields with the knowledge, resources, infrastructure, and leadership necessary to improve the quality of basic skills instruction and the literacy achievement of children, youth and adults

Objective 8.1 of 1: Translate findings from scientifically based or the most rigorous research available into useful information and products for practitioners

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Research to Practice: Translate findings from scientifically based or the most rigorous research available into useful information and products for practitioners.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of recipients who say they will use the product and/or information to improve instructional practice and/or service delivery within six months.			**Explanation:** This measure is new for FY 2004 and will serve as the baseline.	**Source 1:** Other **Other:** Other. **Sponsor:** Aspen Systems/EDPubs. **Date Sponsored:** 12/11/2003. **Source 2:** Other **Other:** Other. **Sponsor:** The National Institute for Literacy. **Date Sponsored:** 12/11/2003. **Source 3:** Non-NCES Survey/Research **Collecting Agency:** National Institute for Literacy. **Survey/Research Report Title:** Training/Technical Assistance Evaluations. **References:** .
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
2004		999		
2005		40		

		Additional Source Information: Re: Source #2: The National Institute for Literacy will create a "dialogue" box on the NIFL website that asks visitors if they are willing to answer a few questions. If so, they will be asked whether they plan to use the online publications to improve instructional practice and/or service delivery within the next six months. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Not everyone who reads or downloads NIFL publications will agree to respond to the questions.

ATA: Assistive Technology – 2004

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 1: 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			**Progress:** The percentage of grantees whose activities resulted in legislative and/or policy changes which are deemed to have increased the availability or provision of assistive technology devices and/or services remained the same in FY03, 63% in comparison to FY02, 63%. The performance target of 95% was not met in FY03. **Explanation:** NIDRR is working with a technical assistance grantee to revise the data collection tool. During this process, NIDRR plans to reassess the current indicator and determine whether to continue using this indicator and target or establish a different indicator and/or target.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual web-based reporting system. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Improvements:** In June 2004, NIDRR and a technical assistance grantee began to develop data cleaning procedures to improve the overall quality of the data collected in the annual performance reports and minimize the number of errors included in the reports. NIDRR plans to implement these procedures for the FY2004 data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	95			
1998	95			
1999	88	95		
2000	50	95		
2001	78	95		
2002	63	95		
2003	63	95		
2004		95		

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

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Outcome-oriented measure of loans: The number of loans to individuals with disabilities per $1 million in Federal investment and state matching funds

Targets and Performance Data					
Number of loans to individuals with disabilities per $1 million Federal investment and State matching funds					
Year	**Actual Performance**				**Performance Targets**
	Fed dollars in Millions	State dollars in Millions	# of loans	# of loans per 1million dollars invested	# of loans per 1million dollars invested
2000	3.80	3.80	247	33	
2001	13.60	4.60	594	33	
2002			840		
2003	35.80	13			
2004					33

Assessment of Progress

Progress: Under Title III of the Assistive Technology Act of 1998, the Alternative Financing Program was funded to increase access to assistive technology for individuals with disabilities. In FY2002, 840 loans were made to individuals with disabilities to purchase assistive technology and the total amount loaned was 9.16 million dollars. However, for FY2002, there is no actual performance for indicator 8.2.1 of 1, the number of loans to individuals with disabilities per $1 million Federal investment and State matching funds, because there were no new awards in FY2002. In other words, there was no Federal investment or State matching funds for FY2002 which is needed in order to calculate the actual performance for the indicator.

Explanation: Since there was no Federal investment for the Alternative Financing Program for FY2002, there is no actual performance data for indicator 8.2.1 of 1 and therefore, there is no performance data to compare with

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Annual web-based reporting system.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: December 2004

Limitations: There are two reporting systems for the AFP. At the end of the AFP grant year, grantees submit loan program data into a Web-based program data collection system using the Annual Loan Program Data Form. Grantees also submit loan program data on a regular basis in a Web-based applicant data collection system that includes the initial applicant survey, the follow-up survey for an approved loan and the follow-up survey for a denied loan. For FY2002, all grantees submitted data for the program data collection

	FY2000 and FY2001.	system but all grantees did not submit data for the applicant data collection system. **Improvements:** NIDRR is working with the technical assistance grantee for the AFP to improve the quality of the data used to measure the performance of the AFP by (1) evaluating the two data collection systems, and (2) modifying the data collection system to address the problems that were identified. In addition, NIDRR plans to submit the data collection tool(s) for OMB clearance in December 2004. Consequently, upon OMB approval, the data collection tool(s) will become mandatory, requiring all grantees to submit all requested data.

EDA: Gallaudet University – 2004

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
University Enrollment							**Progress:** In fiscal year 2004, the total undergraduate enrollment did not change significantly from last year and remains fairly near the target. Both the graduate student and professional studies enrollment totals appear significantly lower than last year's figures. (See reason in explanation section). The Model Secondary School did not reach its target, however, it maintained at nearly the same level reported in fiscal year 2003. The Kendall	**Additional Source Information:** Collegiate Office of Enrollment Services, and Clerc Center student database, FY 2004 enrollment as of October 2003, summarized in Gallaudet's FY 2003 annual report, submitted in 2004. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 - 2005
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional Studies	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional Studies		
1998	1,339	714	92					
1999	1,300	628	70	1,250	700	70		
2000	1,318	541	86	1,250	700	70		
2001	1,321	625	93	1,250	700	70		
2002	1,243	517	92	1,250	700	70		
2003	1.243	617	154	1.250	700	70		

2004	1,236	506	70	1,250	700	70
2005				1,250	650	70

Clerc Center Enrollment

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Model Sec. School	Kendall Elem. School	Model Sec. School	Kendall Elem. School
1998	224	137		
1999	209	117	225	140
2000	541		700	
2001	205	148	225	140
2002	188	148	225	140
2003	190	152	225	140
2004	186	145	225	140
2005			225	140

School enrollment exceeded its target.

Explanation: Gallaudet has changed its system for counting Graduate and Professional Studies students this fiscal year in order to present a more accurate enrollment picture. The University realized that the prior system of calculating enrollment in these areas presented a danger of double counting the same student. Under the new counting method, if a degree-seeking student or a graduate special student is also enrolled in a professional studies course, that student will be counted only once. The new counting method has an impact on both the graduate and professional studies enrollment numbers. The University will continue to implement the new method so that future reports will be comparable. It should also be noted that there was an increase of degree-seeking graduate students this year of 405 compared to last year's figure of 377. Gallaudet has established minimum enrollment targets based on longstanding enrollment targets and historical trends recognizing that actual figures vary from year to year.

Data Available: October 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center. No formal verification procedure applied.

Improvements: Gallaudet has implemented a new method for calculating its Graduate and Professional Studies enrollment numbers in order to present a more accurate enrollment picture.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Student retention rate: Increase the undergraduate retention rate and increase or maintain the graduate student retention rate.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
University Student Retention Rates - %					**Progress:** In fiscal year 2003, the Undergraduate retention rate fell short of its target, while the Graduate student retention rate met its target **Explanation:** While the overall Undergraduate retention rate has not changed significantly, the fall to fall persistence for freshmen and transfer students has been increasing by 1 percent each year for the past 5 years. With the continuous improvement of academic support services, it is projected that this 1-2 percent increase will continue and will result in a more visible impact in the next few years. Gallaudet is committed to increased focus on retention of students at all levels and particular attention to the success of first year students.	**Additional Source Information:** Collegiate Office of the Register records, summarized in the FY 2003 annual report, submitted in 2004. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Undergraduate Graduate	Graduate	Undergraduate Graduate	Graduate		
1998	72					
1999	73		75			
2000	72	78	76	80		
2001	71	82	76	82		
2002	73	98	76			
2003	71	86	79			
2004			79	86		
2005			79	86		

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Student graduation rates: By 2008, the Undergraduate graduation rate will reach 48 percent; the Graduate student and Model Secondary School student graduation rates will be increased or maintained.

