

Archived Information COMPREHENSIVE CENTERS PROGRAM

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

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Objective 1: High standards for all students are addressed in Indicators 1.1 – addressing legislative priorities, 1.2 – integrating technical assistance, 1.3 – addressing customer needs, and 1.4 – showing impact with customers.

FY 2000—\$28,000,000

FY 2001—Funds for the Comprehensive Centers Program are being requested under the Strengthening Technical Assistance Capacity Program. The FY 2001 request for strengthening Technical Assistance Capacity Grants is \$38,000,000.

OBJECTIVE 1: PROVIDE HIGH-QUALITY COMPREHENSIVE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES, TERRITORIES, TRIBES, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AND SCHOOLS THAT HELPS STUDENTS REACH HIGH ACADEMIC STANDARDS.

Indicator 1.1 Addressing legislative priorities: An increasing percentage of comprehensive center customers will be schoolwide programs, high-poverty schools, and Bureau of Indian Affairs-funded schools.

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets	Status: Positive movement toward the target. Explanation: To provide a fuller understanding of the range of center customers, including the targeted customers in 1.1, the following explanation is presented: Year Services Targeted to: Percent 1998: Schools 50% State Agencies 12% Local School Districts 21% Others 17% 1999: Schools 49% State Agencies 9% Local School Districts 27% Others 15% “Others” included intermediate units, community-based organizations, universities, tribal entities, the Department of Education, and regional labs. The legislation required the centers to provide services to state agencies and districts as well as schools. The centers have directed a large percentage of services to states and districts in response to requests for help in assisting high poverty programs, assessing needs, developing program plans for distributing funds, and conducting subsequent followup work at the local district and school levels.	Source: Comprehensive Centers (CC) performance reports, including <u>Data Tables</u> , quarterly and annually 1998-99. Frequency: Performance reports are now semi-annual (Jan. 30 and July 30), a 1999 change from previously required quarterly reports. <i>Next update: 2000.</i> Validation Procedure: Data supplied by project’s uniform reporting system. No formal verification procedure applied to data collection, but data analysis validated by outside contractor. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Self-reported project-level data have been analyzed with assistance of an outside contractor. <u>Data Tables</u> specifications used in 1998 were not clear; they were more defined in 1999, resulting in more valid data. These same specifications will be used for the July 2000 performance reports.
	Schoolwide Programs	High-poverty schools, non-schoolwide programs	BIA Schools	TOTAL			
1998:	50%	12%	4%	66%			
1999:	44%	30%	3%	77%	80%		
2000:					80%		
2001:					Program proposed to end September, 30, 2000		

Indicator 1.2 Integrating technical assistance: An increasing percentage of CC activities will provide integrated, noncategorical technical assistance (such as focusing on standards, assessment of special populations, reading, other challenging curricula, leadership development, and whole-school reform).				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Noncategorical topics</i>			Status: Target exceeded. Explanation: Examples of integrated activities that show the increased work in noncategorical services to schools, districts, and state agencies are The Reading Success Network, involving all of the centers; comprehensive school reform activities; and increased services for special populations.	Source: Performance reports 1999. <i>Frequency:</i> Semi-annual reports, submitted on January 30 and July 30 for analysis by an outside contractor. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000. Validation Procedure: Data supplied by project's uniform reporting system. No formal verification procedure applied to data collection, but data analysis validated by outside contractor. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Same as 1.1.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998:	61%			
1999:	75%	65%		
2000:		68%		
2001:		Program proposed to end September 30, 2000		
Indicator 1.3 Addressing customer needs: An increasing percentage of state and local administrators served by the CCs will report satisfaction with the usefulness of technical assistance provided.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Satisfaction with usefulness of technical assistance</i>			Status: Target exceeded. Explanation: The 1999 national evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers reached district and school administrators, not just the state program administrators.	Source: 1999 Evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers, conducted by an outside contractor. 1998 Follow-up Study of State Implementation of Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Programs, conducted by an outside contractor. <i>Frequency:</i> Biannual requirement. <i>Next Update:</i> None planned. Program proposed to end 9/30/00. Validation Procedure: 1998: Data validated by external contractor. 1999: Data validated by external, experienced evaluation contractor. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Customer satisfaction surveys are not planned for 2001.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998:	64% of state Federal-program administrators			
1999:	79% of state and local administrators	65%		
2000:		80%		
2001:		Program proposed to end September 30, 2000		

Indicator 1.4 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
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: New indicator added in 1999. Explanation: Customer satisfaction surveys conducted under the National Evaluation enabled the Department to collect, for the first time, impact data on customer application of what they learned from Center services. Validation Procedure: Data validated by external contractor. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Customer impact data are not planned in 2001.
1999:	72%	Continuing increase	
2000:		75%	
2001:		Program proposed to end September 30, 2000	

KEY STRATEGIES
Strategies Continued from 1999

- ❖ Increase collaboration across the network of Comprehensive Centers on the Reading Success Network.
- ❖ Improve communication between ED and the CCs on statutory and OESE program priorities and initiatives, and encourage CCs to develop strategies to further objectives in ED Strategic Plan.
- ❖ Identify and disseminate models of technical assistance that are noncategorical and support coordination of programs.
- ❖ Create or expand regional and national networks of technical assistance providers through activities such as joint meetings of CCs and other service providers.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- ❖ Evaluate the impact of the Reading Success Network on students, teachers, and schools.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- ❖ The Comprehensive Center Program works to support and coordinate with all Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) programs and initiatives, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) programs, and all other Federal technical assistance providers, such as regional labs and state coalitions. Title I efforts, Comprehensive School Reform Demonstrations, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools programs are examples of work with other offices inside ED. Promoting effective early childhood, parental involvement, and safe schools results in coordination with other Federal agencies, such as Justice and Health and Human Services.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- ❖ Funding to the centers has been substantially lower than originally anticipated. Since the centers' implementation in 1996, the funding has remained low, although the demands on and expectations of the centers have been great. The program office will continue to assist the centers in finding ways to target OESE/OBEMLA priorities without overextending their current agenda.

INDICATOR CHANGES**From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)**

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- ❖ Indicator 1.4 (building capacity) was dropped because of the need to collect these data after a longer period of time, 4–5 years, for impact purposes.
- ❖ Indicator 1.5 (participating in ED Integrated Review Teams) was dropped because it was a process, not an outcome indicator.
- ❖ Indicator 2.1 (maintaining staff expertise) was dropped because it was a process, not an outcome indicator.
- ❖ Indicator 2.2 (collaborating with other technical assistance providers) was dropped because it was a process, not an outcome indicator.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted—None.

Dropped—None.

New

- ❖ Indicator 1.4 (addressing customer needs) has been added to report important data from the comprehensive national evaluation, conducted by an outside contractor, on the impact of the Comprehensive Center's work. When the research study on the Reading Success Network is completed in spring 2000, the first student impact data, which is the most difficult linkage to validate with technical assistance, will be available.