FY 2002
PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REPORT

U.S. Department of Education

Contents

Introduction 1
21st Century Community Learning Centers 2
Adult Education: State Grants and Knowledge Development 6
Advanced Placement Incentives Program 13
Aid for Institutional Development, Title III 14
Alaska Native Education Program 17
American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services 18
Arts in Education 20
Assistive Technology Program 22
Bilingual Education Instructional Services Program 24
Byrd Honors Scholarships Program 27
Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program 28
Civic Education 29
Comprehensive Centers Program 31
Demonstration and Training Programs 33
Demonstration of Comprehensive School Reform 35
Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students With Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education 37
Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions, Title V 38
Eisenhower Federal Activities 41
Eisenhower Professional Development Program 43
Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia 50
Even Start Family Literacy Program 53
Fund for the Improvement of Education 56
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education 59
Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP) 61
Gallaudet University 64

Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) and Javits Fellowships 69
Grants to States and Preschool Grants Program--IDEA Part B 72
Helen Keller National Center (HKNC) for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults 78
High School Equivalency Program and College Assistance Migrant Program 80
Howard University 82
Impact Aid 87
Independent Living Services Program 89
Indian Education 95
Infants and Toddlers With Disabilities--IDEA Part C 99
International Education and Foreign Language Studies Program 103
Magnet Schools Assistance Program 107
McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Program 109
Migrant Education 110
National Activities--IDEA Part D 116
National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Statistics and Assessment 123
National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) 125
National Technical Institute for the Deaf 130
Native Hawaiian Education Program 132
Perkins Vocational and Technology Education (State Grants and Tech-Prep Indicators) 133
Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology 140
Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) 143
Projects with Industry Program (PWI) 144
Public Charter Schools Program 146
Regional Educational Laboratories 148
Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program--State Grants Program and National Programs 152
Smaller Learning Communities (Small, Safe and Successful High Schools) 156
Star Schools Program 157
State Vocational Rehabilitation Services (Including Supported Employment) 159

Student Financial Assistance Policy 163
Student Financial Assistance Programs 169
Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants 171
Technology Challenge Programs: Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, Technology Innovation Challenge Grants, and National Activities 172
Title I Grants for Schools--ESEA 179
Training Program 185
TRIO Programs 188
Office for Civil Rights 190
Office of the Inspector General (OIG) 193

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The Department's *FY 2002 Performance and Accountability Report (PAR)* reports on both the Department-level measures and program measures and is located on our Web site at http://www.ed.gov/pubs/annualreport2002. This document is a compilation of the program performance reports, which contain the results on the program measures.

21st Century Community Learning Centers - 2002

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

Goal 8: 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 continuous improvement in achievement through measures such as test scores, grades, and/or teacher reports.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of regular program participants whose Math/English grades increased from fall to spring.

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

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 70	6	6	6	6	6	6	6

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: Performance data are pending and expected in March 2003.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Grantee and performance reports.

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

Limitations: Data are supplied by grantees.

Improvements: The Web-based system for collecting data from grantees is continually subject to modification on the request of grantees in order to improve the quality of performance reporting.

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

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Behavior: Students participating in the program will show improvements on 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

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

Status: **Unable to judge**

Explanation: Performance data are pending and expected in March 2003.

Additional Source Information: Grantee reports.

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

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

Improvements: The Web-based system for collecting data from grantees is continually subject to modification on the request of grantees in order to improve the quality of performance reporting.

Objective 8.2 of 2: 21st Century Community Learning Centers will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental, and recreational services.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Core educational services: More than 85 percent of centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.

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	95	85

Status: Target exceeded

Explanation: Nearly all of the grantees (95%) provided at least one core educational service (e.g. supplementary help in reading, mathematics, or science).

Additional Source Information: Grantee performance reports.

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

Limitations: There is no objective measure of service quality.

Improvements: The Web-based system for collecting data from grantees is continually subject to modification on the request of grantees in order to improve the quality of performance reporting.

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Enrichment and support activities: More than 85 percent of centers will 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	81	85

Status: Target exceeded

Progress: Target for enrichment and support activities in other areas exceeded. Positive movement toward target for technology services.

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

Additional Source Information: Grantee performance reports.

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

Limitations: Data supplied by grantees.

Improvements: The Web-based system for collecting data from grantees is continually subject to

Percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in other areas.				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	97	85		modification on the request of grantees in order to improve the quality of performance reporting.
2001	95	85		
2002	96	85		

Adult Education: State Grants and Knowledge Development - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.002 - Adult Education_State Grant Program

Goal 8: 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 3: Improve literacy in the United States.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Improve literacy: By 2002, the percentage of adults performing in the lowest proficiency level in the National Adult Literacy Survey will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of adults estimated to be in the lowest of five proficiency levels in the 1992 National Adult Literacy Survey:

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Percentage of Adults	Percentage of Adults
1992	21	

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: No 2002 data are available.

Explanation: The indicator is built around a national household adult literacy survey conducted every 10 years. The initial survey benchmarking adult literacy proficiency in the United States was conducted in 1992. The second national survey, which will provide comparative data on the literacy proficiencies of adults, was scheduled for 2002 but has been delayed to December 2003 with data available in late 2004. No interim data are available.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: NCES Survey/Assessment
Survey/Assessment: Adult Literacy and Lifeskills Survey.

Additional Source Information: National Adult Literacy Survey I, 1992; National Assessment of Adult Literacy Skill, 2002.

Frequency: Other.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: 2004
Validated By: NCES.
Data validated by National Center for Education Statistics review procedures and standards.

Limitations: Limited background information collected on adults in the sample limited the scope of analyses. National Assessment of Adult Literacy Skills, now scheduled for release in 2003, will expand the background questionnaires to provide additional descriptive information and contextual information to enhance the overall analyses of the data.

Objective 8.2 of 3: 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 8.2.1 of 5: Basic skill acquisition: By 2002, 32 percent of adults in beginning level Adult Basic Education programs will acquire the level of basic skills needed (validated by standardized assessments) to complete those beginning levels of instruction.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of adults in beginning-level Adult Basic Education who complete that level and achieve basic skill proficiency.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** In 2002 new standards required validation of basic skills acquisition through standardized assessment. Because of the new standard, new performance targets and baseline have been established. Therefore, no data are available for 2002. **Explanation:** 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 standards require validation of basic skill proficiency through standardized assessment. New targets reflect new standard. Data for 2001 were updated with additional reports from grantees.	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** 1810-0503 Annual Performance Reporting Format for OIE Formula Grants to LEAs. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** March 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review. **Improvements:** The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Percentage of adults	Percentage of adults		
1996	27			
1997	40			
1998	31			
1999	44			
2000	26	40		
2001	36	45		
2002		32		

Indicator 8.2.2 of 5: Basic English language acquisition: By 2002, 30 percent of adults enrolled in the beginning levels of the English Literacy program will acquire (validated by standardized assessment) the level of English language skills needed to complete those beginning levels of instruction.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of adults			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** In 2002, the standard was changed to require validation of basic skill acquisition through standardized assessment. Because of change to the standard, new performance targets and baseline has been established. Therefore, no data are available for 2002. **Explanation:** 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 standards require validation of English proficiency through standardized assessment. New targets reflect new standard. Data for 2001 was revised to reflect additional reports.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** March 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the (OVAE) implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review. **Improvements:** The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards For Evaluating Program Performance Data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1996	30			
1997	28			
1998	28			
1999	49			
2000	20	40		
2001	31	40		
2002		32		

Indicator 8.2.3 of 5: Secondary completion: By 2002, 45 percent of adults with a high school completion goal and who exit during the program year will earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of adults			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Because of change to the standards, new performance benchmark targets have been established. **Explanation:** The performance data reflect the percent 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. No 2002 data are yet available.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** March 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, the OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting. **Improvements:** The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Percent of adults	Percent of adults		
1996	36			
1997	37			
1998	33			
1999	34			
2000	34	40		
2001	33	45		
2002		45		

Indicator 8.2.4 of 5: Transition to postsecondary education or training: By 2002, 40% of enrolled adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who exit during the program year will enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.

Targets and Performance Data				
Number and percentage of adults				
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	300,000	
2002				40

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Because of the change to the standard for data collection, new performance benchmarks and targets have been established. No data are yet available for 2002.

Explanation: 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.

Sources and Data Quality

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: March 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with July 1, 2000, reporting period, OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data quality review.

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

Indicator 8.2.5 of 5: Transition to work: By 2002, 40 percent of unemployed adults with an employment goal will obtain a job of the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number and percentage of adults					**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Because of the change to the standards for data collection, new performance benchmark targets have been established. No 2002 data are currently available. **Explanation:** 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. Data for 2002 are not yet available.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 **Data Available:** March 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. The 2001 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** As a third tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with July 1, 2000, reporting period, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) implemented new data collection protocols, including standards for automated data reporting and a data quality review. **Improvements:** The OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
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	425,000			
2002				40		

Objective 8.3 of 3: Provide adult learners at the lowest levels of literacy access to educational opportunities to improve their basic foundation skills.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Educationally disadvantaged: By 2002, adults at the lowest levels of literacy (those in Beginning Adult Basic Education and Beginning English Literacy) will comprise 50 percent of the total national enrollment.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of adults			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Reported level decreasing. No 2002 data are currently available. **Explanation:** The most educationally disadvantaged adults (those at the lowest levels of literacy and English language skills) have traditionally been a target for services.	**Additional Source Information:** Adult Education Management Information. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** March 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. ED Standards for Evaluating Program performance Data were developed. Other sources corroborate these findings. **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 collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and a data quality review. **Improvements:** OVAE is developing a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Percentage of adults	Percentage of adults		
1996	44			
1997	45			
1998	49			
1999	47			
2000	42	50		
2001	35	50		
2002		50		

Advanced Placement Incentives Program - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.330 - Advanced Placement Program

Goal 8: 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 will increase by 10 percent annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
.			**Status:** Target exceeded **Explanation:** In May 2002 low-income students took 140,572 AP tests, a 25% increase over 2001. Part of the increase, however, may reflect a change in the way the data are collected. More than likely, these numbers were under-reported in previous years.	**Additional Source Information:** Education Testing Service (ETS) data **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** September 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	92,570	83,300		
2000	102,474	102,000		
2001	114,112	112,200		
2002	140,572	124,180		

Aid for Institutional Development, Title III (Aid for Institutional Development, Titles III and V) - 2002

CFDA Numbers: 84.031 - Higher Education_Institutional Aid
84.031B Strengthening HBCU's and Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions
84.031N Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaaiian-Serving Institutions
84.031T Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities
84.120A Minority Science and Engineering Improvement

Goal 8: To assist institutions that have limited resources and that traditionally serve large numbers of low-income and minority students to continue to serve these students, and to improve the capacity of these institutions to provide on going, up-to-date quality education in all areas of higher education.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the academic quality of participating institutions.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Graduation Rates: Completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in Title III 4-year and 2-year colleges will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data

The percentage of full-time, degree-seeking students at Title III institutions completing a 4-year degree within 6 years and a 2-year degree, certificate, or transferring to a 4-year school within 3 years.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	4-Year	2-Year	4-Year	2-Year
1996	37	18		
1997	35	18		
1998	34	21.50		
1999	31.80	20.70		
2000	35.40	21.70		
2001	35.31	23.74		

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Although graduation rates have improved over 1998 levels, there is a slight decline (.09%) at 4-year institutions, but an increase (2.04%) at 2-year institutions compared to the previous year. This progress indicator will be eliminated. The new progress indicator will be based on the Performance Measurement System, with expected results available in March, 2003.

Explanation: These graduation rates understate actual graduation rates, as this analysis only includes the full-time, first-time cohort of students enrolled in degree-seeking (or certificate) programs, and only at the Title III institutions students initially attended. As a result, the graduation rates presented here do not include part-time, transfer, or returning students, which represent a significant portion of the student body at Title III institutions.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: NCES Survey/Assessment
Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
References: Graduation Rate Surveys (GRS).

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: NCES.

Limitations: In 2000-2001 data were voluntarily submitted by 86% of 4-year Title III institutions and 85% of 2-year Title III institutions. In addition, the data tends to be several years old.

Improvements: ED is currently implementing a new Performance Measurement System that will collect data that is more relevant to the impact that Title III projects have on academic quality at grantee institutions. Title III grantees are reporting to the measurement system for the first time and aggregate 2002 data will be available March, 2003.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Improve the fiscal stability of participating institutions.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Fiscal balance: The percentage of Title III institutions having a positive fiscal balance will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Targets and Performance Data The percentage of Title III institutions having a positive fiscal balance

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Public Instructions	Public Instructions
1997	62.60	94.30
1998	70.80	89.50
1999	72.80	87.30
2000	67.10	83.80
2001	67.80	58.67

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: The 1996-97 data established a baseline for the Title III program with the goal of continuous improvement. In 2000 and 2001 there was a decline from the preceding years.

Explanation: The percentage of public institutions has increased, although the percentage of private institutions has decreased. The number of private institutions included in this analysis has decreased significantly over time, which may be account, in part, for the decreased percentage of private institutions having a positive fiscal balance. In addition, the downturn in the national economy has had a profound impact on the fiscal operations at institutions of higher education.

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

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Data validated by NCES review and NCES statistical standards.

Limitations: Data tend to be several years old.

Improvements: New Performance Measurement System will provide more relevant data on the impact of Title III grants on fiscal stability.

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Endowment: The percentage of Title III institutions having an endowment will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of Title III institutions having a positive endowment			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** The percentage of Title III public institutions with a positive endowment has increased by 11.53 percentage points since 1997. **Explanation:** Of the 208 Title III institutions completing the IPEDS financial survey for public institutions, 123 institutions reported a positive endowment and 85 either did not report endowment information, or did not have an endowment. Data has been corrected to only include institutions reporting data to IPEDS and only institutions receiving funds during the reporting year.	**Source:** NCES Survey/Assessment **Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. **References:** Finance Survey. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** January 2004 **Validated By:** NCES. Data validated by NCES review and NCES Statistical Standards. **Limitations:** Data tend to be several years old. Data on endowment balances of private institutions is not available at this time. **Improvements:** New Performance Measurement System will provide more relevant data on the impact of Title III grants on fiscal stability.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Public Institutions	Public Institutions		
1997	47.60			
1998	53.20			
1999	54			
2000	59.20			
2001	59.13			

Alaska Native Education Program - 2002

CFDA Numbers: 84.320 - Alaska Native Educational Planning, Curriculum Development, Teacher Training, and Recruitment Program
84.321 - Alaska Native Home Based Education for Preschool Children
84.322 - Alaska Native Student Enrichment Program
84.356 - Alaska Native Educational Programs

Goal 8: 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: Alaska Native students will have access to instruction and curricula that meet their unique educational needs.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Student achievement: An increasing percentage of Alaska Native students participating in the program will meet or exceed the performance standards in math and science that are established by the grantee.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
An increasing percentage of Alaska Native students participating in the program will meet or exceed the performance standards in math and science that are established by the grantee.	**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Data for this indicator were not collected for 2002; therefore, we cannot measure progress.	

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
- No Data -		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Professional development : Teachers participating in the program will report improved knowledge, skills, and abilities in addressing the unique educational needs of Alaska Native students.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of Teachers	**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Data for this indicator were not collected for 2002; therefore, we cannot measure progress.	

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	70	

American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.250 - Rehabilitation Services_American Indians with Disabilities

Goal 8: 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

The number of individuals who received vocational rehabilitation services under an individualized plan for employment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	2,617	
1998	3,423	
1999	3,186	3,750
2000	4,148	3,730
2001	4,473	4,350
2002		4,500

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Progress on these objectives is expected to reflect the targets established for FY2002

Explanation: The FY2002 data is expected to be available and clean for purposes of reporting by February of 2003. RSA is still in the process of developing a standardized data collection and reporting system. The system has been modified to meet the anticipated requirements of programs results in the OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool. At this time, OMB is reviewing the reporting system. It is still hoped that the Department will be able to have the resources to implement the system and that the system will be implemented to provide 2003 data.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Performance Report
Contractor Performance Report

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

Limitations: Data are self-reported and not standardized. Prior to the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1998, the Department did not have clear authority to collect routine performance data and very limited information was available on the operation and performance of these projects.

Improvements: RSA has developed a standardized data collection and reporting system. The system has been modified to meet the anticipated requirements of programs results in the OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool. The Notice of Proposed Information Collection Request was published in the Federal Register/Vol.67, No. 151 /page 50875 on August 6, 2002. After comments are received, evaluated and changes made if necessary, OMB will review the reporting system. It is hoped that the Department will be able to have the resources to implement the system and that the system will be implemented to provide 2003 data. The first comprehensive evaluation of the AIVRS has been completed and is in the process of being implemented.

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

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	530	
1998	598	
1999	678	715
2000	951	765
2001	1,088	980
2002		1,000

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Progress on these objectives is expected to reflect the targets established for FY2002.

Explanation: The FY2002 data is expected to be available and clean for purposes of reporting by February of 2003.RSA is still in the process of developing a standardized data collection and reporting system. The system has been modified to meet the anticipated requirements of programs results in the OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool. At this time, OMB is reviewing the reporting system. It is still hoped that the Department will be able to have the resources to implement the system and that the system will be implemented to provide 2003 data.

Source: Performance Report
Contractor Performance Report

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

Improvements: Same as reported under Indicator 1.1.

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

.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	57.90	
1999	61.10	
2000	62.20	61
2001	64.60	61.50
2002		62

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Progress on these objectives is expected to reflect the targets established for FY2002.

Explanation: The FY2002 data is expected to be available and clean for purposes of reporting by February of 2003.RSA is still in the process of developing a standardized data collection and reporting system. The system has been modified to meet the anticipated requirements of programs results in the OMB Program Assessment Rating Tool. At this time, OMB is reviewing the reporting system. It is still hoped that the Department will be able to have the resources to implement the system and that the system will be implemented to provide 2003 data.

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

Limitations: Same limitations as reported under Indicator 1.1.

Improvements: Same as reported under Indicator 1.1.

Arts in Education - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.351 - Arts in Education

Goal 8: To promote, improve, and enhance arts education and cultural activities for elementary and secondary school students.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Activities supported with federal funds will improve quality of life outcomes for program participants.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Outcomes: Increasing percentages of individuals who participate in VSA Arts national program activities and activities conducted by state affiliates will report to VSA Arts and its affiliates that these activities positively affected their quality of life outcomes.		
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
- No Targets And Performance Data -	**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Writing: Data will not be available until January 2003. The majority (57 percent) of participants involved in a creative writing program reported that, in addition to writing more, they had increased the amount of time they spent writing. In another group, approximately 50 percent indicated increased skill in written expression. Music: One third of children with autism who participated in a 10-week music program showed improvement in social, verbal and/or listening skills. No current data are available.	**Additional Source Information:** Performance Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 **Data Available:** January 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Performance reports rely on self-reporting.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Kennedy Center Activities will improve the quality of Arts Education programs by providing professional development to school staff.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Quality of services: Increasing percentages of school staff participating in the Professional Development Opportunities for Teachers program will report they are very confident that they learned workshop content well enough to use it in their classrooms.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentages of school staff **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **1999** / 55 /	**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Data for this indicator will not be available until late January 2003. Increasing numbers of teachers will participate in projects supported by the Kennedy Center that create, revise, and disseminate high quality professional development activities and curriculum materials tied to challenging standards. (FY 1998 baseline: 14,000 teachers; FY 1999 18,959 teachers; FY 2000: 22,724 teachers). No current data are available. **Explanation:** During FY 2001, 25,454 teachers though the nation directly participated in activities of the Kennedy Center. This represents an 11% increase over FY 2000.	**Additional Source Information:** Performance Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** January 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Assistive Technology Program - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.224 - Assistive Technology

Goal 8: To increase availability of, funding for, access to, and provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services.

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

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of the 56 grantees responsible for change in at least one area.			**Status:** Target not met **Progress:** All grantees did not report since response on new web-based data collection instrument for FY 02 was voluntary per Office of Management and Budget regulations; future years' reporting is mandatory for all grantees. **Explanation:** NIDRR has developed accurate strategies for collecting and reporting barrier reduction data that incorporate useful definitions.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Program:** NIDRR. **Contractor:** RTI International. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	95			
1998	95			
1999	88	95		
2000	50	95		
2002	78	95		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Individuals who receive loans: The number of individuals with disabilities who receive loans per $1 million invested will met or exceed the baseline.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Approved Loans **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2000** / 229 /	**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Set baseline in FY00 **Explanation:** Analysis of grants made in FY00, analysed and reported in FY01. Analysis of grants made in FY01 completed in 02. report pending.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Program:** NIDRR. **Contractor:** University of Illinois - Chicago. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** November 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

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

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of individuals who received Assistive Technology devices/services **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2001** / 1,290 /	**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** With 34 of 56 State Protection and Advocacy entities reporting. **Explanation:** Informal survey used in absence of formal reporting instrument. Development of approved instrument in planning stages. Working closely with pertinent Dept agencies. Data will be collected as part of annual performance reporting requirements.	**Additional Source Information:** Utilized annual performance reports submitted to the Secretary. Analysis reflects those States that reported on this indicator. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Improvements:** Plans are underway to develop a formal reporting instrument that captures indicator.

Bilingual Education Instructional Services Program - 2002

CFDA Numbers: 84.288 Enhancement Grants
84.289 Program Development and Improvement Grants
84.290 Comprehensive School Grants
84.291 Systemwide Improvement Grants

Goal 8: To help limited-English proficient (LEP) students reach high academic standards.

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

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

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

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

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Status: Unable to judge	**Frequency:** Biennially. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** January 2004 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

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

Comparison within cohorts-Language Arts Cohort 1

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	ENH1	CS1	SW1	ENH1	CS1	SW1
1998	72	64	50			

Comparison within cohorts-Reading Cohort 1

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	ENH1	CS1	SW1	ENH1	CS1	SW1
1998	78	59	53			

Comparison within cohorts-Math Cohort 1

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	ENH1	CS1	SW1	ENH1	CS1	SW1
1998	63	70	43			

Comparison within cohorts-Language Arts Cohort 2

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	PDI	CS2	PDI	CS2
1999	47	41		

Comparison within cohorts-Reading Cohort 2

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	PDI	CS2	PDI	CS2
1999	50	56		

Comparison within cohorts-Math Cohort 2

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	PDI	CS2	PDI	CS2
1999	68	48		

Comparison within cohorts-Language Arts Cohort 3

Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets				
	ENH3	CS1	CS3	SW1	SW2	ENH3	CS1	CS3	SW1	SW2
2000	80	53	72	75	82					

Comparison within cohorts-Reading Cohort 3

Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets				
	ENH3	CS1	CS3	SW1	SW2	ENH3	CS1	CS3	SW1	SW2
2000	80	53	72	75	82					

Comparison within cohorts-Math Cohort 3

Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets				
	ENH3	CS1	CS3	SW1	SW2	ENH3	CS1	CS3	SW1	SW2
2000	76	76	62	63	73					

Byrd Honors Scholarships Program - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.185 - Byrd Honors Scholarships

Goal 8: 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: Ninety percent or more of 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 or receiving a scholarship for 4 years			**Status:** Target not met **Explanation:** Reporting states indicated in 2001 that 86 percent of students receiving a Byrd scholarship in 1996-1997 either graduated or received four years of funding, indicating that they were on track to graduate. For 2002, the data show *only* the percentage of individuals who graduated after four years; in prior years the data show receipt of 4 years of funding or graduation. Targets will be revised for subsequent years.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual Performance Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **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 and/or receiving four years of Byrd funding. Byrd Scholars may not have received four years of Byrd funding for a variety of reasons other than failure to complete an academic program, including early graduation or no unmet financial need.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	85			
1998	90			
1999	94	90		
2000	88	90		
2001	86	90		
2002	22	90		

Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.335 - Child Care Access Means Parents in School

Goal 8: To support the participation of low-income parents in the postsecondary education system through the provisions of campus-based child care services.

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

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

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Median percentage of Retention Rate

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	79	80

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: The percentage of students receiving child care services who persist in post-secondary education varies widely between projects. Of the 76 respondents that reported data on persistence rates, the rates varied between 11 and 100 percent, with a median of 79 percent. 13 of the grantees reported 100 percent retention rates.

Explanation: New program: Little performance data available. Performance data will be collected through 18 month Performance Reports. One year of retention rate data is available, and no completion rate data is available. The program management set performance goals for the 2003 Annual Plan. However, it will be Fall 2004 before the completion rate measure will be meaningful.

Frequency: Other.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: April 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data will be supplied by child care centers with no formal verification procedure provided.

Limitations: Most grantees reported retention data in their first year reports but the program is over. Unsure of the percentage of child care centers that will be able to obtain completion data.

Civic Education - 2002

CFDA Numbers: 84.304 - Cooperative Education Exchange Program
84.929 We The People

Goal 8: To enhance the attainment of the third and sixth National Goals by educating students about the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Provide high-quality civic education curricula to elementary and secondary school students through the "We the People: the Citizen and the Constitution" Program.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Student participation in the "We the People…" Program: The total number of adoptions of "We the People…" curriculum will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The total number of adoptions by states and large school districts of the "We the People…"curriculum.			**Status:** Target met **Explanation:** The "We the People…" Program staff members continue to spend time assisting states and school districts in the formal curriculum adoption process.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual grantee project report and annual grant application, April 2002. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** August 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Actual count of adoptions.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	9			
1999	19			
2000	20	20		
2001	22	21		
2002	25	23		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Teacher institutes: The number of teachers who attend the summer "We the People…" professional development institutes will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The number of teachers participating in professional development institutes.			**Status:** Target exceeded **Explanation:** "We the people"...program staff members were able to conduct institutes in each of the five regions of the United States as well as in some individual states.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual grantee project report and annual grant application, April 2002. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** August 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Actual count of teacher participants.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	183			
1999	317	200		
2000	354	318		
2001	406	320		
2002	785	350		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Foster Students' interest and ability to participate competently and responsibly in the democratic process.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Simulated congressional hearings: At least 80 percent of students participating in the "We the People…" national finals competition will outperform nonparticipating students on national assessments of their knowledge of and support for democratic institutions and processes.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of students participating			**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** Survey items were taken from three sources: the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress Civics Assessment, the 1997 University of Michigan's "Monitoring the Future" survey, and the 1998 UCLA American Freshman survey. **Explanation:** An item-by-item comparison was conducted, and at least 82 percent of the participants in the "We the People…" finals outperformed the average of nonparticipating students in knowledge of and support for democratic institutions and processes by statistically significant margins on every item of the survey instrument, based on previous nationally administered surveys.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual random sample of participants. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** September 2003 **Validated By:** NCES. The National Assessment of Educational Progress, University of Michigan, and UCLA survey results have been validated by National Center for Education Statistics and other nationally recognized research institutions. The Center for Civic Education conducts a survey of the participants in the national finals and is analyzing the results. **Limitations:** Data are self-reported. The Center for Civic Education would like to utilize an external data collection agency to conduct its surveys and prepare independent reports, but additional funding would be required to support an external evaluation.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	89	80		
2000	82	80		
2001	91	80		
2002	87	80		

Comprehensive Centers Program - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.283 - Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers

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

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

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

Targets and Performance Data

Comprehensive Center customers (in percentages)

Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets			
	School wide Programs	High-poverty schools, non-school wide programs	BIA Schools	TOTAL	School wide Programs	High-poverty schools, non-school wide programs	BIA Schools	TOTAL
1998	50	12	4	66				
1999	44	30	3	77				80
2000	59	26	2	89				80
2001	44	43	3	89				80
2002	52	34	1	87				80

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded

Progress: In 2002, 87 percent of customers receiving CC services were legislative priority schools (high-poverty school-wides, high-poverty non-schoolwides or BIA schools). Of the legislative priority schools, the CCs targeted and provided services to an increasingly larger number of high-poverty schools in 2002.

