Archived Information

Revised Fiscal Year 2006 Program Performance Plan

(Revised After Appropriations)

U.S. Department of Education
January 2006

Contents

Introduction 1

Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement

APEB: American Printing House for the Blind 5
CRA: Training and Advisory Services 10
ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers 12
ESEA: Advanced Credentialing 17
ESEA: Advanced Placement 18
ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity 21
ESEA: Arts In Education 22
ESEA: Charter Schools Grants 24
ESEA: Comprehensive School Reform 27
ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities 30
ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development 32
ESEA: Early Reading First 34
ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians 36
ESEA: Educational Technology State Grants 38
ESEA: English Language Acquisition 40
ESEA: Even Start 46
ESEA: Excellence in Economic Education 49
ESEA: Foreign Language Assistance 50
ESEA: Impact Aid Basic Support Payments 51
ESEA: Impact Aid Construction 53
ESEA: Impact Aid Payments for Children with Disabilities 55
ESEA: Impact Aid Payments for Federal Property 57
ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants 58
ESEA: Javits Gifted and Talented Education 61
ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries 63
ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance 65
ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships 67
ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program 70
ESEA: National Writing Project 76
ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program 77
ESEA: Parental Information and Resource Centers 79
ESEA: Reading First State Grants 80
ESEA: Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution 83
ESEA: Ready to Teach 84
ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television 85
ESEA: Rural Education 87
ESEA: School Dropout Prevention 89
ESEA: School Leadership 91
ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities 93
ESEA: Special Programs for Indian Children 95

ESEA: Star Schools Program 98
ESEA: State Assessments 99
ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs 103
ESEA: Teaching American History 106
ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies 107
ESEA: Transition To Teaching 109
ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers 111
ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice 113
ESEA: Women's Educational Equity 115
ESRA: Comprehensive Centers 116
HEA: High School Equivalency Program 118
HEA: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders 120
HEA: Teacher Quality Enhancement 121
IDEA: Special Education Grants for Infants and Families 124
IDEA: Special Education Grants to States 128
IDEA: Special Education Parent Information Centers 136
IDEA: Special Education Personnel Preparation 139
IDEA: Special Education Preschool Grants 142
IDEA: Special Education State Personnel Grants 145
IDEA: Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination 148
IDEA: Special Education Technology and Media Services 151
MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths 154
VTEA: Tech-Prep Education State Grants 156
VTEA: Vocational Education National Programs 158
VTEA: Vocational Education State Grants 161

Goal 3: Develop Safe and Drug-Free Schools

ESEA: Alcohol Abuse Reduction 171
ESEA: Character Education 173
ESEA: Close-Up Fellowships 174
ESEA: Elementary and Secondary School Counseling 175
ESEA: Excellence in Economic Education 177
ESEA: Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners 178
ESEA: Mentoring Program 180
ESEA: Physical Education Program 182
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Other National Programs 183
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants 185

Goal 4: Transform Education into an Evidence-Based Field

ESEA: Indian Education - National Activities 191
ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination 192
ESRA: Research in Special Education 195
ESRA: Statistics 197
RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research 199

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

AEFLA: Adult Basic and Literacy State Grants 207
AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities 212
AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy 213
ATA: Assistive Technology Alternative Financing 215
ATA: Assistive Technology Programs 217
EDA: Gallaudet University 221
EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf 227
HEA: AID Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions 231
HEA: AID Minority Science and Engineering Improvement 235
HEA: AID Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions 237
HEA: AID Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities 240
HEA: AID Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions 243
HEA: AID Strengthening Institutions 245
HEA: AID Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities 249
HEA: B.J. Stupak Olympic Scholarships 252
HEA: Byrd Honors Scholarships 254
HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program 257
HEA: Demonstration Projects to Ensure Quality Higher Education for Students with Disabilities 259
HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education 260
HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) 262
HEA: Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) 266
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Domestic Programs 270
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Institute for International Public Policy 282
HEA: Javits Fellowships 284
HEA: SFA Federal Pell Grants 286
HEA: Student Aid Administration 288
HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers 290
HEA: TRIO McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement 291
HEA: TRIO Student Support Services 293
HEA: TRIO Talent Search 296
HEA: TRIO Upward Bound 298
HEA: Underground Railroad Program 300
HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults 301
MECEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Overseas Programs 303
RA: Client Assistance State Grants 309
RA: Independent Living Centers 311
RA: Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals 314
RA: Independent Living State Grants 316
RA: Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers 318
RA: Projects With Industry 319
RA: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights 322

RA: Supported Employment State Grants 323
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs 325
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Grants for Indians 327
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Recreational Programs 329
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants 330
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training 335
USC: Howard University 339
VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions 341

Goal 6: Establish Management Excellence

DEOA: Office for Civil Rights 345
DEOA: Office of Inspector General 347

Ongoing Plans Without FY 2006 Measures

ESEA: Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies 351
ESRA: National Assessment 353
HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents in School 354
HEA: SFA Federal Direct Student Loans 356
HEA: SFA Federal Family Education Loan Program & Liquidating 357
HEA: SFA Federal Perkins Loans 358
HEA: SFA Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants 359
HEA: SFA Federal Work-Study 360
HEA: SFA Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnerships 361

INTRODUCTION

The strategic goals and objectives set forth in the Department of Education's *FY 2002 - 2007 Strategic Plan* form the context for the broad outcomes that the Department believes should characterize American education. We continue our commitment to these 6 goals and the 26 related objectives.

The Department administers more than 150 programs in support of these goals and objectives. This *Revised FY 2006 Program Performance Plan* presents the individual program performance plans, which align to the individual program's provisions and the audience that it serves. In addition, selected measures from these plans have been identified as key measures at the strategic level. These strategic-level measures are presented in our *Revised FY 2006 Performance Plan*. The *Revised FY 2006 Performance Plan* is located on our Web site at http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2006plan/index.html.

Key to Legislation:

APEB = Act for the Promotion of Education for the Blind
AEFLA = Adult Education and Family Literacy Act
AID = Aid for Institutional Development
ATA = Assistive Technology Act
CRA = Civil Rights Act
DEOA = Department of Education Organization Act
EDA = Education of the Deaf Act
ESEA = Elementary and Secondary Education Act
ESRA = Education Sciences Reform Act
HEA = Higher Education Act
HKNCA = Helen Keller National Center Act
IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
MECEA = Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act
MVHAA = McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act
RA = Rehabilitation Act
SFA = Student Financial Assistance Programs
USC = United States Code
VTEA = Vocational and Technical Education Act

Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement

APEB: American Printing House for the Blind - FY 2006

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

Objective 1 of 2: *Appropriate, timely, high-quality educational materials are provided to pre-college-level blind students to allow them to benefit more fully from their educational programs.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Customer satisfaction: The American Printing House's customers/consumers will agree that the educational materials provided through the act are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.

Measure 1.1.1 of 4: The percentage of trustees who agree that the American Printing House's educational materials are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1998	95	
1999	96	95
2000	96.50	96
2001	97	96
2002	99	96
2003	98.75	96
2004	99.50	96
2005	100	98
2006		98

Measure 1.1.2 of 4: The percentage of advisory committee members who agree that the American Printing House's educational materials are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	100	100
2000	100	100
2001	100	100
2002	100	100
2003	100	100
2004	100	100

2005	100	100
2006		100

Measure 1.1.3 of 4: The percentage of consumers who agree that the American Printing House's educational materials are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1999	90	
2000	100	95
2001	97	95
2002	96	95
2003	100	95
2004	99	95
2005	96	95
2006		96

Measure 1.1.4 of 4: The percentage of teachers who agree that the American Printing House's educational materials are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	96	
2003	97	96
2004	98	96
2005	99	96
2006		97

Source: Surveys of Ex Officio Trustees; APH Advisory Committees; other consumers; and teachers of students who are visually impaired.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The survey instrument used by APH was constructed with the input of an external research firm and was designed to measure the levels of customer/consumer satisfaction with each of the factors. The survey is distributed to ex officio trustees, as well as to various professional groups whose members work in the field of blindness. Additionally, the survey was available on the APH Web site. This makes it easily available for response by individuals who are not on a specific mailing list, but who are encouraged to respond through invitations on list servs and in various newsletters and announcements. The Web-based format also provides accessibility to visually impaired individuals who require alternate media.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Student performance and participation: The percentage of American Printing House ex officio trustees who report that the performance of students and their participation in their educational programs improves as a result of the availability of educational materials provided through the act will be maintained.

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: The percentage of trustees who agree that the performance of students and their participation in educational programs improves as a result of the availability of educational materials provided by the American Printing House.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1998	98	
1999	98	98
2000	97	99
2001	97	99
2002	100	99
2003	99.50	99
2004	100	99
2005	99.50	99
2006		99

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: The percentage of teachers who agree that the performance of students and their participation in educational programs improves as a result of the availability of educational materials provided by the American Printing House.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1999		100
2002	93	
2003	95	95
2004	98.50	95
2005	98.50	95
2006		96

Source: Survey of Ex Officio Trustees and Survey of Teachers.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Student achievement: The percentage of students who attain identified concepts or skills during the field testing of products in four areas--low vision, early childhood, multiple disabilities, and tactile graphics.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of students who attain concepts or skills.								
Year	**Actual Performance**				**Performance Targets**			
	Low Vision	Early Childhood	Multiple Disabilities	Tactile Graphics	Low Vision	Early Childhood	Multiple Disabilities	Tactile Graphics

2005		999	999	999	999
2006		999	999	999	999

Source: American Printing House for the Blind records on testing of new products.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.

Objective 2 of 2: *Improve the quality of APH research and product usefulness.*

Indicator 2.1 of 3: High Quality Research: Conduct high quality research.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of APH research judged to be of high quality.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Expert panel review.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 3: Relevance and Utility: Increase the relevance and usefulness of new APH products.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of new APH products judged to be of high relevance and high utility for the target audience.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Expert panel review

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.3 of 3: New products: Maintain an appropriate balance between production of new APH and ongoing products.

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: The percentage of total APH product sales that are new APH product sales.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2001	10.70	
2002	11.80	
2003	6.50	
2004	18.30	
2005	15.40	
2006		15

Source: APH Annual Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: This is a new measure for 2006. The calculation is the number of new APH product sales divided by the total APH product sales.

CRA: Training and Advisory Services - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.004D - Training and Advisory Services

Program Goal: To support access and equity in public schools and help school districts solve equity problems in education related to race, sex, and national origin.

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

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Training and technical assistance services result in the promotion of policies and practices to ensure that all children regardless of race, sex, or national origin have equal access to quality education and equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices in eliminating, reducing, or preventing harassment, conflict, and school violence.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices ensuring that students of different race, sex, and national origin have equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Equity Assistance Center Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is the baseline plus 1 percent.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Training and technical assistance services result in products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to education policy or practices.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of customers that report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high usefulness to their policies and practices.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Equity Assistance Center Annual Performance Reports.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1 percent.

ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers - FY 2006

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

Program Goal: To establish community learning centers that help students in high-poverty, low-performing schools meet academic achievement standards; to offer a broad array of additional services designed to complement the regular academic program; and to offer families of students opportunities for educational development.

Objective 1 of 3: *Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.*

Indicator 1.1 of 4: Achievement: The percentage of regular program participants whose mathematics/English grades improved from fall to spring.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of regular program participants whose mathematics/English grades improved 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
2002	41	44	37	39	39	42	45	45	45	45	45	45
2003	43	45	36	37	40	42	45	45	45	45	45	45
2004	43	47	38	41	41	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
2005							45	45	45	45	45	45
2006							46	46	46	46	46	46
2007							47	47	47	47	47	47
2008							48	48	48	48	48	48
2009							48	48	48	48	48	48
2010							48	48	48	48	48	48

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006
Data supplied by grantees.

Explanation: 2004 data reported for 3539 centers

Indicator 1.2 of 4: Achievement: The percentage of regular 21st Century Community Learning Centers program participants whose achievement test scores improve from below proficient to proficient or above in reading and mathematics on state assessments.

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: The percentage of elementary 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in reading on state assessments.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: The percentage of middle/high school 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in mathematics on state assessments.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Profile and Performance Information Collection System.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006
Data supplied by grantees.

Explanation: This is a new measure for 2006. The FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline.

Indicator 1.3 of 4: The percentage of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The 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
2004	66.71	70	68.75			
2006				70	70	70
2007				70	70	70

Source: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Report/PPICS.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: For 2006 we are considering this a new measure because this program is no longer a Federal discretionary program but rather administrated by states. As a result a different data collection instrument is now being used. These two changes mean that the data collected before 2004 are no longer comparable with data for 2004 and beyond.

Indicator 1.4 of 4: Behavior: Students participating in the program will show improvement through measures such as attendance, classroom performance, and decreased disciplinary action or other adverse behaviors.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The 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
2004	61.20	65	64.08			
2006				67	67	67
2007				70	70	70

Source: 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Report/PPICS.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006
Data supplied by grantees.

Explanation: For 2006 we are considering this a new measure because this program is no longer a Federal discretionary program but rather administrated by states. As a result a different data collection instrument is now being used. These two changes mean that the data collected before 2004 are no longer comparable with data for 2004 and beyond.

Objective 2 of 3: *21st Century Community Learning Centers will offer high-quality enrichment opportunities that positively affect student outcomes such as school attendance and academic performance, and result in decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors.*

Indicator 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.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of 21st Century Centers reporting emphasis in at least one core academic area.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2000	97	85
2001	96	85
2002	94.80	85
2003	96.10	85
2004	97.75	85
2005		100
2006		100
2007		100

Source: 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006
Data supplied by grantees.

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

Explanation: 2004 data reported for 3539 centers.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Other enrichment activities: More than 85 percent of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and physical education.

Measure 2.2.1 of 2: The percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in technology.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	70	85
2001	79	85
2002	80.60	85
2003	81.30	85
2004	65.60	85
2005		85
2006		85
2007		85

Measure 2.2.2 of 2: The percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in other areas.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	97	85
2001	95	85
2002	96	85
2003	95.90	85
2004	92.57	85
2005		100
2006		100
2007		100

Source: 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006
Data supplied by grantees.

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

Explanation: 2004 data reported for 3539 centers.

Objective 3 of 3: *Improve the operational efficiency of the program.*

Indicator 3.1 of 2: Program Efficiency: An increase in the percentage of SEAs that submit complete and accurate data on program performance measures in a timely manner.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: An increase in the percentage of SEAs that submit complete and accurate data on program performance measures in a timely manner.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Online data collection system

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish baseline.

Indicator 3.2 of 2: Program Efficiency: A decrease in the time it takes SEAs to draw funds down to reimburse grantees.

Measure 3.2.1 of 1: A decrease in the time it takes SEAs to draw funds down to reimburse grantees.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Monthly GAPS drawdown reports

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish baseline.

ESEA: Advanced Credentialing - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.925 - Advanced Certification or Advanced Credentialing

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

Objective 1 of 1: *To increase the number of National Board-certified teachers.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The number of teachers awarded National Board certification will increase annually.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The cumulative number of teachers certified.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	23,936	
2003	32,142	
2004	40,200	35,000
2005	47,503	40,000
2006		45,000
2007		50,000

Source: Data on the number of National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs) is provided initially in a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) press release announcing those teachers who have received National Board certification. This information is also provided on the NPBTS Web site and in the annual performance report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006
Upon release of the number of NBCTs, the name of each individual and his/her certification area are available on the NBPTS Web site.