Targets and Performance Data

University Students' Graduation Rates - %

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Graduate
1998	41			
1999	42		41	
2000	41	82	42	80
2001	41	82	43	80
2002	42	82	44	
2003	42	82	45	
2004			45	82
2005			46	83
2006			47	
2007			47	
2008			48	

Clerc Center - Model Secondary School graduation rate - %

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	93	
1999	88	94
2000	98	94
2001	90	94
2002	80	94
2003	71	94

Assessment of Progress

Progress: In fiscal year 2003, the Undergraduate graduation rate fell short of its target but remained steady with last year's rate. The Graduate student graduation rate met its target. The Model Secondary School graduation rate declined from the previous year and fell short its target (see explanation section).

Explanation: The Undergraduate graduation rates are calculated as the number of graduates in one year over the number of entering students six years previously. Consistent with other universities, Gallaudet students are taking longer to complete baccalaureate studies. Gallaudet continues to institute new strategies to improve its Undergraduate graduation rate. In fiscal year 2003, 71 percent of the Model School seniors completed all graduation requirements by the end of their senior year. However, as of this report, an additional 21 percent have deferred graduation until 2004 in order to complete graduation requirements and IEP goals. An additional 2 percent are pending graduation upon completion of required coursework. Therefore, the total projected

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Collegiate Office of the Registrar and the Clerc Center Office of Exemplary Programs and Research records, summarized in FY 2003 annual report, submitted in 2004.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: October 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center.

Limitations: The Clerc Center (MSSD) graduation rates reported here give an incomplete picture of the graduation status of seniors from fiscal year 2001 onward. There is a need to reconceptualize how performance is assessed to make this indicator a more valid reflection of actual graduation rates. Graduation from MSSD is

2004		94	graduation rate for the fiscal year 2003 senior class is expected to be 94 percent.	more than completion of required course work. Graduation signals that students have successfully met their IEP goals, so that graduation becomes an IEP decision. Students may graduate at the end of their senior year, or they may make the decision, as part of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) process, to change their graduation so they may continue to pursue their IEP goals, or they may elect to take the fifth year option. Clerc Center personnel are currently in the process of redefining graduation outcomes and indicators at MSSD to reflect progress through school and changes in graduation requirements and program options. The Clerc Center will work with the Department in an effort to propose a revised indicator(s) and performance measure(s) to better show MSSD graduation rates.
2005		94		

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
Numbers of Programs adopting Model/Kendall Innovative strategies/curricula			**Progress:** The Clerc Center exceeded its target in fiscal year 2003. **Explanation:** In fiscal year 2003, 54 programs adopted the Clerc Center's curricula and other products, or modified their strategies as a result of MSSD and KDES leadership. The cumulative number of programs utilizing MSSD/KDES expertise since 1998 is 304 programs. 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 activities.	**Additional Source Information:** Records of the Clerc Center Office of Training and Professional Development, summarized in the FY 2003 Annual Report, submitted in January 2004. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **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	54	41		
2004		50		
2005		55		

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 commensurate with their training and education or attend advanced education or training programs during their first year after graduation.

Targets and Performance Data

Graduates employed or in advanced education or training during first year after graduation - %

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Students Employed	Advanced Education or Training	Students Employed	Advanced Education or Training
1998	95			
1999	98		95	
2000	97		95	
2001	90	38	77	38
2002	89	49		
2003	79	40		
2004			80	40
2005			81	41

Assessment of Progress

Progress: In fiscal year 2003, the targets of students who were either employed or in advanced education or training programs were met.

Explanation: Gallaudet has broken out this indicator to provide the percentages in each category of students, those actually employed and those students who were in advanced education or training programs. In the past, these two categories were combined. Please note that the percents total more than 100 percent because some respondents were employed and undertook a program of advanced education or training in the same year. Advanced education and training includes students enrolled in a Master's or Ph.D. program, a vocational or technical program, or another type of program, e.g., law school or medical school.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: University study on the status of graduates' employment and advanced studies, February, 2002

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: October 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by Gallaudet University.

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 (%)			**Progress:** The fiscal year 2003 rate exceeds the target. **Explanation:** The fiscal year 2003 rate exceeds the target by 2 percent. This includes fiscal year 2003 MSSD graduates who were engaged in productive activities, including postsecondary education, work, or Vocational Rehabilitation evaluation or training 4 months after June graduation. An additional 15 percent of graduates reported that they were actively involved in looking for work. Key strategies to address this indicator, implemented in fiscal year 2001, have maintained the impact seen in fiscal year 2002 and 2003.	**Additional Source Information:** Clerc Center Exemplary Programs and Research. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	74			
2001	72	80		
2002	90	80		
2003	82	80		
2004		80		
2005		81		

EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf – 2004

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							**Progress:** NTID did not achieve its enrollment targets in the Undergraduate program or in the Educational Interpreter program. However, it well exceeded its target in the Graduate/Masters in Special Education program. **Explanation:** NTID's goal is to maintain a student body of 1,080 undergraduates, 100 Education Interpreters, and 75 Graduate/Master's in	**Additional Source Information:** National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office records, FY 2004 as of October 2003. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 - 2005 **Data Available:** October 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	Undergraduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.	Undergraduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.		
1995	1,035	59	10					
1996	1,038	59	27					
1997	1,069	72	32					
1998	1,085	84	36					
1999	1.135	93	50	1.080	100	50		

2000	1,084	77	59	1,080	100	50
2001	1,089	75	55	1,080	100	50
2002	1,125	53	60	1,080	100	75
2003	1,093	65	73	1,080	100	75
2004	1,064	92	114	1,080	100	75
2005				1,080	100	90

Special Education in fiscal year 2004. This goal focuses on the total enrollment as year-to-year shifts in specific programs may result in the individual targets either being exceeded or not met. There are also human and physical resource limitations to the number of students NTID can serve. The Undergraduate Program and Educational Interpreter program enrollments are below target primarily due to more rigorous entrance requirements. More aggressive recruitment efforts have paid off in the Educational Interpreter Program and NTID expects the same results next year with Undergraduate programs.

Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification applied.

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

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Graduation rate: Graduation rate: By 2008, the overall student graduation rate will be 60 percent.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Student graduation rates - %							**Progress:** In fiscal year 2003, the graduation rates for all three categories equaled or exceeded their targets. **Explanation:** In fiscal year 2003, the graduation rate for students in the sub-baccalaureate programs decreased to 52 percent while the rate for students in the baccalaureate programs increased to 68 percent resulting in an overall graduation rate of 56 percent for all deaf students. The Institute's goal is to maintain or increase the rate for students in sub-baccalaureate programs at or above 52 percent in FY 2004 and increase the rate for students in baccalaureate programs.	**Additional Source Information:** National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office Records. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate		
1997	50	50	51					
1998	51	50	57					
1999	53	50	61					
2000	53	50	63	53	51	61		
2001	54	50	64	53	51	61		
2002	57	54	66	53	52	61		
2003	56	52	68	53	52	61		
2004				57	52	69		
2005				57	52	69		
2006				58	53	70		
2007				59	53	71		
2008				60	54	72		

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Student retention rate: The first-year student overall retention rate for students in sub-baccalaureate and baccalaureate programs will meet or exceed established targets.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Student retention rates-%							**Progress:** In fiscal year 2003, the overall performance of 76 percent exceeded its target by 2 percentage points. **Explanation:** The sub-baccalaureate rate of 70 percent was 4 percentage points below the goal, but 2 percentage points above the average of the last three years. This pattern of improvement makes NTID confident that current and new retention strategies will help achieve the target of 74 percent in 2004. Baccalaureate retention rate decreased to 86 percent, but once again surpassed the target of 84 percent, and is only slightly below the rate for hearing freshmen entering the Rochester Institute of Technology (88 percent).	**Additional Source Information:** NTID Registrar office records **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by NTID. No formal verification procedure applied.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate		
1997	76	85	84					
1998	74	73	81					
1999	74	69	84					
2000	74	69	85	74	73	84		
2001	74	68	86	74	74	84		
2002	77	72	87	74	74	84		
2003	76	70	86	74	74	84		
2004				74	74	84		
2005				75	74	86		