Explanation: In addition to schools designated in the legislation as high priority schools, the CCs also provided services to State agencies, targeted local school districts, intermediate units, and non-priority schools. Since 1998, the CCs have increasingly targeted technical assistance to high-poverty, low-performing schools.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Comprehensive Centers (CC) Semi-Annual Performance Report: Data Tables

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

Limitations: Data are self-reported in the CC Performance Reports (a uniform, reporting instrument), reviewed by ED during information synthesis, and compiled and analyzed by an external contractor.

Improvements: The Comprehensive Centers recently refined reporting to ensure no duplication of school counts occurs during a given year.

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

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

Demonstration and Training Programs - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.235 - Rehabilitation Services Demonstration and Training_Special Demonstration Programs

Goal 8: 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: Eighty percent 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
.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Annual reports for 10/01 – 09/02 have been received and data is being analyzed by Program Officers. **Explanation:** Data from the reports will be available by the February, 2003 reporting period.	**Additional Source Information:** Web-based Annual Performance Reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** February 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	95.60			
2000	100			
2001		80		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: 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 will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Annual reports for 10/01 – 09/02 have been received and data is being analyzed by Program Officers. **Explanation:** Data from the reports will be available by the February, 2003 reporting period.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** February 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations:** Grantees may have difficulty in reporting on their impact to an external agency. Numerous external factors may change the provision or methods of rehabilitation services, and grantees may not be able to pinpoint their impact in the process. Increased contact/interaction with State VR and other rehabilitation service agencies should in crease the impact.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	83			

Objective 8.2 of 2: Disseminate information about successful new types of patterns of services or devices for individuals with disabilities and report the impact of the projects.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Dissemination: The percentage of funded projects that disseminate information to state VR agencies and other funded projects and disability-related organizations will increase and the number of presentations will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of projects			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Data from FY 2001 was used to establish a baseline. **Explanation:** Data are not available for FY2002.	**Additional Source Information:** Web-based Annual Performance Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** April 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations:** Grantees and their objectives, goals and activities are extremely diverse, ranging from direct consumer services, system change projects, technical assistance projects, etc. In addition, this is the first year of using the web-based system. Using the Unified Data Collection Instrument will improve the self-reports from the grantees.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Grantees Presentations	Grantees Presentations		
2001	83			

Demonstration of Comprehensive School Reform - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.332 - Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration

Goal 8: 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: Increasing percentages of students in CSRD program schools will meet or exceed the proficient level of performance on state assessments in reading and math.

Targets and Performance Data

Reading

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Elementary	Middle	High	Elementary	Middle	High
2000	67	56	72			
2001	75	77	64			

Mathematics

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Elementary	Middle	High	Elementary	Middle	High
2000	62	74	61			
2001	74	74	74			

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: Data for this indicator are not yet available. The deadline for submitting the Consolidated State Performance Report for school year 2001-2002, the source of these data, was extended because of the transition to No Child Left Behind. 2002 data are expected by Spring of 2003.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
The 2002 Consolidated Performance Report data (available Spring 2003) may be validated, analyzed, and summarized by Westat if the current contract is modified and extended. That contract is presently under consideration.

Limitations: Data for this indicator will be self-reported by State Educational Agencies and will be in response to reporting requirements outlined in the revised Consolidated State Performance Report.

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: The number of schools implementing comprehensive, research-based approaches to improve curriculum and instruction will increase annually.

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			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Progress on this indicator can be measured by consulting the CSR Awards Database maintained by the Southwest Education Development Laboratory (SEDL). These data are not entirely reliable because they are self-reported by states and must be validated.	The 2002 Consolidated State Performance data (available Spring 2003) may be validated, analyzed, and summarized by Westat if the contract is modified and extended. That contract is presently under consideration.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	31			
2000	46			
2001		55		
2002		60		

Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students With Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.333 - Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive a Higher Education

Goal 8: To improve the quality of higher education for students with disabilities.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that faculty and administrators in institutions of higher education increase their capacity to provide a high-quality education to students with disabilities.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Increased attendance: The number of students with disabilities attending an institution benefiting from grants will increase each year beginning in 2001.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of students benefiting from grants **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **2000** / 125,345 / **2001** / 126,439 /	**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Being refined. **Explanation:** We anticipate a new performance report for this program in the future. This new report will be designed to capture data for these indicators.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** June 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations:** Data are self-reported.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Increased degree attainment: The number of students with disabilities completing coursework leading to a degree or attainment of a degree at an institution benefiting from grants will increase each year beginning in 2001.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
- No Targets And Performance Data -	**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Being refined. **Explanation:** Most states reporting on degree completion indicated increases from 2000 to 2001, but precise numbers were not reported.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** June 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied. **Limitations:** Data are self-reported.

Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions, Title V (Aid for Institutional Development, Titles III and V) - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.031S Strengthening Hispanic-Serving Institutions

Goal 8: To assist Hispanic-serving institutions that have limited resources and that traditionally serve large numbers of low-income and Hispanic students to continue to serve these students, and to improve the capacity of these institutions to provide on-going, up-to-date quality education in all areas of higher education.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the academic quality of participating institutions.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Graduation rates: Completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in Title V 4-year and 2-year colleges will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data

The percentage of full-time, degree-seeking students at Title V institutions completing a 4-year degree within 6 years and a 2-year degree, certificate, or transferring to a 4-year school within 3 years

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	4-year	2-year	4-year	2-year
1998	32.80	19.20		
1999	36.90	17.70		
2000	37.40	17.70		
2001	33.40	22.36		

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Although graduation rates have improved over 1998 levels, there is a decline (4%) at 4-year institutions, but an increase (4.66%) at 2-year institutions compared to the previous year. This progress indicator will be eliminated. The new progress indicator will be based on the Performance Measurement System, with expected results available in March, 2003.

Explanation: The data is representative of the 1999 and 2000 cohort of Title V grantees. Although prior to the time period that grantees actually received funds in 1999, the graduation rates for proceeding years are provided for reference. These graduation rates understate actual graduation rates, as this analysis only includes the full-time, first-time cohort of students enrolled in degree-seeking (or certificate) programs, and only at the Title V institutions students initially attended. As a result, the graduation rates presented here do not include part-time, transfer, or returning students, which represent a significant portion of the student body at Title V institutions.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: NCES Survey/Assessment
Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
References: 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000 Graduation Rate Surveys (GRS).

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: NCES.

Limitations: In 2000-2001 data were voluntarily submitted by 70% of 4-year Title V institutions and 98% of 2-year Title V institutions. In addition, the data tend to be several years old.

Improvements: ED is currently implementing a new Performance Measurement System that will collect data that is more relevant to the impact that Title V projects have on academic quality at grantee institutions. Title V grantees are reporting to the measurement system for the first time and aggregate 2002 data will be available March, 2003.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Improve the fiscal stability of participating institutions.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Fiscal balance: The percentage of Title V institutions having a positive fiscal balance will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data				
The percentage of Title V institutions with a positive fiscal balance				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Public Institutions	Private Institutions	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
2000	53.60	87.50		
2001	70.51	75		

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: The 1999-00 data established a baseline for the Title V program with the goal of continuous improvement. The percentage of public institutions having a positive fiscal balance has increased, although the percentage of private institutions has decreased. The number of private institutions included in this analysis increased from 9 institutions to 24, which may account for the decreased percentage of private institutions having a positive fiscal balance. In addition, the downturn in the national economy has had a profound impact on the fiscal operations at institutions of higher education.

Explanation: 108 Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI) received funding under the Title V program in 1999 and 2000. 84 of the funded HSIs are public institutions and 78 reported revenue and expenditure data to the IPEDS finance survey. Of these 78 public institutions 55 reported having a positive fiscal balance in 2000-01. All 24 private institutions reported financial data, of these 18 reported positive fiscal balances in 2000-01.

Sources and Data Quality

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

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: NCES.
Data validated by NCES review and NCES statistical standards.

Limitations: Data tend to be several years old.

Improvements: New Performance Measurement System will provide more relevant data on the impact of Title V grants on fiscal stability.

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Endowment: The percentage of Title V institutions having an endowment will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of Title V institutions with a positive endowment.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Relative to previous year, the percentage of Title V public institutions with a positive endowment has increased by 2.7%. **Explanation:** Of the 83 public Title V institutions completing the IPEDS financial survey, 41 institutions reported a positive endowment and 42 either did not report endowment information, or did not have an endowment. Data has been corrected to only include institutions reporting data to IPEDS and only institutions receiving funds during the reporting year.	**Source:** NCES Survey/Assessment **Survey/Assessment:** Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. **References:** Finance Survey. **Additional Source Information:** Finance survey conducted as part of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** January 2004 **Validated By:** NCES. Data validated by NCES review and NCES Statistical Standards. **Limitations:** Data tend to be several years old. Data on endowment balances of private institutions is not available at this time.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Public Institutions	Public Institutions		
2000	46.70			
2001	49.40			

Eisenhower Federal Activities - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.168 - Eisenhower Professional Development_Federal Activities

Goal 8: To improve the teaching and learning of all students through the provision 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 2: 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

Percent of customers who report that products are:

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Easy to Access	Up to Date	Value to Work	Easy to Access	Up to Date	Value to Work
1998	64	73	74			
1999	89	96	91			
2000	90	95.50	93.40	72	72	72
2001	97	97	97	76	76	76
2002	98	97	98	78	78	78

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded

Explanation: The Clearinghouse has placed increasing emphasis on customer satisfaction. The Actual Performance data for 2002 represent respondents who provided information on Clearinghouse products and services through customer surveys, bimonthly statistics on product access and dissemination, and informal product feedback. Respondents in prior years represent sample members who remembered Clearinghouse materials well enough to respond to questions about Clearinghouse products.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Voluntary Web Survey conducted by the Clearinghouse Report on FY 2002 performance from the Clearinghouse and Cross-Consortia Evaluation Team, 2002.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by the Clearinghouse and the Eisenhower Cross-Consortia Evaluation Team are subject to an internal review procedure to ensure common terminology and data collection and analysis procedures.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Contribute to the improvement of the teaching and learning of all students by expanding the cadre of highly accomplished teachers.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Teachers certified: The number of teachers who will be awarded Board certification will increase annually and will reach a cumulative total of 22,000 by 2002.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Cumulative number of teachers certified			**Status:** Target exceeded **Explanation:** Forty-nine states, the District of Columbia, and approximately 454 school districts offer some kind of incentive for teachers to apply for National Board certification; these incentives have helped to increase the number of applicants for National Board certification. (These incentives include fee support, salary supplements, and license portability.).	**Additional Source Information:** Board reports, 2001. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** November **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by the Board. Data corroborated by other information available on Nationally Board Certified Teachers. **Improvements:** In the past, all NBCTs for a given cycle have been announced in Nov. This will continue to be the case in 2002. In future years, the announcements may be made throughout the year by certificate area.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	912			
1998	1,834			
1999	4,804	3,600		
2000	9,531	7,900		
2001	16,035	15,000		
2002	23,930	24,000		

Eisenhower Professional Development Program - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.281 - Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants

Goal 8: To improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.

Objective 8.1 of 4: Classroom instruction is improved through effective professional development.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Teachers' knowledge and skills: Increasing percentages of teachers will show evidence that participation in Eisenhower-assisted professional development improved their knowledge and skills.

Targets and Performance Data

Subject Area Content

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	Districts	SAHE Grantees
1998	48	68	50	50
2000			60	60

Instructional Methods

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	District	SAHE Grantees	District	SAHE Grantees
1998	63	79	50	50
2000			60	80

Curriculum

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	District	SAHE Grantees	District	SAHE Grantees
1998	56	64	50	50
2000	64		60	68

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: These data were to have been provided on the ESEA Consolidated Performance Report for School Year 2001-2002. The report has yet to be submitted.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: These data are collected by the ESEA Consolidated State Performance Report for School Year 2001-2002.

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

Approaches to Assessment

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	District	SAHE Grantees	District	SAHE Grantees
1998	46	48	50	50
2000			60	60

Use of Technology

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	Districts	SAHE Grantees
1998	24	50	50	50
2000			60	60

Approaches to Diversity

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	Districts	SAHE Grantees
1998	26	35	50	50
2000			60	60

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Teachers' classroom instruction:: Teachers who receive high quality professional development focused on higher order teaching strategies are more likely to change their teaching practices.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Teaching strategy: Use of calculators or computers to develop models.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Extent teachers who participated in professional development used teaching strategy in classroom	Extent teachers who did not participate in professional development used teaching strategy in classroom	Extent teachers who participated in professional development used teaching strategy in classroom	Extent teachers who did not participate in professional development used teaching strategy in classroom
1999			50	50

Teaching strategy: Use of problems with no obvious solution

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Extent teachers who participated in professional development used teaching strategy in classroom	Extent teachers who did not participate in professional development used teaching strategy in classroom	Extent teachers who participated in professional development used teaching strategy in classroom	Extent teachers who did not participate in professional development used teaching strategy in classr
1999			50	50

Teaching strategy: Use of mathematics and science projects to determine student grades.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
- No Data -		

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: These data were to have been provided on the ESEA Consolidated Performance Report for School Year 2001-2002. The report has yet to be submitted.

Additional Source Information: The ESEA Consolidated State Performance Report for School Year 2001-2002.

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

Objective 8.2 of 4: Professional development is sustained, intensive, and high quality and has a lasting impact on classroom instruction.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: High quality: Increasing percentages of teachers will participate in Eisenhower-assisted professional development activities that reflect best practices.

Targets and Performance Data

Major emphasis on academic content

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	Districts	SAHE Grantees
1998	51	68	50	50
2000			56	72

Involves all teachers in grade, department, or school

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	Districts	SAHE Grantees
1998	39		50	50
2000			56	56

Is followed up with other activities

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	Districts	SAHE Grantees
1998	53	70	50	50
2000			56	75

Involves: a) Planning classroom implementation

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	Districts	SAHE Grantees
1998	66	83	50	50
2000			56	86

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: These data were to have been provided on the ESEA Consolidated Performance Report for School Year 2001-2002. The report has yet to be submitted.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: The ESEA Consolidated State Performance Report for School Year 2001-2002.

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

b) Presenting, leading, and writing

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	Districts	SAHE Grantees
1998	40	67	50	50
2000			56	70

c) Observing and being observed

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	Districts	SAHE Grantees
1998	19	35	50	50
2000	36		56	56

d) Reviewing student work

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	Districts	SAHE Grantees
1998	30	38	50	50
2000	43		56	56

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Sustained professional development: Increasing percentages of teachers participating in Eisenhower-assisted activities will participate in activities that span 6 months or longer.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Status: Unable to judge **Explanation:** These data were to have been provided on the ESEA Consolidated Performance Report for School Year 2001-2002. The report has yet to be submitted.	**Additional Source Information:** The ESEA Consolidated State Performance Report for School Year 2001-2002. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

Percentage of teachers in activities that span 6 months or longer

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	Districts	SAHE Grantees
1998	20	46	35	35
2000			39	50

Objective 8.3 of 4: High-quality professional development is provided to teachers who work with disadvantaged populations.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: High-poverty schools: The proportion of teachers participating in Eisenhower-assisted activities who teach in high-poverty schools will exceed the proportion of the national teacher pool who teach in high-poverty schools.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of Eisenhower participants who teach in high poverty schools*					**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** These data were to have been provided on the ESEA Consolidated Performance Report for School Year 2001-2002. The report has yet to be submitted.	**Additional Source Information:** The ESEA Consolidated State Performance Report for School Year 2001-2002. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Districts	SAHE Grantees	Districts	SAHE Grantees		
1998	23	13	23	23		
1999			25	25		
2000	22		27	27		
2001			29	29		
2002			31	31		
** High-poverty schools are those where 50 percent or more of the students are eligible for free lunches. **In FY 1995-96, 21 percent of teachers in the Nation taught in high-poverty schools. Targets are based on this baseline.*						
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
- No Data -						

Objective 8.4 of 4: Measurement of integrated planning and collaboration.

Indicator 8.4.1 of 1: Increasing percentages of states will adopt performance indicators for professional development, demonstrate a technical understanding of such indicators, and have data (or plans to collect data) for their indicators.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Increasing percentages of states will adopt performance indicators for professional development, demonstrate a technical understanding of such indicators, and have data (or plans to collect data) for their indicators.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** These data were to have been provided on the ESEA Consolidated Performance Report for School Year 2001-2002. The report has yet to be submitted.	**Additional Source Information:** The ESEA Consolidated State Performance Report for School Year 2001-2002. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998		50		
1999	72	70		
2000		90		
2001		100		
2002		100		

Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia - 2002

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

Goal 8: 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

Training improved instructional practice

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	91	
1999	96	75
2000		80
2001	93.50	80
2002	90	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

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

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded

Explanation: For all years that data are reported, the Actual Performance data are shown as the percent of respondents who found training and collaboration with the Consortia to be moderately or extensively useful. Data on collaboration will be collected every other year because there is a history of success with this indicator. When using the standard of a 95% confidence level, each Consortium would have to survey 1200-1400 clients to address this indicator. To do so annually would not be a beneficial use of limited resources. In 2002, clients who were surveyed were those who received intensive services (i.e., 12 or more hours of training and technical assistance).

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research

Additional Source Information: Consortia/Clearinghouse Network Evaluation report 2002. The primary sources for this report are the Consortia and Clearinghouse Descriptive Data System (CCDDS) and participant surveys.

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

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

Collaboration leveraged resources and efforts for greater impact		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1998	80	
1999	87	75
2000		80
2001	81.30	80
2002		80

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

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Print			**Progress:** The target for dissemination by Electronic Media was exceeded. The target for Usefulness cannot be judged because 2002 data are not available. **Explanation:** With the increasing costs of print dissemination, the Consortia expanded their electronic dissemination efforts resulting in a big jump in electronic media contacts with a concurrent drop in contacts by print in 1999, 2000, and 2001. The Consortia's strategy was successful both in practice and outcome as measured by 2001 data on usefulness. Data on usefulness of the information disseminated will be collected every other year because there is a history of success with this indicator. By using the standard of a 95% confidence level, each consortium would have to survey 1200-1400 clients to address this indicator. To do so annually would not be a beneficial use of limited resources. Beginning in 2001, data were collected using newer, more accurate, widely accepted techniques for representing the number of contacts that customers had with Web-based information. Shown for 2001 is the baseline of page views, not Web hits.	**Additional Source Information:** Consortia/Clearinghouse Network Evaluation report 2002. The primary sources for this report are the Consortia and Clearinghouse Descriptive Data System (CCDDS) and participant surveys. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** January 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Common definitions and common data collection procedures established across each Consortium. Data are subjected to Cross-Consortia's Eisenhower Network Evaluation Committee internal review and validation procedures. **Limitations:** 2001 and 2002 data cannot be compared with data from the old system.
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		

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

Usefulness

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

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

Even Start Family Literacy Program - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.314 - Even Start_Statewide Family Literacy Program

Goal 8: 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 4: Adult literacy achievement: Increasing percentages of Even Start adults will achieve significant learning gains on measures of math and reading.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of adults showing moderate to large gains on Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE)

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Math	Reading	Math	Reading
1995	26	31		
1996	24	20		
2001			40	30

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Progress toward the target cannot be judged since there was no valid assessment instrument for 2001. Format of the 2001-02 Department's Consolidated State Performance Report (currently under development) will determine if data are available for 2002.

Explanation: The percentage of adults who showed significant gains in 1995-96 (the last year for which data are available) did not change in math and declined in reading. Progress toward the target cannot be judged since the assessment will be changed for the next data point. (An improved but different assessment instrument will be used in the next measure of performance towards this target).

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: In addition to the annual Consolidated State Performance Report, data sources are the Second and Third National Even Start Evaluations: Sample Study.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data for the Second and Third National Even Start Evaluations: Sample Study were collected before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed.

Limitations: The National Even Start Evaluations: Sample Study was designed to look at new participants' gains each year, thus the populations being compared in 1994-95 and 1995-96 were different. The Sample Study also had a small sample size, as well as grantee collected data.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Adult educational attainment: Increasing percentages of adult secondary education (ASE) Even Start participants will earn their high school diploma or equivalent.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** Target not met **Progress:** There has been no significant change in the percentage of ASE participants earning a Graduate Equivalency Diploma. **Explanation:** The GED figures presented for 1998-99, 1999-00, and 2000-01 represent only the GED attainments for new enrollees within the program year of their enrollment. Thus, GEDs that participants earned after the year of their enrollment ARE NOT reflected.	**Additional Source Information:** Second and Third National Even Start Evaluations: Universe Study **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 **Data Available:** 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data were collected for the Second and Third National Even Start: Universe Study before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. Other sources and experience corroborate these findings **Limitations:** Definitions of participation in ASE and Graduate Equivalency Diploma may vary across programs and these data are obtained through grantee self- report.
1996	18			
1997	19			
1999	18.40			
2000	17			
2001		25		

Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Children's language development and reading readiness: Increasing percentages of Even Start children will achieve significant gains on measures of language development and reading readiness.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of children achieving moderate to large gains on a measure of language development			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** No new target was set and no new data are available for FY 2002. **Explanation:** There has been a continuing increase in the percentage of children achieving gains on a measure of language development. Target was met in 1996-97. Progress toward the target for 2000-2001 cannot be judged since there was no valid assessment instrument. The format of the 2001-02 Department's Consolidated State Performance report will determine if data are available for 2002.	**Additional Source Information:** In addition to the Consolidated State Performance Report, data are collected by the Second National Even Start Evaluation. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data for the Second and Third National Even Start Evaluations: Sample Study were collected before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed. **Limitations:** The National Evaluation Study was designed to look at new participants' gains each year; thus, the populations compared in 1994-95 and 1995-96 were different. The Sample Study also has a small sample size, as well as grantee collected data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1996	45			
1997	64			
2001		60		

Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Parenting skills: Increasing percentages of parents will show significant improvement on measures of parenting skills, home environment, and expectations for their children.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of parents of 3-to-6-year-old children making medium-to-large gains on the Home Screening Questionnaire

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995	45	
1996	50	

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: The percentage of parents showing significant improvement on measures of parenting skills improved from 1994-95 to 1995-96. More recent data are not available.

Explanation: ED has continued to place a strong emphasis on improving the literacy focus of parenting education in the last few years. Progress toward the target for 2000-2001 cannot be judged since there was no valid assessment instrument. Data to be collected in the 2001-02 Consolidated State Performance Report are currently being defined. If the Report collects data on Even Start "parenting skills," those data will be available in 2003 and will show what progress was made in 2002.

Additional Source Information: In addition to the Consolidated State Performance Report, data are collected in the Second and Third National Even Start Evaluations.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data were collected for the National Even Start Evaluations before ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data were developed.

Limitations: Instruments used to measure parenting outcomes often have accuracy problems; parents often respond with the answer that is socially acceptable, even if not accurate.

Fund for the Improvement of Education - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.215 - Fund for the Improvement of Education

Goal 8: To contribute to the achievement of the National Education Goals by supporting nationally significant and innovative projects for improving K-12 education.

Objective 8.1 of 1: Support the Department's strategic priorities in elementary and secondary education through nationally significant projects of high quality.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Nationally significant projects are supportive of strategic priorities: Ninety percent of all FIE-funded projects will support the Department's strategic priorities in elementary and secondary education, and 90 percent of the peer-reviewed projects will receive at least an 80 percent rating for national significance.

Targets and Performance Data

Alignment with strategic priorities (in percentage)

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	100	100
2000	100	100
2001	100	100
2002	100	100

National significance receiving rating (in percentage)

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	72	90
2000	95	90
2001	57	90
2002	90	90

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target met

Explanation: Earmarked projects were not included in the analysis of national significance because their applications do not receive scores and are not peer-reviewed. These non-competitive projects are often locally focused and their significance cannot easily be assessed from their original applications. However, overall, many of the projects are expected to produce nationally significant results by the end of the project period. Character education is part of the Department's strategic plan and the unsolicited grants funded are all related to the Department's Strategic Plan.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Peer-reviewer ratings of applications, 2002.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001
Data Available: September 2002
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data collected from peer-reviewed instruments. Data will not be collected for this measure after 2002.

Limitations: In FY 2002, the only competition under the FIE Program administered by OERI was the Partnerships in Character Education Partnerships. The selection criteria for this newly reauthorized program were based on the statute. There was not a specific criterion on national significance. However, there was a competitive preference priority for a rigorous experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation design. All but one of the funded projects responded to this competitive preference priority. A rigorous evaluation of each project is likely to yield nationally significant findings on the effectiveness of the projects.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: High quality: Ninety percent of peer-reviewed projects will receive at least an 80 percent rating for quality of project design.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Criteria: project design

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	48	90
2000	92	90
2001	37	90
2002	86	90

Status: Target not met

Progress: Earmarked projects were not included in the analysis of project design because their applications are not peer reviewed.

Explanation: Only 37% of FY 2001 projects scored at least 80% for project design. In FY 2002, 100 percent of the character education projects scored 80 percent or above for project design. There was a positive trend for unsolicited projects as 60% met the indicator. In FY 2000, none met this indicator. In FY 2001, 35 percent met the target.

Additional Source Information: Peer-reviewer ratings of applications, 2002.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001
Data Available: September 2002
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data to be collected from peer review instruments. Data will no longer be collected for this measure.

Improvements: The greatly increased number of eligible applicants for the character education competition made a difference in the scores of the top rated applications. Unsolicited applications scores are rising.