Explanation: The target has been set at an increase of 5,000 National Board Certified Teachers each year. The National Board continues to focus its efforts on recruitment, including its Targeted High Needs Initiative that works to recruit teachers in districts that have had little or no participation in NBC. With these efforts, along with the Candidate Subsidy Program that supports up to one half of the candidate fee, the expectation is that the target will continue to be met.

ESEA: Advanced Placement - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.330B - Advanced Placement Test Fee Program
84.330C - Advanced Placement Incentives Program

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

Objective 1 of 1: *Encourage a greater number of low-income students to participate in the AP and IB programs and pass the exams.*

Indicator 1.1 of 5: Students served: The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income public school students nationally.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income public school students nationally.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	87,149	
2000	92,083	
2001	105,138	
2002	132,459	
2003	157,334	
2004	187,691	
2006		209,411
2007		242,000

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Advanced Placement Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: This is a new measure that was changed to focus on public school students only. The previous measure reported on public and non-public school students. The new measure now aligns with the population served by the program. Past data is included for historical purposes. Subsequent targets are based on the previous year's target plus 10 percent.

Indicator 1.2 of 5: Students served: The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by minority (Hispanic, Black, Native American) public school students nationally.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by minority (Hispanic, Black, Native American) public school students nationally.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	267,608	
2005	315,203	
2006		336,000
2007		376,000
2008		421,000
2009		472,000
2010		528,000

Source: The College Board/Educational Testing Service (ETS): Freeze File Report. The Freeze File Report is a mid-year data file of Advanced Placement exams taken in May of that year and provides basic student demographic characteristics.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Indicator 1.3 of 5: Students served: The number and percent of Advanced Placement tests passed (tests receiving scores of 3-5) by low-income public school students nationally.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The number and percent of Advanced Placement tests passed (tests receiving scores of 3-5) by low-income public school students nationally.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Percent passed	Number passed	Percent passed	Number passed
2005	37.50	79,800		
2006			38.50	90,009

Source: The College Board/Educational Testing Service (ETS): Freeze File Report. The Freeze File Report is a mid-year data file of Advanced Placement exams taken in May of that year and provides basic student demographic characteristics.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: College Board considers a test "mastered" if it receives a score of 3, 4, or 5 out of a scale of 1 to 5.

Indicator 1.4 of 5: Students served: The number of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate tests taken in public high schools served by API grants, divided by the total number of juniors and seniors enrolled at those schools.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The number of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate tests taken in public high schools served by API grants, divided by the total number of juniors and seniors enrolled at those schools.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Advanced Placement Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: Measure 4 is being used for the first time in 2006. The FY 2005 data will be used as the baseline. FY 2006 target is the baseline plus 1 percent

Indicator 1.5 of 5: Students served: Cost per passage of an Advanced Placement test by a low-income public school student (amount provided for AP Test fees divided by the total number of tests passed by low-income students.)

Measure 1.5.1 of 1: Cost per passage of an Advanced Placement test by a low-income public school student (amount provided for AP Test fees divided by the total number of tests passed by low-income students.)		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
- No Data -		

Source: The College Board/Educational Testing Service (ETS): Freeze File Report. The Freeze File Report is a mid-year data file of Advanced Placement exams taken in May of that year and provides basic student demographic characteristics and scores.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: Measure 5 is being used for the first time in 2006. The FY 2005 data will be used as the baseline.

ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.356A - Alaska Native Educational Programs

Program Goal: To help meet the unique educational needs of Alaska Natives and to support the development of supplemental educational programs to benefit Alaska Natives.

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

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The percentage of participants benefiting from the Alaska Native Education program will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: (a) The percentage of students participating in the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science or reading.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005	44	999
2006		49

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: (b) The percentage of Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs who improve on measures of school readiness.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005	76.40	999
2006		80

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: (c) The dropout rate of Alaska Native and American Indian middle and high school students.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	2.20	999
2006		2

Source: Grantee performance report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Explanation: For measures (a) and (b), the FY 2004 target was to establish the baseline, but data were unusable. Therefore, the FY 2005 target was to establish the baseline.

ESEA: Arts In Education - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.351C - Professional Development for Arts Educators--Arts in Education
84.351D - Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination Grants Program
84.351E - Arts in Education

Program Goal: To help ensure that all program participants meet challenging state academic content standards in the arts.

Objective 1 of 1: *Activities supported with federal funds will improve the quality of standards-based arts education for all participants.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Percentage of participants who benefit from standards-based arts education and meet state standards in the arts will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 5: (a) The percentage of students participating in arts models programs who demonstrate higher achievement than those in control or comparison groups.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Math	Reading	Math	Reading
2005			999	999
2006			999	999

Measure 1.1.2 of 5: (b) The number of students who participate in standards-based arts education sponsored by the VSA and JFK Center for Performing Arts.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	All	Low income students	Students with disabilities	All	Low income students	Students with disabilities
2005				999	999	999
2006				999	999	999

Measure 1.1.3 of 5: (c) The percentage of teachers participating in the JFK Center for Performing Arts programs who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Measure 1.1.4 of 5: (d) The percentage of teachers participating in the VSA programs who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Measure 1.1.5 of 5: (e) The percentage of teachers participating in the Professional Development for Arts Educators program who receive professional development that is sustained and intensive.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Arts in Education Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2007

Explanation: (a): The FY 2004 data will be used as the baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1 percentage point. The FY 2006 target is the previous year plus 1 percentage point. (b): FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 2 percentage points. Data will be disaggregated for low-income participants and for those with disabilities. (c), (d), and (e): The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

ESEA: Charter Schools Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.282 - Charter Schools

Program Goal: To support the creation of a large number of high-quality charter schools.

Objective 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 1.1 of 4: State legislation: The number of states that have charter school legislation.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of states with charter school legislation (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico).		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1996	19	
1997	27	
1998	31	
1999	38	
2000	38	40
2001	39	42
2002	40	42
2003	41	43
2004	41	44
2005	41	44
2006	41	44

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Charter Schools Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: There is variation in the definitions of charter school and of authorizing agency in state charter school legislation.

Indicator 1.2 of 4: Charter operations: The number of charter schools in operation around the nation.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of charter schools in operation.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1996	255	
1997	428	
1998	790	
1999	1,100	
2000	1,700	2,060
2001	2,110	2,667
2002	2,431	3,000
2003	2,700	3,000
2004	2,996	3,000
2005	3,344	3,300
2006	3,625	3,600

Source: Center for Education Reform Annual Survey; state educational agencies (SEAs).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
On-site monitoring by ED and data from the Center for Education Reform.

Limitations: Differences in the definition of charter schools (i.e., some states count multiple sites as single charters, while others count them as multiple charters) cause variability in the counts among SEAs. There is sometimes disagreement about numbers of charter schools in operation among the agencies that do the counting.

Indicator 1.3 of 4: Student Achievement: The percentage of charter school students who are achieving at or above proficient levels on state assessments in mathematics and reading.

Measure 1.3.1 of 2: The percentage of students in charter schools who are achieving at or above proficient on state assessments in mathematics.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Fourth Grade	Eighth Grade	Fourth Grade	Eighth Grade
2006			999	999

Measure 1.3.2 of 2: The percentage of charter school students who are achieving at or above proficient

levels on state assessments in reading.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Fourth Grade	Eighth Grade	Fourth Grade	Eighth Grade
2006			999	999

Source: ED Facts

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2007

Explanation: The targets for FY 2006 are to establish baselines.

Indicator 1.4 of 4: Efficiency: The cost efficiency of the Charter School Program and the State Charter School Facilities Incentive Grant Program

Measure 1.4.1 of 2: (a) The federal cost per student in a "successful" charter school (defined as a school in operation for three or more years).		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Measure 1.4.2 of 2: (b) The ratio of funds leveraged by states for charter facilities to funds awarded by the Department under the State Charter School Facilities Incentive Grant program.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	1.82	
2005	2.52	
2006		2.70

Source: Charter Schools Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: Explanation: (a) The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. (b) FY 2004 data was used to establish the baseline. The leveraging ratio is the total funds available (the federal grant and the state match) divided by the federal grant for a specific year.

ESEA: Comprehensive School Reform - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.332A - ESEA Comprehensive School Reform
84.332B - Comprehensive School Reform Quality Initiatives

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

---

Objective 1 of 2: *Student achievement in core subjects generally will show marked improvement in Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) program schools.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: AYP results: The percentage of Comprehensive School Reform schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made achieved adequate yearly progress (AYP).

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: The percentage of CSR schools achieving AYP in reading/language arts.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	67	
2005		68
2006		68

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: The percentage of CSR schools achieving AYP in mathematics.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	69	
2005		70
2006		70

Source: No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Report, PBDMI

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Explanation: The FY 2004 data were used as the baseline.

Objective 2 of 2: *School Improvement: Decreasing numbers of CSR program schools will be designated as schools in need of improvement.*

Indicator 2.1 of 4: Usefulness of products and services developed through Technical Assistance: The percentage of all products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to education policy or practice by target audiences

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of a random sample of all products and services that receive audience ratings for usefulness of "high and above" on a field survey

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Source: Grantee performance report based on a survey of ratings of products and services

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 4: Capacity building: The percentage of new research projects funded by the CSR Quality Initiatives program that are deemed to be of high relevance to education practice

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of new research projects funded by the CSR Quality Initiatives program that are deemed to be of high relevance to education practice as determined by a review panel of practitioners.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Grantee performance report based on project rating by review panel of practitioners

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.3 of 4: Impact on School Improvement: No schools that have received CSR program funds will be designated as in need of improvement, while CSR funds continue to be targeted on the lowest achieving schools

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: Percentage change from year 1 to year 3 of "need of improvement" schools moving out of "need of improvement"		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	61	
2014		0

Source: Grantee performance data

Frequency: Annually.

Explanation: The FY 2004 data were used as the baseline.

Indicator 2.4 of 4: Research based school reform model: The percentage of principals in Title I schools reporting that they are implementing a research-based school reform model.

Measure 2.4.1 of 1: The percentage of principals in Title I schools reporting that they are implementing a research-based school reform model.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1999	31	
2000	46	
2001	62	55
2002		60
2003		70
2004		72
2005		74
2006		74

Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, (NCES)

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Limitations: Data are taken from a nationally representative sample of Title I schools; data are not available for all Title I schools. Because data are based on self-reports, it is difficult to judge the extent to which reform programs are comprehensive and research based. An examination of school documents on a subsample of Title I schools will allow some indication of the quality of comprehensive school reform efforts in Title I schools in general.

Explanation: Increasing numbers of Title I schools are implementing research-based school reform models to improve curriculum and instruction. The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program is meeting its purpose of increasing awareness of and support for comprehensive school reform among states, districts and schools, and acts as a catalyst for how Title I funds can be used in schoolwide programs to support the adoption of research-based comprehensive school reform programs. The student achievement data at CSR schools collected for 2002 and 2003 were found to be incomplete and inconsistent, and were not used. A contractor worked with states to complete the data collection process for 2004-06, and to provide quality assurance.

ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.354A - Charter Schools Facilities Program

Program Goal: Increase the number of charter school facilities acquired, constructed or renovated.

Objective 1 of 2: *Increase funds available for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Leveraged funds: The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, construction, or renovation of charter school facilities (in millions).		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	66	
2004	74	100
2005		100
2006		100

Source: Charter School Facilities Grantee Performance Report

Next Data Available: January 2006

Limitations: These multiyear grants received all the funding at the beginning of the first project period. As no reports are required for continuation funding, grantees were given a full year of performance before reporting data.

Explanation: Definition of leverage: the number of dollars (in millions) leveraged consists of the dollar amount raised (versus the amount contributed to the financing from the grant) as a direct result of the guarantee. If the grantee received a non-Department of Education grant (including a New Markets Tax Credit allocation) and is using it to provide additional leveraging for a school served by the federal grant, funds leveraged from these other funds may also be counted as funds leveraged by the federal grant. A grantee may count senior debt toward the total amount of funds leveraged if it uses grant funds to guarantee or insure subordinate debt but not the senior debt to which it is tied. Likewise, grantees may count subordinate debt toward the total amount of funds leveraged if it only uses grant funds to credit-enhance senior debt.

Objective 2 of 2: *Increase the number of charter schools facilities acquired, constructed or renovated.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: The number of charter schools served.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The number of charter schools served through this program.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	20	
2004	32	20
2005		20
2006		25

Source: Charter School Facilties Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.349A - Early Childhood Educator Professional Development

Program Goal: To enhance the school readiness of young children, particularly disadvantaged young children.

Objective 1 of 2: *Early childhood educators will more frequently apply research-based approaches in early childhood instruction and child development and learning, including establishing literacy-rich classrooms.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Apply research-based approaches to early childhood pedagogy and child development and learning, including establishing literacy-rich classrooms: Average Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO) score will improve.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The ECEPD teacher's average ELLCO score after intervention.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	20	999
2005		20
2006		999

Source: ECEPD Annual and final Performance Reports, grantee submissions.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was to set the baseline for the 3-year grants. However, FY 2005 was the last year for 2-year grants. Therefore, the FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the first 3-year grants. FY 2004 and 2005 data are the last group of 2-year grantees.

Objective 2 of 2: *Children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate early language and literacy.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Demonstrated improved readiness for school: Children will demonstrate improved readiness for school in the areas of early language and literacy.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of children who demonstrate improved readiness for school in the areas of early language and literacy.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Early Language	Literacy	Early Language	Literacy

2004	43	999	999
2005		43	999
2006		999	999

Source: ECEPD Annual and Final Performance Reports, grantee submissions.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: FY 2004 and 2005 data are from the last 2-year grantees. FY 2006 is the beginning of the first 3-year cohort. The baseline for early language was established with a sample of FY 2004 2-year grantee data. The FY 2006 targets are to establish a baseline for the first group of 3-year grantees. Early Language skills will be measured using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - III (PPVT-III); literacy skills will be measured using the PALS Pre-K, Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask. FY 2004 target for literacy was to establish a baseline for the 2-year grantees. Since data was not collected, the FY 2005 target is to establish baseline for 2-year grantees.

ESEA: Early Reading First - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.359 - Early Reading First

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

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

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Language: The percent of children who achieve significant gains in the development of receptive language.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percent of 4-year old children participating in ERF programs who achieve significant learning gains on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Early Reading First Program Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2007

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for this new measure. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition (PPVT) is a nationally normed test which has been validated internally and correlated with other measures of cognitive development.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Alphabet Knowledge: The average number of letters that preschool-aged children in ERF programs are able to identify as measured by the Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask on the PALS-Pre K assessment.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of letters ERF children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	15	999
2005		16
2006		17

Source: Early Reading First Program Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Not all Early Reading First grantees use the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask to measure alphabet knowledge. Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask.

Improvements: Early Reading First grantees will be encouraged to use the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask as the measure of alphabet knowledge.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. The PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask is a measure of alphabet knowledge that will be administered to ERF preschool children with scores reported in the ERF Performance Report. It has been demonstrated to have a strong positive correlation with the Woodcock-Johnson Letter-Word Identification test.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Language: The percent of children who demonstrate age-appropriate development of receptive language.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percent of preschool-age children participating in ERF programs who demonstrate age-appropriate oral language skills as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	56	999
2005		57
2006		59

Source: Early Reading First Program Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition (PPVT) nationally normed tests which has been validated internally and correlated with other measures of cognitive development.

Limitations: The FY 2004 data reported represent 50 percent of the grantees who use the PPVT to measure vocabulary development.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. SY 2003-04, Early Reading First preschool children took a Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III pre-test and a post-test after the year of Early Reading First intervention. Post-test scores of ERF preschool children were compared to the national norms provided by the test publisher. Both 2002 and 2003 grantees reported data.

ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.209 - Native Hawaiian Family Based Education Centers
84.210 - Native Hawaiian Gifted and Talented
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 Program
84.362A - Native Hawaiian Education

Program Goal: To support innovative projects to provide supplemental services that address the educational needs of Native Hawaiian children and adults.

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

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The percentage of participants who will benefit from the Native Hawaiian Education program will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: (a) The percentage of teachers involved with professional development activities that address the unique education needs of Native Hawaiian program participants.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005	89.30	999
2006		91

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: (b) The percentage of Native Hawaiian children participating in the early education programs who improve on measures of school readiness and literacy.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005	63	999
2006		68

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: (c) The percentage of Native Hawaiian students participating in the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science, or reading.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005	82	999
2006		83.64

Source: Grantee performance report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline, but data were unusable. Therefore, the FY 2005 target was to establish a baseline for all three measures.

ESEA: Educational Technology State Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.318X - Enhancing Education Through Technology

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

Objective 1 of 3: *Fully integrate technology into the curricula and instruction in all schools by December 31, 2006 (FY 2007) to enhance teaching and learning. .*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Curriculum Integration: The percentage of districts receiving Educational Technology State Grants (EETT) funds that have effectively and fully integrated technology, as identified by states, will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of districts receiving EETT funds that have effectively and fully integrated technology.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

Source: U.S. Department Education, Education Data Exchange Network.
Date Sponsored: 10/01/2005.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: No data were collected in 2004. Therefore FY 2005 data will establish the baseline. The target for FY 2006 is baseline plus 5 percent.

Objective 2 of 3: *To help ensure that students and teachers in high-poverty, high-need schools have access to educational technology comparable to that of students and teachers in other schools.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Internet access in high poverty classrooms: Internet access in high-poverty school classrooms will be comparable to that in other schools.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage point difference in Internet access between classrooms in high- and low-poverty schools.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	3	
2003	5	

2006		0

Survey/Assessment: Fast Response Survey System.
References: NCES Study - Internet Access in U. S. Public Schools and Classrooms..

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Poverty measures are based on data on free and reduced-price lunches, which may underestimate school poverty levels, particularly for older students and immigrant students.

Explanation: This was a new measure in FY 2006. Historical data have been provided. While the table shows small differences in 2002 and 2003, these differences are not statistically significantly different. The FY 2006 target is to maintain this equality.

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

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Professional Development: In districts that receive funding from the State Grant Program, the percentage of teachers who meet their state technology standards will increase.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of teachers who meet their state technology standards.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

Source: U.S. Department Education, Education Data Exchange Network.
Date Sponsored: 10/01/2006.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: No data were collected in 2004. Therefore FY 2005 data will establish the baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 5 percent.

ESEA: English Language Acquisition - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.195N - ELA National Activities
84.365A - English Language Acquisition Formula Grant Program

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

Objective 1 of 3: *English Language Acquisition State Grants.*

Indicator 1.1 of 7: The percentage of states that have demonstrated the alignment of English language proficiency (ELP) standards with ELA assessments.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of states that have demonstrated the alignment of English language proficiency (ELP) standards with ELP assessments.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	31	
2005		10
2006		50
2007		75
2008		100

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report; EDEN when available.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Explanation: All 52 entities (50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) are providing information regarding aligned English language proficiency assessments for the first time under NCLB. States are counted as having demonstrated progress in alignment if they explain how their current ELP assessment is being aligned with ELP standards.

Indicator 1.2 of 7: The percentage of states that have demonstrated their English language proficiency standards are linked to academic content standards in English language arts or reading.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of states that have demonstrated their English language proficiency standards are linked to academic content standards in English language arts or reading.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	85	
2005		10
2006		90

2007		100

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report; EDEN, when available.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Explanation: For the first time under NCLB, all 52 entities (50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico) are to provide evidence of linking ELP standards to academic content standards in reading and language arts. States are counted as having demonstrated linking if they described how linking was accomplished.

Indicator 1.3 of 7: The percentage of states that have met state targets for Title III annual measurable achievement objectives.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of states that have met the state targets for Title III annual measurable achievement objectives.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999
2007		999
2008		999
2009		999
2010		999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report, and Biennial Evaluation report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2007

Limitations: Average annual percentage increases vary depending on the LEP population in the state, available resources for serving these students, and allowable Departmental flexibilities for this subgroup.

Explanation: This is a long-term measure. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is baseline plus 10 percent. The target for FY 2008 is baseline plus 20 percent. The target for FY 2009 is baseline plus 40 percent. The target for FY 2010 is baseline plus 70 percent.

Indicator 1.4 of 7: The percentage of states that have met the state targets for making progress in English for LEP students who have received Title III services.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The percentage of states that have met the state targets for making progress in English for LEP students who have received Title III services.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999
2007		999
2008		999

2009		999
2010		999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report, Biennial Evaluation Report, and EDEN when available.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 10 percent. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 20 percent. The target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 40 percent. The target for FY 2010 is the baseline plus 70 percent.

Indicator 1.5 of 7: The number of states receiving Title III services that have met state targets for attainment in learning English.

Measure 1.5.1 of 1: The number of states that meet the state target for attainment of English language proficiency.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	26	
2006		29
2007		31
2008		44
2009		47
2010		49

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports and Biennial Evaluation Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2007

Explanation: The FY 2005 data were used to establish the baseline.

Indicator 1.6 of 7: The amount of time it takes states to resolve compliance issues identified during a Title III compliance review.

Measure 1.6.1 of 1: The amount of time it takes states to resolve compliance issues identified during a Title III compliance review.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		24
2007		18
2008		16
2009		12

2010		9

Source: On-site monitoring and state responses to monitoring reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2007

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Response time will vary from state to state depending on what compliance issue must be addressed and how well the state manages internal resources and communications. Those compliance issues that require action from the state school board or state legislature, such as English language proficiency standards and assessments approval, will require a longer period of time due to state schedules. Those compliance issues that are handled at the school district level, such as parental notification, may be addressed in a much shorter time frame.

Explanation: This is a new efficiency measure for 2006. The FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. Performance targets represent the number of months it will take states to resolve a percentage of monitoring findings for Title III compliance issues. Specifically: in 2006, 50 percent of states will resolve compliance findings within 24 months.

Indicator 1.7 of 7: Amount of time reported by states to make Title III subgrants to subgrantees.

Measure 1.7.1 of 1: Amount of time reported by states to make Title III subgrants to subgrantees.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999
2007		999
2008		999
2009		999

Source: On-site Monitoring Reports and desk monitoring results.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2007

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: States distribute funds to subgrantees according to a set schedule depending on the state application process or on a reimbursable basis (districts provide states either a monthly, quarterly or annual report for reimbursement). Information regarding the timing of subgrant allocations is collected through program office desk monitoring and an on-site monitoring process.

Explanation: This is a new efficiency measure for 2006. The 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. Targets will demonstrate a decrease in the amount of time required for states to allocate federal funds to subgrantees. The target for FY 2006 is a 10 percent decrease from baseline. The target for FY 2007 is a 15 percent decrease from baseline. The target for FY 2008 is a 20 percent decrease from baseline. The target for FY 2009 is a 25 percent decrease from baseline. This indicator addresses the Department's emphasis on risk mitigation, timely drawdown of federal funds, and effective use of federal funds for their intended purpose.

Objective 2 of 3: *Improve the quality of teachers of LEP students.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: The percentage of preservice teachers served by the Title III Professional Development Program who are placed in an instructional setting serving LEP students within one year of graduation.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of preservice teachers served by the Title III Professional Development Program who are placed in an instructional setting serving LEP students within one year of graduation.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	93	999
2006		94
2007		95

Source: Grantee Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was to establish the baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: The percentage of National Professional Development program graduates who meet No Child Left Behind Highly Qualified Teacher requirements.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of National Professional Development Program graduates who are highly qualified teachers.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	95	999
2006		96
2007		97

Source: Grantee Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was to establish the baseline.

Objective 3 of 3: *Improve English proficiency and academic achievement of students served by the Native American and Alaska Native Children in School Program.*

Indicator 3.1 of 2: English proficiency: Limited English proficient (LEP) students served by the Native American and Alaska Native Children in School Program will make gains in English.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Native American and Alaska Native projects in which at least 75% of the participants made gains in English.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2005	60	999
2006		66
2007		72

Source: Grantee Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Limitations: Data are self-reported by grantees. Operational definitions of LEP students vary.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was to establish a baseline.

Indicator 3.2 of 2: Core Academic Subjects: Limited English proficient (LEP) students served by the Native American and Alaska Native Children in School Program will make gains in core academic subjects.

Measure 3.2.1 of 1: The percentage of Native American and Alaska Native projects in which at least 75% of participants make gains in core academic subjects.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	15	
2006		16.50
2007		18

Source: Grantee Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Data are self-reported by grantees. Operational definitions of LEP students vary.

Explanation: The FY 2005 data were used to establish the baseline.

ESEA: Even Start - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.213 - Even Start State Educational Agencies

Program Goal: To help break the cycle of poverty and illiteracy by improving the educational opportunities of the nation's low-income families through a unified family literacy program that integrates early childhood education, adult literacy and adult basic education, and parenting education.

Objective 1 of 1: *The literacy of participating families will improve.*

Indicator 1.1 of 4: Adult literacy and mathematics achievement and English language acquisition: Percentage of adults who achieve significant learning gains on measures of literacy and mathematics, and limited English proficient (LEP) adults who achieve significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Even Start adults showing significant learning gains on measures of literacy and Even Start LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition as measured by CASAS and the TABE.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Reading/English Language	Reading/English Language
2003	70	999
2004	60.50	70.70
2005		71.40
2006		72.10

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report (CPR)

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2006

Explanation: The CASAS = Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System; TABE = Tests of Adult Basic Education

Indicator 1.2 of 4: Adult educational attainment: Percentage of Even Start school-age parents who earn a high school diploma and the percentage of non-school age parents who earn a high school diploma or a general equivalency diploma.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of Even Start adults with a high school completion goal or General Equivalency Diploma (GED) attainment goal that earn a high school diploma or equivalent.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	High School diploma	General Equivalency Diploma/GED	High School diploma	General Equivalency Diploma/GED

2003	59	44.60	999	999
2004	44.60	80.20	59.60	44.40
2005			60.20	44.90
2006			60.80	45.30

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2006

Limitations: Definitions of high school diploma and GED may vary across programs.

Indicator 1.3 of 4: Children's language development: Percentage of Even Start children who are entering kindergarten who demonstrate significant gains in the development of receptive language.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of Even Start children who are entering kindergarten who are achieving significant gains on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Reading Readiness/Language	Reading Readiness/Language
2003		999
2004	82.90	999
2005		83.70
2006		84.60

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2006

Explanation: The FY 2003 target was to establish a baseline. However, no data were collected. Therefore, FY 2004 target was to set the baseline.

Indicator 1.4 of 4: Alphabet Knowledge: The score Even Start children attain on the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The number of letters Even Start children can identify as measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Improvements: Even Start programs are encouraged to use the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask as the measure of alphabet knowledge.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for 2006 is the baseline plus 1 letter. The PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask is a measure that has been validated using a statewide sample of typically developing children.

ESEA: Excellence in Economic Education - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.215B - Excellence in Economic Education

Program Goal: To promote economic and financial literacy among all students in kindergarten through grade 12.

Objective 1 of 1: *To increase students' knowledge of, and achievement in economics to enable the students to become more productive and informed percentage of citizens.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The percentage of students of teachers trained under the grant project who demonstrate an improved understanding of personal finance and economics as compared to similiar students whose teachers have not had the training provided by the program.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of students taught by teachers trained under this grant who demonstrate improved understanding of personal finance issues.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Grantee Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: FY 2005 data will establish the baseline. The FY 2006 target is the baseline plus 1 percent.

ESEA: Foreign Language Assistance - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.293B - Foreign Language Assistance Grants (LEAs)
84.293C - Foreign Language Assistance Program (SEAs)

Program Goal: Assist local and state educational agencies in establishing, improving or expanding foreign language study for elementary and secondary school students.

Objective 1 of 1: *To Improve the foreign language proficiency of students served by the FLAP program.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Increased student achievement: The percentage of projects that report improvements in proficiency in a foreign language for three-quarters of school participants.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of projects that report improvements in proficiency in a foreign language for three-quarters of school participants.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	65	
2005	80	50
2006		75

Source: Grantee Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: There are no statutory reporting requirements. Grantee performance reports indicate a multitude of various assessment measurements used to determine and plot student growth in language ability.

Explanation: Grantees are local educational agencies (LEAs) that receive funding for three years. Each grantee establishes its own annual performance targets for improved foreign language proficiency. Data on improved foreign language proficiency come from the annual report received at the end of the second year of the grant. Not all funded projects provide instruction, some focus on developmental activities such as teacher training and, therefore, would not collect data on improvements in foreign language proficiency. Others may not collect data in the first year of the grant. In 2005, reported performance data were submitted by grantees that were first funded in 2003. 62% of those grantees provided data.

ESEA: Impact Aid Basic Support Payments - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.041 - Impact Aid

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

---

Objective 1 of 2: Make payments in a timely manner.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Timeliness of payments: The percentage of eligible applicants who receive initial Basic Support payments within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of eligible applicants who receive initial Impact Aid Basic Support payments within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	94	
2006		90

Source: Data extracted from the Impact Aid system.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Explanation: In 2006 this measure reports results for only the Basic Support Payments. The previous measure combined results for both Basic Support Payments and Children with Disabilities. The resulting data for the disaggregated measure are the same as those for the combined measure because payments are made at the same time under one PR award number.

Objective 2 of 2: Make accurate payments

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Overpayment forgiveness requests: The number of requests to forgive overpayments of Basic Support payments.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The number of requests to forgive overpayments of Impact Aid Basic Support payments.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	2	
2006		10

Source: Data extracted from Impact Aid system.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Explanation: In 2006 this measure reports results for only the Basic Support Payments. The previous measure combined results for both Basic Support Payments and Children with Disabilities. When a district is overpaid under Section 8003 it is most likely that they are overpaid in both 8003 (b) and 8003 (d). As a result the data are likely to be the same in both instances.

ESEA: Impact Aid Construction - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.041C - Impact Aid Construction Grants

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

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

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Construction: The percentage of schools in LEAs receiving Impact Aid Construction funds that report that the overall condition of their school buildings is adequate.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of LEAs reporting that the overall condition of their school buildings is adequate.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2000		70
2001	44	70
2002	43	70
2003	47	70
2004	54	70
2005	52	70
2006		58

Source: Data collected from LEA application for Impact Aid Section 8003 payments.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Limitations: Data are self-reported by Impact Aid applicants. Assessment of the condition of school facilities may differ depending on the judgment of the individual responding.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target was adjusted based on past actual performance.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Construction: Make 90% of Section 8007(a) formula grant awards in the second quarter of the fiscal year.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The date by which 90 percent of all construction payments are made for the application year.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2006		999
2007		999
2008		999
2009		999

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: This new efficiency measure is intended to track programmatic efficiency by reducing the amount of time it takes to process the formula construction grant payments under Section 8007(a) of the Impact Aid Program. The target for FY 2006 is 7/31/2006; the target for FY 2007 is 6/30/2007; the target for FY 2008 is 5/31/2008; the target for FY 2009 is 4/30/2009.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Construction: The average number of days elapsed between the initial Impact Aid discretionary construction award and the LEAs' awarding of contracts is less than 150 days.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The average number of days elapsed between the initial Impact Aid discretionary construction award and the LEAs' awarding of contracts.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		250

Source: GAPS system data will be used to determine timeliness for this indicator.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: This is a new efficiency measure for FY 2006.