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			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Placement rate-%			**Progress:** Data for 2003 is incomplete at this time, but NTID is confident of achieving or coming very close to the goal of 95 percent. **Explanation:** Placement rate data is reported the year after graduation. Therefore, performance data reported now is data for 2002. The actual rate for 2002 was below the target for 2002. 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. Despite the economy, NTID's placement rate remained close to the 90 percent range. The placement rates are calculated as the percentage of graduates who are employed among those who want to be employed. Those individuals, who continue their education or who are not seeking employment, for whatever reasons, in the respective years, are not included. The Bureau of Labor Statistics uses this same methodology.	**Additional Source Information:** National Technical Institute for the Deaf Placement Records for FY 2002 **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** October 2004 Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1995	94			
1996	96			
1997	97			
1998	95			
1999	94	95		
2000	90	95		
2001	92	95		
2002	89	95		
2003		95		
2004		95		
2005		95		

ESEA: Community Technology Centers – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.341 - Community Technology Centers

Program Goal: To provide disadvantaged residents of economically distressed urban and rural communities with increased access to information technology and related training.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Disadvantaged students within distressed communities receiving community technology centers grants will have greater access to services that help them to improve their academic performance.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Greater Access: Increasing numbers of disadvantaged students in high schools within distressed areas will have access to services that help them to improve their academic performance.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of students served			**Explanation:** Initial grants have been awarded in September 2003. Baseline data will be gathered in 2004.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Grantees provide adult education: Increasing numbers of grantees will provide adult education.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of grantees providing adult education.			**Explanation:** Initial grants were awarded in September of 2003. Baseline will be gathered in 2004.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004		999		

HEA: Aid for Institutional Development Title III & Title V – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.031 - Higher Education_Institutional Aid
84.031A - Strengthening Institutions Program--Development Grants, Planning Grants
84.031B - Strengthening HBCU's and Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions
84.031N - Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions
84.031S - Title V Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program
84.031T - Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities
84.120 - 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 was the first time data were available for these indicators.	**Additional Source Information:** Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	88	75		
2003		75		
2004		75		

		Limitations: Data are self-reported.

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 was the first time that data were available for these indicators.	**Additional Source Information:** Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** December 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	86	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 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 was the first time that data were available for these indicators.	**Additional Source Information:** Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** December 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	78	75		
2003		75		
2004		75		

HEA: Byrd Honors Scholarships – 2004

CFDA Numbers: 84.185 - Byrd Honors Scholarships
84.185A - .

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			**Progress:** As part of the 2006 Budget exercise, we have developed a new graduation rate for Byrd and also developed a revised Annual Performance Report. The new measure, while continuing to assess graduation within four-years, no longer requires the student to receive four consecutive years of grant funds. We have also added a persistence rate. For 2003, these rates were: Graduation rate: 98% Persistence rate: 92% **Explanation:** Progress: The data suggests that Byrd recipients are graduating within four years at a rate that far exceeds the rate at which all college students complete their education within six years (about 53%).	**Additional Source Information:** Annual Performance Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** September 2005 **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	98	90		
2003		26		
2004		26		

HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents in School – 2004

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 education

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Persistence rate: The percentage of students receiving child care services who persist in postsecondary education

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Median percentage of retention rate (2001 cohort)				**Explanation:** For the 2001 cohort of students receiving child care services, performance data were collected through 18 month Performance Reports (covering the period October 2001 through March 2003) and are presented under 2003, the end of the performance period. The 36 month performance report will contain data through September 2004. Data for the 2002 cohort of students are being collected for the 18 month Performance Report for the period September 2002 through March 2004 and for the 36 month Performance Report for the period ending August 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** Grantees are required to submit 18-month and 36-month performance reports **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data are supplied by child care centers with no formal verification procedure provided.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	18 month report	36 month report			
2003	78		80		
2004			80		
Median percentage of retention rate (2002) Cohort					
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	18 month report	36 month report			
2003					
2004			80		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Completion rate: The percentage of students receiving child care services who complete postsecondary education.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Median percentage of completion rate (2001 cohort)				**Explanation:** the 2001 cohort of students receiving child care services, performance data were collected through 18 month Performance Reports (covering the period October 2001 through March 2003) and are presented under 2003, the end of the performance period. The 36 month performance report will contain data through September 2004. Data for the 2002 cohort of students are being collected for the 18 month Performance Report for the period September 2002 through March 2004 and for the 36 month Performance Report for the period ending August 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** Grantees are required to submit 18 and 36 month performance reports. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Improvements:** Data are supplied by child care centers with no formal verification procedure provided.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	18 month report	36 month report			
2003	25				
2004			30		
Median percentage of completion rate (2002 cohort)					
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	18 month report	36 month report			
2004			30		
2005			30		

HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.149A - College Assistance Migrant Program

Program Goal: Assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students to successfully complete their first academic year of college and to continue at a post secondary education.

Objective 8.1 of 2: All CAMP students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: CAMP 1st year completion: Eighty-five percent of CAMP participants will successfully complete the first academic year of study at a postsecondary institution.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
CAMP participants completing the first year of their academic or postsecondary program.			**Progress:** (2001) The proportion of CAMP students who have completed their 1st year of college remains high at 80% but did not increase. This was because the new grantees, who are institutions of higher education did not receive grant award notification until August which made it difficult to met or exceed the target. **Explanation:** Progress for 2003 can not be reported until October 2004 when the 02-03 performance data will be reported in the end of the year report.	**Additional Source Information:** HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data were supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure has been applied. **Improvements:** Improvements will be addressed in the Office of Migrant Education 2004 data Improvement plan
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	82			
2002	80			
2003				
2004		83		
2005		85		

Objective 8.2 of 2: A majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first year of college continue in postsecondary education.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: CAMP students continue in Postsecondary: A Majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first year of college will continue in postsecondary education.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of CAMP students who after completing first year continue their postsecondary education.	**Progress:** (2001)The proportion of CAMP students who, after successfully completing their first year of college then continue their college education continues to remain high at 75 percent. During the 2001-2002 time period this percentage decreased slightly, by 3 percent. This was because the new grantees, who are institutions of higher education did not receive grant award notification until August which made it difficult to met or exceed the target. **Explanation:** Progress for 2003 can not be reported until October 2004 when the 02-03 performance data will be reported in the end of the year report.	**Additional Source Information:** HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data were supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure has been applied.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	78	
2002	75	
2003		
2004		79
2005		80

HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education – 2004

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:** December 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Similar results from site visit scorecard. **Limitations:** Data supplied by project directors in response to survey instruments. OPE has revised the form to match indicators more closely. Planning an external evaluation of the Comprehensive Program through SAS around these indicators.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	92			
1999	100			
2000	83	100		
2001	96	85		
2002	94.50	95		
2003	88	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:** December 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	96	95		
2004		95		
2005		96		
2006		96		
2007		97		

HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP) – 2004

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	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of GEAR UP students who passed prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade and the percentage of GEAR UP students who passed Algebra 1 by the end of the 9th grade.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Prealgebra	Algebra 1	Prealgebra	Algebra 1
2001	18			
2002	18			
2003	22	30	19	19
2004			20	20
2007			35	70

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 for 2003 continues to reflect the percentage of GEAR-UP students who pass prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade. Beginning in 2003 we also establ'd targets for algebra 1. This standard will be measured via GEAR-UP student passing rates by the end of the 7th grade. Data will continue to be collected on successful completion of core academic subjects and other college prep. courses. Note that standards to enter and complete above

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

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: December 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency; and to assess extent to which project

	grade level math courses (such as prealgebra and Algebra I for 7th graders) are becoming more rigorous. This practice may limit the percentage of students in many schools served by GEAR UP who are entering and completing such courses. Note: Data for Year 2001 were obtained from the GEAR UP's APR covering April 2000 - March 2001. Data for Year 2002 were obtained from the GEAR UP Annual Perform. Report covering April 2001 - March 2002.	objectives are being accomplished.

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:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency; and to assess
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Attendance	Attendance		
2001	83			
2002	88			
2003	87	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** 98 / 97 **2004** / 97 **2007** / 98		extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.

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	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
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** 35 / 32 **2004** / 33	**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	**Additional Source Information:** Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

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	57	43	54	40
2004			56	42
2007			75	50

parents' knowledge of postsecondary education entrance requirements, costs of attendance, and financial aid opportunities.

GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency; and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.