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Progress: Eighty percent of projects will be judged to have successfully implemented strategies or yielded results that can contribute to improving education.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **- No Data -**	**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** In 2001, a sample of projects submitting final reports (all from the same competition) were identified and a review instrument designed. **Explanation:** Data not collected. It was determined that as grantees and contractors were not told about this review and were not provided the criteria prior to submitting final reports, that this would not be a fair nor adequate measure of their projects.	**Additional Source Information:** Final reports, which will be externally reviewed. Data will no longer be collected on this measure. **Frequency:** Annually. **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Final reports were collected but were not peer reviewed. **Limitations:** It was determined that in order to be fair to the project and to also obtain reliable data, applicants would need to know about this type of requirement from the very beginning so that an evaluation plan could be part of the original application. Under the new program authority in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, evaluations are to be incorporated into all projects.

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.116 - Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

Goal 8: 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 number of projects that are adapted in full or in part, or whose materials are used by other institutions, will increase over the number in previous years.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of FIPSE grantees reporting full project dissemination to others

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	92	
1999	100	
2000	83	100
2001	96	85
2002	94.50	95

Status: Target not met

Explanation: FIPSE considers itself successful on this measure if 8 of every 10 projects result in project models being adapted on other campuses.

Additional Source Information: Final Report Scorecard.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 - 2004
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Similar results from site visit scorecard.

Limitations: Data supplied by project directors in response to survey instruments. Have revised form to match indicators more closely. Planning an external evaluation of the Comprehensive Program through PES around these indicators.

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 will be maintained or increased beyond current level.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of Projects reporting full or partial institutionalization on their home campuses

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	93	
1999	96	
2000	94	100
2001	100	95
2002	95	95

Status: Target met

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. Based on this assessment, 95 percent demonstrate partial or complete institutionalization by the end of the grant.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003 - 2004
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Similar Data from Site Visit Scorecard. Assessment of project drawn from on-site visitation and evaluation or projects. 100 percent of projects have shown attention devoted to dissemination planning before the end of the project date.

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.

Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP) - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.334 - Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs

Goal 8: 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: Program participants will successfully complete college preparatory courses such as algebra, geometry, chemistry, and physics at increasing rates.

Targets and Performance Data

The percentage of seventh graders who passed prealgebra

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	18	
2002	18	

The percentage of seventh graders who passed Algebra 1

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	2	
2002	2	

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Targets were not established for 2002.

Explanation: Data will continue to be collected on successful completion of core academic subjects and other college preparatory courses. Note that standards to enter and complete above grade level math courses (such as prealgebra and Algebra I for 7th graders) are becoming more rigorous. This practice may limit the percentage of students in many schools served by GEAR UP who are entering and completing such courses. Also Note that data for Year 2001 were obtained from the GEAR UP Annual Performance Report covering April 2000 - March 2001. Data for Year 2002 were obtained from the GEAR UP Annual Performance Report covering April 2001 - March 2002.

Sources and Data Quality

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

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

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, high school completion, and postsecondary enrollment: Program participants will have high rates of attendance in school, be promoted to the next grade level on time, and successfully complete high school and enroll in postsecondary education programs at increasing rates.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

The percentages of participating seventh graders promoted to the next grade level

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	98	
2002	97	

The percentage of seventh graders with fewer than five unexcused absences in the first two quarters of 2000-01

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	83	
2002	88	

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Targets were not established for 2002.

Explanation: Data will continue to be collected on school attendance and grade level promotions, and in future years on high school completion and postsecondary education enrollment. Note that standards for promotion have become more rigorous in many school districts and states that have GEAR UP programs.

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

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

Objective 8.3 of 3: Increase educational expectations for participating students and student and family knowledge of postsecondary education options, preparation, and financing.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Knowledge of postsecondary education costs, financing, and academic preparation: Program participants and their families will increasingly report having knowledge of postsecondary education costs, available financial aid, and necessary academic preparation for college.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

The percentage of GEAR UP students who have talked to their school counselor, advisor or someone else at their school about academic preparation for college and college entrance requirements.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	50	
2002	53	

The percentage of parents of GEAR UP students who have talked to their children's school counselor, or someone else at their children's school about academic preparation for college and college entrance requirements.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	31	
2002	39	

The percentage of parents of GEAR UP students who have talked to their children's school counselor, advisor or someone else at their children's school about availability of financial assistance.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	24	
2002	31	

The percentage of GEAR UP students who are aware of two or more types of postsecondary education institutions.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	62	
2002	62	

The percentage of GEAR UP parents who have participated in GEAR UP events

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	36	
2002	37	

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Targets were not established for 2002.

Explanation: Data will continue to be collected on students and parents' knowledge of postsecondary education entrance requirements, costs of attendance, and financial aid opportunities.

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

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

Gallaudet University - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.994K Gallaudet University Programs, Elementary and Secondary Education Programs, Pre-College Programs, Endowment Grant

Goal 8: 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 2: 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 a minimum enrollment of 1,250 undergraduate and 700 graduate students; 70 students in professional studies; 225 students at the Model Secondary School; and 140 students at the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School.

Targets and Performance Data

Undergraduate enrollment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	1,339	
1999	1,300	1,250
2000	1,318	1,250
2001	1,321	1,250
2002	1,243	1,250
2003	1,243	1,250

Graduate enrollment

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

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: There was a considerable increase in graduate enrollment in fiscal year 2002. In fiscal year 2003, the Undergraduate enrollment fell slightly short its target. The Professional Studies enrollment and Kendall School enrollment targets were exceeded in 2003; Model Secondary School fell short of its target in 2003.

Explanation: The 2002 Undergraduate enrollment, which was slightly short its target was addressed through a number of strategic recruitment activities during fiscal year 2002. The fiscal year 2002 enrollment at the Kendall School exceeded its target. The Model School has developed strategies to address enrollment. In fiscal year 2003, the total undergraduate enrollment held steady at 1,243, very near its target. The Graduate enrollment, while not meeting its target, increased considerably over the fiscal year 2002 enrollment. Implementation of key strategies for increasing Graduate and Professional Studies enrollments has resulted in substantial increases in both categories. While the Model Secondary School did not reach its target enrollment, it slightly increased enrollment over the fiscal year 2002 level. The Kendal School enrollment increased approximately 3 percent over the fiscal year 2002 level, again exceeding its target. Gallaudet has

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Collegiate Office of Enrollment Services, and Clerc Center student database, FY 2003 enrollment as of October 2002, summarized in Gallaudet's FY 2002 annual report, submitted in 2003.

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

Professional studies enrollment

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

Model School enrollment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	224	
1999	209	225
2000	219	225
2001	205	225
2002	188	225
2003	190	225

Kendall School enrollment

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

established minimum enrollment targets based on longstanding enrollment targets and historical trends recognizing that actual figures vary from year to year.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Student retention rate: Increase the undergraduate retention rate and maintain a minimum retention rate of 90 percent at the Model School/Kendall School.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Undergraduate retention rate			**Status:** Target not met **Progress:** The undergraduate retention rate fell show its target, however, there was an increase over the fiscal year 2001 rate for undergraduates. The Clerc Center (Model and Kendall) retention rate fell short its target in fiscal year 2002 **Explanation:** The percentage of students returning to the University increased 2 percent from fiscal year 2001, making performance very close to the target. Increased focus on retention of students and particular attention to the success of first year students have contributed to the increase. The fiscal year 2002 Clerc Center retention rate o f86 percent is nearly at the same level reported for fiscal year 2001 but still slightly below the target.	**Additional Source Information:** Collegiate Office of the Register and Clerc Center (Model and Kendall Schools) Office of Exemplary Programs and Research records, summarized in the FY 2002 annual report, submitted in 2003. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center **Limitations:** Gallaudet plans to refine the retention rate indicator for the Clerc Center students and how progress toward its target is calculated, so that it more validly reflects the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to Clerc Center students. The concepts of retention and persistence at the postsecondary level do not translate appropriately to elementary and secondary special education.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	72			
1999	73	75		
2000	72	76		
2001	71	76		
2002	73	76		
2003		76		
Clerc Center: Model School and Kendall School retention rate				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	85			
1999	92	90		
2000	82	90		
2001	88	90		
2002	86	90		
2003		90		

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

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Undergraduate graduation rate

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	41	
1999	42	41
2000	41	42
2001	41	43
2002	42	44
2003		45

Model School graduation rate

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

Status: Target not met

Progress: The Undergraduate graduation rate declined from the previous year and fell short its target. The Model Secondary School graduation rate declined from the previous year and fell short of its target.

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

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

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

Limitations: Gallaudet plans to reconceptualize how performance is assessed for the Model School graduation rate to make this indicator a more valid reflection of what really occurs with a given senior class. Students may graduate at the end of their senior year, or they may make the decision, as part of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) process, to change their graduation so they may continue to pursue their IEP goals, or they may elect to take the fifth year option.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Gallaudet works in partnership with others to develop and disseminate educational programs and materials for deaf and hard-of-hearing students.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Use of the Demonstration Schools' expertise: Other programs and/or institutions adopting innovative curricula and other products, or modifying their strategies as a result of Model and Kendall's leadership, will be maintained or increased.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Programs adopting Model/Kendall Innovative strategies/curricula			**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** The Clerc Center exceeded its target in fiscal year 2002. **Explanation:** Fifty-six new programs adopted innovative Clerc Center strategies or curricula in FY 2002, representing an increase over fiscal year 2001 and exceeding its target in fiscal year 2002. Again, it should be noted that the number of new programs adopting innovations from year to year will vary and depends in part on the number and type of strategies and curricula being disseminated by the Clerc Center and the financial and personnel resources available within other programs to participate in training and implementation activities.	**Additional Source Information:** Records of the Clerc Center Office of Training and Professional Development, summarized in the FY 2002 Annual Report, submitted in January 2003. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center. No formal verification procedures applied.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	41			
1999	52	41		
2000	62	41		
2001	39	41		
2002	56	41		

Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) and Javits Fellowships - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.200 - Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need

Goal 8: To increase the number of persons trained at the highest academic level

Objective 8.1 of 2: Increase the number of graduate students in areas of national need, including the number of underrepresented groups.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Graduate school completion: There will be an increase in the percentage of U.S. citizens and permanent residents who receive a GAANN fellowship and obtain a doctorate in an area of national need.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of students receiving a GAANN fellowship who earned a doctorate degree.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	60	
2001	12	12
2002		12

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Progress toward performance targets is limited because the grant is for a three-year period, but the average time to degree for a Ph.D. is seven years.

Explanation: Data is reported at the end of a three-year grant period from information provided in the final performance reports. In FY 2002, there is no new data to report because there were no new awards for the grant period FY 1999-2001.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Performance Report
Contractor Performance Report

Additional Source Information: The FY 1999 data is not comparable to the subsequent fiscal year data. In FY 1999, contractors surveyed all grantees funded up to that time and reported the compiled data. The number does not reflect reporting from an individual cohort of grantees, but from all grantees who responded to the survey.

Frequency: Other.
Collection Period: 2000 - 2002
Data Available: December 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: The data on completion rates are limited because the project period for a GAANN grant is three years, while the average time to Ph.D. completion is 7 years. Although grantees are required to submit an interim report for each of the first two years of the grant period and a final report at the end of the project period, the majority of fellows will not have reached completion of their Ph.D during the three-year project period. No further reporting is required.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Enrollment of targeted populations: The percentage of GAANN fellows from underrepresented groups will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data											Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of fellows from traditionally underrepresented groups by grantee cohort											**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Progress toward performance targets is limited because the grant is for a three-year period, but the average time to degree for a Ph.D. is seven years. **Explanation:** Data is reported at the end of a three-year grant period from information provided in the final performance reports. In FY 2002, there is no new data to report because there were no new awards for the grant period FY 1999-2001.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2000 - 2002 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** The authorizing statute recommends, but does not mandate, that grantees seek individuals from traditionally underrepresented groups when awarding fellowships. However, in responding to the selection criteria, grantees must address plans to include students from underrepresented groups.
Year	**Actual Performance**					**Performance Targets**						
	Alaskan/ Native American Indians	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Women	Alaskan/Native American Indians	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Women		
1999	1	10	7	4	37							
2000						1	7	7	6	38		
2001	0	7	7	7	39	1	7	7	6	38		
2002						1	7	7	6	38		

Objective 8.2 of 2: To enable students of superior ability in the arts, humanities, and social sciences to complete their terminal degree.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Graduate school completion: The percentage of Javits fellows who complete a terminal degree within 7 years will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Rates of doctorate attainment by Javits fellows 7 years from enrollment.	**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** No 2000-2002 data are available **Explanation:** The graduation rate within seven years of entering a graduate program for Javits fellows is 26% in 1999. The Survey of Earned Doctorates collects only information on attainment of a doctorate degree. Some Javits fellows pursue programs in fields for which the terminal degree is below the doctorate level; their attainment is not accounted for, resulting in a measure that it biased downward.	**Additional Source Information:** Program performance reports; Survey of Earned Doctorates, 1999. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** January 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
1998	30	
1999	26	

Grants to States and Preschool Grants Program--IDEA Part B - 2002

CFDA Numbers: 84.027 - Special Education_Grants to States
84.173 - Special Education_Preschool Grants

Goal 8: To improve results for children with disabilities by assisting state and local educational agencies to provide children with disabilities access to high-quality education that will help them meet challenging standards and prepare them for employment and independent living.

Objective 8.1 of 5: All preschool children with disabilities receive services that prepare them to enter school ready to learn.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Inclusive settings : 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) will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of preschool children with disabilities receiving services in inclusive settings			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** New state data collections typically take up to five years to achieve reliability. Because there is a one-year lag in the availability of this data after collection, the data that became available in 2002 is for 2000-2001	**Additional Source Information:** IDEA State-reported data **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** September 2003 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	41.40			
1999	41.40			
2000	39.80			
2001	38.90			

Objective 8.2 of 5: All Children who would typically be identified as being eligible for special education at age 8 or older and who are experiencing early reading or behavioral difficulties receive appropriate services earlier to avoid falling behind their peers.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Earlier identification and intervention: The percentage of children served under IDEA ages 6 or 7, compared to ages 6 to 21, will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of children served under IDEA under ages 6 or 7			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** This indicator is under review by the Department. Therefore no actual data or are shown after 1999-or 2000.	**Additional Source Information:** IDEA state reported data **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	% of children	% of children		
1997	13			
1998	13.40			
1999	12.80	14		

Objective 8.3 of 5: All children with disabilities have access to the general curriculum and assessments, with appropriate accommodations, supports, and services, consistent with high standards.

Indicator 8.3.1 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 will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of children			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** The percentage of children served in regular education classrooms at least 80 percent of the day decreased from 47.3 percent in 2000 to 46.5 percent in 2001. Because there is a one-year lag in the availability of this data after collection, the data that became available in 2002 is for 2000-2001.	**Additional Source Information:** Sate-reported data required under IDEA. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** September 2003 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. **Limitations:** The Department is taking steps to reduce the amount of time for collecting and reporting data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	% of Children	% of Children		
1996	52.60			
1997	45.70			
1998	46.40			
1999	47.40	48		
2000	47.30	47.50		
2001	46.50	48.50		
2002		48.80		

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Performance on National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): The percentage of students with disabilities who meet or exceed basic levels in reading, math, and science in the NAEP will increase. The number of students with disabilities who do not meet basic standards will decrease. The percentage of students who are excluded from the NAEP because of their disabilities will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of students with disabilities who met or exceeded basic levels-4th grade

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Reading	Math	Science	Reading	Math	Science
1996		43.30	38.60			
1998	24					
2000	21.50	30.30	36.70			

Percentage of students with disabilities who met or exceeded basic levels-8th grade

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Reading	Math	Science	Reading	Math	Science
1996		26.80	16.70			
1998	28					
2000	0	23.40	25.90			

Percentage of students with disabilities who met or exceeded basic levels-12th Grade

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Reading	Math	Science	Reading	Math	Science
1996		9.40	16.30			
1998	34					
2000		22.90	15.60			

Number of students who did not meet basic level-4th Grade

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Reading	Math	Science	Reading	Math	Science
1996		275,907	298,778			
1998	387,016					

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: Data for this indicator are based on NAEP reading, math and science score. Since each NAEP subject test is administered in a different year, data reported in this indicator will vary. For Math and Science the percentage excluded from NAEP includes public and private school students. For Reading the percentage includes only public school students. The percentage reported for 8th grade Math who met or exceeded basic levels has been corrected to 26.8 percent based on an error in reporting last year's data.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Analysis of data from National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Frequency: Other.

Data Available: January 2003 Analysis of data from National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Limitations: Data on children with disabilities who meet or exceed basic standards are based on very small sample sizes, and, therefore, have a low level of reliability.

Number of students who did not meet basic level-8th Grade

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Reading	Math	Science	Reading	Math	Science
1996		308,728	351,326			
1998	321,330					

Number of students who did not meet basic level-12th Grade

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Reading	Math	Science	Reading	Math	Science
1996		241,110	223,672			
1998	200,173					

Percentage of students excluded from NAEP-4th Grade

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Reading	Math	Science	Reading	Math	Science
1996		4	5			
1998	6					
2000	4	3	3			

Percentage of students excluded from NAEP-8th Grade

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Reading	Math	Science	Reading	Math	Science
1996		3	4			
1998	5					
2000		3	3			

Percentage of students excluded from NAEP-12th Grade

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Reading	Math	Science	Reading	Math	Science
1996		3	3			
2000		2	2			

Objective 8.4 of 5: Secondary school students with disabilities receive the support they need to complete high school prepared for postsecondary education or employment.

Indicator 8.4.1 of 1: Graduation: The percentage of children with disabilities exiting school with a regular high school diploma will increase, and the percentage who drop out will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of students					**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Because there is a one-year lag in the availability of this data after collection, the data that became available in 2002 is for 2000-2001. From 2000 to 2001, the percentage of children with disabilities who graduated with a high school diploma increased from 56.2 percent to 57 percent, while the percentage who dropped out remained at 29.4 percent.	**Additional Source Information:** State reported data required under IDEA. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** September 2003 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. **Limitations:** Supplemental descriptive information will be provided by the National Longitudinal Study II.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Graduation	Drop out	Graduation	Drop out		
1996	52.60	34.10				
1997	53.50	32.70				
1998	55.40	31				
1999	57.40	28.90	56	31		
2000	56.20	29.40	57	30		
2001	57	29.40	59	27		
2002			60	26		

Objective 8.5 of 5: States are addressing their needs for professional development consistent with their comprehensive system of personnel development (CSPD).

Indicator 8.5.1 of 1: Qualified personnel: The number of states and outlying areas where at least 90 percent of special education teachers are fully certified in the area in which they are teaching will increase.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of States					**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Because there is a one-year lag in the availability of this data after collection, the data that became available in 2002 is for 2000-2001. There is a clustering of states around the 90 percent goal in the indicator, which may result in unpredictable changes from year to year. However, evidence of a positive trend is expected to be evident over a 5- to 7- year period. **Note:** Data for actual performance for 1996-2000 have been revised to eliminate effects of rounding. This has resulted in lower results than previously reported.	**Additional Source Information:** IDEA state reported data **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** September 2003 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. **Limitations:** The Department is taking steps to reduce the amount of time for collecting and reporting.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	No. of States Serving Ages 3-5	No. of States Serving Ages 6-21	No. of States Serving Ages 3-5	No. of States Serving Ages 6-21		
1996	34	39				
1997	36	38				
1998	38	40				
1999	36	37	40	41		
2000	36	37	41	42		
2001			40	42		
2002			40	42		

Helen Keller National Center (HKNC) for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.904A Helen Keller National Center

Goal 8: 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: The training program at headquarters will maintain or increase the number of adult consumers and high school students served, the percentage of consumers who complete training and are placed in employment settings, and the percentage of consumers who complete training and return to less restrictive living situations.

Targets and Performance Data

Number of adult consumers, high school students and percentage of consumers

Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets			
	Adult Consumers	High School Students	% Placed	% Placed in Less Restricting Settings	Adult Consumers	High School Students	% Placed	% Placed in Less Restricting Settings
1999	75	16	45	49	85	12	38	25
2000	82	15	52	59	90	12	45	49
2001	87	13	38	64	90	12	45	59
2002					90	12	45	59

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Progress on these objectives is expected to reflect the targets established for FY2002.

Explanation: The FY2002 data will be available for reporting by April 2003.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report for 2001.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: April 2003
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 on self-reported 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: Clients improve functionally: Participants in the core training program at headquarters will increase their skills and abilities in areas such as vocational services, communication, orientation and mobility, and independent living. The target will be established upon receipt of baseline data. The target for 2001 is an 85 percent success rate in achieving training goals.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of identified training goals successfully achieved by participants			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Progress on these objectives is expected to reflect the targets established for FY2002. **Explanation:** The FY2002 data will be available for reporting by April 2003.	**Additional Source Information:** HKNC Annual Report for 2001. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - **Data Available:** April 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Individual Training Plan (ITP). **Limitations:** Data are based upon self-reported data from the grantee and are not independently verified.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	83.70	84		
2000	88.90	85		
2001	92	86		

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							**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** In 2001, the regional offices served more consumers and families than were targeted. The 913 agencies/organizations served represented a decrease of 82. **Explanation:** No data are available for FY2002. 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 for 2001. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** March 2003 **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				1,500	400	1,050		

High School Equivalency Program and College Assistance Migrant Program - 2002

CFDA Numbers: 84.141 - Migrant Education_High School Equivalency Program
84.149 - Migrant Education_College Assistance Migrant Program

Goal 8: 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 2: 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			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** The percentage of HEP students who received the GED decreased in FY 2000 and 2001 because the GED requirements changed, grantees had problems with test centers in their States, in particular with GED testing in Spanish, and five of the projects were new projects and had difficulty with late start-up dates. Data for 2002 are not yet available.	**Additional Source Information:** HEP/Camp grantee performance reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** January 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data were supplied by grantees.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1996	70			
1997	66			
1998	72			
1999	73			
2000	58			
2001	53			

Objective 8.2 of 2: CAMP students will graduate from 4-year colleges or universities at higher rates

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Student graduation: The percentage of former CAMP participants who complete a postsecondary degree program will be as high as that achieved by a comparable group of students.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of former CAMP participants who successfully complete a postsecondary degree. **Year** | **Actual Performance** | **Performance Targets** **- No Data -**	**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** The data for FY 2001-2002 will be available when grantees submit their Grant Performance Report, ED Form 524-B for the non-competing continuation awards. These reports cover the period from February 15, 2001 through February 15, 2002, and include the data for the end of the year report for FY 2000-2001. **Explanation:** These data have not been available as grantees have not systematically tracked progress made by former migrant students past completion of the 1-year CAMP effort. The Office of Migrant Education is working with grantees to start collecting these data. A baseline will be established in 2002.	**Additional Source Information:** HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** January 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** OME is working with grantees to provide detailed information within the annual performance reports

Howard University - 2002

Goal 8: 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 freshman will increase by 1.0 percent per year.

Targets and Performance Data

Average SAT score

Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets			
	Math	Verbal	Total	% Change	Math	Verbal	Total	% Change
1997	494	513	1,007					
1998	506	519	1,025	1.80				
1999	517	533	1,050	2.40			1,035	
2000	525	537	1,062	1.10			1,055	2
2001	516	530	1,046	-1.50			1,060	.50
2002							1,060	.50

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: However, actual performance still exceeds the national average for black students.

Explanation: Average SAT scores decreased from 1062 in 2000 to 1046 in 2001, resulting in a 1.5% decrease. This decline was due in large part to greater than anticipated enrollment of new students who met admissions requirements, but did not have SAT scores at the high end of the SAT range. The University's average SAT score is still 26 points higher than the national average, which is 1020. The 2002 objective is to reach or exceed the unmet 2001 goal of an average of 1060 SAT total.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Howard University

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

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

Attrition rates

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	National Rate	HU Rate	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		12.90	13	

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Target of bettering the national average and decreasing attrition to 14% was exceeded. The National Attrition rate for 2000 was 20%.

Explanation: The attrition rate of 12.9 percent at Howard University is well below the national average of 20.2%. The objective remains to decrease the attrition rate by at least 1 percent per year.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Other
Other: Record/File.
Sponsor: The Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange.

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

Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Graduation rates: The undergraduate and graduate graduation rates will increase by 2 percent per year until the national average is reached or exceeded.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

6-year graduation rate

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Consortium Rate	HU Rate	Consortium Rate	HU Rate
1997		49		
1998		40.90		
1999	54.20	46.10	43	
2000	54.10	48.70	48	
2001		51.30	50	
2002			52	

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: The graduation rate at Howard University of 51.3% demonstrates continuous improvement from 1998 (40.9%) and a pattern of exceeding performance targets for each succeeding year.

Additional Source Information: Howard University.

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

Limitations: The reported 6-year national rate comes from the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange at the University of Oklahoma. Howard University is a member of the institution.

Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Excellence in teaching and scholarship: The participation rate of faculty in activities of the Fund for Academic Excellence will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Proposals

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets	
	Funded	Number of Participants	Number of Participants	Number of 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				150	225

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: The principal goal for the Fund for Academic Excellence is to be a catalyst for increasing extramural research. Enhanced standards for faculty extramural repeat awards will ultimately constrain the participation rate for faculty. The number of proposals submitted, and those funded increased; however, the number funded did not meet our target due to prevailing economic conditions.

Additional Source Information: Howard University.