ESEA: Impact Aid Payments for Children with Disabilities - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.041 - Impact Aid

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

---

Objective 1 of 2: Make payments in a timely manner.

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Timeliness of payments: The percentage of eligible applicants who receive initial Children with Disabilities payments within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of eligible applicants who receive initial Children with Disabilities payments within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	94	
2006		90

Source: Data extracted from the Impact Aid system.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Explanation: In 2006 this measure reports results for only the Children with Disabilities Program. The previous measure combined results for both Basic Support Payments and Children with Disabilities. The resulting data for the disaggregated measure are the same as those for the combined measure because payments are made at the same time under one PR award number. The FY 2005 data were used to establish the baseline.

Objective 2 of 2: Make accurate payments.

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Overpayment forgiveness requests: The number of requests to forgive overpayments of Children with Disabilities payments.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The number of requests to forgive overpayments of Children with Disabilities payments.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	2	
2006		10

Source: Data extracted from the Impact Aid system.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Explanation: In 2006 this measure reports results for only the Children with Disabilities Program. The previous measure combined results for both Basic Support Payments and Children with Disabilities. When a district is overpaid under Section 8003 it is most likely that they are overpaid in both 8003 (b) and 8003 (d). As a result the data are likely to be the same in both instances. The FY 2005 data were used to establish the baseline.

ESEA: Impact Aid Payments for Federal Property - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.041 - Impact Aid

Program Goal: To assist local school districts that have lost a portion of their local tax base because of federal ownership of property.

Objective 1 of 1: *Manage Section 8002 Payments for Federal Property to disburse funds accurately and efficiently under the statutory formula.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Program Management: Review and verify validity of estimated assessed value of Federal property in each Section 8002 applicant LEA at least every three years.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of eligible Section 8002 applicants reviewed during the year.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		33

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Timeliness of payments: Make initial Section 8002 payments to eligible school districts by the end of the second quarter.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of initial payments to eligible LEAs that are made by the end of the second quarter.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		75

Source: Data extracted from the Impact Aid system.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.367 - Improving Teacher Quality State Grants

Program Goal: To improve teacher and principal quality and increase the number of highly qualified teachers in the classroom and highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools.

Objective 1 of 2: *Show an annual increase in the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers.*

Indicator 1.1 of 4: Highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools: The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of core academic classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	74	
2004	81	
2005		90
2006		95
2007		100

Source: No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI); 2004-2005 school survey

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Explanation: FY 2003 data established the baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 4: Highly qualified teachers in low-poverty schools: Percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in low-poverty schools.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2004	89	
2005		90
2006		95
2007		100

Source: No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI)

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Explanation: The FY 2004 data used to establish a baseline.

Indicator 1.3 of 4: Highly qualified teachers in elementary schools: Percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of core academic classes in elementary schools taught by highly qualified teachers .		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	85	999
2004	89	89
2005		90
2006		95
2007		100

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report, PBDMI

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Explanation: The FY 2003 target was to establish the baseline.

Indicator 1.4 of 4: Highly qualified teachers in secondary schools: Percentage of core academic classes in secondary schools taught by highly qualified teachers.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The percentage of core academic classes in secondary schools taught by highly qualified teachers.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	80	999
2004	84	85

2005		85
2006		92
2007		100

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report, PBDMI

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Explanation: The FY 2003 target was to establish a baseline.

Objective 2 of 2: *Improve the operational efficiency of the program.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Program Efficiency: A decrease in the number of days it takes the Department of Education to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring visits.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Average number of days between monitoring visit and report sent to state.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Program office records

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: The target for FY2006 is to establish a baseline data.

ESEA: Javits Gifted and Talented Education - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.206A - Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Student Education

Program Goal: To improve the teaching and learning of gifted and talented students through research, demonstration projects, personal training, and other activities of national significance.

Objective 1 of 1: *Develop models for developing the talents of students who are economically disadvantaged, are limited English proficient, and/or have disabilities.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Model Effectiveness: The number of new evidence-based project designs, targeting at-risk children that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists and practitioners.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of new evidence-based project designs with average reviewer ratings for quality of "high and above."		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Grantee data.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for 2006 is the baseline plus 1 percent.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Model Effectiveness: The number of projects with significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations as indicated by scientifically based evaluations.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of projects with significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Based on evaluations of Gifted and Talented programs.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Capacity Building: The number of high quality projects targeting at-risk children, with evidence of

effective professional development focusing on Gifted and Talented education delivered to a significant number of practitioners, as measured by an independent review panel of qualified scientists and practitioners.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The number of project designs with average reviewer ratings for quality of â€œhigh and above.â€		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Based on review panel data

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for 2006 is the baseline plus 1 percent.

ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.364 - Literacy through School Libraries

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

Objective 1 of 2: *Improve the literacy skills of students served by the Improving Literacy Through School Libraries program.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: School/District/State Reading Assessments: The percentage of schools/districts served by Improving Literacy Through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of schools/districts served by Improving Literacy Through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Improving Literacy Through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; program evaluation by Department of Education.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Explanation: The first program year for grantees receiving funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries is 2003-2004. The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. However, the FY 2004 data were unusable for reporting. Therefore, the FY 2005 target is to establish the baseline. The FY 2006 target is baseline plus 1 percent.

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

Indicator 2.1 of 1: School library media collection: The comparison between the rate at which the school library media collection is increased at schools participating in the grant program and nonparticipating schools.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The difference in rate of increase between participating schools and nonparticipating schools.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	25	999
2005		27

2006		29

Source: Improving Literacy Through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; program evaluation of 2005 by Department of Education.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Explanation: The first program year for grantees receiving funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries is 2003-2004. The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline.

ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.165A - Magnet Schools Assistance

Program Goal: Students have access to high-quality education in desegregated magnet schools.

Objective 1 of 2: *Federally funded magnet schools will eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation in targeted elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group students.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The percentage of magnet schools whose student applicant pool in relation to the general student population in the school reduces, eliminates, or prevents minority group isolation increases annually.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of magnet schools whose student applicant pool reduces, prevents, or eliminates minority group isolation.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
2005			999	
2006			999	
2008				999

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

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Data are self reported.

Explanation: The Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) grants are three-year grants. New cohorts of grantees were established in SY 2004-05 (cohort 1) and a second cohort will be established in SY 2007-08 (cohort 2). The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 1, and the FY 2008 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 2. The FY 2006 target for cohort 1 is baseline plus 1 percent.

Objective 2 of 2: *Magnet school students meet their state's academic achievement standards.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: The percentage of magnet schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed the state's adequate progress standard.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed the state's adequate yearly progress standard.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
2005			999	
2006			999	
2008				999

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

Next Data Available: October 2006

Limitations: Data are frequently late in being released.

Explanation: New cohorts of grantees are established in SY 2004-05 (cohort 1) and in SY 2007-08 (cohort 2). The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 1. The target for FY 2008 is to establish a baseline for cohort 2. The FY 2006 target for cohort 1 is baseline plus 1 percent.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: The percentage of magnet schools that meet or exceed the state's adequate yearly progress standard.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of magnet schools that meet or exceed the state's adequate yearly progress standard.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
2005			999	
2006			999	
2008				999

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

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Limitations: Data are frequently late in being released.

Explanation: New cohorts of grantees are established in SY 2004-05 (cohort 1) and in SY 2007-08 (cohort 2). The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 1. The FY 2008 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 2. The FY 2006 target for cohort 1 is baseline plus 1 percent.

ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.366A - Mathematics and Science Partnership program

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

Objective 1 of 2: *To increase the number of highly qualified mathematics and science teachers in schools participating in Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) programs.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in MSP schools: The number or percentage of elementary certified teachers who significantly increase their knowledge of mathematics and science.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of K-5 teachers in MSP schools who significantly increase their knowledge of mathematics and science.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Project Annual Reports

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Explanation: The 2004 target was to establish baseline, but FY 2004 data were unavailable. Therefore, the FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 20 percent.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in MSP schools: The percentage of mathematics and science middle and high school teachers who are not highly qualified upon beginning participation in the program who become highly qualified upon completion of the program.

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: The percentage of highly qualified middle school (grades six through eight) teachers.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: The percentage of highly qualified high school (grades nine through twelve) teachers.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Program Evaluation. Individual annual reports from Partnership projects.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was to establish the baseline, but FY 2004 data were unavailable. Therefore, the FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 20 percent.

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

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Student achievement in MSP classrooms: The percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced on state mathematics assessments.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of students in MSP classrooms scoring at proficient or advanced in mathematics.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Program Annual reports

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was to establish the baseline, but FY 2004 data were unavailable. Therefore, the FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 performance target is to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Student achievement in MSP schools: The percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced on state science assessments.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of students in MSP schools scoring at proficient or advanced levels in science.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Program annual reports

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 performance target is to maintain the baseline.

ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.011 - Migrant Education State Grant Program

Program Goal: To assist all migrant students in meeting challenging academic standards and achieving graduation from high school (or a GED program) with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.

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

Indicator 1.1 of 6: Meeting or exceeding state performance standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the elementary school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in reading.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of states meeting an annually set performance target in reading at the elementary level for migrant students.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	States meeting target	States that reported results	States meeting target	States that reported results
1996	4	10		
1997	4	15		
1998	7	18		
1999	2	19		
2000	5	26		
2001	6	23		
2002	8	29	8	27
2003	15	43	10	32
2004			14	36
2005			16	38
2006			18	40

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Limitations: Information that directly measures the impact of the Title I, Migrant Education Program is not

available. However, each state has its own assessment to measure and determine student proficiency. Student achievement across the states cannot be compared directly, but the results for migrant students can be tracked over time, providing the state proficiency levels and assessments' content remain consistent and the disaggregation of assessment data by subgroup is accurate.

Improvements: It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability over time as state assessment systems stabilize, include all migrant students in testing, and properly dissaggregate and report results.

Explanation: The annually set state target for 2003 through 2006 is 50 percent or more of migrant students at the proficient or advanced level. Once 80 percent of all states have met the performance target of 50 percent of migrant students at or above the proficient level, the performance target will be raised in increments of 5 percent.

Indicator 1.2 of 6: Meeting or exceeding state performance standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the middle school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in reading.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of states meeting an annually set performance target in reading for middle school migrant students.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	States meeting target	States that reported results	States meeting target	States that reported results
1996	2	10		
1997	3	15		
1998	6	18		
1999	4	18		
2000	2	23		
2001	7	21		
2002	6	27	9	25
2003	9	45	11	29
2004			15	32
2005			17	34
2006			19	36

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Limitations: Information that directly measures the impact of the Title I, Migrant Education Program is not available. However, each state has its own assessment to measure and determine student proficiency. Student achievement across the states cannot be compared directly, but the results for migrant students can be tracked over time, providing the state proficiency levels and assessments' content remain consistent and the disaggregation of assessment data by subgroup is accurate.

Improvements: It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability over time as state assessment systems stabilize, include all migrant students in testing, and properly dissaggregate and report results.

Explanation: The annually set state target for 2002 through 2006 is 50 percent or more of migrant students at the proficient or advanced level. Once 80 percent of all states have met the performance target of 50 percent of migrant students at or above the proficient level, the performance target will be raised in increments of 5 percent.

Indicator 1.3 of 6: Meeting or exceeding state performance standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the elementary school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in mathematics.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The number of states meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics for elementary school migrant students.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	States meeting target	States that reported results	States meeting target	States that reported results
1996	4	10		
1997	5	15		
1998	9	18		
1999	6	19		
2000	7	25		
2001	10	23		
2002	6	29	12	27
2003	21	44	14	32
2004			18	36
2005			20	38
2006			22	40

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Limitations: Information that directly measures the impact of the Title I, Migrant Education Program is not available. However, each state has its own assessment to measure and determine student proficiency. Student achievement across the states cannot be compared directly, but the results for migrant students can be tracked over time, providing the state proficiency levels and assessments' content remain consistent and the disaggregation of assessment data by subgroup is accurate.

Improvements: It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability over time as state assessment systems stabilize, include all migrant students in testing, and properly dissaggregate and report results.

Explanation: The annually set state target for 2002 through 2006 is 50 percent or more of migrant students at

the proficient or advanced level. Once 80 percent of all states have met the performance target of 50 percent of migrant students at or above the proficient level, the performance target will be raised in increments of 5 percent.

Indicator 1.4 of 6: Meeting or exceeding state performance standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the middle school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in mathematics.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The number of states meeting an annually set performance target in mathematics for middle school migrant students.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	States meeting target	States that reported results	States meeting target	States that reported results
1996	3	10		
1997	3	15		
1998	7	18		
1999	4	18		
2000	2	22		
2001	4	20		
2002	4	27	6	24
2003	8	45	8	28
2004			12	32
2005			14	34
2006			16	36

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Limitations: Information that directly measures the impact of the Title I, Migrant Education Program is not available. However, each state has its own assessment to measure and determine student proficiency. Student achievement across the states cannot be compared directly, but the results for migrant students can be tracked over time, providing the state proficiency levels and assessments' content remain consistent and the disaggregation of assessment data by subgroup is accurate.

Improvements: It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability over time as state assessment systems stabilize, include all migrant students in testing, and properly dissaggregate and report results.

Explanation: The annually set state target for 2002 through 2006 is 50 percent or more of migrant students at the proficient or advanced level. Once 80 percent of all states have met the performance target of 50 percent of migrant students at or above the proficient level, the performance target will be raised in increments of 5 percent.

Indicator 1.5 of 6: Reducing dropout rate: More states have a decreasing percentage of migrant students who drop out from secondary school (grades 7 - 12).

Measure 1.5.1 of 1: The number of states meeting an annually set performance target for dropout rate for migrant students.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	States meeting targets	States that reported results	States meeting targets	States that reported results
2004			999	999
2005			999	999
2006			999	999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Limitations: There are several limitations in collecting and using student dropout data. First, a number of states do not have data collection and reporting systems in place to accurately calculate and disaggegrate student dropout rates for each of the required subgroups. Second, for those states reporting dropout data, there remain significant variations in the definition and calculation of a dropout rate (e.g., rates based on the number of enrolled students who drop out in the 12th grade of high school versus the number of students who were enrolled in the ninth grade of high school and dropped out of school in either the 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade).

Improvements: The Department is working with the states to improve and standardize the definition and calculation of student dropout rates.

Explanation: The annually set state target for 2004 through 2006 is 50 percent or more of migrant students at the proficient or advanced level. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline for the number of states that meet the 50 percent threshold. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%. The target for FY 2006 is baseline plus 2%.

Indicator 1.6 of 6: Achieving high school graduation: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will graduate from high school.

Measure 1.6.1 of 1: The number of states meeting an annually set performance target for high school graduation of migrant students.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	States meeting targets	States that reported results	States meeting targets	States that reported results
2004			999	999
2005			999	999
2006			999	999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Limitations: There are several limitations in collecting and using graduation rate data. First, a number of states do not have data collection and reporting systems in place to accurately calculate and disaggegrate student graduation rates for each of the required subgroups. Second, for those states reporting graduation rate data, there remain significant variations in the the definition and calculation of a graduation rate (e.g., rates based on the number of enrolled students in the 12th grade who graduate from high school versus the number of students who were enrolled in the ninth grade of high school and graduated from high school four years later.

Improvements: The Department is working with the states to improve and standardize the definition and calculation of graduation rates.

Explanation: The annually set state target for 2004 through 2006 is 50 percent or more of migrant students at the proficient or advanced level. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline for the number of states that meet the 50 percent threshold. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1%. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 2%.