HEA: Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) – 2004

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.			**Progress:** Data not collected **Explanation:** OPE will not be collecting data for this measure. **The measure has been discontinued.**	
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2004	999	999		

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.

Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets				
	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Women	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Women
2002	1	11	10	5	38					
2003	0	6	7	2	35	999	999	999	999	999
2004	1	6	10	4	36	0	6	7	2	35

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. **Collection Period:** 2004 - 2005 **Data Available:** December 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Programs – 2004

CFDA Number: 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 1: 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: Title VI 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
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
1995	21			
2000	21	20		
2002	22	20		
2003	22	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
2002	55	55
2003	55	56
2004		58

funded since 1958 through the International Research and Studies program under Title VI.

Frequency: Other.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: December 2004
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: Graduate Employment: National Resource Center programs who report that their graduates found employment that utilizes their language and/or area expertise.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of Ph.D. graduates of NRC institutions with positions where they use their expertise.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	%	%
1996	76	
2000	80	76
2001	71	76
2002	74	76
2003	76	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	40	44
2003	50	44
2004		78

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: NRC Ph.D. graduates become the experts that ensure 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.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research
Survey/Research Report Title: EELIAS.
References: National Resource Center Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system.
Web Site: http://www.eeliasonline.net.

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

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	36	24
2003	27	32
2004		34

placement data is consistent with projected targets. M.A. continuing education data is consistent with projected targets.

HEA: Javits Fellowships – 2004

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	**Explanation:** Some Javits fellows pursue programs in fields for which the terminal degree is below the doctorate level; their attainment is not accounted for. In future years the measures will reflect graduate school completion rate and average time to degree completion.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **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).

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	31	29
2004		30

HEA: Student Financial Assistance Policy – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.007 - Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants
84.033 - Federal Work-Study Program
84.037 - Perkins Loan Cancellations
84.038 - Federal Perkins Loan Program Federal Capital Contributions
84.063 - Federal Pell Grant Program
84.069 - Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership
84.268 - Federal Direct Student Loans

Program Goal: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants, loans, and work-study in an efficient, financially sound and customer-responsive manner.

Objective 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			**Explanation:** In the past, data were estimated for years in between National Postsecondary Student Aid Studies (NPSAS)--which are conducted approximately every four years. However, upon reconsideration of the estimation methodology, OPE decided in 2001 to discontinue these between survey estimates. Therefore, no data is anticipated for 2001 or 2002.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Record/File. **Sponsor:** National Postsecondary Student Aid Study. **Date Sponsored:** 01/31/2005. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** January
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			
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

2005
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: NPSAS data are collected only every four years.

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	

Source: NCES Survey/Assessment
Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

Additional Source Information: Enrollment data for 2002 and 2003 are currently available. However, these data

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			
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

must be run against Census data (Current Population Survey) to generate immediate transition to college figures by income levels. Due to delays in obtaining census data, it is anticipated that we will have '02 data in late October 2004 and '03 data in December '04.

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

Limitations: Small subgroup sample sizes for low-income students lead to large yearly fluctuations in enrollment rates.

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	**Explanation:** Increases in the maximum award without other changes in the formulas used to	**Source:** Other **Other:** Record/File. **Sponsor:** Pell Grant

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	82	
1998	80	
1999	78	75
2000	78	75
2001	79	75
2002	78	75
2003	76	75
2004		75

award Pell grants will tend to lower the percentage of funds going to the neediest students. The long term target for 2008 is 75%

Applicant/Recipient File.
Date Sponsored: 03/31/2004.

Additional Source Information: The latest student-level data comes from the 2002-2003 applicant universe of the Office of Federal Student Aid's Central Processing System and the recipient universe of the Pell Grant Recipient Financial Management System. The poverty levels used in the analysis are the 2002 poverty guidelines issued by the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: August 2005
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	
2001	6.20	
2003		9.90
2004		9.90

Progress: The 6.2 % for 2002 is the last time OPE will be collecting this data. In the past, be were able to benchmark our debt burden measurements against lending community debt burden measures. However, now that the lending community has moved to a credit scoring approach, there is no longer an appropriate benchmark. In addition, the complexity of the calculation, involving a long wait for obtaining necessary IRS data, precludes OPE from being able to do this regularly.

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.

Additional Source Information: National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS) and Internal Revenue Service (IRS) records.

Frequency: Annually.

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

The percentage of full-time degree seeking students completing a 4-year degree within 150% of the normal time required.

Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets
	Total	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference between Black and White	Difference between White and Hispanic	Total
1997	52.50	35.50	55.50	39.10	20	16.40	
1998	52.60	34.50	55.80	39.10	21.30	16.70	
1999	53	35.80	56	40.90	20.20	15.10	
2000	52.40	35.70	55.40	41.50	19.70	13.90	
2002	54.40	38.20	57.20	44.80	19	12.40	
2003	54.30	38.50	57.30	43.50	18.80	13.80	54
2004							55

The percentage of full-time degree seeking students completing a less than 4-year program within 150% of the normal time required.

Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets
	Total	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference between Black and White	Difference between White and Hispanic	Total

Assessment of Progress

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Graduation Rate Survey (GRS)

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: July 2005
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Postsecondary institutions were 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.

1997	30.90	22.80	32.60	26.20	9.80	6.40	
1998	32.20	25.10	33.80	29.90	8.70	3.90	
1999	34.40	29.50	35.30	32.50	5.80	2.80	
2000	32.70	26.50	34	30.10	7.50	3.90	
2002	29.30	23.30	30.70	27	7.40	3.70	
2003	30.60	26.10	31.70	30.10	5.60	1.60	34
2004							35

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

Return on Investment

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

Assessment of Progress

Progress: This measure has been discontinued. A determination was made that this measure has not been a helpful tool in support of programs' management and policy development.

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

Sources and Data Quality

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.

Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

	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. It is not expected that data for 2003 or 2004 will be collected, as this measure has been discontinued.	**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.

HEA: Student Aid Administration – 2004

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			**Explanation:** Using FY 2003 data, we will develop baseline unit costs for the business processes referenced. (In the table, the code 999 represents setting a baseline.) FSA's target for FY 2004 is to maintain the baseline set with FY 2003 data.	**Additional Source Information:** FSA Activity-Based Cost Model will be used to collect data. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	$ Unit Cost	$ Unit Cost		
2003		999		
2004		999		
Unit Cost of Origination and Disbursement				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	$ Unit Cost	$ Unit Cost		
2003		999		
2004		999		
Unit Cost of Direct Loan Repayment				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	$ Unit Cost	$ Unit Cost		
2003		999		
2004		999		

Unit Cost of Direct Loan Consolidation

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	$ Unit Cost	$ Unit Cost
2003		999
2004		999

Unit Cost of Default Collections

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	$ Unit Cost	$ Unit Cost
2003		999
2004		999

HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers – 2004

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase postsecondary enrollment rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of EOC participants enrolling in college

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

EOC's : College Enrollment (percent)

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	57	
2001		57
2002		
2003		
2004		57
2005		57.50
2006		58
2007		58.50

Explanation: This indicator is being introduced for the first time in 2004. The 2000 baseline from the EOC Annual Performance Reports is the only data currently available. Note that we will be reporting data for 2001-02 in April of 05 and will report 2002-2003 and 03-04 data in July 05.

Additional Source Information: TRIO Program Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: December 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

HEA: TRIO McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement – 2004

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase postsecondary persistence and completion rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: 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)					**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:** TRIO Program Performance Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** September 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. The data are self reported.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Enrollment	Persistence	Enrollment	Persistence		
1999	35	48				
2000	35	75	35	48		
2001	40	66	35	48		
2002	39	65	35	48		
2003			36	75		
2004			36	75		

HEA: TRIO Student Support Services – 2004

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase postsecondary persistence and completion rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: 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	70		67	29
2002	72		67	29
2003			68	29.50
2004			68.50	30

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: Data from the national evaluation of SS S 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 were to increase the persistence and completion rates to 70% and 31%, respectively, by 2007; however, due to the fact that we have exceeded these goals we will be meeting to set new goals by Jan. 1,05. 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

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Performance reports

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: September 2005
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
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

	within 6 years. The long-term goal is intended to increase this rate to 70%. We will be able to report on college completion for the year 2003-2004 in Sept. 05. Note that because we will be reporting on cohorts there will not be data for college completion for the years 00-01, 01-02, and 02-03.	improvements on an annual basis.