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

Objective 8.2 of 3: To promote excellence in research

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Grants received: The number of grant proposals that are funded will increase

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
.Number of funded grant proposals			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Grants received increased by 3.6% over last year's number of awards.	**Additional Source Information:** Howard University. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** March 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	232			
1998	279			
1999	299			
2000	252	301		
2001	261	260		
2002		270		

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					**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** The value of grants received increased by 6.2% to approximately $53.4 million. This exceeded our target by $1.7 million.	**Additional Source Information:** Howard University. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** March 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Value of Grants Received	% Change	Value of Grants Received	% Change		
1997	45,268,427					
1998	44,057,827	2.70				
1999	47,533,841	7.90				
2000	50,294,706	5.80	48,009,180	20		
2001	53,416,128		51,700,000			
2002			53,800,000			

Objective 8.3 of 3: Increase Howard University's financial strength and independence from Federal Appropriations

Indicator 8.3.1 of 3: 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)			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** The market value of Howard University's endowment increased approximately 3.5% over last year. The increase is substantial given recent market conditions.	**Additional Source Information:** Howard University. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** March 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Audited Financial Statements.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	211.20			
1998	252.90			
1999	297			
2000	329.30	320		
2001	340.90	346		

Indicator 8.3.2 of 3: 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)			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Outside support increased more than 32% over last year, and 27% over our target.	**Additional Source Information:** Howard University. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** March 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Audited Financial Statements.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	11.80			
1998	8.40			
1999	9.20			
2000	13.90	11		
2001	18.40	14.50		
2002		18		

Indicator 8.3.3 of 3: 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			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** The 15 percent participation rate for 2001 is below the desired goal, but a significant increase from the prior year's record, and closer to the average alumni participation rate for Tier II universities, which is approximately 18%. The University's fundraising operations have been completely restructured and we anticipate greater congruence with the goals.	**Additional Source Information:** Howard University **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** March 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	11.40			
1999	9.40			
2000	12.20	25		
2001	15	30		
2002		32		

Impact Aid - 2002

CFDA Numbers: 84.040 - Impact Aid_Facilities Maintenance
84.041 - Impact Aid

Goal 8: To provide appropriate financial assistance for federally connected children who present a genuine burden to their school districts

Objective 8.1 of 3: Make payments in a timely manner

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Timeliness of payments: At least 90 percent of eligible applicants will 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
.			**Status:** Target not met **Explanation:** For FY 2002, 63 percent of eligible applicants received their payments within 60 days. Many FY 2002 payments were delayed beyond the initial 60 days of funds availability because States were slow to submit total current expenditure data needed to calculate payments. For FY 2003, the Department arranged for an alternate data collection method that will avoid this delay.	**Additional Source Information:** Program office files, 2002. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** March 2002 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Improvements:** In FY 2003, an alternate data collection will help avoid delays in payments.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	75			
1998	87			
1999	13	90		
2000	96	90		
2001	73	90		
2002	63	90		

Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve consultation between school districts and the Indian community to support the education of Indian children

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Indian community consultation: At least 75 percent of Title IX (Indian Education) coordinators in school districts that receive Impact Aid will report that the district solicits input from the Indian community on strategies for increasing the achievement of Indian children.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Data are collected through a question included in the Title IX performance report. FY 2001 data collected in 2002 from a new electronic performance report have not been extracted and analyzed. The low response rate in earlier years (47% for 1998-1999 data and 21% for 1999-2000 data) prevents a meaningful measure for this indicator.	**Additional Source Information:** Title IX, Part A Performance Reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** January 2002 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Verified by ED attestation. **Limitations:** Title IX coordinators' survey responses may not accurately reflect the quality of LEAs' parental and tribal consultation.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000		75		
2001		75		
2002		75		

Objective 8.3 of 3: Make accurate payments

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Overpayment forgiveness requests: The number of requests to forgive overpayments of Basic Support Payments and Payments for Children With Disabilities will not exceed 10 in a given fiscal year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of request to forgive overpayments of Basic Support Payments			**Status:** Target exceeded **Explanation:** There were four requests to forgive overpayments in 2002. This represents a decrease from the previous year. Applicants are permitted to request forgiveness of overpayment amounts, although not all requests are granted.	**Additional Source Information:** Program office files, 2002. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** December 2002 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Verified by ED attestation.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	5	10		
2000	2	10		
2001	10	10		
2002	4	10		

Independent Living Services Program - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.169 - Independent Living_State Grants

Goal 8: 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 6: 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 2: Number of individuals with significant disabilities served grouped by age: The number of individuals who receive individual independent living services will increase in all age categories.

Targets and Performance Data

The number of individuals receiving individual independent living services

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Under 6	6-17	18-22	Under 6	6-17	18-22
1998	2,390	7,028	11,755			
1999	1,723	5,596	9,161			
2000	1,597	6,703	10,564			
2001	1,966	8,154	12,054			

The number of individuals receiving individual independent living services

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	23-54	55-older	23-54	55-older
1998	81,012	53,045		
1999	64,383	35,593		
2000	74,097	30,434		
2001	99,513	39,663		

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: Data are gathered from over 306 reporting entities. Data are entered into a data base by a subcontractor. Since the 2001 target was exceeded in 1998, the 2001 target has been increased to take into account actual performance and the new centers to be established in 2001.

The source for this indicator, the 2001 Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) 704 annual report, reports on FY2001 data in late 2002. Therefore, the latest data for this indicator show FY2001 performance.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) 704 reports (704 Report), annual, 2001.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001
Data Available: May 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Program and budget staff or two program staff visually scan data for errors and compare to prior year's data.

Limitations: There were 11,023 consumers that chose not to indicate age. Also, grantees may interpret definitions differently. We are providing training and technical assistance.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Number of goals set and achieved by consumers: The number of consumer goals set and achieved will increase in all service areas measured.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of consumers who have achieved their goals.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** The FY 2001 Goals Set Met Rate Self-care: 47,832 28,337 59.24% Communication: 16,414 13,273 80.86% Mobility: 19,308 13,240 68.57% Residential: NA Educational: 16,439 11,730 71.35% Vocational: 15,565 8,905 57.21% Other: 24,601 16,184 65.79%, **Explanation:** Data are gathered from over 306 reporting entities. Data are entered into a data-base by a subcontractor. The source for this indicator, the 2001 Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) 704 annual report, reports on FY2001 data in late 2002. Therefore, the latest data for this indicator show FY2001 performance.	**Additional Source Information:** Performance Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** May 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Program and budget staff or two program staff visually scan data for errors and compare to prior year's data. **Limitations:** Grantees may interpret definitions differently. We are providing training and technical assistance.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	62.30			
1998	65			
1999	67	62.50		
2000	63	63		
2001	64	63		
2002		63		

Objective 8.2 of 6: Increase the satisfaction of consumers who receive chapter 1 Independent Living services

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Consumer satisfaction with IL services: A consistently high proportion of consumers will report satisfaction with IL services.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
New York State survey: Percentage of consumers who are very or mostly satisfied with services.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Information based upon CESSI report. In addition RSA Independent Living Services program will request that when the state submits its annual 704 report, that they provide a copy of Customer Satisfaction Survey. Attachment 16 to the 704 report, which deals with customer satisfaction surveys, was deleted in a previous revision approved by OMB. Consumer satisfaction surveys are submitted to the state annually. **Explanation:** Consumer satisfaction survey conducted as part of an overall evaluation of Independent Living Centers.	**Additional Source Information:** Performance Report. Evaluation of the Title VII Chapter I pt. C Centers for Independent Living , CESSI **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** May 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Program and budget staff visually scan data for errors and compare to prior year's data. **Limitations:** Grantees may interpret definitions differently. We are providing training and technical assistance.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
1997	85			
2000		87		
2001	87	87		
2002		87		

Objective 8.3 of 6: Improve access to personal assistance services (PAS), housing, transportation, and community-based living through increased advocacy efforts.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Number of Centers for Independent Living (CILs) using effective advocacy techniques: All CILs will have an advocacy program to address at least two of the following areas: (a) community-based personal assistance services (b), accessible/affordable housing (c), accessible/affordable transportation, and (d) options for moving people from nursing homes and other institutions to the community.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Preliminary results 1997, New York State: Percentage of CILs with programs in two areas			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** There is no recent data for OIB program. With the approval of the 70B report, OMB inform IL that the consumer satisfaction survey is to be a separate section other than the 70B. RSA/II is currently investigating methods to gather the required information. **Explanation:** Data is in but analysis is not yet completed. Projecting analysis will be completed by end of second quarter.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2003 **Data Available:** May 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Grantees may interpret definitions differently. We are providing training and technical assistance.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	25			
1999		30		
2000		50		
2001		80		

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Increased Community-based Living: The number of individuals who leave nursing homes and other institutions for community-based housing and the number of individuals at risk of entering nursing homes and other institutions who are receiving IL services and can remain at home will increase.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of individuals					**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Data are gathered from over 306 reporting entities. Data are entered into a data base by a subcontractor. The source for this indicator, the 2001Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) 704 annual report, reports on FY2001 data in late 2002. Therefore, the latest data for this indicator show FY2001 performance.	**Additional Source Information:** RSA 704 Report, 2000. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** May 2003 **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**			
	Number of individuals who left Nursing Homes/ Institutions	Number of individuals who remained in the Community	Number of individuals who left Nursing Homes/ Institutions	Number of individuals who remained in the Community		
1998	1,671	18,343				
1999			850	8,500		
2000	1,372	18,036	850	8,500		
2001	1,777	23,983	900	9,000		
2002			950	9,500		

Objective 8.4 of 6: Increase the amount of funds in addition to title VII that support chapter 1 grantees.

Indicator 8.4.1 of 1: Increased funding from alternative sources: Up to 76 percent of CILs will have greater than 25 percent of their budget from sources other than Title VII, Chapter 1, and 80 percent of states will contribute more than the required minimum match for Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of budget from sources other than Title VII and Chapter 1 and Percent of states that will contribute more than match					**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Data is in but analysis is not yet completed. Projecting analysis to be completed by end of second quarter of FY2003.	**Additional Source Information:** RSA 704 Report, 2000 **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - **Data Available:** May 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Program and budget staff or two program staff visually scan data for errors and compare to prior year's data. **Limitations:** Grantees may interpret definitions differently. We are providing training and technical assistance.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Percent CILS>25%	Percent of States Overmatch Part B	Percent CILS>25%	Percent of States Overmatch Part B		
1997	74	80				
2000	66		75	80		
2001			76	80		
2002			76	80		

Objective 8.5 of 6: Provide chapter 2 services to increasing numbers of individuals who are older and severely visually impaired, and increase consumer satisfaction.

Indicator 8.5.1 of 2: 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			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Target revised because of increased program budget in FY 2001. The source for this indicator, the 2001Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who Are Blind (7-OB Report), reports on FY2001 data in late 2002. Therefore, the latest data for this indicator show FY2001 performance.	**Additional Source Information:** Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who Are Blind (7-OB Report), 2001. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** May 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. 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		41,000		

Indicator 8.5.2 of 2: Increased consumer satisfaction: The satisfaction rate in consumers' confidence in ability to perform activities that were "given up" as a result of vision loss will increase, and the percentage of consumers who feel more in control in making decisions on important issues will increase.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of costumer confidence					**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** There is no recent data for OIB program. With the approval of the 70B report, OMB inform IL that the consumer satisfaction survey is to be a separate section other than the 70B. RSA/II is currently investigating methods to gather the required information. **Explanation:** Data is in but analysis is not yet completed. Projecting analysis will be completed by end of second quarter.	**Additional Source Information:** Other. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** May 2003 **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**			
	Ability to perform daily working tasks	Make decisions on important issues	Ability to perform daily working tasks	Make decisions on important issues		
1998	87	76				
2000			89	79		
2001			90	80		
2002			90	80		

Objective 8.6 of 6: Increase funding for chapter 2 programs from sources other than Title VII, Chapter 2.

Indicator 8.6.1 of 1: Increased funding from alternative sources: An increasing percentage of states contribute more than the minimum match amount.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of States			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Grantees must match FY 1999 (discretionary) and FY 2000 (formula) funds during FY 2000. States can make their discretionary match at anytime during FYs 2000 and 2001 because of our extension of their budget period. This is a one-time event caused by the transition from discretionary to formula funding.	**Additional Source Information:** Performance Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** May 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Research and Training Center and program staff review data **Limitations:** Lowered over match targets for FY 2000 and FY 2001 because of dramatic one-time increase in required state match.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Percentage of States	Percentage of States		
1997	75	0		
1998	77	0		
1999	80	0		
2000	80	25		
2001	55	25		
2002		80		

Indian Education - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.060 - Indian Education_Grants to Local Educational Agencies

Goal 8: 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 2: 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

Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade 4 who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994	48	
1998	47	
2000	43	
2002		60

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	
2001		64

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: Increases in the percentage of students scoring above basic in math are occurring at the fourth grade level; however, similar increases are not occurring in reading and math at the eighth grade level. 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. The scores for the 2002 National Assessment of Educational Progress will not be available until Spring 2003.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: NCES Survey/Assessment
Survey/Assessment: National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Additional Source Information: National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2000, 2002; School and Staffing Survey, 1997.

Frequency: Biennially.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: May 2003
Validated By: NCES.
Data validated by National Center for Education Statistics review procedures and National Center for Education Statistics statistical standards.

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

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
1992	43	
1996	52	
2002		64

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
1992	39	
1996	52	
2000	42	
2002		62

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 students in schools who meet proficient and advanced performance levels in reading and math. **Year** / **Actual Performance** / **Performance Targets** **- No Data -**	**Status:** Unable to judge **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. The data from the Consolidated state performance reports for Title I are not yet analyzed for reporting data results.	**Source:** Performance Report **Grantee Performance Report:** 1810-0503 Annual Performance Reporting Format for OIE Formula Grants to LEAs. **Additional Source Information:** Performance Consolidated State Reports, Title I Section. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** May 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Substantial variation across states in their definitions of proficient student performance.

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

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native 20 to 24 years old who are high school graduates

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	70	
2000		75
2001		80

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: Projects are targeting services to reduce dropouts and increase the graduation rates of American Indian and Alaska Native students. Increased promotion and graduation completion are expected. Unable to locate any specific racial/ethnic data on educational attainment from 2000 census data on website. Only total U.S. data are reported. Results from the NCES transcript data for 2000-2001 will not be available until January 2003. Analysis of data from the 2001-02 annual performance report will not be completed until Spring 2003

Additional Source Information: NCES Transcript Data, OIE Annual Performance Report

Frequency: Other.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: January 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification. Census data validated by the Census Bureau review procedures and Census standards; OIE Annual Performance Report data supplied by grantee. No formal verification procedures applied; National Center for Educational Statistics Transcript data. Validated by the National Center for Educational Statistics review procedures and National Center for Educational Statistics.

Limitations: Participation in Census surveys varies by regions and location, resulting in undercount of population.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Discretionary programs will focus on improving educational opportunities and services for American Indian and Alaska Native children and adults

Indicator 8.2.1 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					**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Data are being collected. **Explanation:** Projects to train teachers were funded in FY 1999 for the first time since FY 1994. Because the projects are just beginning, some of the targeted number of participants will take part in these programs, and the number will increase. Data are pending and expected.	**Additional Source Information:** Schools and Staffing Survey, 1999; OIE Annual Performance Report; National Longitudinal Survey (1998-99 and 2000-2001). **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** May 2003 **Validated By:** NCES. No formal validation for OIE annual performance report. **Limitations:** Sample size is small, and it is costly to add supplemental samples to data collection programs. National sample results in an under-representation in sample count. **Improvements:** Monitor the number of American Indian and Alaska Native students through LEAs reporting on program effectiveness in their Annual Performance Reports.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Principals	Teachers	Principals	Teachers		
1994	13	15				
2001			18	20		

Infants and Toddlers With Disabilities--IDEA Part C - 2002

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

Goal 8: To assist states in providing a comprehensive system of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families to enhance child and family outcomes.

Objective 8.1 of 2: All infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families will receive early intervention services in natural environments that meet their individual needs.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Infants and toddlers served: The percentage of children ages birth through 2 who are served under Part C will increase as a proportion of the general population in this age range, while the number of states that serve less than 2 percent of the general population of the state in this age range will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of children ages birth through 2 who are served under Part C

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Part C count as percentage of 0-2 U.S. Population	Number of states serving less than 2 percent of states population	Part C count as percentage of 0-2 U.S. Population	Number of states serving less than 2 percent of states population
1997	1.70	39		
1998	1.60	40		
1999	1.80	36	1.60	38
2000	2	29	1.80	35
2001			1.80	33

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: Data indicate that States were serving 1.99 percent of the population of children ages birth through two in 2000-2001 compared with 1.79 percent in the prior year. The number of States serving less than 2 percent of the State's population decreased from 36 to 29.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: IDEA state reported data

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

Limitations: When the original baseline was established, this indicator included data from only the 50 states and the District of Columbia because of the lack of general population data for Puerto Rico and the outlying areas. Also, varying data collection methods and definitions among states may cause unpredictable variations in counts.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Infants under 1 year of age served: The percentage of children under 1 year of age served under Part C, as a proportion of the general population in this age range, will increase, while the number of states that serve less than 1 percent of the general population of the state in this age range will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of children under 1 year of age served under Part C					**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Nationally, 0.9 percent of the population ages birth through two were being served in 2000-2001, the same as the prior year. The number of States serving less than 1.0 percent of the State's population decreased from 36 in 1999-2000 to 33 in 2000-2001.	**Additional Source Information:** IDEA state reported data **Collection Period:** 2002 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. **Limitations:** When the original baseline was established, this indicator included data from only the 50 states and the District of Columbia, because of the lack of general population data for Puerto Rico and the outlying areas. Also, varying data collection methods and definitions among states may cause unpredictable variations in counts.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Percentage of the general U.S. Population	Number of states serving less than 1 percent of states population	Percentage of the general U.S. Population	Number of states serving less than 1 percent of states population		
1997	.90	39				
1998	.80	38				
1999	.90	36	.80	35		
2000	.90	33	.90	34		
2001			1	33		

Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: 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
Percentage of children receiving age appropriate services			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** This measure provides an indication of the extent to which infants and toddlers are receiving services in the natural environment. Because there is a one-year lag in the availability of this data after collection, the data that became available in 2001 is for 1999-2000 rather than for the reporting year 2000-2001. These data indicate that there is a continuing positive trend toward the target.	**Additional Source Information:** IDEA State-reported data for 50 states, DC, Puerto Rico, Guam, Virgin Islands, and Northern Marianas. (56 entities) **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** September 2003 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. **Limitations:** ED is pursuing strategies to decrease the time lags between collection, reporting, and availability of data.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1996	56			
1997	58			
1998	63			
1999	67			
2000	73	67		
2001	76	69		
2002		71		

Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Referral to services: The percentage of children leaving Part C services with referral to preschool or other services will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of children getting referrals	**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** 1998-99 was the first year of data collection. New state data collections typically require 5 years to achieve reliability. Because there is a one-year lag in the availability of this data after collection, the data that became available in 2002 is for 2000-2001 rather than for the reporting year 2001-2002.	**Additional Source Information:** IDEA state-reported data.. Experienced Public/Private Entity. Data to be validated by an experienced data collection contractor. **Limitations:** The decrease in percentage referral may be due more to data quality than to an actual trend. ED is pursuing strategies to decrease the time lags between collection, reporting, and availability of data.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	65	
1999	63.40	
2000	63.40	69
2001	57.50	70

Objective 8.2 of 2: Children's functional development is enhanced by early intervention services

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

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
- No Targets And Performance Data -	**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** A contract to obtain data is under way. Data collected in 2003-04 will provide the baseline for this indicator.	**Additional Source Information:** IDEA National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** July 2005 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. **Limitations:** Because data are obtained from a longitudinal survey, updates will occur infrequently.

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Data collected for 2001 indicate that 73% of percent of families report that early intervention services have increased their capacity to enhance their child's development. These data were obtained from families approximately 36 months after beginning to receive early intervention.	**Additional Source Information:** IDEA National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study, 2001. **Frequency:** Other. **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. **Limitations:** Because data are obtained from a longitudinal survey, updates will occur infrequently.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	72			
2001	73			
2002		80		

International Education and Foreign Language Studies Program - 2002

CFDA Numbers: 84.015 - National Resource Centers and Fellowships Program for Language and Area or Language and International Studies
84.016 - Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs
84.017 - International Research and Studies
84.018 - International: Overseas Seminars Abroad_Bilateral Projects
84.019 - International: Overseas_Faculty Research Abroad
84.021 - International: Overseas_Group Projects Abroad
84.022 - International: Overseas_Doctoral Dissertation
84.153 - Business and International Education Projects
84.220 - Centers for International Business Education
84.229 - Language Resource Centers
84.269 - Institute for International Public Policy
84.274 - American Overseas Research Centers
84.337 - Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access

Goal 8: To meet the nation's security and economic needs through the development of a national capacity in foreign languages, and area and international studies.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Maintain a US Higher Education system able to produce experts in less commonly taught languages and area studies who are capable of contributing to the needs of US Government, academic and business institutions.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Language Enrollments: NRC supported institutions provide the majority of the instruction in foreign languages, especially the less commonly taught languages.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of total national undergraduate language enrollments that are at NRC/FLAS funded institutions.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** No change from previous Planning and Performance Management report. **Explanation:** While Title VI-supported institutions account for less than 3 percent of all higher education institutions, 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 **Survey/Research Report Title:** MLA Study of Foreign Language Enrollments. **References:** Modern Language Association (MLA) and Associations of Departments of Foreign Languages "Study of Foreign Language Enrollments." This study has been funded since 1958 through the Title VI: International Research and Studies program. **Web Site:** http://www.mla.org/adfl/projects/index.htm. **Additional Source Information:** Modern Language Association (MLA) conducts language enrollment survey once every three to five years. This study has been funded since 1958 through the International Research and Studies program under Title VI.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
1995	21			
2000	21	20		
2001		20		
2002		20		

Percentage of total national "graduate" language enrollments that are at NRC/FLAS funded institutions.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	%	%
1995	55	
1999	56	55
2000	56	55
2001		55
2002		55

Frequency: Other.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: October 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED. NRC and FLAS performance reports through the EELIAS system will be checked against the data from the MLA study. The MLA data has been collected long before the Department's standards for evaluating program performance data were developed. Now that data can be validated by university enrollment figures reported in annual NRC performance reports this will provide tangible secondary validation.

Limitations: MLA studies are conducted once every 3 to 4 years, and therefore data for the out years must be extrapolated from annual performance reports.

Improvements: The MLA summary datasets will be integrated into the EELIAS system to provide a performance baseline for years when MLA study is not conducted.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Percentage of graduates of Title VI supported programs who report that they found employment that utilizes their language and/or area skills.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

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

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	%	%
1996	76	
2000	80	76
2001	71	76
2002		76

Percent of M.A. graduates of NRC institutions with positions where they use their expertise.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	%	%
1996	44	
2000	54	44
2001	52	44
2002		44

Percentage of M.A. graduates continuing their graduate studies and pursuing Ph.D.s.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	%	%
1996	24	
2000	26	24
2001	34	24
2002		24

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: The data from the EELIAS performance reporting system showed that of the 1,782 Ph.D. graduates for 2001 no employment data was available for 343 of these graduates. IEGPS will work with grantees to develop strategies for better tracking program graduates. M.A. placement data is consistent with projected targets. M.A. continuing education data is consistent with projected targets.

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.

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: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: March 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: NRCs have difficulty tracking program graduates. Currently, most graduate tracking is the responsibility of a university's 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.

Objective 8.2 of 2: To establish an Institute for International Public Policy (IIPP) to conduct a program to significantly increase the numbers of underrepresented minorities in the international service.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Graduate Placement: The number of IIPP program graduates who are employed in the international service.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of IIPP program graduates employed in international service			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** As the IIPP program graduates students more consistently, a greater pool of students with international competency becomes available for government and international organizations to draw upon. The goal of the program is to develop a positive reputation for IIPP graduates, such that they become a sought after commodity for internationally focused organizations. **Explanation:** The IIPP comprehensive program of study is a 5-year program with six components. It currently consists of the following: (1) sophomore summer policy institute; (2) junior year abroad; (3) junior year summer policy institute; (4) post-senior-year intensive language instruction; (5) post-baccalaureate internships at international affairs agencies and organizations; and (6) Master's degree in international relations. Fellows from the first cohort completed the comprehensive program in June 2000. The number of fellows graduated should become more consistent as the program matures.	**Additional Source Information:** Previously, graduate data was collected through paper-based annual performance reports. Beginning in 2002, data will be collected through the EELIAS performance reporting system. This data will provide more information on the status of IIPP program graduates and alumni. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** April 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** The data on program graduates is being provided by the grantee, with little opportunity for the Department to double-check the data. As the number of fellows employed in international service increases, tracking all of these individuals will become more difficult. **Improvements:** ELLIAS system will provide greater tools for the electronic analysis of report data. This will prove useful for conducting longitudinal studies on the IIPP program graduates.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	10	5		
2001	13	7		
2002		9		

Magnet Schools Assistance Program - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.165 - Magnet Schools Assistance

Goal 8: To assist in the desegregation of schools served by local educational agencies

Objective 8.1 of 2: 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: Minority group isolation: Increasing percentages of targeted schools will eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation according to their individual objective.

Targets and Performance Data

Percent of targeted schools meeting their objective

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	43	
2001		50

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Unvalidated data for school year 01-02 (which corresponds to FY2002) enrollment was included in performance report and analysis of these data is pending.

Explanation: Data for FY 1998 grantee cohort indicates that MSAP projects targeted 295 schools with desegregation objectives in 1999-00. The data suggest that a total of 139, or 47%, of the 295 schools for which data are available either achieved their benchmarks (34 schools) or showed some progress toward achieving their desegregation objective (105 schools). In 2001, a new cohort of grant recipients includes 60 school districts implementing projects to support 289 magnet schools. Of those schools, approximately 80% have proposed objectives to reduce minority group isolation. Remaining schools have proposed objectives to eliminate or prevent minority group isolation or to reduce minority group isolation in feeder schools. As yet unvalidated data for school year 01-02 enrollment was included in performance reports and analysis of these data are pending.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: NCES Survey/Assessment
Survey/Assessment: Common Core of Data.

Additional Source Information: NCES and Common Core of Data., 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-00.

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

Limitations: Most student recruitment occurs at the entry grade of a school. The data presented in 'Assessment of Progress' does not address the extent to which progress being made toward the achievement of desegregation objectives is being masked by other factors. Additionally, for the FY 2001 cohort of grants, grants could not be made early enough to permit the conduct of recruitment activities that would affect enrollment in the fall of 2001.

Improvements: For FY 2001 cohort of grants, data quality is improved by deferring analysis until valided version is released by NCES.

Objective 8.2 of 2: Federally funded magnet programs or innovative programs strengthen students' knowledge of academic subjects and skills needed for successful careers in the future.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Improved student achievement: Students will show achievement gains in core subjects, as well as in applied learning skills, that meet or exceed the gains for students in the district as a whole.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percent of targeted schools meeting their objective			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** For new grantees whose projects began with school year 2001-02, student achievement data are pending and expected. Information contained in the first year report of a program evaluation of FY 1998 being conducted by the American Institutes for Research indicates that more than 80 percent of MSAP districts report that they place a major emphasis on establishing high standards for students and on aligning curricula with standards. When compared with large high-poverty districts in 1998-99, MSAP districts appear to place somewhat more emphasis on new approaches to curriculum and instruction (technology and reform models). The AIR is completing an evaluation of FY 1998 MSAP grant recipients that will provide data on actual performance through the final year of those projects. **Explanation:** AIR has reported that a variety of factors have impeded progress in conducting an analysis of student achievement gains. These factors include imprecision in some objectives; substantial changes in the state and district assessment programs upon which objectives were based; grantee reliance on alternative assessments; and the delayed submission of student achievement results that were not available until after performance reports were due. Data are pending and expected.	**Additional Source Information:** Analysis of 1998 Magnet Schools Assistance Program applications; Magnet Schools Assistance Program annual performance reports; Magnet Schools Assistance Program Evaluation. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** August 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Improvements:** Suggestions are welcome.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001		50		

McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Program - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.196 - Education for Homeless Children and Youth

Goal 8: To ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education, including a public preschool 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 1: Public schools: An increasing percentage of homeless children and youth will enroll in public schools and will attend school regularly.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of homeless children and youth enrolled in grades K-12, as reported by states

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	78	
1999	67	82
2000	87	87

Percentage of homeless children and youth in grades K-12 attending school, as reported by states

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995	55	
1996	45	
1999	77	59
2000	87	82

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: No data collected in 2002.