ESEA: National Writing Project - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.928 - National Writing Project (OII)

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

Objective 1 of 1: *To support and promote the establishment of teacher training programs designed to improve the writing skills of students and teachers.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Students taught by National Writing Project (NWP) teachers will show improved student writing skills.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: The percentage of students of NWP trained teachers who achieve effectiveness in major areas of writing competence such as persuasive and rhetorical.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: The percentage of students of NWP trained teachers who demonstrate clear control of the writing conventions of usage, mechanics and spelling.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Academy for Educational Development-derived tests; the NAEP Test of Writing.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Limitations: NWP sites measure effectiveness using different instruments, so data are difficult to aggregate.

Explanation: The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. However, no data were available for FY 2003-2004. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1 percent.

ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program - FY 2006

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

Program Goal: To ensure that neglected and delinquent children and youth will have the opportunity to meet the challenging state standards needed to further their education and become productive members of society.

Objective 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 1.1 of 3: Progress and achievement: The percentage of neglected or delinquent students obtaining a secondary school diploma, or its recognized equivalent, will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of neglected or delinquent students obtaining a diploma or diploma equivalent.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	8	999
2004		8.40
2005		8.80
2006		8.80

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Limitations: Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.

Explanation: The FY 2003 target was to establish a baseline. No data were collected in FY 2004. For FY 2006, the measure was slightly modified by deleting the phrase "obtain employment."

Indicator 1.2 of 3: High school course credits: The percentage of high school course credits earned by neglected or delinquent students will increase.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of neglected or delinquent students earning high school course credits.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: OESE State Consolidated Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Academic skills: Neglected or delinquent students shall have the same opportunities to learn as students served in regular classrooms. The academic skills of neglected or delinquent students served will increase, closing this gap.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of Neglected or Delinquent students who improve academic skills as measured on approved and validated measures.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Limitations: Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.

ESEA: Parental Information and Resource Centers - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.310A - Parental Assistance and Local Family Information Centers

Program Goal: To increase information and options for parents.

Objective 1 of 1: *Federally funded PIRC programs provide parents of children attending schools that are not making adequate yearly progress with the information they need to understand their state accountability systems and their rights and opportunities for supplemental services and public school choice.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The number of parents of children attending schools who are not making adequate yearly progress, who are participating in PIRC activities designed to provide them with the information necessary to understand their state accountability systems and the rights and opportunities for supplemental services and public school choice afforded to their children under section 1116 of the ESEA.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of parents of children in the Parent Information and Resource Centers (PIRC) program's target population, who receive information on their state accountability systems, rights and opportunities for supplemental services, and public school choice options.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003		999
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Parent Information Resource Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Data are self-reported.

Explanation: Performance reporting requirements for the PIRC program are being revised to incorporate the collection of information needed to respond to this indicator. The target for FY 2003 was to establish a baseline, but data were not collected. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 5%. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 10%.

ESEA: Reading First State Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.357 - Reading First State Grants

Program Goal: To improve kindergarten through third grade student achievement in reading by supporting state and local educational agencies in establishing reading programs that are based on scientifically based reading research.

Objective 1 of 1: *To increase the percentage of students that learn to read proficiently by the end of third grade.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Reading achievement in Reading First schools: Increased percentages of grade one through three students will read at grade level or above in schools participating in Reading First programs, as measured by meeting or exceeding the proficient level in reading on Reading First outcomes of fluency.

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: The percentage of grade 1 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency in reading on Reading First outcome measures of fluency.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Grade 1	Grade 1
2004	43	
2006		45

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: The percentage of grade 3 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency in reading on Reading First outcome measures of fluency.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Grade 3	Grade 3
2004	36	
2006		38

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: The percentage of grade 2 students in Reading First schools that meet or exceed proficiency in reading on Reading First outcome measures of fluency.										
Year	**Actual Performance**					**Performance Targets**				
	Economically Disadvantaged	LEP	African American	Hispanic	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged	LEP	African American	Hispanic	Students with Disabilities
2004	33	27	34	30	17					
2006						35	29	36	32	19

Source: Contractor Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The 2004 data established the baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Reading achievement in Reading First schools: Number of States showing an increase in the percentage of grade one through three students who read at grade level or above in schools participating in Reading First programs, as measured by meeting or exceeding proficiency in reading on Reading First outcomes of comprehension.

Measure 1.2.1 of 3: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of grade 1 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency on Reading First measures of reading comprehension.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Grade 1	Grade 1
2004	2	
2006		5

Measure 1.2.2 of 3: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of grade 3 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency on Reading First measures of reading comprehension.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Grade 3	Grade 3
2004	7	
2006		12

Measure 1.2.3 of 3: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of grade 2 students in Reading First schools who meet or exceed proficiency on Reading First measures of reading comprehension.										
Year	**Actual Performance**					**Performance Targets**				
	Economically Disadvantaged	LEP	African American	Hispanic	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged	LEP	African American	Hispanic	Students with Disabilities
2004	4	5	5	5	2					
2006						7	10	10	10	5

Source: Reading First Annual Performance Report. Recipients of Reading First grants, as required by statute, will submit Annual Performance Reports on reading results for students in grades one, two, and three.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2006

Explanation: The 2004 data established the baseline.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Reading achievement in Reading First Schools: Increased percentages of third grade students who will read at grade level or above in schools participating in Reading First programs, as measured by meeting or exceeding the proficient level in reading on state assessments in reading.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of grade 3 students who score at or above proficient on state assessments in reading.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Grade 3	Grade 3
2004	9	
2006		15

Source: Reading First Annual Performance Report. Recipients of Reading First grants, as required by statute, will submit Annual Performance Reports on reading results for students in grades one, two, and three.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2006

Explanation: The FY 2004 data established the baseline.

ESEA: Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution - FY 2006

Program Goal: To motivate low-income children to read.

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

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Reading is Fundamental (RIF) will provide books and scientifically based reading services to low-income children at risk of educational failure due to delays in reading.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of low-income children who receive books and reading services through the Reading is Fundamental Program.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	3,713,541	999
2004	3,704,383	3,899,218
2005	3,626,846	4,089,895
2006		3,759,960

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Inexpensive Book Distribution/Reading Is Fundamental Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2007

Explanation: The program has had an across the board decrease in funding of .15 percent since the original baseline target was established in FY 2003. In addition, the costs of books have substantially increased. Thus, the grantee can only start a small number of new programs. As a result, this decreases the possibility that the grantee can continue to raise the percentage of students served since there will be too few new programs to substantially impact the book distribution.

ESEA: Ready to Teach - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.286 - Ready to Teach

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

Objective 1 of 1: *To improve the quality of digital professional development and classroom content developed through the Ready to Teach program.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: The percentage of Ready to Teach products deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substanive content of the products will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Ready to Teach products deemed to be of high quality.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Researcher and expert panel review.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2007

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. RTT grantees will be in year one of new multi-year awards.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: The percentage of Digital Educational Programming products deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substanive content of the products will increase.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of Digital Educational Programming products deemed to be of high quality.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Researcher and expert panel review.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2007

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. RTT grantees will be in year one of new multi-year awards.

ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.295 - Ready-To-Learn Television

Program Goal: The Ready to Learn television program will enhance the learning strategies of preschool and early elementary school children.

Objective 1 of 2: *Develop, produce, and distribute high-quality televised educational programming for preschool and elementary school children.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The percentage of RTL children's television programming deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of RTL children's television programming deemed to be of high quality.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Researcher and expert panel review of a sample of Ready-To-Learn programming content.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2007

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. In FY 2006, all Ready To Learn grantees will be in year one of new multi-year awards.

Objective 2 of 2: *Develop and implement high quality targeted outreach strategies (including Ready To Learn products and services).*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: The percentage of RTL targeted outreach products and services deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Ready-To-Learn targeted outreach products and services deemed to be of high quality.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Researcher and expert panel review of a sample of Ready To Learn targeted outreach products and services.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2007

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. In FY 2006, all RTL grantees will be in year one of new multi-year awards.

ESEA: Rural Education - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.358A - Small, Rural School Achievement Program
84.358B - Rural Education Achievement Program

Program Goal: Raise educational achievement of students in small, rural school districts.

Objective 1 of 3: *Local educational agencies (LEAs) participating in the Small Rural Schools Achievement (SRSA) Program, will make adequate yearly progress after the third year.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Adequate yearly progress: Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of SRSA participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress after three years.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report, State Report Card, Evaluation Survey, NCES and ED Facts

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1 percent.

Objective 2 of 3: *Local educational agencies (LEAs) participating in the Rural and Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program, will make adequate yearly progress after the third year.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Adequate yearly progress: Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of RLIS participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress after three years.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report, State Report Card, Evaluation Survey, NCES and ED Facts

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1 percent.

Objective 3 of 3: *Eligible rural school districts will use the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Use of the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority will remain high, if not increase.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of eligible school districts utilizing the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	61	999
2004	59	71
2005		65
2006		65

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report, grantee submissions.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Explanation: The FY 2003 data were used to establish a baseline. Only districts eligible for the Small Rural Schools Achievement (SRSA) Program are eligible to utilize the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.

ESEA: School Dropout Prevention - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.360 - Dropout Prevention Programs

Program Goal: To support effective, sustainable and coordinated school dropout prevention and reentry programs in high schools.

Objective 1 of 4: *Support effective programs designed to prevent at-risk students from dropping out of high school.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The annual dropout rate of at-risk students who entered the Dropout Prevention will decrease.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The dropout rate of at-risk students who entered the Dropout Prevention Program.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		16

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Dropout Prevention Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Data are self-reported by grantee through a Performance Report.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for SEA level data, which is the result of a change in the focus of the program. The dropout rate is an average of the twenty-four grantees as reported in their initial applications. The grantees use the NCES definition for dropout rates. The performance targets for dropout rates are based on data from the first cohort of grantees.

Objective 2 of 4: *Support effective programs that identify youth who have dropped out of school and encourage them to reenter school and complete their secondary education.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: The percentage of Students reentering schools who complete their secondary education will increase.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of students who reentered school and completed their secondary education.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		5

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Dropout Prevention Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Data are self-reported by grantee through a Performance Report.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for SEA level data, which is the result of a change in the focus of the program. The dropout rate is an average of the twenty-four grantees as reported in their initial applications. The grantees use the NCES definition for dropout rates. The performance targets for dropout rates are based on data from the first cohort of grantees.

Objective 3 of 4: *Support statewide school dropout prevention programs, collaborations with other agencies, and individual performance plans for at-risk incoming ninth grade students*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: The annual State event dropout rate will decrease

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The state event dropout rate of SEA's.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Data are self-reported

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 4 of 4: *Support effective programs that identify youth who have dropped out of school and encourage them to reenter school and complete their secondary education.*

Indicator 4.1 of 1: The percentage of students reentering schools who complete their secondary education will increase.

Measure 4.1.1 of 1: The percentage of students reentering schools who complete their secondary education.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Limitations: Data are self-reported.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

ESEA: School Leadership - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.363A - School Leadership Program

Program Goal: To increase the number of new, certified principals and assistant principals, and to improve the skills of current practicing principals and assistant principals, all serving in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.

Objective 1 of 2: *To recruit, prepare, and support teachers and individuals from other fields to become principals including assistant principals in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The percentage of new participants recruited and trained to become qualified assistant principals and principals to serve in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: The percentage of those enrolled in the School Leadership Program who become certified as principals and assistant principals.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
2004	28			
2006				999
2007				999
2008				999

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: The percentage of School Leadership program completers earning certification as a principal or assistant principal who are employed in those positions in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
2004	38			
2006				999
2007				999
2008				999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, School Leadership Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2007

Limitations: Each grantee uses its own method of recording and reporting data and inconsistencies exist.

Explanation: These data are reported by cohorts depending on the project year. Each grant is for three years. Twenty grants were awarded for cohort 1 in FY 2002 and data were collected in project years 2004 and 2005. 26 grants were awarded for cohort 2 in FY 2005. For Cohort 2, data will be collected in project years 2006,

2007, and 2008. For cohort 1, the FY 2004 data established the baseline and project year 2005 will be the final year of data. For cohort 2, the project year 2006 target is to establish a baseline, and the target for project year 2007 is baseline plus one percent. The target for project year 2008 is baseline plus 2 percent.

Objective 2 of 2: *To provide professional development, coaching, and mentoring and other support activities to current practicing principals and assistant principals in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: The percentage of current practicing principals and assistant principals serving in high-need schools in high need LEAs who participate in a structured, job embedded program of professional development that included mentoring, coaching, and support activities.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of School Leadership participating principals and assistant principals in structured professional development.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
2004	60			
2006				999
2007				999
2008				999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, School Leadership Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2007

Explanation: These data are reported by cohorts depending on the project year. Each grant is for three years. Twenty grants were awarded for cohort 1 in FY 2002 and data were collected in project years 2004 and 2005. 26 grants were awarded for cohort 2 in FY 2005. Data will be collected in project years 2006, 2007, and 2008. For cohort 1, the project year 2004 data established the baseline and project year 2005 will be the final year of data. For cohort 2, the project year 2006 project year target is to establish a baseline, the target for 2007 project year is baseline plus one percent, and for the 2008 project year the target is one percent over the previous year's target.

ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.215L - FIE/Smaller Learning Communities

Program Goal: To assist high schools to create smaller learning communities that can prepare all students to achieve to challenging standards and succeed in college and careers.

Objective 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 1.1 of 4: Academic achievement: Increasing percentages of students in high schools, receiving Smaller Learning Community grants, will score at or above the basic and proficient levels on state and local reading and math assessments.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of students scoring at or above basic and proficient levels on state and local reading and math assessments.				
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	66.70	57.10		
2003	54.90	50.45	66.70	58.10
2004	54	48	70	60
2005			74	63
2006			78	63

Source: Contractor Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2007

Explanation: FY 2001 data established the baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 4: Graduation: The percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants who will graduate from high school will increase.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of students in high schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants who graduate from high school (based on 9th grade enrollment).		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	59.20	

2003	56.60	60.20
2004	83	63
2005		66
2006		69

Source: Contractor Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2006

Explanation: FY 2001 data established the baseline.

Indicator 1.3 of 4: Postsecondary Transition: The percentage of graduates who enroll in postsecondary education, apprenticeships, or advanced training for the semester following graduation will increase.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of graduates who enroll in postsecondary education, apprenticeships, or advanced training for the semester following graduation.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Contractor Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2006

Explanation: This measure is new for FY 2006. FY 2005 data will establish the baseline. The FY 2006 target maintains the baseline.

Indicator 1.4 of 4: Postsecondary Transition: The percentage of graduates, in schools receiving Smaller Learning Community grants, who are employed by the end of the first quarter after they graduate will increase.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The percentage of graduates who are employed by the end of the first quarter after they graduate.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Contractor Performance Report, Performance report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2006

Explanation: This measure is new for FY 2006. FY 2005 data will be used to establish the baseline. FY 2006 targets will maintain the baseline.

ESEA: Special Programs for Indian Children - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.299A - Indian Education Special Programs for Indian Children
84.299B - Indian Education--Professional Development Grants

Program Goal: To improve the educational opportunities and achievement of preschool, elementary, and secondary school Indian children by developing, testing, and demonstrating effective services and programs.

Objective 1 of 2: *Discretionary programs will focus on improving educational opportunities and services for American Indian and Alaska Native children and adults.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Increasing percentages of the teacher and principal workforces serving American Indian and Alaska Native students will themselves be American Indian and Alaskan Native.

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: The percentage of program participants who become principals/vice principals/school administrators of schools with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		20
2007		20

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: The percentage of program participants who become teachers in schools with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		23
2007		23

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: The percentage of program participants who receive full state licensure.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		75
2007		75

Source: Office of Indian Education Project Performance Reports: Schools and Staffing Survey 1999; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools (1998-99 and 2000-01).