HEA: TRIO Talent Search – 2004

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase postsecondary enrollment rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of Talent Search participants enrolling in college.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Talent Search : College Enrollment (percent)

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	College Enrollment	College Enrollment
2000	73	
2001		73
2002		
2003		
2004		73.50
2005		74
2006		74.50
2007		75

Explanation: This indicator is being introduced for the first time. The 2000 baseline from the Talent Search Annual Performance Reports is the only data currently available. The 2000- 2001 and 2001-2002 performance data will be available in April 05. The 02-03, and 03-04 data will be available September 05.

Additional Source Information: TRIO Program Performance Report

Collection Period: 2000 - 2001
Data Available: April 2005
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

HEA: TRIO Upward Bound – 2004

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: 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		
2002			66	
2003			65	35
2004			65	35.50

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: Data from a national evaluation of Upward Bound provides the baseline data. The 2004 plan reflects two changes to the performance indicators and targets. (1). Elimination of project persistence because this indicator does not measure program outcomes. The new indicator has been selected as an interim measure because the national evaluation of UB found a correlation between length of participation in the program and the educational outcomes of the participants. (2). To track separately the effect of the program on higher risk students. This change reflects the findings of the national evaluation of the UB program that found the program has significant effects on higher risk students, along with funding initiatives encouraging UB projects to serve high risk students. The long-term goals for UB are to maintain the current overall enrollment

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: TRIO Program Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: February 2005
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

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.

	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. Data not available for 01-02. Data for 02-03 will be available by February 05.	

HEA: Underground Railroad Program – 2004

Program Goal: Underground Railroad Program Internal Goal

Objective 8.1 of 1: Underground Railroad Program Internal Objective 1

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Fundraising initiatives: Private sector support will increase by 20 percent.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Private sector support (in dollars)

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	33,717,762	
2002	35,000,000	
2003	39,000,000	
2004	39,000,000	41,000,000

Explanation: As of June, 2004 the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center has raised a total (including pledges) of 39,000, 000 in private funds. An additional $16,000,000 was raised in government funds.The program's long-term target for FY 2008 is $42, 000,000.

Additional Source Information: Underground Railroad Program Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2004 - 2005
Data Available: September 2005
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults – 2004

Program Goal: Individuals who are deaf-blind will become independent and function as full and productive members of their local community.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Ensure that individuals who are deaf-blind receive the specialized services and training they need to become as independent and self-sufficient as possible.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Services to consumers at headquarters: By FY 2008, the training program at headquarters will increase the number of adult consumers who have achieved successful employment to 45% or less restrictive setting outcomes to 75%.

Targets and Performance Data

% of adult consumers placed in employment and those in less restrictive settings

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Adult consumers	% in Less Restrictive Settings	% Placed in Employment Settings	Adult consumers	% in Less Restrictive Settings	% Placed in Employment Settings
1999	75		45	85		38
2000	82		52	90		45
2001	87	71	38	90	59	45
2002	85	80	27		59	45
2003	100	70	42.50			
2004				95	70	45
2005				95	70	45
2006				95	70	45
2007				95	75	45
2008				95	75	45

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: In the year 2003, 40 of the 83 individuals who terminated training had a desire to achieve a vocational outcome. Of this 40, 17 or 42.5% achieved this goal. Of the remaining 23, 22 were home seeking competitive employment or supported employment and 1 is participating in sheltered employment. Among the 20 individuals not seeking a vocational outcome, 3 received short-term training in adaptive technology, 6 were homemakers, 2 attended college, 2 attended other voc/training programs, 3 are deceased and 4 discontinued training. In addition, HKNC served 13 high school and 10 senior citizen consumers in 2003. Of the 23 consumers who terminated the program with a desire to move to

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: October 2004
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Final transition plans on each client will include the employment and living situations each client will be entering upon completion of training.

Limitations: Data are based upon self-reported

	less restrictive living situations, 16 or 70% achieved this goal. Data prior to 2001 were calculated using a different method and are not included for the percentage placed in less restrictive settings.	data from the grantee and are not independently verified. A follow-up survey was developed but budgetary limitations prevented it implementation. HKNC will conduct a limited survey using selected RSA regions.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Services to consumers at headquarters: To increase the percentage of training goals achieved by consumers by participating in the training program.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of identified training goals successfully achieved by participants

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	92	86
2002	90	
2003	88	
2004		88
2005		88
2006		88
2007		90
2008		90

Explanation: Consumers come to HKNC with training goals that go beyond those reported in indicator 1.1. This indicator represents the percent of training goals achieved by all adult consumers served during the program year. These measurable, instructional objectives are mutually developed by the consumers and their instructors. Data prior to 2001 were calculated using a different method and are not included.

Additional Source Information: Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report.

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

Limitations: Data is based upon self-reported data from the grantee and are not independently verified.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Ensure that deaf-blind consumers and their family members receive the services they need to function more independently in the home community.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Regional services to consumers and families: Helen Keller National Center will maintain or increase the number of consumers and family members served through its regional offices.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number served through Helen Keller National Center							**Progress:** In 2002, the regional offices served more consumers, families and organizations than were targeted. **Explanation:** The number of consumers and families served fluctuates from year to year. In establishing the targets, trend data were used from prior years.	**Additional Source Information:** HKNC Annual Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. HKNC regional reps maintain client case summary files that indicate re activity with individual consumers, family members, professionals and organizations/agencies. **Limitations:** Client case summary reports do not measure the level of service provided or impact of the services on the lives of the consumers and family members. There are no improvements planned at this time.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	Consumers	Families	Organizations	Consumers	Families	Organizations		
1999	1,336	368	976	1,250	400			
2000	1,340	461	995	1,300	400	950		
2001	1,727	484	913	1,400	425	1,000		
2002	1,932	487	1,090	1,500	400	1,050		
2003	1,982	611	1,288					
2004				1,700	450	1,050		
2005				1,700	450	1,050		

RA: Client Assistance State Grants – 2004

Program Goal: To provide assistance and information to help individuals with disabilities secure the benefits available under the Vocational Rehabilitation State grants program and other programs funded under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended

Objective 8.1 of 1: Accurately identify problem areas requiring systemic change and engage in systemic activity to improve services under the rehabilitation act.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Effects of systemic change: By FY 2008, the percentage of CAPs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will increase to a rate of 55%.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of CAPs reported that their systematic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice			**Explanation:** Performance percentage based on reporting of successful systemic change activity by 27 out of 56 CAPs. A baseline of 43% was established in FY 1999. Performance trends are based on actual data reported for FY 2000 through 2003. Performance in FY 2000 through 2001 remained consistent with established targets. Data for FY 2002 demonstrated a significant increase in the percentage of CAPs achieving changes in policies and practices. Performance in FY 2003 is in line with the target for that year, and is consistent with performance trends for the period prior to FY 2002.	**Additional Source Information:** CAP FY 2003 performance report, RSA-227, narrative section. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** April 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Data will be limited because it is self-reported and in a narrative format. The data submitted are reviewed by program specialists, but data validity will be unattainable.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	50.90			
1999	43			
2000	44	44		
2001	45	45		
2002	54	46		
2003	48	48		
2004		49		
2005		50		
2006		52		
2007		54		
2008		55		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Alternative dispute resolution (ADR): Through FY 2008, the percentage of cases resolved through the use of ADR will be maintained at a rate of 84%.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of cases resolved though ADR will be maintained at a rate of 84%.			**Explanation:** A baseline rate of 84% and performance targets have been established based on FY 2001 and 2002 data. Although the percentage achieved in FY 2003 represents a decrease of 2% from FY 2002, the change in the underlying numbers used to calculate this percentage is relatively small. In FY 2002, 5737 out of a total of 6707 cases were resolved through the use of ADR, while in FY 2003, 5507 out of a total of 6729 cases were resolved though these strategies, a decrease of only 220 cases.	**Additional Source Information:** CAP performance report, RSA-227 **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** April 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialists. On-site compliance reviews are conducted and random sampling of on site files is cross-checked with reported data for verification. **Limitations:** The collection instrument does not contain known data limitations.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	84			
2002	85			
2003	82			
2004		84		
2005		84		
2006		84		
2007		84		
2008		84		