Explanation: States were required under prior reauthorization to submit data triennially. States last reported in 2001 for 2000 performance. States were not required by statute to collect data for 2001 or 2002. From 2003 on, data will be collected annually with the 2000 data serving as baseline data.

Sources and Data Quality

Frequency: Other.
Collection Period: - 2002
Data Available: October 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: States' methods of data collection vary, and the resulting data are not uniform.

Improvements: From 2003 on, the Department will collect data annually and use existing targets from 2000 as baseline information. Target and Performance Data tables have been amended since the last GPRA report. The Year column has been changed. The years listed in the amended table reflect the years of performance rather than the succeeding years when performance data were reported.

Migrant Education - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.011 - Migrant Education_State Grant Program

Goal 8: 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

Objective 8.1 of 1: Along with other federal programs and state and local reform efforts, the Migrant Education Program will contribute to improved school performance of migrant children.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Inclusion in State Assessments: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will be included in state assessments.

Targets and Performance Data

Number of states meeting performance target

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students assessed	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students assessed
2000			50	52	52	50
2001			50	52	52	50
2002			50	52	52	50

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Although data are not available to report directly on the performance indicator, in 2000, 56, 091 migrant students were reported as tested in 27 states. In 2001, 85,729 migrant students were reported as tested in 26 states. For elementary reading: 2000 -- 17,389, 2001-22,759; elementary math: 2000-14,513, 2001--23,634; middle school reading: 2000-13,542, 2001-19,623; middle school math: 2000-10,647, 2001-19,713.

Explanation: Some of the data for 2000 and 2001 are missing and not expected. Specifically, although many states did report the numbers of migrant students tested in each grade assessed, most states did not report the number of migrant students enrolled in the grade level(s) tested. Thus, ED was not able to calculate percentages of migrant students tested for reporting on the inclusion of migrant students in state assessments. 2002 data are pending and expected.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: March 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
ED Contractor

Limitations: Initially, the percentage of migrant students tested will have to be calculated using the total number of migrant students who 'participated' in the MEP during the regular term at the appropriate grade level rather than the total number of migrant children in residence in a state during the regular term in the appropriate grade level.

Improvements: Data on the total number of "resident" migrant students will be requested for inclusion in the next revised version of the Consolidated State Performance Report. However, ED staff plan to delete this indicator from the GPRA plan in 2004 as it focuses on a 'process' indicator (instead of a results indicator).

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments.

Targets and Performance Data

Number of States meeting performance target in reading--Elementary.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	States meeting target	States that reported results for migrant students	Percentage of students who test at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results for migrant students	Percentage of students who test at or above proficient
1996	4	10	50	52	52	50
1997	4	15	50	52	52	50
1998	7	18	50	52	52	50
1999	2	19	50	52	52	50
2000	5	26	50	52	52	50
2001	6	23	50	52	52	50
2002				52	52	50

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Over the six years reported, this indicator shows a general trend increase in the number of states disaggregating migrant students performance in reading at the elementary & middle school level. Measure 1: The number of states reporting that 50% or more of those migrant students tested scored at or above the proficient level on those tests remains relatively flat. Measure 2: The number of states reporting that 50% or more of those migrant students tested at or above proficient on those tests has risen. Measure 3: The number of states reporting that 50% or more of those migrant students tested at or above proficient on those tests has risen. Measure 4: The number of states reporting the 50% or more of those migrant students tested scored at or above the proficient level on those tests remains relatively flat.

Explanation: 2002 data are pending and expected. Numbers have been corrected since the previous report and an additional column (States that reported results for migrant students) has been added to additional clarity.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: March 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
ED contractor

Limitations: The states reporting assessment data for migrant students are fluctuating from on year to the next. As such the indicator does not represent performance on the same states from one year to the next.

Improvements: It is expected that this indicator will become reliable as the state assessment systems become more stable.

Number of States meeting performance target in reading--Middle.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	States meeting target	States that reported results for migrant students	Percentage of students who test at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results for migrant students	Percentage of students who test at or above proficient
1996	2	10	50	52	52	50
1997	3	15	50	52	52	50
1998	6	18	50	52	52	50
1999	4	18	50	52	52	50
2000	2	23	50	52	52	50
2001	7	21	50	52	52	50
2002				52	52	50

Number of States meeting performance target in Math--Elementary.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	States meeting target	States that reported results for migrant students	Percentage of students who test at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results for migrant students	Percentage of students who test at or above proficient
1996	4	10	50	52	52	50
1997	5	15	50	52	52	50
1998	9	18	50	52	52	50
1999	6	19	50	52	52	50
2000	7	25	50	52	52	50
2001	10	23	50	52	52	50
2002				52	52	50

Number of States meeting performance target in Math--Middle.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	States meeting target	States that reported results for migrant students	Percentage of students who test at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results for migrant students	Percentage of students who test at or above proficient
1996	3	10	50	52	52	50
1997	3	15	50	52	52	50
1998	7	18	50	52	52	50
1999	4	18	50	52	52	50
2000	2	22	50	52	52	50
2001	4	20	50	52	52	50
2002				52	52	50

Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Targeting of "Priority for Service" Students: An increasing number of "priority for service" migrant students will receive MEP services in both the regular and summer-terms.

Targets and Performance Data

Numbers of "Priority for Service" Students

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Regular-Term	Summer-Term	Regular-Term	Summer-Term
1999	242,138	172,247		
2000	268,405	196,667		
2001	300,197	237,739		

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Progress toward target is likely. Under section 1304(d), migrant students who are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet the states' challenging state content and state student performance standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year (rather than during the summer) have a priority for services under the MEP. The indicator examines whether there is an increase over time in the numbers of such 'priority for services' students receiving either regular-term or summer-term, MEP services. 2001 data are based on an initial draft report and changes to the totals may occur during the data review process.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: March 2003
Experienced Public/Private entity. Data and tabulations are validated by internal review procedures of an ED contractor.

Limitations: The percentage of priority students served (by type of service and by the intensity of such services) would provide a much better indication of how effective MEPs are targeting services.

	Explanation: 2002 data are pending and expected.	**Improvements:** In order to calculate the percentage of 'priority for service' migrant students who receive services, data on the total number of 'priority for service' migrant students will be requested for inclusion in the next revised version of the Consolidated State Performance Report. However, ED staff plan to delete this indicator from the GPRA plan in 2004 as it focuses on a 'process' indicator (instead of a results indicator).

Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Coordination with Title 1, Part A, Programs: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will receive services in School wide or Targeted Assistance Programs funded in part or wholly by Title 1, Part A.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of States meeting Performance Target of Students Served.							**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** This indicator examines the degree to which migrant students receive Title 1 part A services. The indicator suggests that less than 25% of the states provide Title 1 services to 50 percent or more of their migrant children. **Explanation:** 2002 data are pending and expected. Numbers in data fields were corrected since the previous report and an additional column (States that reported results for migrant students) was added for clarity.	**Additional Source Information:** Consolidated State Performance Report. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. ED contractor **Limitations:** Data on migrant student participation in Title I Part A programs is collected from local districts and aggregated at the state level. **Improvements:** Better instructions on how this data should be collected will be provided in the next revised version of the Consolidated State Performance Report. However, ED staff plan to delete this indicator from the GPRA plan in 2004 as it focuses on a 'process' indicator (instead of a results indicator).
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	States meeting target	States that reported results for migrant students	Percentage of students served	States meeting target	States that reported results for migrant students	Percentage of students served		
1997	7	50	50	52	52	50		
1998	8	49	50	52	52	50		
1999	14	43	50	52	52	50		
2000	10	44	50	52	52	50		
2001	11	50	50	52	52	50		

National Activities--IDEA Part D - 2002

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

Goal 8: To link best practices to states, school systems and families to improve results for infants, toddlers and children with disabilities

Objective 8.1 of 5: 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 IDEA program activities that are determined by expert panels to respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families will increase: (a) Research and innovation, (b) Technology, (c) Personnel preparation, (d) Technical assistance, and (e) State improvement.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Research & Innovation

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	91	
2000	72	
2001	83	
2002		85

Technology (from Technology & Media)

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	75	
2001	77	
2002		85

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: Actual data for the years 2000 and earlier have been moved back one year compared to the FY 2001 report. This adjustment reflects the year in which the data were collected rather than reported.

Fluctuations in previous year data are expected for several years while the data collection methodology is refined. There is a one-year lag in data. Projects are evaluated by an expert panel after a full year of funding.

Additional Source Information: Expert Panel

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

Media (from Technology & Media program)

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	41	
2001	74	
2002		85

Personnel preparation

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	67	
2000	68	
2001	78	
2002		85

Technical assistance

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	57	
2001	75	
2002		85

State improvement

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	80	
2002		85

Parent training

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	88	
2002		85

Objective 8.2 of 5: Projects use high-quality methods and materials.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Highest standards for methods and materials: Highest standards for methods and materials: Expert panels determine that IDEA-funded projects use exceptionally rigorous quantitative or qualitative research and evaluation methods (for Research and innovation and Technology and media activities); or use current research-validated practices and materials (for Personnel preparation, Technical assistance, and State improvement activities).

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of projects that meet exceptionally high standards: research and innovation

Year	Actual Performance							Performance Targets						
	Research	Demo.	Outreach	PPrep	TA	Tech	State Imprvt	Parent Training	Research	Demo.	Outreach	PPrep	TA	Tech	State Imprvt	Parent Training
1998	60	12	20													
1999	50	70	20	50	97	94			65	20	25					
2000	77	13	11	50	8	40										
2001	69	66	50	16	27	33	66									
2002									75	70	55	20	40	40	70	

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded

Explanation: Actual data for the years 2000 and earlier have been moved back one year compared to the FY 2001 report. This adjustment reflects the year in which the data were collected rather than reported. There is a one-year lag in data. Projects are evaluated by an expert panel after a full year of funding.

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. It takes at least three years to achieve stability in review and assessment process. For Research, Demonstration and Outreach Activities, which have had four years of measurement, the data indicate continuing positive progress. This results from increased emphasis in the application requirements on project evaluation, and increased size of the grant funding to support improved methods and materials. It is too soon to assess progress for six of these programs.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Expert Panel

Frequency: Biennially. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** March 2003 **Validated By:** NCES.

Objective 8.3 of 5: Projects communicate appropriately and products are used to improve results for children with disabilities and their families.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Communication with target audiences: The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that communicate appropriately with target audiences will increase. (a) Research and innovation (b) Technology (c) Personnel preparation projects of national significance (d) Technical assistance.

Targets and Performance Data												
Percentage of projects that meet exceptionally high standards: Research and Innovation												
Year	**Actual Performance**					**Performance Targets**						
	Research	Demo.	Outreach	Tech	Parent PPrep TA Training	Research	Demo.	Outreach	Tech	Parent PPrep TA Training		
2000	60	40	100	40	100							
2001	91	57	80	80	71							
2002						85	60	85	85	80		

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: FY 2001 data represents baseline.

Explanation: Actual data for the years 2000 and earlier have been moved back one year compared to the FY 2001 report. This adjustment reflects the year in which the data were collected rather than reported.

There is a one-year lag in data. Projects are evaluated by an expert panel after a full year of funding. Projects are expected to be of high quality and communicate findings through appropriate referred journals and other vehicles such as the Internet, association publications, CD-ROMs, films, teaching modules, state and national directories, career plan, radio interviews, course syllabi, and Federally-funded technical assistance providers, and to include a citation of funding support under IDEA.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Project information.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001
Data Available: September
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.

Indicator 8.3.2 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. (a) Research and innovation (b) Technology (c) Personnel preparation (d) Technical assistance (e) parent training, and (f) State improvement.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of expert panelist with positive determination: Research & Innovation			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Actual data for the years 2000 and earlier have been moved back one year compared to the FY 2001 report. This adjustment reflects the year in which the data were collected rather than reported. There is a one-year lag in data. Projects are evaluated by an expert panel after a full year of funding. 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:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** Baseline data for the state improvement grant program are being collected through an evaluation study and will be available in 2002.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	53			
2001	58			
2002		65		
Percentage of expert panelist with positive determination: Technology and media				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	78			
1999		89		
2000	47			
2002		65		
Percentage of expert panelist with positive determination: Personnel Preparation				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	55			
2002		65		
Percentage of expert panelist with positive determination: Technical Assistance				
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	67			
1999		78		
2000	59			
2001	69			

Percentage of expert panelists with positive determination: Parent information		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	75	
Percentage of panelists with positive determination: State improvement		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	80	

Objective 8.4 of 5: Personnel are prepared to serve children with disabilities.

Indicator 8.4.1 of 3: Persons trained to serve children with disabilities: The percentage of persons who obtain their degrees with IDEA support and serve children with disabilities as teachers, early intervention personnel, related services personnel, or leadership personnel within 3 years of receiving their degrees will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
- No Targets And Performance Data -	**Explanation:** This indicator is under review by the Department. No data to report for FY2002.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual Performance Reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. **Limitations:** In 2001 this indicator will be revised to reflect employment, 1 year after receipt of degrees. This data is more readily accessible and timely than data in the current indicator.

Indicator 8.4.2 of 3: Grants to minority institutions: The percentage of IDEA grants for personnel preparation awarded to Historically Black Colleges and Universities and other minority institutions, including tribal colleges, will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of all personnel-preparation awards (new and continuation) that went to minority institutions		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1997	15.40	
1998	17.70	
1999	26.40	
2000	34	28
2001		32

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: This indicator is under review by the Department. No data to report for FY2002.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Analysis of project information.

Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: See explanation.

Indicator 8.4.3 of 3: Minority and disabled personnel: The percentage of personnel who are minority and the percentage who are disabled who receive financial assistance for training under IDEA will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
- No Targets And Performance Data -	**Explanation:** This indicator is under review by the Department. No data to report for FY2002.	**Additional Source Information:** Performance Report. **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** Self-report by projects may hamper validity. OSEP will verify results with follow-up survey.

Objective 8.5 of 5: Families receive information about services for children with disabilities.

Indicator 8.5.1 of 1: Increase in informed families: The percentage of families that report that the training and technical assistance received from the Parent Information and Training Centers made a positive difference in their child's supports and services will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of families reporting positive difference

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	71	
2000	86.50	75

Percentage of families reporting positive difference from face-to-face and telephone sessions

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Face-to-face	Telephone	Face-to-face	Telephone
2001	97	69		

Assessment of Progress

Explanation: This indicator is under review by the Department. No data to report for FY2002.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Project Performance Data.

Limitations: Self-report by projects may hamper validity. OSEP will verify results with follow-up survey.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Statistics and Assessment - 2002

CFDA Numbers: 84.830 Statistics
84.902 Assessments

Goal 8: 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: Provides timely, useful, and comprehensive data that are relevant to policy and educational improvement.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Customer satisfaction: At least 85 percent of surveyed customers in 1999 and 90 percent in 2001 will agree that National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data are timely, relevant, and comprehensive.

Targets and Performance Data

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

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

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness
1997	82	52		
1999	87	67	85	85
2001	88	66	90	90

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: The overall NCES customers satisfaction rating remains high for NCES publications performance. NCES showed improvement in all areas of its performance data between 1997 and 2001. During the period, NCES focused on improving the timeliness of its publications and data files. Significant progress was made in Common Core of Data (CCD) Reports and the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Explanation: The CCD School and Agency Report has shown an improvement from 25 months to 15 months from data collection to publication and a 3-month improvement in State Nonfiscal. NAEP has shown dramatic improvements in timeliness for many of it major reports. In 2001, NCES did meet most of its publications performance targets, but does need to improve its timeliness. The next data (2003) will not be available until 2004.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: NCES Customer Satisfaction Survey.

Frequency: Biennially.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: NCES.
NCES Data was validated by using NCES review procedures and by applying NCES statistical standards.

Limitations: None

Improvements: In 2001, NCES Customers expressed a 94% satisfaction rate with the overall quality of our publications and 89% with our data files.

Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES services					
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**	
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility
1997	89					
1999	93	93		85	85	
2001	83	88		90	85	

National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.133 - National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research

Goal 8: To conduct high-quality research that leads to high quality research products.

Objective 8.1 of 4: To support the conduct and dissemination of high-quality research that contributes to improvement in the quality of life of persons with disabilities.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Scientific excellence: Grantee research quality is good or excellent, as reflected in research design and its usefulness to customers.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of grantees sampled who had good or excellent ratings

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	37	
1998	55	
1999	53	60
2000	60	65
2001	76	70
2002	68	65

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target met

Progress: 67.86% of all centers (19 of 28) reviewed during a rating of research design and its usefulness to customers.

Explanation: This year's data are based on 28 summative reviews conducted during FY2002. The rigor of this evaluation program, which utilizes panels of experts in relevant program areas, has been significantly enhanced by an increasing emphasis on evaluation of outcomes resulting from funded research. Consequently, it is difficult to compare data to previous years. Centers that are focused on engineering and medicine achieved the highest research and development ratings. 86% of Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers in topics related to health and function were rated at good or excellent.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Other
Other: Other.

Additional Source Information: NIDRR Program Review; Center of Excellence Scale.

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

Improvements: Data are based upon ratings obtained from expert panels during reverse site visits. Extensive efforts have been made to ensure that centers being rated and experts serving as reviewers are conversant with the evidence based and outcomes oriented approaches to the review process.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Increased publication and citation: Publication of research findings, with the appropriate citation, will increase in refereed journals.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Average number of publications per grantee --RRTC%; ARRTs%; RERCs%.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	7.10	
2000	5.60	6
2001	6.60	6

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Average number of Peer reviewed journal articles and published books and book chapters is increasing.

Explanation: This indicator information comes from grantees data on Outcomes and Publications in NIDRRs web-based Performance Reporting System that went on line in July, 2001. Data is reported by calendar year of publication; consequently 2001 is the most recent completed year. Bibliographies reported by each center have been extensively evaluated so that only publication in indexed journals and major published books have been counted. Preliminary evaluation of reports for the first three quarters of 2002 indicates that the number of publications continues to increase.

Source: Other
Other: Other.

Additional Source Information: NIDRR Reporting System; Annual Performance Management Report; Outcomes and Publications sections of the following grantee types Performance Reports: ARRT, RERC, and RRTC.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: April 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Verified by Dept. of Ed. attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluation Program Performance Data. Extrapolated document from NIDRR web based Performance Reporting System.

Limitations: Data is based upon reports by the funded centers. Concerns have been raised about the potential for under-reporting. Methods to indepedently confirm publications are planned. The number of publications using the strict definitions are likely to fairly represent the productivity of centers in areas related to engineering and medicine. However, these definitions may not fully represent the productivity of centers in other areas.

Improvements: NIDRR is evaluating methods of assessing productivity that fairly represent all parets of the NIDRR grant portfolio.

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

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Information and TA usefulness: Recipients will find the products, information, and technical assistance that they receive from grantees useful.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of recipients responding "yes," "no," and "N/A" to the question on being served adequately							**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** Current information on this indicator is based on Disability and Business Technical Assistance Centers (DBTACs) reporting system ADA Impact Management System (AIMS, data for Year '01 and '02) The AIMS use a Likert Scale. **Explanation:** The AIMS survey consists of postcard survey that is sent out after a request for information on ADA. The survey is voluntary and in '02, 715 customers completed the required 8 questions. Question #5 refers to the usefulness of materials requested. 97% of respondents rated the information as Very and Somewhat Useful; 2% as Not Very Useful and 1% as Not Applicable.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Other. **Additional Source Information:** AIMS Survey. **Frequency:** Semi-Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 **Data Available:** January **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** Sample size is limited.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A		
1998	80	15	5					
2000	95	2	3	83.50				
2001	90	5	5	86				
2002	97	2	1	90				

Objective 8.3 of 4: Expand system capacity for conduct of high-quality rehabilitation research and services by ensuring availability of qualified researchers and practitioners, including persons with disabilities and other underserved groups.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Contributions of trainees and fellows: Contributions by NIDRR trainees and fellows that apply to study rehabilitation will increase.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
.					**Status:** Target met **Explanation:** Our Capacity Building data reported in this period come from the ARRTs only. The ARRTs conduct the NIDRR Fellows Program. Other NIDRR programs are not required to report these data. The measure is based on the number of fellows surveyed. In FY '01, there were 18 fellows. In FY '02 we based our data on the number of centers	**Source:** Other **Other:** Other. **Additional Source Information:** AART, NIDRR Annual Performance Management Report **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** October 2002 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Verified by Dept. of Ed. attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluation Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** Our capacity building data comes from the ARRT training/fellows program. In FY02 there were 15 funded centers, on average each program has 3-4 full-time fellows conducting post doctoral research. NIDRR's
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Published	Presentations	Published	Presentations		
1998	6.70	18.20				
2001	19.70	16.30	22	14		
2002	7	12	6	12		

	funded (15) with an average of 3-4 fellows in each program. The number of fellows varies every year.	reporting system has data on 14 of these centers. These data indicate that 102 publications resulted from the work of the fellows in these centers. An average of 6 publications and 12 presentations per center and 2 per fellow. The number of fellows in each center varies every year.

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Researchers with disabilities and from underserved groups: Participation of researchers working in the field who have disabilities or are from underserved groups will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of people with disabilities and members of minority populations who are paid employees.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Disabled	Minority	Disabled	Minority
2002	13	16		

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: The information collected is based on the grantees reports on Staffing by staffing position and category. Some persons worked less than full time on the grant. The data refer only to paid grantee staff. The total number of centers reporting during this period was 114 (58%) out of 194 centers who entered their staffing information using the new web system.

This measure represents successful completion of planning tasks and conduct of capacity building and outreach conference. Participation of at least 25 individuals from currently funded entities and individuals from other eligible entities.

Source: Other
Other: Other.

Additional Source Information: NIDRR Web Reporting System; Annual Performance Report; NIDRR Performance Reporting System sections on Staffing from the following programs only D&U, DRRP, FIP, MS, RERC, RRTC.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: January 2002
Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

Limitations: Disability and minority data reported on the Staffing section of the NIDRR web-based Performance Reporting System are based on voluntary disclosure information.

Objective 8.4 of 4: Ensure productivity and management effectiveness.

Indicator 8.4.1 of 1: Usefulness of NIDRR products: The percentage of customers reporting that NIDRR products and information are useful will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Consumer, Stakeholders and Researchers reporting their access to disability research information from NIDRR is useful			**Status:** Target met **Progress:** Data gathering activities were started in 2001, with help from the National Center for the Dissemination of Disability Research (NCDRR) annual survey. The survey seeks comsumers' and stakeholders' input and interests on disability research information and their ability to access such information. The sample consisted of 1028 consumers from NIDRR's Independent Living Centers; 430 stakeholders and 166 NIDRR grantees' researchers. **Explanation:** Ninety-four (94%) of consumers and stakeholders indicated that disability research information was useful. They stated that their preferred means of accessing research information was contacting community service providers (70%), disability research organizations (68%); looking in brochures (56%) and looking on the Internet (54%). Eighty-two (82%) of researchers use the Internet, 66% use brochures and 58% use research journals. Overall consumers used these approaches less frequently.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Other. **Sponsor:** National Center for the Dissemination of Disability Research.. **Date Sponsored:** 01/01/2001. **Additional Source Information:** The National Center for the Dissemination of Disability Research (NCDRR) engages annually on a survey activity that helps increase the knowledge base in the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation research community regarding dissemination and utilization of research findings. A key component of the research is to gain knowledge on what kinds of disability - related research are key to consumers, how they prefer to learn about this information and how they apply it. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** July 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. The survey addresses three distinct types of customers - 1) Consumer group - individuals with disabilities and their families participating in Independent Living Centers across the country; 2) Stakeholders-- representatives from various organizations that come in direct contact with consumers and 3) Researchers -- only NIDRR-funded researchers, i.e. grantees. **Limitations:** Results are based on relatively small samples of the three types of customers. **Improvements:** Questions on the survey must be refined to look for the usefulness on the information presented (i.e. formats) and access needs.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	90	85		

National Technical Institute for the Deaf - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.998 National Technical Institute for the Deaf: Operations, Construction, and Endowment Grant

Goal 8: 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 National Technical Institute for the Deaf expertise and expand outside sources of revenue.

Objective 8.1 of 2: 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 student body of at least 1,080 undergraduate students, 100 educational interpreter program students, and 50 graduate students.

Targets and Performance Data

Number of students

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Undergraduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.	Undergraduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.
1995	1,035	59	10			
1996	1,038	59	27			
1997	1,069	72	32			
1998	1,085	84	36			
1999	1,135	93	50	1,080	100	50
2000	1,084	77	59	1,080	100	50
2001	1,089	75	55	1,080	100	50
2002	1,125	53	60	1,080	100	75
2003	1,093	65	73	1,080	100	75

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target met

Progress: Undergraduate enrollment target exceeded. Negative trend away from target in the Educational Interpreter Program enrollment and the Graduate Program enrollment.

Explanation: In fiscal year 2002, the number of Undergraduates increased beyond the target. The Educational Interpreter Program enrollment is below target. With more aggressive recruitment, the Institute is confident that the Educational Interpreter Programs enrollment will increase. The Graduate enrollment fell short its target, but increased over the fiscal year 2001 number. The fiscal year 2003 number of Undergraduates exceeded its target. The Educational Interpreter Program enrollment is below target primarily due to more rigorous entrance requirements since the program as elevated to a bachelor's level program last fall. With more aggressive recruitment, the Institute is confident that the Educational Interpreter enrollment will increase, but more slowly than originally anticipated. The graduate enrollment increased considerably over fiscal year 2002, but fell slightly short its target in fiscal year 2003.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office records, FY 2003 as of October 2002.

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

Objective 8.2 of 2: Maximize the number of students successfully completing a program of study

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

Targets and Performance Data

Student graduation rates

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate
1997	50	50	51			
1998	51	50	57			
1999	53	50	61			
2000	53	50	63	53	51	61
2001	54	50	64	53	51	61
2002	57	54	66	53	52	61

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded

Progress: In FY 2002, the overall target of 53 percent was surpassed by 4 percentage points.

Explanation: In FY 2002, the graduation rate for students in the sub-baccalaureate programs was increased to 54 percent, and the rate for students in the baccalaureate programs increased to 66 percent, resulting in an overall graduation rate of 57 percent for all deaf students. The Institute's goal is to maintain the rate for students in sub-baccalaureate programs at 52 percent in FY 2003 and maintain the rate for students in baccalaureate programs above 60 percent.