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.

Limitations: Sample size is small and it is costly to add supplemental samples to data collection programs.

National sample results in an under-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 Report.

Explanation: Targets for FY 2007 may be revised once actual data for FY 2005 are obtained.

Objective 2 of 2: *Discretionary programs will focus on improving educational opportunities and services for Indian children and adults.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Increasing percentages of preschool American Indian and Alaska Native students will possess school readiness skills gained through a scientifically based research designed curriculum that prepares them for kindergarten.

Measure 2.1.1 of 3: The percentage of 3- to 4-year-old American Indian and Alaska Native children achieving educationally significant gains on a measure of language and communication development based on curriculum benchmarks.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		46
2006		46

Measure 2.1.2 of 3: The percentage of 3- to 4-year-old American Indian and Alaska Native children achieving educationally significant gains on prescribed measure of cognitive skills and conceptual knowledge, including mathematics, science and early reading based on curriculum benchmarks.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		46
2006		46

Measure 2.1.3 of 3: The percentage of 3- to 4-year-old American Indian and Alaska Native children achieving educationally significant gains on prescribed measure of social development that facilitates self-regulation of attention, behavior and emotion based on curriculum benchmarks.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		46
2006		46

Source: Office of Indian Education Project Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006
Office of Indian Education performance report data supplied by grantees.

Limitations: Substantial variation will exist in curriculum benchmarks and assessments.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native high school graduates will increase competency and skills in challenging subject matters, including mathematics and science, to enable successful transition to postsecondary education.

Measure 2.2.1 of 2: The percentage of high school American Indian and Alaska Native students successfully completing (as defined by a passing grade) challenging core courses. Core subjects include English, mathematics, science and social studies.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		46
2006		46

Measure 2.2.2 of 2: The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students participating in the program that have college assessment scores (ACT, SAT, PSAT) as high or higher than the district average.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		46
2006		46

Source: Project Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006
Office of Indian Education performance report data are supplied by grantees.

Limitations: Substantial variation may exist in methods used to assess student performance.

Explanation: Data collection for this new program began in FY 2004.

ESEA: Star Schools Program - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.203 - Star Schools

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

Objective 1 of 1: *To improve the quality of technology-based applications in core academic subjects developed through the Star Schools program.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The percentage of Star Schools technology-based applications in core academic subjects deemed to be of high-quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts and individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Star Schools technology-based applications in core academic subjects deemed to be of high quality.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Researcher and expert panel review

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2007

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: In FY 2006, most Star Schools grantees will be in year one of new multi-year awards. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

ESEA: State Assessments - FY 2006

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

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

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

Indicator 1.1 of 6: Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades three through eight and in high schools in reading/language arts that align with the state's academic content standards.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of states (including DC and PR) that have reading/language arts assessments in grades three through eight and high school.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	0	999
2005	0	18
2006		52

Source: Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: Each state has developed a schedule by which its reading/language arts assessments for grades 3-8 and high school will be developed and field tested, and submitted to the Department for review and approval, prior to implementation. The Department developed the Standards and Assessment External Review process to review and approve the state assessments and conducted its first peer review in early 2005. States are required to have their reading/language arts assessments in place by SY 2005-06. The 2006 performance target of 52 reflects the compliance of the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

Indicator 1.2 of 6: Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades three through eight and in high schools in mathematics that align with the state's academic content standards.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of states (including DC and PR) that have mathematics assessments in grades three through eight and high school

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	0	999
2005	0	18
2006		52

Source: Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: Each state has developed a schedule by which its mathematics assessments for grades 3-8 and high school will be developed and field tested, and submitted to the Department for review and approval, prior to implementation. The Department developed the Standards and Assessment External Peer Review process to review and approve the state assessments and conducted its first peer review in early 2005. States are required to have their mathematics assessments in place by SY 2005-06. The 2006 performance target of 52 reflects the compliance of the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

Indicator 1.3 of 6: Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (three through five, six through eight and high school) in science that align with the state's academic content standards.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The number of states (including DC and PR) that have science assessments in each grade span (grades three through five, six through eight and high school).		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	0	999
2005	0	18
2006		15
2007		25
2008		52

Source: Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: Each state has developed a schedule by which its science assessments in each grade spans (3-5, 6-8, and high school) will be developed and field tested, and submitted to the Department for review and approval, prior to implementation. The Department developed the Standards and Assessment External Review process to review and approve the state assessments. No state submitted their science assessments for review in 2004 or 2005. States are required to have their science assessments in place by SY 2007-08. The 2008 performance target of 52 reflects the compliance of the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

Indicator 1.4 of 6: Field testing reading: States' field testing assessments in reading/language arts.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The number of states that have completed field testing of the required assessments in reading/language arts.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	16	
2004	20	
2005	47	30
2006		52

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports and state Web sites

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: Field testing is a prerequisite for implementation of new assessments.

Indicator 1.5 of 6: Field testing mathematics: States' field testing assessments in mathematics.

Measure 1.5.1 of 1: The number of states that have completed field testing of the required assessments in mathematics.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	16	
2004	20	
2005	47	30
2006		52

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports and state Web sites

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: Field testing is a prerequisite for implementation of new assessments.

Indicator 1.6 of 6: Field Testing Science: States field testing assessments in science

Measure 1.6.1 of 1: The number of states that have completed field testing of the required assessments in science.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	18	

2004	19	
2005	24	
2006		20
2007		52
2008		52

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports and State Web Sites.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: Field testing is a prerequisite for implementation of new assessments.

ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.298 - Innovative Education Program Strategies

Program Goal: To support state and local programs that are a continuing source of innovation and educational improvement.

Objective 1 of 2: *To encourage states to use flexibility authorities in ways that will increase student achievement.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Improved student achievement: School districts that direct Title V funds to activities designated as strategic priorities by the U.S. Department of Education will be more likely to achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP) than those that use funds for all other activities. Strategic priorities include (1) those that support student achievement, enhance reading and math, (2) those that improve the quality of teachers, (3) those that ensure that schools are safe and drug free, (4) and those that promote access for all students.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of LEAs meeting AYP.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Of districts targeting Title V funds, the percent achieving AYP	Of districts not targeting Title V funds, the percent achieving AYP	Of districts targeting Title V funds, the percent achieving AYP	Of districts not targeting Title V funds, the percent achieving AYP
2003	65	55	65	55
2004			68	58
2005			69	59
2006			70	60

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

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 performance targets are increased by 1%.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Improved student achievement: The percentage of funds that districts use for the four strategic priorities combined will increase. The four strategic priorities are: (1) support student achievement, enhance reading and math; (2) improve the quality of teachers; (3) ensure that schools are safe and drug free; and (4) promote access for all students.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of combined funds that districts use for the four strategic priorities.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2006		999

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report; Title V Monitoring

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: The performance target for FY 2006 is to establish the baseline.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Improved student achievement: The percentage of LEAs that complete a credible needs assessment will increase.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of LEAs that complete a credible needs assessment .		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Program monitoring; Site visits.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: The performance target for FY 2006 is to establish the baseline.

Objective 2 of 2: *Improve the operational efficiency of the program.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Program Efficiency: A decrease in the number of days it takes the Department of Education to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring visits (both on-site and virtual).

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The number of days it takes the Department of Education to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring visits (both on-site and virtual).		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Program office records

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Program Efficiency: A decrease in the number of days it takes States to respond satisfactorily to findings in their monitoring reports.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The number of days it takes States to respond satisfactorily to findings in their monitoring reports.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2006		999

Source: Program office records

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline.

ESEA: Teaching American History - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.215X - Teaching of Traditional American History

Program Goal: To improve student achievement by providing high-quality professional development to elementary and secondary-level teachers of American history.

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

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Students in experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational effectiveness in the Teaching of Traditional American History projects will demonstrate higher achievement on course content measures and/or statewide U.S. history assessments than students in control and comparison groups.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: (a) The percentage of students in studies of educational effectiveness who demonstrate higher achievement than those in control or comparison groups.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: (b) The percentage of school districts that demonstrate higher educational achievement for students in TAH classrooms than those in control or comparison groups.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Teaching American History Grantee Performance Report.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Explanation: (a) The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1 percent; the FY 2006 target is to maintain the FY 2005 target. (b) The FY 2004 data will establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1 percent. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the FY 2005 target.

ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies - FY 2006

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

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

Objective 1 of 2: *The performance of low-income students will increase substantially in reading and mathematics.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Fourth-grade reading proficiency: The number of states administering fourth-grade reading assessments that report an increase in the percentage of low-income students who perform at either proficient or advanced performance levels will increase annually.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade low-income students meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in reading on state assessments.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	25	
2005		25
2006		25

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: SY 2002-03 was the first year for which states were required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report. Actual performance data for FY 2005 will be obtained by comparing SY 2004-05 data to 2003-04 data. Actual performance data for FY 2006 will be obtained by comparing SY 2005-06 to 2004-05 data.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Eighth-grade mathematics proficiency: The number of states administering eighth-grade mathematics assessments that report an increase in the percentage of low-income students who perform at either the proficient or advanced performance levels will increase annually.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade low-income students meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in mathematics on state assessments.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2004	31	
2005		25
2006		25

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: SY 2002-03 was the first year for which states were required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report. Actual performance data for FY 2005 will be obtained by comparing SY 2004-05 data to 2003-04 data. Actual performance data for FY 2006 will be obtained by comparing SY 2005-06 data to 2004-05 data.

Objective 2 of 2: *Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Status*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Making AYP: The number of states that report an increase in schools making AYP.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of schools making AYP.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		10
2006		20

Source: Consolidated State Performance Report; PBDMI

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: School year 2002-2003 was the first year for which states were required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report. Actual performance data for FY 2005 will be obtained by comparing school year 2004-2005 data to school year 2003-2004 data. Actual performance data for FY 2006 will be obtained by comparing SY 2005-06 data to 2004-05 data.

ESEA: Transition To Teaching - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.350 - Transition to Teaching

Program Goal: To increase the number of mid-career professionals, qualified paraprofessionals, and recent college graduates who become highly qualified teachers in high-need schools in high-need LEAs and teach for at least three years.

Objective 1 of 1: *Recruit, prepare, and retain highly qualified teachers in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The percentage of new, highly qualified Transition to Teaching teachers who teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for at least three years.

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: a) The percentage of all Transition to Teaching (TTT) participants who become teachers of record in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	2002 Grant	2004 Grant	2002 Grant	2004 Grant
2003	27			
2004	41		60	
2005	45	18	70	
2006			55	40
2007			75	45
2008				55
2009				75

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: (b) The percentage of Transition to Teaching (TTT) participants receiving certification/licensure within three years.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	2002 Grant	2004 Grant	2002 Grant	2004 Grant
2005	18	10		
2006			40	15
2007			65	25
2008				40
2009				65

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: (c) The percentage of Transition to Teaching (TTT) teachers of record who teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for at least three years.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	2002 Grant	2004 Grant	2002 Grant	2004 Grant
2006			999	
2007			999	
2008				999
2009				999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Transition to Teaching Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Limitations: In 2005, the Transition to Teaching Program piloted a uniform reporting system that improved data consistency but which required outside contractors to manage. In 2006 the program is likely to use the Department's standard performance reporting form. This form has been piloted with 2002 grantees for a different purpose. While the new form is an improvement over the previous year's performance reporting form that relied entirely on narrative formats, the new form requires very specific directions to ensure reporting consistency across grantees.

Improvements: The use of the on-line uniform reporting system, created by AIR provided agreed upon definitions of key terms and should improve consistency across grantees as a result.

Explanation: (a) FY 2003 established baseline. Actual values have been updated to reflect standardized definitions. Some TTT participants begin teaching immediately as part of training. Language clarified to "teachers of record," now a standard definition for TTT, meaning the participant has primary instructional responsibility. "Highly qualified" was removed, as all TTT participants are HQT according to the No Child Left Behind Act as enrollees in an alternative route to certification program. Calculation is the cumulative number of teachers of record in high-need schools/LEAs over total number of TTT participants. (b) This refines previous 8.1.2 by adding a three-year timeframe to reflect expectation of expedited processes. Calculation will be cumulative number receiving certification over total number of participants. (c) Calculation will be cumulative number of teachers of record staying at least three years over total number of teachers of record. FY 2006 target is to establish baseline for 2002 grantees. FY 2007 target is baseline plus 1 percent for 2002 grantees. FY 2008 target is to establish baseline for 2004 grantees. FY 2009 target is baseline plus 1 percent for 2004 grantees.

ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.815 - Troops to Teachers

Program Goal: To increase the number of military personnel or qualified participants in a reserve component who become highly qualified teachers in high-need LEAs.

Objective 1 of 1: *To provide schools in high-need LEAs with highly qualified teachers who are former military or reserve component personnel.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Recruitment: Recruit and retain highly qualified teachers in high-need LEAs.

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: (a) The percentage of troops participants who become teachers of record in high-need LEAs.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	71	
2004	76	
2005		75
2006		75
2007		75

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: (b) The percentage of troops participants who become mathematics or science or special education teachers.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	44	
2004	45	
2006		49
2007		50

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: (c) The percentage of troops participants who remain in teaching for three or more years after placement in a teaching position in a high-need LEA.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		80
2006		80

2007		80

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Troops to Teachers Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: "Participants" are those receiving financial support from the Troops-to-Teachers program, either stipend or bonus. Both participants and recruits receive funding from the program and the words are used interchangeably. "Eligible school district " is a high-need LEA as defined by program regulations. "Teachers of record" are those Troops participants hired by an eligible school district, and all Troops teachers are highly qualified. Measure (a): the calculation is the total number of highly qualified Troops teachers since Jan. 2002 divided by the total number of Troops participants since Jan. 2002. Measure (b): the total number of math or science or special education Troops teachers since Jan. 2002 divided by the total number of Troops participants since Jan. 2002. Measure (b) includes special education teachers in order to track priority subject areas in the NCLB statute. For FY 2006, measure (c) will report on Troops participants who began teaching in the 2003-04 school year, for 2007 those who began teaching in 2004-05; for 2008 those who began teaching in 2005-06. The FY 2005 data were not collected. The goal is to maintain the same percentage of retention over the years.

ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.361 - Voluntary Public School Choice

Program Goal: To assist states and local school districts in creating, expanding, and implementing a public school choice program.

Objective 1 of 1: *The Voluntary Public School Choice Program increases options for public school choice.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The number and percentage of families who exercise public school choices will increase annually.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: (a) The number of students who have the option of attending participating VPSC schools selected by their parents.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	755,387	
2005	862,396	849,864
2006		846,523
2007		843,384

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: (b) The percentage of students participating at each VPSC site who exercise school choice by changing schools.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	1	
2005	1.90	
2006		2
2007		2.50

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Voluntary Public School Choice Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: (a) The measure is the total number of all students eligible to apply for transfers. In some instances, grantees may not have slots available for all students applying for a transfer. The performance target is the estimated number of participating students when projects are fully implemented, excluding Florida for which no estimate was possible. (b) The calculation is the total number of students who changed schools divided by the total number of eligible students for the VPSC program across the 13 grantees. This approach is consistent with the national evaluation of this program. This measure replaces a previous similar measure that was based on an average of averages across sites. Trend data shown in the table reflect a re-calculation under the new definition. "School" refers to a day or residential school, as well as schools within a school, off-campus

learning and "alternative" programs. "Exercising choice" refers to students who moved from their assigned school to a school of their choice. The targets reflect anticipated full implementation but may decrease over time because of predicted declining enrollments in some grantee sites.

ESEA: Women's Educational Equity - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.083 - Women's Educational Equity Act Program

Program Goal: To promote gender equity in education in the United States.

