LEARNING ANYTIME ANYWHERE PARTNERSHIPS

Goal: To expand access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning through the use of technology to all citizens who are unable to take advantage of on-campus programs.	**Funding History** ($ in millions)			
	Fiscal Year	**Appropriation**	**Fiscal Year**	**Appropriation**
Legislation: SubPart 8, Part A of Title IV of the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070f-1070f-6).	1985	$0	2000	$23
	1990	$0	2001	$30
	1995	$0	2002 (Requested)	$0

Program Description

The goal of the Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships (LAAP) Program is to assist postsecondary educational institutions in making the transition to a new generation of distance education, which has been made possible by the Internet and other new technologies. LAAP projects focus the application of the new technologies by postsecondary institutions on: (1) enabling greater access to education and training; (2) structuring institutions in alliances to develop and deliver large-scale, web-based programs; (3) assessing student learning in new ways; (4) improving online teaching; and (5) developing policies that facilitate this type of distance education.

The LAAP program forms partnerships that are aimed at widening the availability of new forms of distance education, as well as improving instructional and program quality. LAAP especially aims to help underserved populations in geographically remote areas, and adults needing more flexible education and training to keep pace with changes in the job market.

The program supports grants of up to five years for the development of regional or national partnerships among colleges or universities, private industry employers, State and local governments, community agencies, software and other technology developers, learning assessment specialists, and others. Funds awarded through LAAP grants may be used to develop and assess model distance learning programs or innovative educational software; develop methodologies for the identification and measurement of skills competencies; and develop and assess innovative student support services. Federal funds provide no more than 50 percent of the cost of LAAP projects.

For more information, please visit the program Web site at: http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/FIPSE/LAAP/

Program Performance

OBJECTIVE 1: DEVELOP INNOVATIVE PARTNERSHIPS RESULTING IN ECONOMIES OF SCALE DELIVERING ASYNCHRONOUS DISTANCE EDUCATION AND TRAINING.

Indicator 1.1 National Distribution: The number of products, courses, and/or degree programs developed for delivery statewide or nationally will increase.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects are in their first year of activity (FY 2000).			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Projects are in their first year of activity. Year 2000 baseline data are from the 29 funded projects in FY 1999; their first year shows progress is in line with program goals. Eleven projects funded in FY 2000 are in startup mode.	**Source:** Grantee annual reports; program evaluation. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* June 2001. *Date to be reported:* 2002. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by grantees and independent evaluators; selected data are verified by third party evaluator under contract with FIPSE/LAAP. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Revised annual reports with better defined variables; all data verified with third party evaluator interview.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	Data not available	No target set		
2000:	**171 courses/modules + 201 other products**	**Establish baseline: number of courses/modules/products developed**		
2001:		Baseline + 25% increase		
2002:		Baseline + 25% increase		

OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASE ACCESS TO ASYNCHRONOUS DISTANCE EDUCATION FOR DIVERSE GROUPS OF LEARNERS, ESPECIALLY TO PREPARE THEM FOR WORK IN TECHNICAL AND OTHER AREAS OF CRITICAL SHORTAGE OR FOR THE CHANGING REQUIREMENTS OF FIELDS.

Indicator 2.1 Number of "underserved" students: The number of underserved students enrolled each year will increase—that is, individuals with disabilities, in remote areas, welfare recipients or displaced workers, underrepresented populations (Native American, Hispanic, African American), and other adults not otherwise able to participate in postsecondary education.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects are in their first year of activity.			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Projects are in their first year of activity. Year 2000 baseline data are from 29 projects funded in FY 1999; their first year shows progress is in line with program goals. Eleven Projects funded in FY 2000 are in startup mode.	**Source:** Grantee annual reports; program evaluation. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* June 2001. *Date to be reported:* 2002. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by grantees and independent evaluators. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Will improve registrar data with learner survey.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	Data not available	No target set		
2000:	**6,919 "underserved" students: 764 – with disabilities 1556 – in remote areas without access; 294 – welfare recipients 926 – adults unable to participate in traditional postsecondary 3,237 – underserved minorities**	**Establish baseline: number of underserved learners enrolled;**		
2001:		Baseline + 20% increase		
2002:		Baseline + 20% increase		