Sources and Data Quality

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

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

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

Targets and Performance Data

Student retention rates

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Overall	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate
1997	76	75	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

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target met

Progress: In FY 2002 overall target of 74% was exceeded by 3 percentage points

Explanation: In FY 2002, the sub-Baccalaureate rate of 72 percent was 2 percentage points below the target, but 4 percentage points above the FY 2001 performance level. This pattern of improvement makes NTID confident that current and new retention strategies will help achieve the target of 74 percent in 2003 or 2004. Baccalaureate retention rate improved to 87%, which once again surpassed the target of 84 percent, and is better than the rate for hearing freshmen entering RIT.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: NTID Registrar office records

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2003
Data Available: October 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by NTID. No formal verification procedure applied.

Native Hawaiian Education Program - 2002

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
84.362 - Native Hawaiian Education

Goal 8: To assist the Native Hawaiian population to achieve challenging standards through supporting supplemental programs that meet their unique needs.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Native Hawaiian students will enter school ready to learn and achieve to high standards

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Children's school readiness: An increasing percentage of Native Hawaiian children will improve on measures of school readiness and literacy.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Predicted statewide enrollment for Native Hawaiian students in kindergarten: 1999-2000			**Progress:** Data for this indicator were not collected for 2002; therefore, we cannot measure progress.	
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	3,986			
2000	4,325			

Objective 8.2 of 2: Teachers will receive training and have access to instructional resources that meet the unique educational needs of Native Hawaiian students

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Professional development: Teachers participating in the program will report improved knowledge, skills, and abilities in addressing the unique educational needs of Native Hawaiian students.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of Teachers			**Progress:** Data for this indicator were not collected for 2002; therefore, we cannot measure progress.	
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	500			

Perkins Vocational and Technology Education (State Grants and Tech-Prep Indicators) - 2002

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

Goal 8: To increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen education achievement, workforce preparation and lifelong learning.

Objective 8.1 of 3: Ensure that vocational concentrators, including special populations, will achieve state established academic standards.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Academic Attainment: An increasing percentage of vocational concentrators, including special populations, will meet the core curriculum standards.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of vocational concentrators meeting core curriculum standards

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Percentage of vocational concentrators	Percentage of vocational concentrators
1998	33	
1999	45	
2000	44	
2001	70	55
2002		72

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: 1999-2000 school year data were collected as part of the negotiation process with the states to establish a baseline and agreed-upon performance targets. The 2000-2001 school year data are the first year of performance data and will be used as the basis for determining eligibility for incentive grants.

Explanation: Performance reporting has shifted to a reliance on state accountability reports, as specified in the 1998 Perkins Act. Data for 1997-98 came from a small pilot study testing the new provisions. States began using new measurement approaches negotiated with ED in 1999-2000 to report for 2000-01. 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 2002 data are reported by December 31, 2002. Attestation of data is completed within the following 90 days of States' submissions. Data for the 2002 program year will be available for the public on or after March 31. Some dates were incorrect on the previous report.

Sources and Data Quality

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

Additional Source Information: National Data Bases

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: March 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification. Data quality continues to be a major component of the Data Quality Initiative (DQI) begun last year. A new verification and attestation process was implemented to improve the accuracy of the performance data. OVAE verified data by internal electronic consistency via instrumentation checks, expert staff analysis, and requiring double check and attestation of data by state directors. State data is also checked independently by ED/OVAE during onsite monitoring and State audit reviews.

		Limitations: There is a substantial lag each year before performance data can be reported. Although state data is collected annually, local data are not received by the states until 4-6 months after completion of the school year. States participated in both a self-evaluation and peer review of their measures, definitions, data collection and reporting with assistance and training by OVAE by using data quality criteria, peer review process, ongoing technical assistance on strategies to improve measurement. The numbers provided in Actual Performance and Performance Targets do not represent a national average nor the results of any single national assessment, rather a composite of the diversity of the states, their measures, measurement approaches and definitions that vary from state to state. Significant latitude was given states in the identification and development of baseline data for each of the Core Indicators and thus variability in results. **Improvements:** ED will work with states through the D/PQI to streamline data collection and verification and promote greater consistency in measurement and reporting approaches.

Objective 8.2 of 3: Ensure that institutions, secondary and postsecondary, will offer programs with industry-recognized skill standards so that concentrators, including special populations, can earn skill certificates in these programs.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Skills proficiencies: An increasing proportion of secondary and postsecondary institutions will offer programs in which vocational students can earn industry-recognized skill certificates. (Program measures to be reassessed in 2000 to reflect new law.)

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of secondary vocational concentrators meeting state-established academic standards, using state adopted approaches.

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-established academic standards, using state adopted approaches

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	39	
2001	61	
2002		63

Percentage of postsecondary 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			

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: 1999-2000 school year data were collected as part of the negotiation process with the states to establish a baseline and agreed-upon performance targets. The 2000-01 school year data are the first year performance data and were used as the basis for determining eligibility for incentive grants.

Explanation: Performance reporting has shifted to a reliance on state accountability reports, as specified in the 1998 Perkins Act. Data for 1998 came from a small pilot study testing the new provisions. Data for 1999 were transitional, with states using data sources and approaches that existed before the 1998 law. States began using new measurement approaches negotiated with the Education Department to report for 2000. Performance data developed by states is reported to OVAE 90 days after termination of the grant, i.e., the 2002 data is reported by December 31, 2002. Attestation of data is completed within the following 90 days of States' submissions. Data for the 2002 program year will be available for the public on or after March

Sources and Data Quality

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

Additional Source Information: National Skills Data Bases

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: March 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data quality continues to be a major component of the Data Quality Initiative (DQI) begun last year. A new verification and attestation process was implemented to improve the accuracy of the performance data. OVAE verified data by internal electronic consistency via instrumentation checks, expert staff analysis, and requiring double check and attestation of data by State directors. State data are also checked independently by ED/OVAE during onsite monitoring and state audit reviews.

Limitations: There is a substantial lag each year before performance data can be reported. Although state data is collected annually, local data are not received by the states until 4 to 6 months after completion of the school year. The Education Department will work with states through the DQI to streamline data collection and verification and to promote greater consistency in measurement and reporting approaches. The numbers provided in Actual Performance and Performance Targets do not represent a national average nor the results of any single national assessment. Rather a composite of the diversity of the states, their measures, measurement

Percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators meeting state/ locally-adopted skill standards, using state recognized approaches		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2000	76	
2001	76	
2002		76

31. Data for 1998 and 1999 have been revised and updated since the previous report. States can update and revise their performance information when more data become available.

approaches and definitions that vary from state to state. Significant latitude was given states in the identification and development of baseline data for each of the Core Indicators and thus variability in results.

Objective 8.3 of 3: Ensure that concentrators, including special populations, make transitions to continuing education, work or other career options.

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

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		
2002			84	84

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: 1999-2000 school data were collected as part of the negotiation process with the states to establish a baseline and agreed-upon performance targets. The 2000-01 school year data are the first year of performance data and will be used as the basis for determining eligibility for incentive grants.

Explanation: Performance reporting is shifting to a reliance on state accountability reports, as specified in the 1998 Perkins Act. Data for 1997-98 came from a small pilot study testing the new provisions. Data for 1998-99 are transitional, with states using data sources and approaches that existed before the 1998 law. Data collected for 1999-2000 will be the first year the data will be reported based on the Education Department-negotiated measures. Performance data developed by States is reported to OVAE 90 days after termination of the grant, i.e., the 2002 data will be reported by December 31, 2002. Attestation of data is completed

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Performance Report
Grantee Performance Report: 1810-0503 Annual Performance Reporting Format for OIE Formula Grants to LEAs.

Additional Source Information: National Data Bases

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: March 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Attestation and Audit -- Data quality continues to be a major component of the Data Quality Initiative (DQI) begun last year. A new verification and attestation process was implemented to improve the accuracy of the performance data. OVAE verified data by internal electronic consistency via instrumentation checks, expert staff analysis, and requiring double check and attestation of data by State directors. State data is also checked independently by ED/OVAE during onsite monitoring and State audit reviews.

	within the following 90 days of States' submissions. Data for the 2002 program year will be available for the public on or after March 31.	**Limitations:** There is a substantial lag each year before performance data can be reported. In addition, states collect placement data from 6 months to 1 year after the school year resulting in a further lag in data reporting. Limited access to federal data bases (e.g. military/defense) and issues related to FERPA and use of social security numbers is also a great barrier to both accurate reporting and completeness of data. The numbers provided in Actual Performance and Performance Targets do not represent a national average nor the results of any single national assessment. Rather a composite of the diversity of the states, their measures, measurement approaches and definitions that vary from state to state. Significant latitude was given states in the identification and development of baseline data for each of the Core Indicators and thus variability in results. **Improvements:** Ongoing technical assistance is being provided through the DQI to address these challenges. These include but are not limited to in-state cooperative agreements and national resources such as the Peer Collaborative Resource Network(PCRN) for sharing of methods, techniques, and research.

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

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 or Employment Adm. Record Exchange	Placement in Military or Employment Survey	Postsecondary Degree/Certificate Completion Administrative Data	Placement in Military or 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			39	84

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: 1999-2000 school data were collected as part of the negotiation process with the states to establish a baseline and agreed-upon performance targets. The 2000-01 school year data are the first year of performance data and will be used as the basis for determining eligibility for incentive grants.

Explanation: States used various measurement approaches for postsecondary completion and placement, i.e. wage record exchanges, administrative record exchanges and surveys to indicate completion and placement performance. Results were collected through the CAR instrument on current performance and matched to previously identified targets. State actual and target differences were matched and aggregated. Performance data developed by States is reported to OVAE 90 days after termination of the grant, i.e., the 2002 data will be reported by December 31, 2002. Attestation of data is completed within the following 90 days of States' submissions. Data for the 2002 program year will be available for the public on or after March 31. Military data has been dropped for the 2001-2002 program year. Previous data years have been corrected to reflect end of full year.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Performance Report
Grantee Performance Report: 1810-0503 Annual Performance Reporting Format for OIE Formula Grants to LEAs.

Additional Source Information: National Data Bases

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: June
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data quality continues to be a major component of the Data Quality Initiative (DQI) begun last year. A new verification and attestation process was implemented to improve the accuracy of the performance data. OVAE verified data by internal electronic consistency via instrumentation checks, expert staff analysis, and requiring double check and attestation of data by State directors. State data is also checked independently by ED/OVAE during onsite monitoring and State audit reviews.

Limitations: There is a substantial lag each year before performance data can be reported. In addition, states collect placement data from 6 months to 1 year after the school year resulting in a further lag in data reporting. Limited access to federal data bases (e.g. military/defense) and issues

		related to FERPA and use of social security numbers is also a great barrier to both accurate reporting and completeness of data. The numbers provided in Actual Performance and Performance Targets do not represent a national average nor the results of any single national assessment, rather a composite of the diversity of the states, their measures, measurement approaches and definitions that vary from state to state. Significant latitude was given states in the identification and development of baseline data for each of the Core Indicators and thus variability in results. **Improvements:** Ongoing technical assistance is being provided through the DQI to address these challenges.

Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology - 2002

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

Goal 8: To improve the knowledge and ability of future teachers to use technology in teaching practices and student learning opportunities, and to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs.

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

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

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of programs

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

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target not met

Progress: The percentage of projects that redesigned curriculum *during this reporting period* has decreased.

Explanation: Curriculum design is a priority for many Implementation projects, and some had completed redesign before this reporting period. The cumulative percent of Implementation projects that have redesigned curriculum as a grant activity since the beginning of the program is ninety-one percent (91%). Curriculum redesign is not the purpose of all Catalyst projects, many of which are not located at an institution of higher education.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Project Performance Reports.

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

Limitations: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator. Capacity-building grants were one-year grants given in 1999 so there are data only for 2000.

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

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of faculty members in funding teacher preparation programs that effectively use technology in their teaching will increase.							**Status:** Target not met **Progress:** Positive movement toward target. The percentage of technology proficient faculty is increasing. **Explanation:** Implementation projects are using various methods to assess technology proficiency. Fifty-seven percent (57%) of faculty were rated to be proficient using self-assessment, fifteen percent (15%) using observation, and thirty-three percent (33%) using other methods such as exams and portfolios.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Additional Source Information:** Project Performance Reports **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator. Capacity building grants were one-year grants given in 1999 so there are data only for 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**				
	Capacity Building Projects	Implementation Projects	Catalyst Projects	Capacity Building Projects	Implementation Projects	Catalyst Projects		
2000	56	53						
2001		61			63			
2002		62			63			

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

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

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Percentage of students assessed at catalyst projects that demonstrated proficiency in using technology.

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

Status: Target not met
Progress: The percentage of graduating students who are rated as technology proficient *out of all those assessed* has decreased.

Explanation: Fifty-nine percent (59%) of Implementation projects required preservice teachers to demonstrate technology as a grant activity during the reporting period and an additional thirty-one percent (31%) required proficiency but not as a grant activity. Implementation grantees are assessing a growing number of graduating students for technology proficiency. Many Catalyst projects are not located at institutions of higher education and therefore do not assess the technology proficiency of preservice teachers.

Additional Source Information: Project Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: December 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Evaluation data collection will be verified by on-site monitoring and review as well as survey and analysis performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.

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

Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) - 2002

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

Goal 8: 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 1: Progress and achievement: An increasing number of states will show that Neglected or Delinquent students are obtaining regular high school diplomas, General Equivalency Diplomas, and/or earning high school course credits.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of states reporting					**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** States not required to report data for indicator based on prior reauthorization. New baseline to be set in 2004. **Explanation:** Data last collected by PES mail survey for 1999 data. No survey was authorized for 2001-2002 data.	**Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2005 **Data Available:** January 2006 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Studies of programs for Neglected or Delinquent students were conducted by voluntary state and local surveys through PES. There has been, and is, no authorization of program funds for data collection. Additionally, states and local programs are only required to provide program information once every three years. **Improvements:** The Department plans to conduct surveys through a MATO contractor and invite states to annually share data for program indicators.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	GED	School Credits	GED	School Credits		
1999	36	12				

Projects with Industry Program (PWI) - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.234 - Projects with Industry

Goal 8: To facilitate the establishment of partnerships between rehabilitation service providers and business and industry in order to create and expand employment and career advancement opportunities for individuals with disabilities.

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

Percentage of individuals served who were placed in competitive employment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	59	
1998	49	
1999	59	61
2000	61.90	61
2001	62.40	62
2002		62.20

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

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.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Grantee performance indicator data.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: April 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
The sources and data quality are validated by checking to see if the data are reasonable. On site compliance reviews are also conducted on at least 15 percent of grant recipients annually to (a) determine whether that grant is managed in accordance with Federal requirements; (b) identify areas where the project can be improved; and (c) assess the project's mission as it relates to the Department's mission.

Limitations: The primary limitation of the data is that they are self-reported. Technical assistance and regular monitoring is provided to grantees in order to receive updated reports from the grantee regarding progress toward meeting project goals.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Change in earnings of individuals who are placed in competitive employment: Projects With Industry projects will report that participants placed in competitive employment increase earnings by an average of at least $218 per week.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Average increase in weekly earnings in dollars			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Performance data, due 12/01/02, is still being submitted, and the system which allows for analysis and compilation of aggregates is being worked on to effect import of data from GAPS. Final data are expected by February 2003. **Explanation:** Unable to judge. Data are pending as some projects do not meet the deadline date. In addition, the system which allows for analysis and compilation of aggregates is being worked on to effect import of data from GAPS.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Additional Source Information:** Grantee performance indicator data. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** February 2003 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. Same as 1.1 **Limitations:** While on-site monitoring allows for some validation, only 15 percent of PWI projects are visited each year. Otherwise, data is self-validated by grantees. **Improvements:** Ability to import data from GAPS will be addressed.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	207			
1998	209			
1999	226	209		
2000	252	218		
2001	236	218		
2002		226		

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			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Performance data, due 12/01/02, are still being submitted, and the system which allows for analysis and compilation of aggregates is still being worked on to effect import of data from GAPS. Final data are expected by February 2003. **Explanation:** Unable to judge. Data are pending as some projects did not meet the deadline date. In addition, the system which allows for analysis and compilation of aggregates is being worked on to effect import of data from GAPS.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** February 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Grantee performance indicator data. **Limitations:** While on-site monitoring allows for some validation, only 15 percent of PWI projects are visited each year. Otherwise, data is self-validated by grantees. **Improvements:** Ability to import data from GAPS will be addressed.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	60			
1998	48			
1999	58	62		
2000	60.80	60		
2001	69	61		
2002		61.20		

Public Charter Schools Program - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.282 - Charter Schools

Goal 8: 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: By 2000, 40 states will have charter school legislation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of states with charter school legislation (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico)			**Status:** Target not met **Progress:** There has been a positive gain even with only two state persuing legislation between 1999 and 2002. Several states will be considering legislation this year. **Explanation:** Data shows positive trend even with gain of only one state between 1999 and 2001. Several States will be considering legislation this year. Several states have considered, but have not yet passed, legislation. We will continue to provide information and technical assistance to those states and to new states that are considering legislation.	**Additional Source Information:** State Educational Agencies (SEA); state legislatures. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** January 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** There is variation in the definition of state charter school legislation. **Improvements:** N/A
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1995	12			
1996	19			
1997	27			
1998	31			
1999	38			
2000	38	40		
2001	39	42		
2002	40	42		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Charter operations: By 2002, there will be at least 3,000 charter schools in operation around the Nation.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of charter schools in operation			**Status:** Target not met **Progress:** 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 **Explanation:** Several states have met caps on the number of charter schools allowed, and the growth has declined slightly to about 400 new schools per year. Several states are considering raising their caps.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Other. **Sponsor:** Center for Education Reform annual survey; State Education Agencies. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** January 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** Differences in the definition of charter schools (i.e., some states count multiple sites as single charter schools, while others count them as multiple charter schools) cause variability in the counts SEAs. There is sometimes disagreement about numbers of charter schools in operation among the agencies that do the counting. **Improvements:** N/A
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		

Regional Educational Laboratories - 2002

Goal 8: To promote knowledge-based educational improvement to help all students meet high standards through development, applied research, dissemination, and technical assistance conducted with local, state, and intermediate agencies.

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

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

Targets and Performance Data

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

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

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: The 2002 data represent the baseline year for development sites in the 2001-2005 contract period and cannot be compared to data from the previous contract period in which different definitions for “site” and “participant” were used. Explanation: Of 206 total sites, 52 (25%) reported at least one outcome/category of improved practice. These 52 sites include 41 of 154 (27%) school-level sites, 9 of 40 (23%) district-level sites, 1 of 4 (25%) intermediate agency level site and 1 of 8 (13%) state level sites. A site is defined as a school, district, intermediate agency, or state in which “the Laboratory is engaged in collaborative field work that is: a) direct, face-to-face, long-term, and intensive; b) designed with the explicit goal to improve practice; and c) expected to produce outcomes that are measurable and indicative of improved practice.” A participant is defined as “an individual directly involved in collaborative field work.” Students do not collaborate directly with the Laboratories and are not included in the 2002 data.

Explanation: (cont'd). Examples of areas for improved practice include differentiated instruction to help all students succeed, effective use of assessment resources/tools, efficient and effective resource allocation, or increased capacity to deliver high-quality professional

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Laboratory records and quarterly reports, 2002.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: September 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification. Validated By: Experienced Public/Private Entity. Each Laboratory utilized its own quality assurance process to review data provided.

Limitations: The Education Department relies on Laboratory records for these data.

	development. No performance targets are shown for the number of development sites or participants because their numbers are not expected to increase significantly. The indicator may be revised to emphasize the results of the development work. Additional information in the measure has been added for clarification, i.e. "intermediate agency."	**Improvements:** Independent reviewers conducted data verification in 2002.

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

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of schools showing increases in student achievement

Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets			
	Less than 12 months	12-23 months	24-35 months	36 months or more	Less than 12 months	12-23 months	24-35 months	36 months or more
2001				41.40				
2002	4	54.80	91.70	0				

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: The current year (2002) is a new baseline year. The previous year (2001) was the first year of a new contract period and represents only 6 months of data collection. Explanation: Of the 206 total sites (Indicator 8.1.1 of 2 above), there were 194 school- and district-level sites. Of these, 155 indicated a direct focus on the outcome/category of “increased student achievement in low performing schools.” The other 39 school/district sites are focused on research and development to enhance their capacity to improve student achievement. Four of 100 sites (4.0%) with fewer than 12 months of development, 23 of 42 sites (54.8%) with 12-23 months of development, and 11 of 12 sites (91.7%) with 24-36 months of development (total N=38 sites, or 24.5% of the 155 total school- and district-level sites) reported collecting evidence demonstrating increased student achievement. The one site in cohort 4 (36 months or more of development) collected student achievement data, but these data indicated no increase.

Explanation: (cont'd). Sites were included in this data set only if they met the criterion for inclusion under Indicator 8.1.1 of 2 (above) and if they indicated that “increased student achievement” was a

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Laboratory records and quarterly reports, 2002.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: September 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Experienced Public/Private Entity. Each Laboratory utilized its own quality assurance process to review the data provided.

Limitations: The Education Department relies on Laboratory records for these data.

Improvements: Independent reviewers conducted data verification in 2002.

	targeted outcome. This is the first year in which data were gathered and reported by cohort (e.g., grouped by length of time of development work). Work at several of these low performing school sites began during the previous contract period. No performance target is included for 2002 because 2002 is a new baseline year representing the first complete year of data collection in the 2001-2005 contract period. The indicator may be revised to show the results of the Laboratories' development work over time.	

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

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

Targets and Performance Data

Number of products, services, and electronic materials

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

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

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

Explanation: The total number of individual contacts with the Laboratories (adding together products, services, and web site hits) increased substantially from 68,748,373 in 2001 to 211,443,788 in 2002 because of continued increase in the use of the Web for dissemination as access to the Laboratories' web sites continued to grow. In 2002, the number of web page views was added as a second measure of receipt of electronic materials. The term page views (impressions) refers to client access to entire pages, but does not include a site's supporting graphic files. Using this new measure, the total number of individual contacts with the Laboratories (adding together products, services, and web page views) increased substantially from 15,595,222 in 2001 to 43,128,451 in 2002. The web site hits and page views include the 10 laboratory web sites plus the REL web site. The indicator may be revised to include new ways to measure the impact of web site dissemination.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Laboratory records and quarterly reports, 2002.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: September 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Experienced Public/Private Entity. Each Laboratory utilized its own quality assurance process to review the data provided.

Limitations: The Education Department relies on Laboratory records for these data.

Improvements: Independent reviewers conducted data verification in 2002.

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

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of clients rating products and services to be of excellent or good quality			**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** Data are based on client ratings of excellent or good quality and are consistent with reviewers' findings on the quality and utility of Laboratory products and services in the 1999 evaluation study conducted by the Education Department. In 2002, utility/impact was added as a second measure of the quality of products and services. 88.7% of clients sampled rated products and services as having utility/impact in 1 or more of the following categories: increased knowledge/skills (78.9%), used for decision-making/planning (74.6%), used to enhance professional practice (73.6%), and positive effect on student performance (59.2%). 2002 data are the result of increased attention to instrumentation and data collection issues, improved consistency across the system, better use of electronic programs for data analysis, enhanced quality assurance, and the identification of areas for further improvement. **Explanation:** (cont'd). Indicators of quality may be revised to include additional measures of impact on educational research and policy. Examples of impact include the number of publications in journals and presentations to policy audiences and at refereed conferences. Baseline data were established for these impact measures in 2002.	**Additional Source Information:** Client surveys, 2002. **Frequency:** Biennially. **Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004 **Data Available:** September 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Experienced Public/Private Entity. Each Laboratory utilized its own quality assurance process to review the data provided. **Limitations:** The Education Department relies on Laboratory records for these data. **Improvements:** Independent reviewers conducted data verification in 2002.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	90	90		
1998	90.10	90		
1999	88.30	90		
2000	84.30	90		
2001	93.20	90		
2002	92.10	90		

Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program--State Grants Program and National Programs - 2002

CFDA Numbers: 84.184 - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities_National Programs
84.186 - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities_State Grants

Goal 8: To help ensure that all schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug and violence prevention programs.

Objective 8.1 of 4: Reduce the use and availability of alcohol and drugs in schools.

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

Targets and Performance Data

Rate of annual use of alcohol in school (in percentage)

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	8th Graders	12th Graders	8th Graders	12th Graders
1994	5	8		
1995	5	7		
1996	6	8		
1997	5	8		
1998	5	8		
1999	4	7	5	8
2000			5	8
2001			4	7
2002			4	7

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Data for 2000, 2001, and 2002 are not available because no special analysis has been conducted of the Monitoring the Future Survey in those years.

Explanation: Rates of substance use in school generally parallel but are much lower than overall rates of substance abuse by youth. Rates of alcohol use for all grade levels have remained relatively steady for many years and are, therefore, unlikely to decline in the near future. Marijuana use rates increased in the mid-nineties, but recently have been relatively steady and may have leveled off. No 2000, 2001, or 2002 are available as a special analysis of the Monitoring the Future Survey was not conducted for those years. In future years a new data source will be used that provides regularly collected data and the indicator will be redefined.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Monitoring the Future, 1999.

Frequency: Annually.

Validated By: NCES.

Limitations: According to NCES calculations, from 1976 to 1996 the total annual response rate for this survey varied between 46 percent and 67 percent. MTF does not release its data on in-school use; special runs for these data are generally not available until the spring of the year following the December release of other MTF data. MTF does not collect data for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders on drug use in school in a way that allows data to be compared across the three grades.

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

Objective 8.2 of 4: Reduce number of criminal and violent incidents in schools.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Violent incidents in schools: By 2003, the proportion of high school students in a physical fight on school property will decrease, and the annual rate of students ages 12 to 18 who report experiencing serious violent crime, in school or going to and from school, will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of high school students who reported being involved in a physical fight on school property in the past year			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Target was met for 2001. Data for the next reporting period (2003) will not be available until December 2003. **Explanation:** Measure 1: The percentage of students reporting being in a fight at school had declined since 1995. Standard error for 2001 data is +/- 1%.	**Additional Source Information:** Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 2001, National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), 2000. **Frequency:** Biennially. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. **Limitations:** YRBS data are collected biennially and reported in the year after collection; the 2003 data will be reported in 2004. While most NCVS data are reported the year after collection, in-school victimization data is a special
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1995	16			
1997	15			
1999	14			
2001	12.50	12		

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

analysis with a delayed release. The data collected in 2001 will be released in 2004.

Objective 8.3 of 4: Increase the percentage of safe and drug free schools and communities grantees that achieve results-based goals.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Grantee progress: By 2002, National Programs grantees will demonstrate substantial progress toward achieving their 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			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Requirements for measuring progress toward goals and objectives have been incorporated into all applications for National Programs direct grants. No data are currently available for 2002.	**Additional Source Information:** Review of grantee reports **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** January 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2001	84	75		
2002		85		

Objective 8.4 of 4: Provide crisis intervention assistance to school districts.