RA: Independent Living Centers and State Grants – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.132 - Centers for Independent Living
84.169 - Independent Living_State Grants

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 3: 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			**Explanation:** The annual 704 Report is used to collect data. Grantees are given 90 days after the close of the fiscal year to submit data. We anticipate 2004 data will be available by summer 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** RSA - 704 Annual Performance Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005
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	63	80		
2004		80		

Objective 8.2 of 3: 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			**Explanation:** The annual 704 Report is used to collect data. Grantees are given 90 days after the close of the fiscal year to submit data. We anticipate 2004 data will be available by summer 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** RSA 704 Report, 2002. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** Grantees may interpret definitions differently. We are providing training and technical assistance.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	74			
1998	1,671			
2000	1,372	850		
2001	1,777	900		
2002	2,012	900		
2003	1,996			

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.			**Progress:** The annual 704 Report is used to collect data. Grantees are given 90 days after the close of the fiscal year to submit data. We anticipate 2004 data will be available by summer 2005.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999		8,500		
2000	18,306	8,500		
2001	23,983	9,000		
2002	21,439	9,500		
2003	21,656			

Objective 8.3 of 3: 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.					**Explanation:** Indicator and measure written incorrectly in PPMD system. Correct Indicator-Increased funding from alternative sources: A high percentage of CILs will have greater that 25% of their budget from sources other than Title VII, chapter 1, part C, and a high percentage of states will contribute more than the required minimum match for Title VII, chapter 1, part B. Correct Measure-Percentage of CILs that have greater than 25% of their budget from sources other than Title VII, chapter 1, part C funds, and the percentage of states that contribute more that the required minimum match for Title VII, chapter 1, part B funds. (updated by BAB 6/30/04) The annual 704 Report is used to collect data. Grantees are given 90 days after the close of the fiscal year to submit data. We anticipate 2004 data will be available by summer 2005.(updated by BAB 9/28/04)	**Additional Source Information:** For CILs - 704 Report Part 2; for DSUs 704 Report Part 1 **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 Program and budget staff or two 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	71	84	76	80		
2004			80	80		

RA: Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals – 2004

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 1: Provide chapter 2 services to increasing numbers of individuals who are older and severely visually impaired, and increase consumer satisfaction

Indicator 8.1.1 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			**Explanation:** Data collection is performed by Mississippi State University Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Blindness (gratis) and is available upon their completion of the analysis.	**Additional Source Information:** Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who Are Blind (7-OB Report), 2003 **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Research and Training Center and program staff review data **Limitations:** Targets based on estimates of program funding level.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1994	14,968			
1995	22,103			
1996	26,846			
1997	31,460			
1998	36,280			
1999	38,150	28,500		
2000	47,596	35,000		
2001	58,436	40,000		
2002	60,039	41,000		
2003	65,525	63,000		
2004		68,000		

RA: Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers – 2004

Program Goal: To increase employment opportunities for migrant and seasonal farmworkers who have disabilities

Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that eligible migrant and seasonal farmworkers with disabilities receive rehabilitation services and achieve employment.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Individuals who achieve employment outcomes: Within project funded states, the percentage of migrant or seasonal farmworkers with disabilities served by VR and the projects, who achieve employment outcomes is higher than those who do not access the project.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of individuals served who were placed in employment outcomes					**Explanation:** Baseline 2002 data submission is suspect; Consequently, the targets 2003 and 2004 have been projected at a lower rate until 2003 data is analyzed. Targets for the VR only category are represented as static numbers because the focus of these projects is to improve the performance for the VR + Project participants.	**Additional Source Information:** Rehabilitation Services Administration agency state data from the RSA-911 and grantee performance reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** April 2005 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. **Limitations:** By 2005, it is anticipated that data quality will be more dependable.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	VR & Project	VR Only	VR & Project	VR Only		
2002	65	53.10				
2003	66	59				
2004			62	53		

RA: Projects with Industry – 2004

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			**Progress:** FY 2001 performance exceeded the 2001 target. **Explanation:** In FY 1998, following a new grant competition, there were significantly fewer projects (104 projects) participating in the PWI program as compared to the FY 1997 base year (119 projects). The number of projects operating in fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 were 101, 99, and 102 respectively. Following a corresponding drop in performance in 1998, the percent of individuals placed in competitive employment by the program has increased annually. Performance in FY 2001 surpassed the 1997 level.	**Additional Source Information:** Grantee performance indicator data. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** January 2005 **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
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	59			
1998	49			
1999	59	61		
2000	61.90	61		
2001	62.40	62		
2002	63.20	62.20		
2003	53.27	62.40		
2004		62.70		

		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 **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **1997** / 207 / **1998** / 209 / **1999** / 226 / 209 **2000** / 252 / 218 **2001** / 236 / 218 **2002** / 234 / 226 **2003** / 244 / 231 **2004** / / 233	**Progress:** FY 2001 performance exceeded the 2001 target by $18. **Explanation:** FY 2001 performance reflected an average increase in earnings of $236 per week. On average, the FY 2001 group of grantees demonstrated higher performance on this indicator than in most prior years. However, we have only raised the FY 2002 target to $226 per week because of the variability in annual performance.	**Additional Source Information:** Grantee performance indicator data. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** January 2005 **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.

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			**Progress:** FY 2000 performance slightly exceeded the 2000 target, bringing the actual performance rate back up to a level commensurate with performance experienced in the 1997 base year. **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:** 2004 **Data Available:** January 2005 **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	67.20	61		
2002	64.70	61.20		
2003	73.03	63		
2004		64		

RA: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.240 - Program of Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights

Program Goal: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) Internal Goal

Objective 8.1 of 1: Identify problem areas requiring systemic change and engage in systemic activities to address those problems.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Policy Changes: By FY 2008, the percentage of PAIRs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will increase to a rate of 82%.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of PAIRs reported that their systemic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice.			**Explanation:** Actual performance percentage based on 43 out of 57 PAIRs reporting successful systemic change activities for FY 2003. Performance trends are based on actual data reported for FY 2000 through 2003. This data demonstrates significant annual increases in the percentage of PAIRs achieving changes in policies and practices, making it difficult to accurately assess trends and performance. However, FY 2003 performance is in line with the target established for the program.	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** 1820-0627 Annual Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) Program Performance Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** April 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied through uniform data reporting. Once data are submitted appropriate review will be conducted by program specialists. **Limitations:** Data will be limited because it is self-reported and in a narrative format. The data submitted will be reviewed by program specialists, but data validity will be unattainable.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	54			
2001	68			
2002	81			
2003	75			
2004		77		
2005		79		
2006		80		
2007		81		
2008		82		

RA: Supported Employment State Grants – 2004

Program Goal: Individuals with disabilities served by the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grant program will achieve high quality employment.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase the number of individuals with the most significant disabilities who have received supported employment services but achieve competitive employment outcomes.

Indicator 8.1.1 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			**Explanation:** This indicator has been a GPRA indicator for a number of years. With this indicator, RSA examines State agency performance regarding supported employment for individuals with the most significant disabilities. Individuals in supported employment can achieve competitive employment (with wages at or above the minimum wage), although not all individuals in supported employment do achieve these competitive wages. RSA wants to encourage State agencies to help individuals with disabilities in supported employment to achieve these competitive employment outcomes. FY 2001 was the year that served as the baseline for this measure and for establishing its targets. In FYs 2002	**Additional Source Information:** RSA state agency data from the RSA-911. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** April 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** Accuracy/consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	69.60			
1998	69.10			
1999	73.30	71		
2000	77.30	71.50		
2001	79.20	77.40		
2002	90.50	77.60		
2003	92.70	77.80		
2004		78		
2005		80		

	and 2003, State VR agencies surpassed their targets for this indicator.	dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs – 2004

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.	**Progress:** Actual performance for this indicator has been at 100% since reporting year 2001. It will, therefore, be dropped as an indicator in 2005. **Explanation:** Past data has been moved forward one year because of a change in the way data is now being reported. Current and future reporting will be based on a project/performance period instead of fiscal year.	**Additional Source Information:** Web-based Annual Performance Reports for 2001-2003. For 2001, a narrative report produced by RTI, the contractor that designed the web-based system, was also used. The original figure of 95.65% came from a peer review of the projects that was done in 2000, before the web-based system was used. The panel determined that the indicator was met by 22 out of 23 projects. One project did not provide enough information to make a determination.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	95.65	
2001	100	80
2002	100	82
2003	100	85
2004		90

		Frequency: Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations:** The web-based reporting system does not have specific questions that relate to project expansion. Actual performance was based on the purpose of the priority that grantees were funded to perform these services; therefore, those who submitted acceptable reports (100%) successfully contributed to expansion of services.