Objective 1 of 1: *To ensure equal access to mathematics, science and computer science educational courses, programs and careers for women and girls.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Increase in the percentage of female students pursuing advanced courses in mathematics, sciences, and computer science.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: (a) The percentage of female students served by the Women's Educational Equity program enrolled in advanced mathematics and science courses (including computer science).		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: (b) The percentage of female students served by the Women's Educational Equity program who indicate increased knowledge of and intent to pursue career options in mathematics and the sciences (including computer science).		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Women's Educational Equity Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2007

Limitations: Data are self-reported by grantees.

Explanation: FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. For (a), the FY 2005 target is 5% more than the baseline and the FY 2006 target is 3% more than the 2005 target. For (b), the target for FY 2005 is 10% more than the baseline and the target for FY 2006 is 7% more than the 2005 target. Prior performance indicators represented selected data elements collected by WEEA Center in Boston only. Data from several WEEA projects has been delayed because much of the information is being collected as part of the project evaluation. Some projects only had summer participants which accounts for the delay in providing information.

ESRA: Comprehensive Centers - FY 2006

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

Objective 1 of 2: *Improve the quality of technical assistance.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: High quality: The percentage of products and services that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified stakeholders.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Comprehensive Centers' products and services that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified stakeholders.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999
2007		999
2008		999
2009		999
2010		999

Source: Reviews by independent review panel.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. This is a long-term measure with the following targets: 2007 baseline plus 1 percent, 2008 baseline plus 2 percent, 2009 baseline plus 3 percent, and 2010 baseline plus 4 percent.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: High relevance: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational practice by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of Comprehensive Centers' products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational practice by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999
2007		999

2008		999
2009		999
2010		999

Source: Reviews by independent review panel.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. This is a long-term measure with the following targets: 2007 baseline plus 1 percent, 2008 baseline plus 2 percent, 2009 baseline plus 3 percent, and 2010 baseline plus 4 percent.

Objective 2 of 2: *Technical assistance products and services will be used to improve results for children in the target areas.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Use: The percentage of technical assistance services that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified practioners.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of all Comprehensive Centers' technical assistance services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice by target audiences.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999
2007		999
2008		999
2009		999
2010		999

Source: Source information will be based upon a survey of target audiences.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY2006 target is to establish a baseline. This is a long-term measure with the following targets: 2007 baseline plus 1 percent, 2008 baseline plus 2 percent, 2009 baseline plus 3 percent, and 2010 baseline plus 4 percent.

HEA: High School Equivalency Program - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.141A - High School Equivalency Program

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

Objective 1 of 2: *An increasing percentage of HEP participants will receive their General Educational Development (GED) diploma.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Percent of High School Equivalency Program (HEP) participants will receive the GED.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of HEP participants receiving a GED.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1996	70	
1997	70	
1998	66	
1999	72	
2000	73	
2001	58	
2002	53	
2003	63	60
2004		60
2005		65
2006		66
2010		70

Source: HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Limitations: OME is working with grantees to provide detailed information within the annual performance reports.

Explanation: This is a long-term target. This measure differs from a similar FY 2005 performance measure in focusing on the percentage of participants who receive the GED, rather than complete the program and receive the GED, to more accurately reflect data collected from grantees.

Objective 2 of 2: *An increasing percentage of HEP participants in the GED will enter postsecondary education programs, career positions, or the military.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Post-GED placement: The percentage of HEP participants who earn the GED and enter postsecondary education programs, career positions, or the military will continue to be high, if not increase.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of HEP participants who earn the GED and enter postsecondary education programs, career positions, or the military.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

HEA: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders - FY 2006

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

Program Goal: Contribute to the reduction of recidivism by providing incarcerated youth offenders with educational services

Objective 1 of 1: *Improve the vocational and academic achievement of students served through State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Improved vocational and academic achievement: Completion of a degree or certificate by students participating in the program.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of students in the facility participating in the program completing a postsecondary education certificate, associate of arts or bachelor's degree during the program year.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	54.69	50
2003	44.12	50
2004	50	50
2005	23.50	50
2006		23.50
2007		25.50
2008		26.50
2009		27.50
2010		28.50

Source: Data is provided in periodic reports from grantees.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Data is based on continuous enrollment. Therefore, the current enrollment is being compared to the outcome of graduates, including individuals served in the prior year and those still enrolled at year end. This distorts the numbers when the program is either growing or contracting. Programs differ in objectives and degrees/certificates offered, so very different outcomes are being combined. Reporting is inconsistent from State to State. Some data being combined may not be reliable.

Explanation: This is a long-term measure. In FY 2005, for the 43 states submitting aggregate data, 20,080 inmates participated in the program. Of these, 4,633 complete a degree or certificate. The FY 2005 data is more accurate than prior data so targets for FY 2006 and FY 2008 have been revised.

HEA: Teacher Quality Enhancement - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.336 - Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants

Program Goal: To improve the quality of teacher education and initial certification standards, and to improve the knowledge and skills of all teachers, particularly new teachers and teachers who work in high-need areas.

Objective 1 of 3: *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 1.1 of 1: Pass rates: Pass rates will increase for preservice teachers taking subject matter competency tests as part of State licensure requirements in the states that receive funds from the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program to prepare teachers that are highly competent in the academic content areas in which they will be teaching.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of preservice teachers taking and passing subject matter competency tests as part of state licensure requirements.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2000	93	
2001	93	
2002	94	
2003	94	
2004	95	
2005	96	95
2006		95
2007		96
2008		96
2009		97
2010		97
2011		98

Source: ED's HEA Title II Reporting System.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006
Data are verified by testing entities and certified by state licensing authorities. The data collection meets the Title II, Higher Education Act requirement for a national reporting system on the quality of teacher preparation.

Explanation: States use a variety of different licensure and certification exams or batteries of exams. The Department asks states to report across six categories of tests. These include: basic skills; professional

knowledge and pedagogy; academic content areas; teaching special populations; other content areas; and performance assessments. States also report a single "summary rate" that reflects the performance by preservice teachers across a variety assessments. These summary rates are used in calculating the data for this measure.

Objective 2 of 3: *To reform teacher preparation programs in partnership with high need school districts and schools of arts and sciences to produce highly qualified teachers.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Highly qualified teachers: The percentage of program completers who are highly qualified teachers will increase.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of program completers who are highly qualified teachers.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	84	
2005	95	80
2006		95
2007		95
2008		95
2009		95
2010		95
2011		95

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006
Data are verified by testing entities and certified by state licensing authorities. The data collection meets the Title II, Higher Education Act requirement for a national reporting system on the quality of teacher preparation.

Explanation: The FY 2004 data established the baseline. "Highly qualified" is defined in No Child Left Behind, Title IX, Sec. 9101. A highly qualified teacher is a graduate of a teacher preparation program with a bachelor's degree, subject area competence established through testing, and certification from state licensing authorities. NCLB also requires that highly qualified teachers are actually teaching in an area of competency--which is not reflected in the data captured by this measure. Program completion definition includes a reasonable period of time for graduates to pass certification examinations. NOTE: Previously reported data for FY 2004 (SY 2003-2004) have been adjusted to be more accurate.

Objective 3 of 3: *Improve the efficiency of supported teacher education projects.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Efficiency measure: Cost per successful program outcome.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: Cost per successful program outcome.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2004	2,932	
2005	4,728	

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006
Data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Limitations: For FY 2003-2004, Only a small number of grantees were able to report on highly qualified teachers. Therefore, results may not necessarily be representative of a full set of grantee institutions.

Explanation: This efficiency measure is calculated as the allocation for partnership grants divided by the number of highly qualified teacher candidates graduating from grantee postsecondary institutions. FY 2004 data was calculated by dividing the appropriation to institutions reporting highly qualified teachers during the school year 2003-'04 ($4,078,018) by the number of program completers who were certified as highly qualified teachers (2,125). $4,078,018/1,391 = $2,932. Note: Previously reported data for 2004 have been adjusted to be more accurate.

IDEA: Special Education Grants for Infants and Families - FY 2006

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

Program Goal: To enhance the development of infants and toddlers (birth to three) with disabilities and support families in meeting the special needs of their child.

Objective 1 of 2: *The functional development of infants and toddlers will be enhanced by early intervention services.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: FUNCTIONAL ABILITIES: The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in the Part C program who demonstrate positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and demonstrate appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in Part C who demonstrate positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and demonstrate appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2007		999

Source: Part C Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2008

Explanation: The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. Entry data on infants and toddlers included in this measure will be available in February 2007. Exit data, which will serve as the baseline for FY 2007, will be available in February 2008.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: FAMILY CAPACITY: The percentage of families participating in Part C that report that early intervention services have increased their capacity to enhance their child's development.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have increased their capacity.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1998	72	
2001	73	

2002		80
2003		80
2004		80
2005		80

Source: NEILS through FY 2001. Part C Annual Performance Report starting FY 2007.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2008
OSEP is currently determining a data collection methodology for this indicator.

Explanation: FY 1998 data established an initial baseline. Data for 1998 and 2001 were obtained from the IDEA National Early Intervention Study (NEILS). No data was collected FY 2002-2006. A new baseline will be established for FY 2007 based on data collected through the Annual Performance Report.

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

Indicator 2.1 of 3: INFANTS SERVED: The number of states that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under age one through Part C.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The number of states that serve at least one percent of infants in the general population under age one through Part C.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	21	
2003	23	
2004	23	37
2005	24	27
2006		27

Source: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618 and U.S. census data.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: FY 2002 data established the baseline. The 1 percent threshold is based on the prevalence rates of 5 conditions: 0.4 percent, severe mental retardation; 0.2 percent, hearing impairment; 0.1 percent, visual impairment; 0.2 percent, physical conditions (spina bifida, cerebral palsy, etc.); and 0.1 percent, autism. Actual performance data previously reported for FY 2001-2003 reflected performance in FY 2002-2004 and have been corrected here.

Indicator 2.2 of 3: INFANTS AND TODDLERS SERVED: The number of states that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, through Part C.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The number of states that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, through Part C.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	25	
2003	27	20
2004	28	40
2005	30	31
2006		31

Source: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618 and U.S. census data.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: FY 2002 data was used to establish the baseline. Actual performance data previously reported for FY 2001-2003 reflected performance in FY 2002-2004 and have been corrected here.

Indicator 2.3 of 3: SERVICE SETTINGS: The percentage of children receiving early intervention services in home or in programs for typically developing children.

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: The percentage of children receiving early intervention services in home or in programs designed for typically developing peers.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1996	56	
1997	58	
1998	63	
1999	67	
2000	73	67
2001	76	69
2002	82	71
2003	83	78
2004	85	79
2005		83
2006		85

2007		86
2008		87
2009		88
2010		89

Source: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: FY 1996 data was used to establish the baseline.

IDEA: Special Education Grants to States - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.027 - Special Education Grants to States

Program Goal: Ensure all children with disabilities served under IDEA have available to them a free appropriate public education to help them meet challenging standards and prepare them for independent living and postsecondary education and/or competitive employment by assisting state and local educational agencies and families.

Objective 1 of 4: *All children with disabilities will meet challenging standards as determined by national and state assessments with accommodations as appropriate.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: PERFORMANCE ON NAEP: The percentage of children with disabilities that meet or exceed Basic levels in reading and mathematics on the NAEP.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic in reading on the NAEP.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2000	22	
2002	29	24
2003	29	25
2005	33	35
2007		35
2009		37
2011		39

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic in mathematics on the NAEP.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2000	20	
2003	29	23
2005	31	32
2007		33
2009		35
2011		37

Source: NCES (NAEP).

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: November 2007

Data Validated By: NCES.

Limitations: Results of the NAEP scores for students with disabilities from this sample cannot be generalized to the total population of such students.

Explanation: Targets for FY 2002 and 2003 were adjusted to be consistent with the Department's Strategic Plan (2002-2007)

Indicator 1.2 of 3: EXCLUSION FROM NAEP: The percentage of students with disabilities excluded from NAEP testing due to their disability.

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities included in the NAEP reading sample who are excluded from testing.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1998	41	
2002	39	
2003	33	
2005	35	
2007		33
2009		31
2011		29

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities included in the NAEP mathematics sample who are excluded from testing.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2000	32	
2003	22	
2005	24	
2007		23
2009		21
2011		19

Source: NCES

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: November 2007

Data Validated By: NCES.

Limitations: NAEP sample does not include schools specifically for students with disabilities.

Explanation: This measure was changed in 2006 to better focus on the percentage of children with disabilities who are excluded from NAEP testing. Previous year data were recalculated accordingly.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: PERFORMANCE ON STATE ASSESSMENTS: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above on state assessments.

Measure 1.3.1 of 2: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in reading on state assessments.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	24	
2005		25
2006		25
2007		26

Measure 1.3.2 of 2: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in mathematics on state assessments.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	26	
2005		25
2006		25
2007		26

Source: OESE Consolidated State Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Explanation: This measure parallels a measure for the Title I Grants to Local Education Agencies program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Objective 2 of 4: *Secondary school students will complete high school prepared for postsecondary education and/or competitive employment.*

Indicator 2.1 of 3: GRADUATION RATE: The percentage of students with disabilities with IEPs who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of students with disabilities who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1996	42	
1997	43	
1998	45	
1999	47	
2000	46	
2001	48	
2002	51	
2003	52	
2004	54	
2005		54
2006		56
2007		57
2008		58
2009		59
2010		60

Source: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students with disabilities aged 14 and older who graduate with a regular diploma by the total number of students with disabilities in the same age group who graduate with a regular diploma, receive a certificate of completion, reach the maximum age for services, die, drop out, or move (not known to have continued in education). This includes calculations for 57 entities (50 states, DC, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, N. Marianas and BIA).

Indicator 2.2 of 3: DROPOUT RATE: The percentage of students with disabilities who drop out of school.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of students with disabilities who drop out of school.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1996	47	
1997	46	
1998	44	

1999	42	
2000	42	
2001	41	
2002	38	
2003	34	
2004	31	
2005		34
2006		29
2007		28
2008		27
2009		26
2010		25

Source: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students with disabilities aged 14 and older who drop out or move (not known to have continued in education) by the total number of students with disabilities in the same age group who graduate with a regular diploma, receive a certificate of completion, reach the maximum age for services, die, drop out, or move (not known to have continued in education). This includes calculations for 57 entities (50 states, DC, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, N. Marianas and BIA).

Indicator 2.3 of 3: POSTSECONDARY SCHOOL AND EMPLOYMENT: The percentage of children with disabilities who are either competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within two years of leaving high school.

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: The percentage of children with disabilities who are either competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within two years of leaving high school.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	59	
2005		59.50
2006		60
2007		60.50

Source: OSEP.
Date Sponsored: 09/30/2002.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: Data for 2004 were gathered by the National Longitudinal Study 2 (NLTS2) from school year 2003-2004.

Objective 3 of 4: *All children with disabilities will receive a free appropriate public education.*

Indicator 3.1 of 3: CERTIFIED TEACHERS UNDER IDEA (6-21): The number of states with at least 90 percent of special education teachers of children with disabilities aged 6 to 21 fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The number of states with at least 90 percent of special education teachers fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1996	35	
1997	36	
1998	37	
1999	36	41
2000	36	42
2001	37	42
2002	33	42
2003	30	37
2004	36	37
2005		39
2006		40

Source: State-reported data under IDEA section 618.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: Data reflect grades 1-12, not teachers teaching children aged 6-21. States maintain data by grades taught, not ages of students. State requirements for teacher certification vary widely (i.e., teachers fully certified in one state might not be considered eligible for full certification in another state).