Indicator 8.4.1 of 1: Crisis intervention: By 2001, the Department will implement policies and procedures necessary to ensure rapid response to school districts seriously affected by crises that interfere with learning.		
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
- No Targets And Performance Data -	**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Funding was approved by congress for this initiative in December 2000. Additional funding provided in FY 2002 appropriation. In 2001, ED initiated responses to eligible requests within 48 hours in 8 of 9 instances. No 2002 data are available.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Record/File. **Additional Source Information:** Review of program files and organizational plans **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** January 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Smaller Learning Communities (Small, Safe and Successful High Schools) - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.215L FIE/Smaller Learning Communities

Goal 8: 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 2: 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
.					**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Baseline Established **Explanation:** New program. Initial grants awarded in October 2000.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Percentage Meeting Levels in Reading	Percentage Meeting Levels in Math	Percentage Meeting Levels in Reading	Percentage Meeting Levels in Math		
2001	42.60	51.10				

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Behavior: Increasing percentages of students in high schools receiving Small Learning Community grants will show improvements on measures such as school attendance and incidence of disciplinary actions.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
.					**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Baseline established **Explanation:** New program. Initial grants awarded in October 2000. Data for FY 2002 will be based on Annual Performance Reports that are not due until 12/31/02. A lengthy tabulation process will then be necessary.	**Source:** Performance Report **Contractor Performance Report** **Additional Source Information:** Program evaluation to begin in 2001 and Annual Performance Reports to begin in 2002. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** December 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Percentage of Students in daily Attendance	Total Number of Disciplinary Actions	Percentage of Students in daily Attendance	Total Number of Disciplinary Actions		
2001	90.40	57,084				

Star Schools Program - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.203 - Star Schools

Goal 8: 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 1: 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 will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data

Number of full credit courses offered through Star Schools

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

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target exceeded

Progress: Grantees report that 1502 courses are aligned with standards. Grantees also report that 1481 modules are aligned with standards.

Explanation: These are final data figures aggregated for the FY 2002 performance period. It should be noted that the Iowa Distance Education Alliance project is not included in the final FY 2001 total of courses aligned with standards because the project failed to comply with the Star Schools GPRA reporting deadline requirements. Excluding Iowa's perviously reported count of 813 courses for FY 2000, a total of 108 courses were reported by the other remaining projects. For FY 2001, there was a substantial increase from 108 (FY 2000) to 387 (FY 2001) in the number of courses offered that were aligned with standards by the other grantees. For FY 2002, there was a significant increase in total courses reported aligned with standards, because the Iowa Distance Education Alliance project, which was excluded in the final data figures aggregated for the FY 2001 performance period, complied with the FY 2002 Star Schools program GPRA reporting deadline requirements and therefore is included in the final data figures aggregated for FY 2002.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Fy 2002 Annual performance and evaluation reports; FY 2002 data retrieved from online reporting system.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002 - 2003
Data Available: October 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
However, the program evaluation liaison and program officers review data from the online reporting system and evaluation reports from the projects to ascertain the extent to which evidence exists that the content is aligned with standards. The program evaluation liaison or program officer's review includes: examining the procedures that grantees use to align the standards with all academic levels; reviewing the sources of standards, strategies and procedures utilized for alignment; and verifying the evidence provided for alignment. The evaluation liaison performs a quality check and review for inconsistencies in the data, contacts the project for clarification of the input or request that data be modified. Projects modify data in the

		online reporting system accordingly and also provide an explanation for those modifications to the evaluation liaison and team leader. Site visits and reviews of additional reports from the project further confirm the data. **Limitations:** Data are self- reported by the projects. Evidence of alignment with standards has been particularly difficult to assess. Determining the extent to which courses are challenging has also been difficult to assess. **Improvements:** Planned improvements include utilizing the new aggregate analysis feature from the Star Schools online reporting system to gather and analyze specific data across all projects for courses and modules offered that are aligned with standards. Planned validation improvements on evidence of course alignment with standards include verifying whether or not projects utilize content experts to review and validate the extent to which: a) content is challenging b) standards are appropriate for the content delivered. In addition, we propose to modify the indicator in FY 2004 as follows: a) expand to include an elementary and secondary course and modules content category b) focus on projects offering reading, math, science, and foreign language courses and modules. We propose to add an indicator in professional development because half of the FY 1999 & FY 2000 grants focus on professional development and currently do not report to current indicator.

State Vocational Rehabilitation Services (Including Supported Employment) - 2002

CFDA Numbers: 84.126 - Rehabilitation Services_Vocational Rehabilitation Grants to States
84.187 - Supported Employment Services for Individuals with Severe Disabilities

Goal 8: Individuals with disabilities served by the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grant program will achieve high quality employment.

Objective 8.1 of 2: Ensure that individuals with disabilities who are served by the vocational rehabilitation (VR) state grant program achieve employment consistent with their particular strengths, resources, abilities, capabilities and interests.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 5: Number achieving employment: The number of individuals with disabilities who achieve employment will increase by at least 1 percent annually.

Targets and Performance Data

The number of individuals who achieved an employment outcome

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Number of Individuals	Percent Increase	Number of Individuals	Percent Increase
1997	211,503			
1998	223,668	5.80		
1999	231,714	3.60	215,770	
2000	236,220	1.90	234,040	
2001	233,687	-1	238,582	
2002			238,582	

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Preliminary FY 2001 data show that the target was not met. Data is not yet available for 2002.

Explanation: The target for FY 2001 was set prior to the current economic downturn. Economic conditions affect the placement rates for populations who are disadvantaged in the labor market. Targets for future years have been adjusted accordingly.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: RSA state agency data from RSA-113.

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

Limitations: Appropriate crosschecks and edits to verify and validate the quality of these data are currently being implemented.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 5: Percentage of individuals obtaining employment: The percentage of all persons served who obtain employment will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage obtaining employment.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Preliminary FY 2001 data show that the target was not met. Data is not yet available for 2002. **Explanation:** The FY 2000 and 2001 targets were not met. The target for 2001 was set prior to the economic downturn. Economic conditions affect the placement rates for populations who are disadvantaged in the labor market. Targets for future years have been adjusted accordingly and reflect the expectation of very modest increases.	**Additional Source Information:** RSA state agency data from the RSA-113. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Verified by ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** Appropriate crosschecks and edits to verify and validate the quality of these data are currently being implemented.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	61.20			
1998	62.20			
1999	62.50	61		
2000	62.50	62.70		
2001	60.60	63		
2002		63		

Indicator 8.1.3 of 5: Percentage of individuals obtaining competitive employment: Of individuals obtaining employment, the percentage who obtain competitive employment will increase. Among individuals with significant disabilities obtaining employment, the percentage obtaining competitive employment will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of all individuals with disabilities who obtained competitive employment			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** The 2002 data are expected to be available by Fall 2003. We expect the data to show the target has been met. **Explanation:** In FY 2000 the minimum wage remained constant, thus allowing time for the wages of VR consumers (with and without significant disabilities) to increase to minimum wage levels. States have been successful in assisting individuals in achieving competitive employment outcomes. Because of the marked increase in performance in FYs 1999 and 2000, we have adjusted targets for 2001 and 2002.	**Additional Source Information:** RSA state agency data from the RSA-911. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** Accuracy/consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees (respondents). Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	81.20			
1998	80			
1999	83.10	82.30		
2000	86	82.50		
2001	87.60	86.20		
2002		86.40		

Percentage of individuals with significant disabilities who obtained competitive employment

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	79.10	
1998	78.70	
1999	82.10	80
2000	85.20	85.50
2001	86.70	85.10
2002		85.40

Indicator 8.1.4 of 5: Improved earnings: Among individuals exiting the program in competitive employment, the median ratio of their average hourly wage to the state's average hourly wage for all individuals in the state who are employed will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Median ratio for general and combined agencies

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	.60	
1998	.60	
1999	.60	.60
2000	.60	.60
2001	.56	.60
2002		.58

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: The 2002 data are expected to be available by Fall 2003.

Explanation: Projections for future years reflect very modest increases in performance on this measure based on past trends.

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

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

Limitations: Same limitations and planned improvements reported under 1.3 apply to this indicator. In addition, the data for this indicator are limited by the fact that the required comparison involves numbers reported from two different sets of state-reported data.

Indicator 8.1.5 of 5: Own income as primary support: The percentage of individuals who report upon obtaining employment that their own income is their primary source of support will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of individuals who report upon obtaining employment that their own income is their primary source of support			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** The 2002 data are expected to be available by Fall 2003. **Explanation:** The 2000 data show an increase from 74.5 percent, in 1999, to 77.3 percent. The 2000 figure exceeded the target for that year. The targets for future years have been adjusted based on performance in 2000.	**Additional Source Information:** RSA state agency data from RSA-911. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** Same as discussed under Indicator 1.3.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	74.60			
1998	75.80			
1999	74.50	74.50		
2000	77.30	75		
2001	77.70	76		
2002		76.20		

Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the number of individuals with the most significant disabilities who have received supported employment services but achieve competitive employment outcomes.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal achieving competitive employment: The percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieve a competitive employment outcome (including supported employment outcomes in which the individual receives the minimum wage or better) will continue to increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieved a competitive employment outcome			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** The 2002 data are expected to be available by Fall 2003. We expect the data to show that the target has been met. **Explanation:** In FY 2000 the minimum wage remained constant, thus allowing time for the wages of VR consumers (with significant disabilities) to increase to minimum wage levels. States have been successful in assisting individuals in achieving competitive employment outcomes. Because of the marked increase in performance in FYs 1999 and 2000, we have adjusted targets for future years.	**Additional Source Information:** RSA state agency data from the RSA-911. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - **Data Available:** October 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. Verified by ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. **Limitations:** Same as discussed under Indicator 1.3.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	69.60			
1998	69.10			
1999	73.30	71		
2000	77.30	71.50		
2001	79.20	77.40		
2002		77.60		

Student Financial Assistance Policy - 2002

Goal 8: 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: Considering all sources of financial aid, the percentage of unmet need, especially for low-income students, will continuously decrease.

Targets and Performance Data

Total for Undergraduates

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995	23	
1996	23	
1997	22	
1998	21.20	
1999	20.80	
2000	21.20	

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			

Assessment of Progress

Status: Target not met

Progress: No 2001 or 2002 data.

Explanation: Unmet need as a percentage of total cost of attendance was estimated to decrease slightly in each year with somewhat larger decreases for low-income students. Since 1995-96, unmet need is estimated to have decreased 2 percentage points for undergraduates overall and 4 or more percentage points for low-income undergraduates.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Other
Other: Record/File.
Sponsor: National Postsecondary Student Aid Study.

Data Available: January 2005
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: NPSAS data are collected only every four years.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: College enrollment rates: Postsecondary education enrollment rates will increase each year for all students, while the enrollment gap between low- and high-income and minority and nonminority high school graduates will decrease each year.

Targets and Performance Data

The percentage of high school graduates ages 16-24 enrolling immediately in college - Total

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994	61.90	
1995	61.90	
1996	65	
1997	67	
1998	65.60	
1999	62.90	
2000	63.30	
2001	61.70	

Income

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Low	High	Difference	Low	High	Difference
1994	44	78.40	42.20			
1995	41.20	83.40	36.50			
1996	41.50	78	35.10			
1997	47.10	82	26.60			
1998	50.60	77.30	25.10			
1999	50.90	76	28.70			
2000	48.50	77.10	32			
2001	47.80	79.80	32			

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: No 2002 data. Some progress is being made in reducing the enrollment gap between low- and high- income students but progress is not being made in increasing the overall enrollment rate or reducing the gap between minority and nonminority students.

Explanation: There was a statistically significant increase in the overall enrollment rate from the 1994-95 period to the 1997-98 period. However, since then enrollment rates have fallen significantly (back to the 1994-95 levels), indicating a lack of overall progress. Prior year data has been updated from previous reports to reflect more complete information.

Sources and Data Quality

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

Limitations: Small subgroup sample sizes for low-income and minority students lead to large yearly fluctuations in enrollment rates. Three-year weighted averages are used to smooth out these fluctuations.

Race										
Year	**Actual Performance**					**Performance Targets**				
	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference between Black and White	Difference between White and Hispanic	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference between Black and White	Difference between White and Hispanic
1994	51.30	64.50	55.70	13.20	8.90					
1995	52.40	64.30	55	11.90	9.30					
1996	52.90	67.40	51.60	14.50	15.90					
1997	55.40	68.20	57.60	12.80	10.50					
1998	58.80	68.50	55.30	9.80	13.30					
1999	59.80	66.30	51.90	6.50	14.40					
2000	58.60	65.70	47.40	7.10	18.30					
2001	56.30	64.20	48.60	7.90	15.60					

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.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** Increases in the maximum award without other changes in the formulas used to award Pell grants will tend to lower the percentage of funds going to the neediest students.	**Source:** Other **Other:** Record/File. **Sponsor:** Pell Grant Applicant/Recipient File. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** March 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	82			
1998	80			
1999	78	75		
2000	78	75		
2001		75		
2002		75		

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	

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: As a general rule, it is believed that an educational debt burden of 10 percent or greater will negatively affect a borrower's ability to repay his or her student loan and to obtain other credit such as a home mortgage. We expect the 2001 and 2002 median debt burden rate to remain well below 10 percent.

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

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2000 - 2001
Data Available: August 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: To overcome limitations with the data from the Social Security Administration (SSA) that were previously used, we switched to IRS data on household income for 1998 and future years. The IRS data may slightly understate debt burden for married borrowers where both individuals have student loans

Objective 8.2 of 3: Ensure that more students will persist in postsecondary education and attain degrees and certificates.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Completion rate: Completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in 4-year and less than 4-year programs will improve, while the gap in completion rates between minority and non-minority students will decrease.

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	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference between Black and White	Difference between White and Hispanic
1997	52.50	35.50	55.50	39.10	20	16.40						
1998	52.60	34.50	55.80	39.10	21.30	16.70						
1999	53	35.80	56	40.90	20.20	15.10						
2000	52.40	35.70	55.40	41.50	19.70	13.90						

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	Black	White	Hispanic	Difference between Black and White	Difference between White and Hispanic
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						

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: There was a decrease in degree of completion rates in both 4-year and less than 4-year programs between 1999 and 2000. The decrease in completion of 4-year programs was the result of a reduction of almost one percentage point in the degree completion rate for white students because both Black and Hispanic students showed slight increases in the completion of 4-year degrees. Prior year data has been updated from previous reports to reflect more complete information.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Graduation Rate Survey (GRS)

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: March 2003
Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Postsecondary institutions are not required to report graduation rates until 2002. However, data were voluntarily submitted by institutions representing 87 percent of 4-year students and 77 percent of 2-year students. Investigating whether a proxy for graduation rates for student aid recipients can be obtained from administrative records.

Objective 8.3 of 3: Ensure that taxpayers will have a positive return on investment in the federal student financial assistance programs.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Return on investment: The benefits of the student aid programs, in terms of increased tax revenues, will continue to exceed their costs.

Targets and Performance Data

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			

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: 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.

Explanation: The estimated return on investment is calculated in the following manner: 1) The discounted present value of tax revenue and welfare benefits is calculated for different educational attainment levels. 2) Under the “best” scenario, 90 percent of the revenue differential calculated in step 1 is assumed to be caused by obtaining more education.

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research

Additional Source Information: March Current Population Survey (CPS) and Beginning Post Secondary (BPS) study with imputations from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) and High School and Beyond (HS&B). Behavioral assumptions were derived, where feasible, from meta-analyses conducted by Leslie and Brinkman in their 1988 book, *The Economic Value of Higher Education*.

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

Limitations: A number of assumptions and imputations are required to estimate the return on investment. By providing high and low estimates, one can assess the sensitivity of the results to the assumptions used. Prior year data has been updated from previous reports to reflect more complete information.

Student Financial Assistance Programs - 2002

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

Goal 8: Postsecondary student aid delivery and program management is efficient, financially sound, and responsive to customers.

Objective 8.1 of 3: Increase customer satisfaction.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Increase Customer Satisfaction to a comparable private sector industry average - American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) rating of 75.9 (out of a possible score of 100) - by FY 2002

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

Customer satisfaction rating

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	Customer satisfaction rating	Customer satisfaction rating
1999	63	
2000	72.90	
2001	74.20	
2002		75.90

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: The Department is re-evaluating how it, as a whole, performs customer monitoring. Therefore separate 2002 data are not available for FSA.

Explanation: 1999-2001: The ACSI uses a widely accepted methodology to obtain standardized customer satisfaction for all its participants. Over 170 private-sector corporations use ACSI. Because it is widely used across all business sectors it allows us to benchmark and compare ourselves to the best in business. The 1999 data were based on SFA's student application process.

Additional Source Information: 1999-2001 American Customer Satisfaction Index.

Objective 8.2 of 3: Decrease unit cost

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Reduce actual unit costs: By FY 2004, reduce actual unit costs from projected unit costs by 19 percent

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Unit Costs			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** FSA is in the process of evaluating and refining its activity-based cost model and will develop separate until cost for its major products and services. These data will be available in 2003. **Explanation:** 1999-2001 Data: Costs are defined as total obligations recorded in a fiscal year divided by the number of unduplicated recipients of loans and grants. Unit cost data are based on FSA Obligations and Contract Costs.	**Additional Source Information:** 1999-2001 Data: The cost component comes from obligation incurred 1999 through 2001. Out-year estimates are based on budget projections. The number of unduplicated recipients comes from the Office of the Undersecretary. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** September 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Projected Unit Costs	Projected Unit Costs		
1999	16.70	16.70		
2000	20.10	20.10		
2001	19.60	19.60		

Objective 8.3 of 3: Increasing employee satisfaction

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Increase Customer Satisfaction to a comparable private sector industry average - American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) rating of 75.9 (out of a possible score of 100) - by FY 2002: Raise Gallup Workplace Management Grand Mean Score to at least 3.6 -- the private sector average -- by 2004.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
FSA Employee satisfaction ranking					**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** The Department will monitor work place satisfaction issues as part of Objective 6.2 of the Strategic Plan, "Improve the strategic management of the Department's human capital." **Explanation:** 1999-2001 Data: Source data for this indicator changed in 2001 to the Gallup Organization's Workplace Measurement Tool. The Gallup tool not only provides long-term consistency; it provides more diagnostic information to gauge employee satisfaction. Additionally, it requires that individual work groups develop action plans to address employee satisfaction issues.	**Additional Source Information:** 1999-2000 Data: OPM's Employee Opinion Survey 2000-2001 Data: Gallup Workplace Management Tool (Survey).
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	OPM (out of 49)	Gallup (on a 5 point scale)	OPM (out of 49)	Gallup (on a 5 point scale)		
1998	33					
1999	38					
2000	5	3.51				
2001		3.74		3.50		

Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.336 - Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants

Goal 8: 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 of state policies that strengthen initial licensing standards and the development of state or local policies/programs that reduce the number of uncertified teachers.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Certification rate. State, recruitment, and partnership grantees: The percentages of new and current teachers who meet their state's teacher certification requirements, including passing content knowledge and competency tests, will increase each year.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
- No Targets And Performance Data -	**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** This is a new program, so performance data are not yet available.	**Additional Source Information:** Secretary's Report on the Quality of Teacher Preparation (Sec. 207). **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** April 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Secretary's Report will contain self-reported data from states. **Improvements:** Definitions of data elements are being refined assure consistency with definitions contained in the No Child Left Behind legislation.

Technology Challenge Programs: Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, Technology Innovation Challenge Grants, and National Activities - 2002

CFDA Numbers: 84.303 Technology Innovation Challenge Grants
84.318 - Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Grants
84.341A Community Technology Center

Goal 8: To use educational technology as part of broader education reform that will provide new learning opportunities and raise educational achievement for all students.

Objective 8.1 of 5: Students in high-poverty schools will have access to educational technology that is comparable to the access of students in other schools.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Computer access in high-poverty schools: The student-to-computer with Internet access ratio in high-poverty schools will be comparable to that in other schools.

Targets and Performance Data

Student-to-computer ratio (?:1)

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Low-Poverty Schools	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools	High-Poverty Schools
1998	11	17		
1999	8	17	10	15
2000	6	9	10	10
2001	5	7	5	5
2002			5	5

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Target not met for 2001. Data for 2002 will not be available until August 2003.

Explanation: Student to computer ratios are decreasing toward the goal of one computer for every five students in high poverty schools. However, the gap in access between high-poverty schools and low poverty schools has not been closed.

Sources and Data Quality

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: - 2002
Data Available: August 2003
Validated By: NCES.

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

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: 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					**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Target not met for 2001. Data for 2002 will not be available until August 2003. **Explanation:** The number of high-poverty schools with Internet access rose to 97 percent in 2001, up from 94 percent in 2000. As high-poverty schools increasingly obtain access to the Internet, it is likely that their classroom connections will subsequently increase.	**Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** August 2003 **Validated By:** NCES. **Limitations:** Poverty measures are based on data on free and reduced-price school lunches, which may underestimate school poverty levels, particularly for older students and immigrant students.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**			
	Low-Poverty Classrooms	High-Poverty Classrooms	Low-Poverty Classrooms	High-Poverty Classrooms		
1994	3	2				
1995	9	3				
1996	17	5				
1997	33	14				
1998	57	38				
1999	73	38				
2000	82	60	100	100		
2001	90	79	100	100		

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: High-poverty districts—Technology Literacy Challenge Fund: The number of states that award at least 66 percent of their TLCF funds to school districts designated as high-poverty will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of states			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Positive movement toward target. **Explanation:** The FY 2001 performance covers the period from October 2000 to September 2002. In September 2002, 29 states reported awarding 66 percent or more of their FY 2001 TLCF allocation to districts they designated as high-poverty.	**Additional Source Information:** Performance Report. Final year of Performance Report **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Subgrant allocation data are state self-reported and there is no alternative source. Reports on the distribution of funds are estimates (and may be substantially inaccurate) until the year following the end of their period of availability. Thus, state awards of FY 2001 funds are reported in 2003, following the end of their period of availability in September 2002. Corrections to 1998 data were made in March 2001.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	# of States	# of States		
1997	27			
1998	28	32		
1999	30	35		
2000	30	37		
2001	29	39		
2002		50		

Objective 8.2 of 5: Provide teachers and other educators with the professional development and support they need to help students learn through the use of educational technology.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: Staff training and support: Increasing percentages of teachers will indicate that they feel very well prepared to integrate educational technology into classroom instruction.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of Teachers

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	% of Teachers	% of Teachers
1998	20	
2000	27	40

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: In 2000, 27 percent of teachers reported that they were fully prepared to integrate technology in their instruction. Federal resources for training for teachers to use technology (including the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and the Technology Innovation Challenge Grants) as well as state and local funds continue to support professional development in the use of educational technology for teachers and, correspondingly, progress toward the targets for this indicator.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Teacher Preparation of Professional Development.

Frequency: Biennially.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: January
Validated By: NCES.

Limitations: The data are self-reported by teachers. The cost and burden to regularly gather data other than self-report data on teacher preparedness for a nationally representative sample are prohibitive.

Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: District professional development: The percentage of TLCF subgrantees that report professional development as a primary use of funds will increase.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of TLCF districts

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	% of districts	% of districts
1997	55	
1998	60	60
1999	69	65
2000	77	70
2001	81	75
2002		80

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: FY 2001 target exceeded.

Explanation: The FY 2001 performance covers the period from October 2000 to September 2002. States conduct competitions under the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and have wide discretion to set priorities for those competitions. Districts also have considerable discretion (depending on the state) to direct the use of funds. States have been encouraged to devote at least 30 percent of funds to professional development related to educational technology beginning in 1998.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Performance Report - Final year for performance report.

Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: District data are self-reported by districts to states that self-report to ED. Data are estimates from district technology coordinators for the most part.

Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: Professional development models: An increasing percentage of TICG projects will develop models of professional development that result in improved instructional practice.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of projects in their 4th or 5th year			**Status:** Target exceeded **Explanation:** Based on the rationale that it would take at least 3 years for projects to develop and implement professional development models that could result in improved instructional practice, a target of 50 percent was set for projects in their 4th and 5th year. Third-year data show that more than half of these projects provided data indicating improved instructional practices. Data for 2002 published previously was incorrect.	**Source:** ED Evaluation **Evaluation:** Education Reform. **Section:** Technology Connections for School Improvement Planners' Handbook and Teacher's Guide. **Additional Source Information:** Technology Connections for School Improvement Planners Handbook and Teachers Guide **Frequency:** Annually. **Data Available:** January 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Data are supplied by grantees. A 2-tier data collection, review, and analysis process is used, involving program staff and team leaders. Each review stage examines and analyzes the reported results for quality and validity of data and methodology. The Department will continue to assess the quality of the data and develop plans for improvement, if needed.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	% of projects	% of projects		
2000	44	10		
2001	51	15		
2002	87	50		

Objective 8.3 of 5: Promote the availability and use of educational technology as part of a challenging and enriching curriculum in every school.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 3: Classroom use: Students will increasingly use educational technology for learning in core academic subjects.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Status: Unable to judge **Progress:** No NCES update yet. **Explanation:** Computer use is fairly ubiquitous in writing. As computers become more available and knowledge about how to integrate computer use into instruction increases, computer use in mathematics also likely will increase	**Additional Source Information:** National Assessment of Educational Progress **Frequency:** Other. **Validated By:** NCES. **Limitations:** No NCES update yet available. Questions yielding this data do not fully capture the extent to which computers are regularly used in classrooms to support instruction. For mathematics, NAEP asks students if they have ever used a computer to solve math problems. (For changes in the mathematics measure between 1996 and 1999, NCES indicates a certainty level of less than 95 percent that the difference is significant). For writing, NAEP asks students if they use a computer to write stories or papers.

Percentage of students that ever use a computer to solve math problems

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Age 13	Age 17	Age 13	Age 17
1996	74	70		
1999	71	66	75	75

Percentage of students using computers in writing

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Eighth Grade	Eleventh Grade	Eighth Grade	Eleventh Grade
1996	91	96		
1998			98	98

Indicator 8.3.2 of 3: Progress on State Goals—Technology Literacy Challenge Fund: An increasing percentage of states will report progress on state goals related to integrating online and other technology resources into the curriculum.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Status: Unable to judge **Progress:** FY 2001 target exceeded. **Explanation:** States report progress on state goals related to the national goals in annual performance reports. Most states (46 of 50) have goals that relate to national ET goal that concerns integrating ET resources into the curriculum. States that have met earlier goals have adopted new ones.	**Additional Source Information:** Performance Report. Final year for TLCF Performance Report. **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** States report on their own goals and information cannot be added across states. There are currently no plans to establish common measures, although the consolidated application includes performance indicators.