Indicator 2.2 Course Completion Rate: The number of students who enroll in and complete courses or training programs will increase.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects are in their first year of activity.			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Projects are in their first year of activity. Year 2000 baseline data are from the 29 projects funded in FY 1999 and represents their first year's activity; progress is in line with the program goals. (The rates are well above the norm for web-based instruction.) Eleven projects funded in FY 2000 are in startup mode.	**Source:** Grantee annual reports; program evaluation. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* June 2001. *Date to be reported:* 2002. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by grantees and independent evaluators. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** This year's data relies more on grantee self-report; better definition of variable and involvement of independent evaluator planned for subsequent years.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	Data not available	No target set		
2000:	**85.2% completion of courses 100.0% completion of modules NA completion of programs**	**Establish baseline; ratio of number of students completing courses/modules to those enrolled**		
2001:		Baseline + improved completion rates		
2002:		Baseline + improved completion rates		

OBJECTIVE 3: ENABLE ADVANCEMENTS IN QUALITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY WITHIN POSTSECONDARY, ASYNCHRONOUS DISTANCE EDUCATION.

Indicator 3.1 Competency-based: The number of courses that base assessment on student competency, rather than on traditional units of instruction, will increase.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects are in their first year of activity.			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Projects are in their first year of activity. Year 2000 baseline data are from the 29 projects funded in FY 1999 and represents their first year's activity; progress is in line with the program goals. Eleven projects funded in FY 2000 are in startup mode.	**Source:** Grantee annual reports; program evaluation. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* June 2001. *Date to be reported:* 2002. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by grantees and independent evaluators. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	Data not available	No target set		
2000:	**55 courses, modules, programs**	**Establish baseline: number of courses/modules that are competency-based**		
2001:		Baseline (55) + 25% increase		
2002:		Baseline (55) + 25% increase		

OBJECTIVE 4: CONTINUATION OR EXPANSION OF LAAP PROJECTS BEYOND FEDERAL FUNDING.

Indicator 4.1 Projects sustained: Projects sustained or expanded at least 2 years beyond the Federal funding period.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects are in their first year of activity			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** New program; Projects are still in early funding period; baseline data on this indicator will not be available until 29 FY 1999 programs have completed their funding period in FY 2002. In their first or second year, several projects have already expanded, demonstrating progress in line with program goals.	**Source:** Grantee survey 2 years after funding ends. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* June 2002. *Date to be reported:* 2002. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by grantees. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data will be self-reported.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	No Data Available	No target set		
2000:	**No Data Available**	**No target set**		
2001:		No target set		
2002:		No target set		

OBJECTIVE 5: IMPROVE SERVICE DELIVERY AND CUSTOMER SATISFACTION FOR LAAP PROGRAMS.

Indicator 5.1 Project directors' overall satisfaction with LAAP programs and services: Meet or exceed satisfaction levels from previous years.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Projects are in their first year of activity			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** Projects are in their first year of activity. Year 2000 baseline data will be from 29 projects funded in FY 1999, who have completed one year and eleven projects funded in FY 2000 who are in start-up mode. Initial data from projects funded show 100% satisfaction with available assistance from LAAP staff. Data from February e-mail survey confirms this. 100% rated project directors meeting "outstanding" or "very good". 96% reported that all of the assistance they needed was available and 96% found project officer support "very strong" or "strong".	**Source:** Annual surveys; project director interviews by independent evaluator *Frequency:* Annually. *Next collection update:* Fall 2001. *Date to be reported:* 2002. **Validation Procedure:** Data will be supplied by grantees and gathered by independent evaluator. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Self-reported data from the project directors will be improved by follow-up interviews with all PD's by external program evaluator.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	No Data Available	No target set		
2000:	**No Data Available**	**Establish baseline**		
2001:		Continued or improved satisfaction ratings		
2002:		Continued or improved satisfaction ratings		

INDICATOR CHANGES
From Annual Plan (FY 2001)
Adjusted
- Objective 5 (continuation and expansion of LAAP program) is now Objective 4
- Indicator 5.1 (projects sustained) is now Indicator 4.1

Dropped
- Objective 6 (improve service delivery and customer satisfaction for LAAP)
- Indicator 6.1 (project directors' overall satisfaction with LAAP programs and services)

New—None.