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

Percentage of Grantees that Interacted and Presented to State VR Agencies

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	83	85
2002	84	85
2003	80	87
2004		89

Percentage of Consumers Referred by State VR to Projects

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	37	58
2002	29	58
2003	22	60
2004		62

Percentage of Consumers Referred by Projects to State VR

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	8	10
2002	8	10
2003	20	10
2004		10

Assessment of Progress

Progress: Actual performance in the three areas reported on decreased in terms of grantees interacting and presenting to VR agencies by 7% and the percentage of consumers referred by state VR to projects by 38%. The number of projects that made referrals to state VR went up by 10%, however, which suggests that the impact of the projects is changing as the number of consumers served by the projects increases.

Explanation: Baseline data for 2001 is based on information obtained from a narrative report from RTI, the contractor that designed the web-based system. The percentage for 2001 represents 24 grantees who presented to VR agencies out of a total of 29 grantees who reported making presentations. In 2002, 38 projects out of a total of 45 reported making presentations to VR. In 2003, 40 projects reported making presentations. Of these, a total of 32 made presentations to VR. Past data has been moved forward one year to reflect the current process of using data collected on a performance rather than fiscal year. Performance percentages for consumers referred from VR to

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Web-based Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: December 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations: The peer review system used in 2000 before the web-based system was in place did not provide data on presentations or referrals to and from VR. Not all grantees reported through the web-based system on whether or not presentations were made.

Improvements: Grantees will be reminded to address this section of the report.

	projects were determined as follows- 2001: Of 3,942 consumers served, 1,444 were referred from VR; 2002: of 8,247 consumers served, 2,362 were referred from VR; 2003: of 14,158 consumers served, 3,121 were referred from VR. Actual performance percentages for consumers referred from projects to VR were determined as follows- 2001: of 3,942 consumers served, 325 were referred to VR; 2002: Of 8,247 consumers served, 742 were referred to VR; 2003: of 14,158 consumers served, 3,121 were referred to VR.	

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
2001	93	85
2002	88	85
2003	87	87
2004		89

Progress: In addition to the VR percentages reported, presentations to disability related organizations went from 90% in 2001 to 86% in 2002, and back to 90% in 2003. Presentations to other disability-related organizations started at 66% in 2001, then went to 77% in 2002 and 80% in 2003. Projects that disseminated information to state VR projects met the target of 87% for the current reporting period.

Explanation: Data from 2001 was used to establish a baseline. This information came from a narrative report published by RTI, the contractor that designed the web-based system. This information showed that almost all grantees disseminated project materials to state VR and disability related organizations. Dissemination has continued at a reasonably high rate in all areas that were reported, as noted in the progress narrative for this indicator.

Additional Source Information: Web-based Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: December 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting. No formal verification procedure applied.

Limitations: No information regarding this indicator was included in the 2000 review of grantee reports. Not all grantees reported on this indicator in the 2003 web-based report.

Improvements: Grantees will be reminded to address this section of the report.

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Grants for Indians – 2004

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			**Explanation:** Data will not be available until December 30, 2004.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **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	5,105	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			**Progress:** Data will not be available until December 30, 2004. **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 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **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	1,452	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
Percentage of individual who leave the program with employment outcome.			**Explanation:** Data will not be available until December 30, 2004.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** December 2004 **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	66	64.10		
2004		64.50		

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Recreational Programs – 2004

Program Goal: Recreational Programs

Objective 8.1 of 1: Recreational Programs Project Continuation Objective

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Project Continuation: The percentage of Recreation programs sustained after Federal funding ceases.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

The percentage of projects in operation 1, 2, and 3 years after federal funding ceases will maintain baseline.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	66	
2002	80	
2003	75	
2004		66

Explanation: Previous reporting reflected only programs in operation 1 year after federal funding ceased. This new measure will indicate the cumulative number of programs in existence 1, 2, and 3 years following the end of federal funding. Number of programs being tracked after federal funding ceases: FY 1999 (N=4); 2000 (N=8); 2001(N=6); 2002 (N=9); 2003 (N=6); 2004 (N=10). For 1999-2001, 12 of the 18 programs were still in operation. Targets for 2002 -2004 are based on 1 year of data and may need to be adjusted in subsequent years subject to actual performance.

Source: Other
Other: Other.
Sponsor: Telephone Monitoring.
Date Sponsored: 12/31/2003.

Additional Source Information: Telephone monitoring.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: November 2004

Limitations: Contacting past grantees.

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants – 2004

CFDA Number: 84.126A - Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants

Program Goal: Individuals with disabilities served by the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grant program will achieve high quality employment.

Objective 8.1 of 1: 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 4: Percentage of individuals obtaining employment: Increase the percentage of: (a) general and combined State VR agencies that assist at least 55.8% of individuals who receive services to achieve employment outcomes; and (b) State VR agencies for the blind that assist at least 68.9% of individuals who receive services to achieve employment outcomes.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage obtaining employment for general and combined VR agencies			**Explanation:** This new indicator was developed to better measure RSA's efforts to provide assistance to raise the performance of State VR agencies. This indicator is derived from State VR agency performance on indicator 1.2, one of the indicators developed pursuant to Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve employment of all individuals whose cases were closed after receiving services. In order to pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 55.8 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a	**Additional Source Information:** RSA state agency data from the RSA-911. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** April 2005 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors'
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	75			
2003	66			
2004		83		
2005		85		
Percentage obtaining employment for VR agencies for the blind				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	75			
2003	58			
2004		83		

2005		87

rate of 68.9 percent. In FY 2001, the year that served as a baseline for this measure, and for establishing its targets, 75 percent of agencies achieved these rates. Performance targets were not met in 2002 and 2003 due to the growing number of agencies experiencing a decline in employment outcomes. This decline can be attributed to two facts: since FY 2002, extended employment (employment in segregated settings) has not been considered an employment outcome in the VR program; and, during this period of time, there were challenging labor market conditions.

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 8.1.2 of 4: Percentage of individuals obtaining competitive employment: Increase the percentage of: (a) general and combined State VR agencies that assist at least 72.6 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment; and (b) State VR agencies for the blind that assist at least 50 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage obtaining competitive employment for general and combined VR agencies.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	96	
2003	96	
2004		93
2005		94

Percentage obtaining competitive employment for VR agencies for the blind.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: This new indicator was developed to better measure RSA's efforts to provide assistance to raise the performance of State VR agencies that are currently performing poorly. This indicator is derived from State VR agency performance on indicator 1.3, one of the indicators developed pursuant to Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve competitive employment of all individuals who

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: April 2005
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

2002	79	
2003	87	
2004		85
2005		87

achieve employment. In order to pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 72.6 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 35.4 percent. For purposes of this GPRA indicator, we felt that 35.4 percent was too low a target, and we therefore used 50 percent for the agencies for the blind instead. FY 2001 was the year that served as a baseline for this measure and for establishing its targets. In FYs 2002 and 2003, State VR agencies surpassed targets established for this indicator, demonstrating the continued strong program emphasis on assisting individuals with disabilities to achieve high-quality employment outcomes.

Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting 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 8.1.3 of 4: Percentage of competitively employed individuals who have significant disabilities: Increase the percentage of: (a) general and combined State VR agencies for which at least 65 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities; and (b)State VR agencies for the blind for which at least 89 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage with significant disabilities for general and combined VR agencies.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	96	
2003	100	
2004		93
2005		94

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: This new indicator was developed to better measure RSA's efforts to provide assistance to raise the performance of State VR agencies that are currently performing poorly. This indicator is derived from State VR agency performance on indicator 1.4, one of the indicators developed pursuant to Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: April 2005
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for

Percentage with significant disabilities for VR agencies for the blind.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	92	
2003	96	
2004		89
2005		91

of individuals achieving competitive employment who have significant disabilities. In order to pass this indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 62.4 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 89 percent. For purposes of this GPRA indicator, we felt that 62.4 percent was too low a target for general/combined agencies, and we therefore used 65 percent instead. FY 2001was the year that served as the baseline for this measure and for establishing its targets. In FYs 2002 and 2003, State VR agencies surpassed their targets, demonstrating the continued strong program emphasis on serving individuals with significant disabilities.

Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.

Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Percentage of individuals obtaining competitive employment (long-term): By 2008: (a) 75 percent of general and combined State VR agencies will assist at least 85 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment; and (b) 60 percent of State VR agencies for the blind will assist at least 65 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of general and combined State VR agencies assisting at least 85 percent of individuals to achieve competitive employment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	84	
2003	89	
2004		67
2005		69
2006		71

Explanation: This long-term indicator is derived from State VR agency performance on indicator 1.3, one of the indicators developed pursuant to Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve competitive employment of all individuals who achieve employment. In order to pass this indicator, a

Additional Source Information: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 – 2004
Data Available: April 2005
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. Verified by ED attestation

2007		73
2008		75

Percentage of State VR agencies for the blind assisting at least 65 percent of individuals to achieve competitive employment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2002	50	
2003	54	
2004		48
2005		51
2006		54
2007		57
2008		60

general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 72.6 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 35.4 percent. For purposes of this long-term GPRA indicator, we felt that these rates were too low. Therefore, we set a rate of 85 percent for general/combined agencies and 65 percent for agencies for the blind. In FY 2001, 62.5 percent of general/combined agencies achieved a rate of 85 percent, while 41.7 percent of agencies for the blind achieved a rate of 65 percent. This was the year that served as the baseline for this measure and for establishing its targets through FY 2008. In FYs 2002 and 2003, State VR agencies surpassed their targets for this long-term indicator.

process and ED Standards for Evaluation Program Performance Data.

Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training – 2004

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
Scholars supported			**Progress:** Note: Targets were generally exceeded, but the target for scholars supported per million not met as college tuition rates have increased sharply, making the target impossible to reach. **Explanation:** FY 2000-2002 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.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** April 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	1,600			
1998	1,550			
1999	1,665	1,473		
2000	2,390	2,000		
2001	2,540	2,000		
2002	2,232	2,000		
2003		2,050		
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	170
2002	163	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	817	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	56.60	44
2002	59.60	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	15,348	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	**Progress:** FY 2000-2002 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. The performance targets were exceeded due to collaborative efforts between university programs and aggressive recruitment by state vocational rehabilitation agency HR departments. **Explanation:** Next data available will be for FY2003 and will be available in April 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual grantee reporting form. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** April 2005 **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

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	72	70
2001	71	71
2002	85	72
2003		72
2004		74

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

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	69	
2001	71	70
2002	65	75
2003		77
2004		79

Progress: FY 2000-2002 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. In light of the recent high turnover among state VR counselors, we believe that the trend has been downward, and may continue going down until turnover rates stabilize; and/or the recruiting pool increases.

Explanation: In FY 2000, RSA began an evaluation of the Training program that will collect data on each state's CSPD current standard and the number of staff that meet that standard. Many external factors could affect the ongoing collection of data for this indicator.

Additional Source Information: Annual Evaluation. Ongoing collection could be through the In-Service Training program's annual performance report.

Frequency: Other.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: April 2005
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data would be supplied through external RSA contractor. No formal verification procedure applied.

20 USC: Howard University – 2004

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
Average SAT score										**Additional Source Information:** Howard University **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
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	537	544	1,081	.20			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
Attrition rates				**Explanation:** Performance Targets are shown for Howard University rate only; not for national rates.	**Additional Source Information:** The Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange. Howard University. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
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	32.70	14.90	13		
2004			13		

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				**Explanation:** (1) The 45% graduation rate for the consortium in 2003 is a 5-year rate. No 6 year rate was available. (2) For comparative purposes, Howard University's 5-year rate (50.2%) is shown. However, the 6-year graduation rate was 54.8%.	**Additional Source Information:** Howard University and the Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005
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	45	54.80	52
2004			55

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	222	169	160	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 – 2004
Data Available: March 2005
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			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of grant proposals			**Explanation:** Targets for 2004 were not established for this measure.	**Additional Source Information:** Howard University. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	232			
1998	279			
1999	299			
2000	252	301		
2001	261	260		
2002	250	270		
2003	313	275		

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 were not established for this measure. In 2002 and 2003 Howard University was very successful in receiving grants.	**Additional Source Information:** Howard University. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **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	6.20	51,700,000
2002	63,000,000	17.90	53,800,000
2003	65,608,032	4.10	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:** No target for 2004 was established for this measure.	**Additional Source Information:** Howard University & the Chronicle of Higher Education. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **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			
2003	326.50			

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)				**Additional Source Information:** Howard University. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	11.80			
1998	8.40			
1999	9.20			

2000	13.90	11		**Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Audited Financial Statements.
2001	18.40	14.50		
2002	42.40	18		
2003	42.40	20		
2004		35		

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				**Additional Source Information:** Howard University. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	11.40			
1999	9.40			
2000	12.20	25		
2001	15	30		
2002	18	32		
2003	20	20.50		
2004		23		

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				**Additional Source Information:** Howard University **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** March 2005
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	170,084,807			
1998	183,789,977			
1999	204,360,845			

2000	213,879,600	184,510,111
2001	216,598,823	193,735,617
2002	225,252,566	203,422,397
2003	214,206,000	226,394,000
2004		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	258,656,000	234,286,000
2004		233,695,000

Validated By: No Formal Verification.

VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions – 2004

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				**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** May 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Enrollment and graduation data are supplied by the two funded tribally controlled institutions. **Limitations:** Calculations of completions are based on the number of students completing a degree relative to all students "available to graduate" (i.e., students in their final semester). **Improvements:** Planned improvements for data collection include investigating
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Percentage of students	Percentage of students		
1999	23			
2000	57	25		
2001	82	59		
2002	46	65		
2003	48	47		
2004	44	49		

		whether a single cohort of students can be selected and tracked to more effectively calculate completions over time.

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 -		

All Goals

DEOA: Office for Civil Rights – 2004

Program Goal: To ensure equal access to education and promote educational excellence throughout the nation through the vigorous enforcement of civil rights.

Objective 8.1 of 2: To eliminate discriminatory educational practices within schools.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Technical Assistance to Recipients: Percentage of OCR directed activities and resource materials designed to assist recipients in identifying and addressing their obligations under federal civil rights laws.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of OCR materials that assist recipients in identifying and addressing federal civil rights obligations.			**Progress:** This performance indicator will no longer be used in FY 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** Until the electronic Case Management System becomes fully operational in FY 2003, OCR components will collect data manually. Data are collected during the fiscal year (from October 1 to September 30). **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2003	76	50		
2004	66	50		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Technical Assistance to Parents: Percentage of OCR directed activities and resource materials designed to assist parents in understanding recipients' federal civil rights obligations.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of OCR materials that assist parents in understanding recipients' federal civil rights obligations.	**Progress:** This performance indicator will no longer be used in FY 2005.	**Additional Source Information:** Until the electronic Case Management System becomes fully operational in FY 2003, OCR components will collect data manually. Data are collected during the fiscal year (from October 1 to September 30). **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	40	20
2004	34	20

Objective 8.2 of 2: To obtain results by the efficient management of civil rights compliance activities.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Resolution of Complaints: Percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days of receipt.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days				**Additional Source Information:** Data source is OCR's Case Management System. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 – 2004 **Data Available:** October 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	80			
1998	81			
1999	0	80		
2000	78	80		
2001	84	80		
2002	89	80		
2003	91	80		
2004	92	80		