Percentage of states

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	% of States	% of States
1996	91	
1998	98	
1999	63	50
2000	49	55
2001	68	60
2002		65

Indicator 8.3.3 of 3: Classroom impact: The percentage of TICG projects that demonstrate positive impacts on curriculum and student achievement will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of projects in 3rd, 4th, or 5th year			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** FY 2001 target exceeded. **Explanation:** Evaluation reports from projects provide necessary data to respond to this indicator. For the purposes of this assessment, positive impacts on student achievement may include improved attendance and discipline, acquisition of technology and telecommunications skills, problem-solving skills, performance or portfolio assessments, state assessment tools, or standardized tests.	**Source:** ED Evaluation **Evaluation:** Education Reform. **Section:** Technology Connections for School Improvement Planners' Handbook and Teacher's Guide. **Additional Source Information:** Technology Connections for School Improvement Planners Handbook and Teachers Guide **Frequency:** Annually. **Data Available:** January **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Data are supplied by grantees. A 2-tier data collection, review, and analysis process is used, involving program staff and team leaders. Each review stage examines and analyzes the reported results for quality and validity of data and methodology. The Department will continue to assess the quality of the data and develop plans for improvement, if needed.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	% of projects	% of projects		
2000	44	25		
2001	84	50		
2002		50		

Objective 8.4 of 5: Help improve students' information technology literacy skills in all states.

Indicator 8.4.1 of 2: Standards for students in educational technology: The number of states that have standards for student proficiency in the use of technology will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of states			**Status:** Target not met **Progress:** Although the target was not met, there is positive movement toward the target. **Explanation:** As States increasingly devote resources to educational technology, they also increasingly focus on measuring the impact of educational technology. Setting standards is a precursor to that measurement of student proficiency.	**Additional Source Information:** Education Week **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** Education Week provides no detail on the rigor or comprehensiveness of standards. Data are based on State Report.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	# of States	# of States		
1998	38			
1999		42		
2000	35	45		
2001	35	46		
2002	37	46		

Indicator 8.4.2 of 2: Student proficiency in technology: In states that assess student proficiency in technology, the percentage of students that are proficient will increase.		
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
- No Targets And Performance Data -	**Progress:** No data were collected for this indicator; therefore, we cannot measure progress.	

Objective 8.5 of 5: Through the creation or expansion of Community Technology Centers in disadvantaged areas, improve access to computers, the internet, and educational technology.

Indicator 8.5.1 of 1: Customer reports on value of access: There is an increase in the number of sites where economically disadvantaged individuals can secure access to education technology and the Internet through the establishment and expansion of community technology centers.

Targets and Performance Data

Number of new or expanded Community Technology Center Sites

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	40	
2000	93	
2001	148	
2002	56	

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: 337 new or expanded Community Technology Center Sites have been established as of FY 2002. The program awarded its first grants in 1999. For 1999-2001, performance focused substantially on measures of "access." For FY 2002, the definition of access was expanded. The number published previously was incorrect.

Explanation: The mission of the Community Technology Centers Program is to establish or expand community centers that increase access to computers, the Internet, and educational technology for residents of economically distressed communities.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Survey responses from grantees.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: January 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by grantees. Questionable information resulted in telephone follow-up by CTC Team staff. Data supplied by grantees through surveys will be verified through close examination of Annual Performance Reports.

Improvements: More extensive follow-up communication with grantees will be done to increase response rate to 80-90%.

Title I Grants for Schools--ESEA - 2002

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

Goal 8: 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: Performance of the lowest-achieving public school students and students in high-poverty public schools will increase substantially on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading and mathematics.

Targets and Performance Data

Reading scale scores on the Main NAEP for public school students at the bottom 25th percentile

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	4th grade	8th grade	12th grade	4th grade	8th grade	12th grade
1992	192	235	268			
1994	187	234	263			
1998	192	239	266			
2000	193			202	249	276
2001				27	249	276

Mathematics scale scores on the Main NAEP for public school students at the bottom 25th percentile

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	4th grade	8th grade	12th grade	4th grade	8th grade	12th grade
1992	197	242	274			
1996	201	247	281			
2000	206	250	276	211	257	291

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Positive movement toward target. Data for FY 2002 are not available until Spring 2003. Progress in meeting 2002 targets cannot be measured until those data are available from NCES.

Explanation: Data are based on the Trend NAEP, which is currently collected every 4 years. Over an 8 year period, trends in NAEP scores appear flat in reading but show gains in mathematics in 4th and 8th grades. In reading, scores for 4th-graders were the same in 1998 as in 1992, while 8th-graders show a gain of 4 points and 12th-graders show a decline of 2 points for that same period. In mathematics, scores rose at two grade levels tested (4th and 8th) and declined in 12th grade.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Reading, Mathematics.

Frequency: Biennially.
Collection Period: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: April 2003
Validated By: NCES.

Limitations: NAEP assessments are not aligned with state content and performance standards. Caution is suggested in interpreting 12th grade achievement data because Title I serves a small number of high school students.

Reading scale scores on the Trend NAEP for public school students in the highest-poverty schools (75-100% poverty)

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	9-year olds	13-year olds	17-year olds	9-year olds	13-year olds	17-year olds
1992	180	223				
1994	184	229	256			
1996	188	233	262			
1999	186	234	266	191	239	271
2000				191	239	271

NAEP mathematics scale scores on the Trend NAEP for public school students in the highest-poverty schools (75-100% poverty)

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	9-year-olds	13-year-olds	17-year-olds	9-year-olds	13-year-olds	17-year-olds
1992	208	248				
1994	215	256	290			
1996	217	252	284			
1999	212	254	283			
2000				217	259	288

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Meeting or exceeding state performance standards: Among states with 2 years of assessment data and aligned content and performance standards, an increasing number will report an increase in the percentage of students in schools with at least 50 percent poverty who meet proficient and advanced performance levels in reading and math on their state assessment systems.

Targets and Performance Data

Number of states with performance standards aligned to content standards and two years of data disaggregated by school poverty level.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	10	
1998	11	
1999	5	15
2000		20
2001		24
2002		26

Number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of students in schools with at least 50% poverty who meet proficient and advanced levels of performance

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Reading	Mathematics	Both	Reading	Mathematics	Both
1997	7	7	7			
1998	10	10	10			
1999	2	4	2	13	13	13
2000				18	18	18
2001	5	7	5	20	20	20
2002				24	24	24

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Data to measure progress on this indicator are not available until Spring 2003.

Explanation: There were a limited number of states with two years of data disaggregated by poverty that also had aligned content standards in the 1998-99 school year and two years of comparable data. Seven states were available for review. Five of the seven states showed progress in both reading and mathematics. Five states showed progress in reading, and seven states showed progress in mathematics. The states not showing progress in reading had minimal declines.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Consolidated State Performance Report which includes the Title I State Performance Reports

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2001 - 2002
Data Available: April 2003
Validated By: No Formal Verification. Verified by ED attestation process and Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: There is substantial variation across states in their definitions of proficient student performance as well as alignment of content and performance standards. All states have submitted evidence and have been reviewed. Many states are transitioning from NRTs to assessments aligned to standards. Many states therefore, will not have two years of data. Also, many states do not disaggregate by poverty, so would not have two years of data.

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Improving schools: An increasing percentage of Title I schools will report that they have met or exceeded state or district standards for progress.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of Title I schools			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Data for this indicator are not available until Spring 2003; therefore, we are unable to measure progress for FY 2002. **Explanation:** The Title I State Performance Report for 1999-2000 indicates that 19% of all schools are designated as Title I Schools in Improvement. The converse of this fact indicates that 81% are not in school improvement.	**Additional Source Information:** The Consolidated State Performance Report which includes the annual Title I State Performance Reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2001 - 2002 **Data Available:** April 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** There is substantial variation across states in their definitions of adequate yearly progress and proficient student performance.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Percentage of Title I schools	Percentage of Title I schools		
1998	57			
1999	80	75		
2000	81	85		
2001		90		

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: Establishing annual progress measures: All states will adopt or develop measures of adequate yearly progress linked to state performance standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of States			**Explanation:** The only data available is for states applying for Ed-Flex authority. Currently 10 states have received approval (as of 10/02). All states are required to establish Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) consistent with No Child Left Behind by January 2003 which is a pre-requisite of Ed-Flex.	**Additional Source Information:** Title I performance reports that respond to the requirements of the Consolidated State Application for No Child Left Behind. Reports on adequate yearly progress measures (due Jan. 2003) are reviewed by Department staff. **Frequency:** Other. **Data Available:** January 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Verification of data will be done through an on-site peer review process which will be completed by April 30, 2003.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Number of States	Number of States		
2000		40		
2001	9	50		

Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: Aligned assessments: All states will have final assessment systems or negotiated agreements that will enable them to meet the criteria in the Title I law—including alignment, inclusion of limited English proficient and special education students, disaggregated reporting, and technical quality—for two or more core subjects.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of States with final assessment systems or negotiated agreements			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** As of January 2003, the Department had reviewed assessment systems for all states, approved 21 states, systems, and negotiated timeline waivers for 26 additional states. The 5 remaining states have entered a compliance agreement.	**Additional Source Information:** Records of the Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs Standards Team in the Title I program office. **Frequency:** Other. **Data Available:** May 2003 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** No known limitations. By design and by the legislation, Title I peer review records are the authoritative data source for this indicator.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Number of States	Number of States		
2000	34	40		
2001	46	50		
2002	50	50		

Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: Schools identified for improvement: An increasing percentage of schools identified for improvement will make sufficient progress to move out of school improvement status.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** Progress on this indicator cannot be judged because the Longitudinal Survey of Schools ended its collection of data on this indicator with the 2000-2001 school year. Future data for this indicator will be obtained through the Consolidated State Performance Report. The baseline for the indicator will be established after 2 years of data from the new data source. The first year for reporting on these new data will be Spring of 2003. **Explanation:** Because the existing state Performance Report was based on the requirements of the Improving America's Schools Act, the Department did not require states to submit data on schools identified for improvement for 2001-02; therefore, no data are available for this year. The Performance Report will be revised to reflect the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act.	**Additional Source Information:** Longitudinal Survey of Schools **Frequency:** Other. **Data Available:** January **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. **Limitations:** State assessments and accountability systems are currently in transition, and state policies for identifying schools vary widely across states. Department performance reporting requirements are also in transition because of new requirements in No Child Left Behind.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	44			
2001	47			

Training Program - 2002

CFDA Number: 84.129 - Rehabilitation Long-Term Training

Goal 8: 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

Scholars supported

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	1,600	
1998	1,550	
1999	1,665	1,473
2000	2,390	2,000
2001		2,000
2002		2,000

Scholars supported per $1 million

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	101	
1998	96	
1999	94	93
2000	172	170
2001		170
2002		170

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Explanation: We are using a new web-based reporting system which is being refined. 2001 data (which covers academic year 9/2001 to 8/2002) is due in 2003. Clean up and analysis of the data is expected to take two to three additional months. Actual 2001 data will be reported by April 30, 2003. FY 2000 data were based on actual numbers using the new electronic reporting system. Previous numbers were based on estimates made from a small number of prospects.

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Annual grantee reporting from Baseline data collected for academic year 2001.

Frequency: Annually.
Collection Period: 2002
Data Available: April 2004
Validated By: No Formal Verification.
Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.

Scholars graduating

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	800	
1998	817	
1999	832	729
2000	764	688
2001		700
2002		700

Scholars graduating per $1 million

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1997	50	
1998	50.50	
1999	47	47
2000	54.90	46
2001		44
2002		44

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

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			**Status:** Unable to judge **Explanation:** 2001 data (which covers 9/01 to 8/02) are reported by grantees by January 2003, and will be available in April of 2003	**Additional Source Information:** Annual grantee reporting form. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** April 2004 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees. **Limitations:** We are using a new reporting system, which is being refined. See comments under indicator 1.1
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	72	70		
2001		71		
2002		72		

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
.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** FY 2000 Performance figure is based on self report survey conducted by Council of State Administration of vocational rehabilitation. **Explanation:** RSA did not collect this information for 2001 as it must be collect through special surveys. 2002 data will be available, via special study, in May of 2003.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual Evaluation. Ongoing collection could be through the In-Service Training program's annual performance report. **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** May 2003 **Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data would be supplied through external RSA contractor. No formal verification procedure applied. Data for 2002 will be available late spring of 2003. **Limitations:** Numerous external factors may pose limits to current collection and ongoing collection. Future data source, In-Service Program's annual performance report.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2000	69			
2001		70		
2002		75		

TRIO Programs - 2002

CFDA Numbers: 84.042 - TRIO_Student Support Services
84.044 - TRIO_Talent Search
84.047 - TRIO_Upward Bound
84.066 - TRIO_Educational Opportunity Centers
84.217 - TRIO_McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement
84.344 - TRIO_Dissemination Partnership Grants

Goal 8: Provide increased educational opportunities for low-income, first-generation students

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

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Persistence in and completion of education programs: TRIO students will persist in and complete their educational programs.

Targets and Performance Data

Upward Bound (UB): Length of time Upward Bound students participate in the project during high school, and college enrollment rates of UB participants

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Project Persistence (months)	College Enrollment (percent)	Project Persistence (months)	College Enrollment (percent)
1996	19			
1999		66		
2001			20	66
2002			20	66

Assessment of Progress

Status: Unable to judge

Progress: Some changes to the performance indicators are planned for the 2004 report. College going rates for UB participants will be available in late 2004. SSS performance report data show a 67% college persistence rate in both 1999 and 2000. Thus, the performance targets for these years have been met. It is expected that these rates will continue for 2001 and 2002. No data are yet available on the 6-year college completion rates of SSS participants. McNair performance data for 1999-2000 show that an estimated 25 to 41% of McNair participants enrolled in a graduate program within one year after receiving an undergraduate degree. The data also show that 75% of McNair participants reported as graduate students in 1998-1999 were still enrolled in graduate school in 1999-2000; another 16% had graduated from the graduate school. Thus the McNair performance targets for 2000 have been met. It is expected that these rates will continue for 2001-2002.

Explanation: Data from the national evaluations of the Upward Bound and Student Support Services programs provide the baseline data for these programs. The 1998-99

Sources and Data Quality

Additional Source Information: Upward Bound (UB), Student Support Service (SSS), and McNair Performance Reports (McNair).

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

Limitations: The national evaluations have provided baseline data for the UB and SSS programs and also provide data on appropriate comparison groups. However, these evaluations cannot be used to measure program improvements on an annual basis. Therefore, the Department has developed new performance reports to collect the needed information. The 1999-2000 data collected from the SSS and McNair reports have been analyzed to determine that the college persistence and graduate school enrollment and persistence targets were met. Actual

Student Support Services (SSS): Percentage of students persisting at same postsecondary school for second year and postsecondary degree attainment rate at same institution within 6 years of starting postsecondary education.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	College Persistence	College Persistence
1994	67	
1999	67	67
2000	67	67
2001		67
2002		67

College completion (percentage)

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001		29
2002		29

McNair: Percentage of McNair participants who enroll in graduate school within a year of completing the bachelor's degree, and percentage persisting toward or completing graduate degree.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	35	
2000	35	35
2001		35
2002		35

Graduate school persistence (in percentage)

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	48	
2000	75	48
2002		48

annual performance reports provide the baseline data for the McNair program. The Student Support Services (SSS) McNair, and Upward Bound performance reports are and will be used to determine if the performance targets are met. The college completion performance target of 29% includes only SSS students who remain at the same school through graduation. The SSS performance report submitted annually only requires projects to report on the academic progress of SSS participants that remain at the grantee institution.

performance data for fiscal years 2001 and 2002 are not yet available. Grantees report on fiscal year 2001 activities/performance in November/December 2002. Performance report data for fiscal year 2002 will be collected November/December 2003.

Office for Civil Rights - 2002

Goal 8: To ensure equal access to education and promote educational excellence throughout the nation through the vigorous enforcement of civil rights.

Objective 8.1 of 3: To eliminate discriminatory educational practices within schools.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Increased compliance: The number of recipients of Federal funds (e.g., school districts, postsecondary institutions, and state educational agencies (SEAs), that change policies, procedures, or practices to comply with Federal civil rights laws will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of recipients			**Progress:** There were no targets set by OCR for FY 2002. **Explanation:** As of March 31, 2002, 476 recipients changed policies, procedures, or practices to comply with federal civil rights laws. These recipients consist of approximately 403 school districts, 2 state education agencies (with 3,443 school districts) and 71 postsecondary institutions.	**Additional Source Information:** OCR Case Information System **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** OCR eliminated this performance indicator in the third quarter of FY 2002 because of ongoing concerns about the agency's ability to fully verify the underlying data. On July 1, 2002, OCR began collecting data on two new performance indicators that more accurately reflect OCR's extensive work with recipients, parents and parent groups.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	1,378			
1999	1,563	1,378		
2000	2,035	1,563		
2001	1,224	2,035		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Number of students affected: The estimated number of students positively affected by OCR's work will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of students affected: The estimated number of students positively affected by OCR's work will increase.			**Progress:** There were no targets set by OCR for FY 2002. **Explanation:** As of March 31, 2002, 1,596,775 students were positively affected by OCR's work. This indicator expands on the results of indicator 1.1. It demonstrates the number of students positively affected by improved access to equal educational opportunity when recipients change policies, practices, and procedures to eliminate or prevent civil rights problems.	**Additional Source Information:** OCR Case Information System **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** OCR eliminated this performance indicator in the third quarter of FY 2002 because of ongoing concerns about the agency's ability to fully verify the underlying data. On July 1, 2002, OCR began collecting data on two new performance indicators that more accurately reflect OCR's extensive work with recipients, parents and parent groups.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998	5,900,000			
1999	6,571,725	5,900,000		
2000	7,695,025	6,571,725		
2001	4,520,724	7,695,025		

Objective 8.2 of 3: To teach parents and students how to resolve problems of securing equal access to high-quality education.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Successful partnerships: The number of partnerships with parents that lead to civil rights compliance will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of partnerships			**Progress:** There were no targets set by OCR for 2002. **Explanation:** A parental partnership is established when OCR, as a result of a case resolution or other activity, facilitates a collaboration between parents and schools to achieve ongoing civil rights compliance without OCR's continued involvement. As of March 31, 2002, OCR facilitated three (3) partnerships with parents.	**Additional Source Information:** Manual Collection **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Limitations:** OCR eliminated this performance indicator in the third quarter of FY 2002. On July 1, 2002, OCR began collecting data on two new performance indicators that more accurately reflect OCR's extensive work with recipients, parents and parent groups. **Improvements:** Data on the two new performance indicators were collected manually for the last quarter of FY 2002 and will continue to be collected manually in FY 2003. Once the Case Management System is fully implemented (4th quarter FY 2003), the data will be available electronically.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999	18			
2000	38	18		
2001	21	38		

Objective 8.3 of 3: To obtain results by the efficient management of civil rights compliance activities.

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Resolution of complaints: Eighty percent of the complaints are resolved within 180 days of receipt.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days			**Status:** Target exceeded **Explanation:** A key factor contributing to OCR's success in prompt complaint resolution is the ability to establish a target date for resolving each case on its own merit in an appropriate and timely way. Informed by experience in case resolution and given adequate funding, OCR determined that approximately 80 percent of its cases could be resolved in 180 days or less. Twenty percent of OCR's cases are so large in scope and complexity that the time needed to resolve these cases exceeds 180 days.	**Additional Source Information:** Office of Civil Rights Case Information System **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 **Data Available:** November 2002 **Validated By:** On-Site Monitoring By ED. **Improvements:** These data are currently available in OCR's electronic Case Information System. The same data will continue to be available electronically when OCR implements the Case Management System (CMS). The CMS will increase the validity of the data by linking them to specific case files.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1997	80			
1998	81			
1999	80	80		
2000	78	80		
2001	84	80		
2002	89	80		

Office of the Inspector General (OIG) - 2002

Goal 8: FY 2002 OIG Performance Report

Objective 8.1 of 2: To Improve the Department's Programs and Operations.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 5: Percentage of OIG Work Plan Goal 1 assignments initiated

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
% of first year Work Plan assignments initiated coinciding with the Performance Report	**Status:** Target not met **Explanation:** This is a new measure. While the target was substantially met, we will assess over time the appropriate target level.	**Additional Source Information:** OIG Time and Travel Reporting System **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 Information is validated internally.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	%	%
2002	62	65

Indicator 8.1.2 of 5: Percentage of OIG Work Plan Goal 1 assignments that yield significant recommendations.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
% of first year Work Plan assignments initiated coinciding with the Performance Report producing significant recommendations.	**Status:** Target exceeded **Explanation:** Significant monetary recommendation is defined as recovering monetary amounts of questioned, unsupported, or other dollars of $300,000 or more. It also includes the associated recommendation to establish/implement control techniques to prevent recurrence of the condition that results in the monetary finding or better use of funds of $500,000 or more. Significant nonmonetary recommendation is a recommendation to establish/implement procedures or control techniques to (1) improve the effective or efficient delivery of program services; (2) safeguard assets or prevent fraud, waste, or abuse; or (3) improve the integrity, accuracy, and completeness of management data involving a program, or a significant component of any program, funded at $500,000 or more annually.	**Additional Source Information:** OIG Audit and Analysis and Inspection Reports **Frequency:** Other. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 Validation done internally. **Limitations:** The measure includes only recommendations from audit and inspection reports. Significant recommendations from other OIG services, such as quick response projects and advice and technical assistance are not included in this measure.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
	%	%
2002	76	75

Indicator 8.1.3 of 5: The number and percentage of significant recommendations from OIG products that the Department accepted during the current fiscal year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Significant recommendations accepted during the FY that coinciding with Report time frame. Accepted recommendations can be from OIG work in the current or a previous fiscal year.			**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** **269 recommendations**	**Additional Source Information:** OIG audit and inspection reports. **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 Internal OIG validation **Limitations:** Based on self-reported data generated by ED staff.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
2002	99	80		

Indicator 8.1.4 of 5: The number and percentage of significant recommendations implemented within one year of acceptance by the Department.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
.The significant recommendations implemented during the FY.			**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** **220 implemented**	**Additional Source Information:** OIG audit and inspection records **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 Validated by OIOG personnel
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
2002	82	70		

Indicator 8.1.5 of 5: Percentage of respondents indicating that OIG Goal 1 activity had a favorable impact in improving Departmental programs and operations.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Response from surveyed program officials, senior managers, and selected members of Congress.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** New survey under development **Explanation:** The OIG is developing a more comprehensive survey, which is designed to provide information about OIG performance in a number of areas instead of the one overall impact measure.	**Additional Source Information:** Annual survey
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
2002		75		

Objective 8.2 of 2: To Protect the Integrity of the Department's Programs and Operations.

Indicator 8.2.1 of 9: Percentage of OIG Work Plan Goal 2 assignments initiated.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of first year Work Plan assignments initiated.			**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** **287 cases**	**Additional Source Information:** OIG Time and Travel Reporting System **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 Data is validated internally
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
2002	67	65		

Indicator 8.2.2 of 9: Percentage of OIG Work Plan Goal 2 assignments that yield significant recommendations.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of first year Work Plan assignments completed for the FY that produced significant recommendations			**Status:** Target not met **Explanation:** Number of goal 2 recommendations insufficient **(1 of 2)**for statistical significance	**Additional Source Information:** OIG audits and inspections **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 Data validated internally. **Limitations:** The measure includes only recommendations from audit and inspection reports. Significant recommendations from other OIG services, such as quick response projects and advice and technical assistance are not included in this measure.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
2002	50	75		

Indicator 8.2.3 of 9: The number and percentage of investigations that are referred for criminal, civil, or administrative actions.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Referrals during the FY			**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** **287 cases**	**Additional Source Information:** OIG Investigative Case Tracking System **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 Information is validated internally
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
2002	83	75		

Indicator 8.2.4 of 9: The number and percentage of investigations that are referred for criminal, civil, or administrative actions that are accepted.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Measures, as based on close case universe			**Status:** Target not met **Progress:** There was a methodology change in how the statistic was derived. It is now based on the closed case universe that coincides with the Performance Report timelines. This is our baseline data and we will determine over time the appropriate annual target.	**Additional Source Information:** OIOG Investigative Case Tracking System **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 Data is validated internally
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
2002	68	85		

Indicator 8.2.5 of 9: The number and percentage of accepted cases that result in judicial actions (e.g. indictments, civil filings, convictions, adverse personnel actions, and suspensions and debarments).

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Measure, as based on close case universe			**Status:** Target exceeded	**Additional Source Information:** OIG Investigative Case Tracking System **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 Data is validated internally
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
2002	83	80		

Indicator 8.2.6 of 9: Amount of monetary penalties, settlements, and recoveries.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Amount of court-ordered or administrative penalties/settlements and actual monetary recoveries from investigations.			**Explanation:** Given the nature of our investigative work, this indicator must be used judiciously and in conjunction with other indicators. Criminal prosecution is not undertaken primarily to recover money. We have deleted performance targets for monetary recoveries to avoid the appearance of a lack of objectivity.	**Additional Source Information:** Semi-annual Report to Congress (Audit Tracking System, Investigative Case Tracking System, Common Audit Resolution System, and Department of Justice). **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 **Validated By:** Federal Statistical Agencies. Numbers are validated internally and by the department of Justice.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	Millions	No Target		
2002	34.38			

Indicator 8.2.7 of 9: The number and percentage of significant compliance recommendations from OIG products that are accepted by the Department during the current fiscal year.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
significant recommendations accepted during FY 2002. Accepted recommendations can be from OIG work in the current or a previous fiscal year			**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** **68 recommendations**	**Additional Source Information:** OIG audits and inspections **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 Data is validated internally
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
2002	68	80		

Indicator 8.2.8 of 9: The number and percentage of significant monetary recommendations Implemented.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
monetary compliance recommendations implemented			**Status:** Target exceeded **Progress:** **3 recommendations**	**Additional Source Information:** OIG audit and inspection reports **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003 Information is validated internally **Limitations:** Not a statistically significant number of recommendations.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
2002	100	80		

Indicator 8.2.9 of 9: Percentage of respondents indicating that OIG Goal 2 activity had a favorable impact in protecting the integrity of the Department's programs and operations.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
% of surveyed program officials, senior managers, selected members of Congress and their staffs.			**Status:** Unable to judge **Progress:** New survey is being developed. **Explanation:** The OIG is developing a more comprehensive survey, which is designed to provide information about OIG performance in a number of areas instead of the one overall impact measure.	**Additional Source Information:** survey results **Frequency:** Annually. **Collection Period:** 2002 - 2003 **Data Available:** November 2003
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
	%	%		
2002		75		