Explanation: There is a clustering of states around the 90 percent threshold in this indicator, which may result in unpredictable changes from year to year.

Indicator 3.2 of 3: HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS UNDER IDEA: The percentage of special education teachers who teach core academic subjects that are highly qualified, consistent with IDEA.

Measure 3.2.1 of 1: The percentage of special education teachers who teach core academic subjects who are highly qualified.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999

Source: State reported data

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 3.3 of 3: SERVICES OUTSIDE THE REGULAR CLASSROOM: The percentage of children aged 6 to 21 served outside of the regular classroom 60 percent or more of the day because of their disability.

Measure 3.3.1 of 1: The percentage of children served outside of the regular classroom 60 percent or more of the day due to their disability (as a percentage of the school population).		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	2.85	
2002	2.81	
2003	2.77	
2004	2.67	
2005		2.69
2006		2.65

Source: Numerator: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618. Denominator: NCES data

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: FY 2001 data was used to establish the baseline.

Objective 4 of 4: *Improve the administration of IDEA.*

Indicator 4.1 of 1: ISSUANCE OF LETTERS: The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and OSEP's response.

Measure 4.1.1 of 1: The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and OSEP's response.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2004	123	
2006		113
2007		103

Source: Program office records.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: The FY 2004 data was used to establish the baseline. This is a new efficiency measure in 2006.

IDEA: Special Education Parent Information Centers - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.328 - Special Education Parent Information Centers

Program Goal: To provide training and information to parents of infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.

Objective 1 of 4: *Improve the quality of parent training and information projects.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: HIGH QUALITY MATERIALS: The percentage of materials used by PTI projects that are deemed to be of high quality.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of materials used by PTI projects that are deemed to be of high quality.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999

Source: Expert panel.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 2 of 4: *PTI products and services will be used to improve results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.*

Indicator 2.1 of 3: RELEVANCE: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the PTI target audiences.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999

Source: Expert panel.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 3: USEFULNESS: The percentage of all products and services deemed to be useful by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of all products and services used by target audiences.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Sample of recipients of products and services.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.3 of 3: COST PER OUTPUT: The cost per output, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating.

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: The cost per output, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Panel of experts.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for this new efficiency measure.

Objective 3 of 4: *Parents served by PTI investments will be able to advocate for scientifically- or evidenced-based practices for their child. (Long-term objective. Target areas: assessment; literacy; behavior; instructional strategies; early intervention; and inclusive practices)*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: PARENTS PROMOTE PRACTICES: The percentage of parents receiving PTI services who promote scientifically- or evidence-based practices for their infants, toddlers, children and youth.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of parents receiving PTI services who promote scientifically- or evidence-based practices for their infants, toddlers, children and youth.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
- No Data -		

Source: Survey of parents.

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: August 2006
Survey of a sample of recipients of information and services. Data for this long-term measure will be collected every 2-3 years.

Explanation: The FY 2005 data will establish the baseline.

Objective 4 of 4: *Parents served by PTI investments will be knowledgeable about their IDEA rights and responsibilities. (Long-term objective. Target areas: assessment: literacy; behavior; instructional strategies; early intervention; and inclusive practices)*

Indicator 4.1 of 1: KNOWLEDGEABLE PARENTS: The percentage of parents receiving PTI services who report enhanced knowledge of IDEA rights and responsibilities.

Measure 4.1.1 of 1: The percentage of parents receiving PTI services who report enhanced knowledge of IDEA rights and responsibilities.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Survey of parents.

Next Data Available: August 2007

Explanation: FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

IDEA: Special Education Personnel Preparation - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.325 - Special Education Personnel Preparation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

Program Goal: To prepare service providers and leadership personnel in areas of critical need who are qualified to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Objective 1 of 4: *Improve the curricula of IDEA training programs to ensure that personnel preparing to serve infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities are knowledgeable and skilled in practices that reflect the current knowledge base.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: EVIDENCE-BASED CURRICULUM: Percentage of projects that incorporate scientifically- or evidence-based practices.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of projects incorporating evidence-based curriculum.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Researcher/expert panel review of a sample of program curricula.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 2 of 4: *Personnel trained using IDEA Personnel Preparation investments will have the knowledge and skills to deliver scientifically- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities. (Long-term objective. Target areas: assessment, literacy, behavior, instructional strategies, early intervention, and inclusive practices)*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: KNOWLEDGEABLE AND SKILLED SCHOLARS: The percentage of scholars completing IDEA-funded training programs who are knowledgeable and skilled in scientifically- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of scholars who are knowledgeable and skilled.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Primary source: sample of scholars survey.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 3 of 4: *The Personnel Preparation Program will ensure an adequate supply of personnel who are fully qualified under IDEA to serve infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. (Long-term objective. Target areas: assessment, literacy, behavior, instructional strategies, early intervention, and inclusive practices)*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: QUALIFIED LOW INCIDENCE PERSONNEL: The percentage of low incidence positions that are filled by personnel who are fully qualified under IDEA.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of low incidence positions that are filled by personnel who are fully qualified under IDEA.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2007		999

Explanation: This is a new measure for 2007. The FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline.

Objective 4 of 4: *Increase the supply of teachers and service providers who are fully qualified under IDEA and serve in positions for which they are trained.*

Indicator 4.1 of 4: SCHOLARS EXITING PROGRAMS: The percentage of scholars who exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance.

Measure 4.1.1 of 1: Percentage who exit program prior to completion due to poor performance.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	0.95	999
2006		0.99

Source: Primary source: Personnel Preparation Annual Data Report

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: OSEP initially anticipated that the performance target for this measure would be to achieve decreases in the rate over time. However, because baseline data were better than anticipated (e.g., less than 1 percent), instead of expecting even further decreases in outyears, OSEP believes that maintaining a rate of less than 1 percent is desirable.

Indicator 4.2 of 4: EMPLOYED UPON COMPLETION: The percentage of degree/certification recipients employed upon program completion who are working in the area(s) in which they were trained.

Measure 4.2.1 of 1: Percentage of degree/certification program recipients employed upon program completion who are working in the area(s) in which they were trained.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	79	
2005	68	82
2006		71

Source: Primary source: Personnel Preparation Annual Data Report

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The significant decrease from the 2003 actual figure of 79 percent to the 2005 actual figure of 68 percent is due to refinements to the data collection system that permit a more accurate link between area of employment and area of training. The FY 2006 target was adjusted based on past performance.

Indicator 4.3 of 4: EMPLOYED AND FULLY QUALIFIED UNDER IDEA: The percentage of degree/certification recipients employed upon program completion who are working in the area(s) in which they were trained and who are fully qualified under IDEA.

Measure 4.3.1 of 1: The percentage of degree/certification recipients employed upon program completion who are working in the area(s) in which they were trained AND who are fully qualified under IDEA.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Primary source: Sample of scholars in the field -- post-completion.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline

Indicator 4.4 of 4: EMPLOYED FOR 3 OR MORE YEARS: The percentage of degree/certification recipients who maintain employment for 3 or more years in the area(s) in which they were trained AND who are fully qualified under IDEA.

Measure 4.4.1 of 1: The percentage of degree/certification recipients who maintain employment for 3 or more years in the area(s) in which they were trained AND who are fully qualified under IDEA.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Primary source: Sample of scholars in the field -- post-completion.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

IDEA: Special Education Preschool Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.173 - Special Education Preschool Grants

Program Goal: To help preschool children with disabilities enter school ready to succeed by assisting states in providing special education and related services.

Objective 1 of 1: *Preschool children with disabilities will receive special education and related services that result in increased skills that enable them to succeed in school.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Service setting: The percentage of children receiving special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of children with disabilities receiving special education and related services with typically developing peers (early childhood settings and home).

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	41	
2000	40	
2001	39	
2002	40	39
2003	38	40
2004	37	40
2005	36	41
2006		40
2007		40

Source: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Limitations: The Department is planning to change the data collection by 2006-07 to reflect where the child spends most of his or her time, as opposed to where the child is receiving special education services.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Certified preschool special education teachers under IDEA: The number of states with at least 90 percent of preschool special education teachers fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of states with at least 90 percent of special education teachers of children aged three to five who are fully certified in the area in which they are teaching.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1996	34	
1997	35	
1998	37	
1999	34	40
2000	36	41
2001	35	40
2002	34	40
2003	32	36
2004	34	36
2005		37
2006		37

Source: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Limitations: States maintain data by grades taught, not by ages of students taught. Therefore, these data are for teachers teaching prekindergarten and kindergarten.

Improvements: Certification of related services personnel are not included because those requirements vary even more widely than requirements for teachers (e.g., some states certify sign language interpreters, but other states do not). OSEP will implement follow-up actions regarding increasing emphasis on related services personnel; possibly follow-up on SPeNSE study.

Explanation: There is a clustering of states around the 90 percent threshold for this measure, which may result in unpredictable changes from year to year.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Functional abilities: The percentage of children with disabilities aged three through five participating in the Preschool Grants program who demonstrate positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and use appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of children with disabilities aged three through five participating in the Preschool Grants program who demonstrate positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and demonstrate appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Initial data for 2005 from the IDEA Pre-elementary Education Longitudinal Study (PEELS). Subsequent years' data collection methodology will be determined through the Early Childhood Outcome Center and will use state-reported data under the Annual Performance Reports and IDEA section 618.

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: October 2007

Explanation: This indicator focuses on early language/ communication, early literacy and social-emotional skills because these skills are the best indictors of success in later years. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

IDEA: Special Education State Personnel Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.323 - Special Education_State Program Improvement Grants for Children with Disabilities

Program Goal: To assist SEAs in reforming and improving their systems for personnel preparation and professional development in early intervention, educational, and transition services in order to improve results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.

Objective 1 of 3: *Personnel trained under programs supported by SPDG will have the knowledge and skills to deliver scientifically- or evidence-based practices to infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities. (Long-term objective. Target areas: assessment; literacy; behavior; instructional strategies; early intervention; and inclusive practices)*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: KNOWLEDGEABLE AND SKILLED PERSONNEL: The percentage of personnel completing training supported by the SPDG on scientifically- or evidence-based instructional practices.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of personnel completing training supported by the SPDG on scientifically- or evidence-based instructional practices.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
- No Data -		

Source: Expert panel review of annual performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: ALIGNMENT WITH STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN: The percentage of SPDG projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies in their State Performance Plan (SPP).

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of SPDG projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies in their State Performance Plan (SPP).		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Annual performance reports; state performance reports

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 2 of 3: *Improve the quality of professional development available to meet the needs of personnel serving children with disabilities.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES: The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG program that are based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the SPDG program that are based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
- No Data -		

Source: Expert panel review of annual performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: SUSTAINED PRACTICES: The percentage of professional development/training activities based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices, provided through the SPDG program, that are sustained through in-going and comprehensive practices (e.g., mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry).

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of professional development/training activities based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices, provided through the SPDG program, that are sustained through in-going and comprehensive practices (e.g., mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry).		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
- No Data -		

Source: Expert panel review of annual performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Objective 3 of 3: *Implement strategies that are effective in meeting the requirements of section 612(a)(14) of IDEA to take measurable steps to recruit, hire, train, and retain highly qualified personnel in areas of greatest need to provide special education and related services.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: TEACHER RETENTION: In States with SPG projects that have special education teacher retention as a goal, the statewide percentage of highly qualified special education teachers in State-identified professional disciplines (e.g., teachers of children with emotional disturbance, deafness) who remain teaching after three years of employment.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: In States with SPG projects that have special education teacher retention as a goal, the statewide percentage of highly qualified special education teachers in State-identified professional disciplines (e.g., teachers of children with emotional disturbance, deafness) who remain teaching after three years of employment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2007		999

Source: Expert review of annual performance reports

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: August 2007

Explanation: The FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline.

IDEA: Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.326 - Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

Program Goal: To assist states and their partners in systems improvement through the integration of scientific-based practices.

Objective 1 of 4: *Improve the quality of technical assistance and dissemination projects.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: HIGH QUALITY PRODUCTS AND SERVICES: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high quality.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999

Source: Panel of Experts

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 2 of 4: *Technical assistance and dissemination products and services will be used to improve results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.*

Indicator 2.1 of 3: RELEVANCE: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the target audiences for the technical assistance and disseminations.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999

Source: Panel of experts

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 3: USEFULNESS: The percentage of all products and services deemed to be of high usefulness by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of all products and services deemed to be of high usefulness.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Panel of experts and survey of target audiences.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.3 of 3: COST PER OUTPUT: Cost per output defined as cost per unit of technical assistance, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating.

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: The cost per unit of technical assistance.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Panel of experts.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2007

Explanation: Cost per output defined as cost per unit of technical assistance, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 3 of 4: *States and other recipients of IDEA Technical Assistance and Dissemination services will implement scientifically- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities. (Long-term objective. Target areas: assessment: literacy; behavior; instructional strategies; early intervention; and inclusive practices)*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: IMPLEMENTATION OF PRACTICES: The percentage of school districts and service agencies receiving IDEA Technical Assistance and Dissemination services regarding scientifically- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities that implement those practices.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of school districts and service agencies receiving IDEA Technical Assistance and Dissemination services regarding scientifically- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities that implement those practices.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
- No Data -		

Source: Survey of a sample of recipients of technical assistance and services. Data for this long-term measure will be collected every 2-3 years.

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline.

Objective 4 of 4: *The Technical Assistance and Dissemination program will identify, implement and evaluate evidence-based models to improve outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities. (Long-term objective. Target areas: assessment: literacy; behavior; instructional strategies; early intervention; and inclusive practices)*

Indicator 4.1 of 1: IMPLEMENTATION OF MODELS: Of the IDEA Technical Assistance and Dissemination projects responsible for developing models, the percentage of projects that identify, implement and evaluate effective models.

Measure 4.1.1 of 1: Of the IDEA Technical Assistance and Dissemination projects responsible for developing models, the percentage of projects that identify, implement and evaluate effective models.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Panel of experts. Data for this long-term measure will be collected every 2-3 years.

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: August 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

IDEA: Special Education Technology and Media Services - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.327 - Special Education Technology and Media Services for Individuals with Disabilities

Program Goal: To promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology and media services to improve results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.

Objective 1 of 5: *Increase the relevance of technology and media projects to the needs of infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Relevance: The percentage of technology and media projects judged to be of high relevance to improving outcomes of infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of technology and media funded applications judged to be of high relevance.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Expert panel review.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.

Objective 2 of 5: *Improve the quality of technology and media projects.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: HIGH QUALITY PROJECTS.: The percentage of technology and media projects judged to be of high quality.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of technology and media funded applications judged to be of high quality.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Expert panel review.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.

Objective 3 of 5: *Products and services will be used to improve results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: USEFUL PRODUCTS.: The percentage of technology and media projects that produce findings, products and/or other services that contribute to improving results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of technology projects that produce findings, products, and/or services that contribute to improving results for children with disabilities.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
- No Data -		

Source: Primary source: Final reports

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. Targets for FY 2007 and beyond will be developed after FY 2005 data are reported.

Objective 4 of 5: *Investments in the Technology and Media Services program will develop and validate current and emerging technologies that incorporate scientifically- or evidence-based materials and services. (Long-term objective. Focus areas: assessment; literacy; behavior; instructional strategies; early intervention, and inclusive practices)*

Indicator 4.1 of 1: EVIDENCED-BASED MATERIALS AND SERVICES.: The percentage of projects that develop and validate technologies that incorporate evidence-based materials and services.

Measure 4.1.1 of 1: The percentage of projects that develop and validate technologies that incorporate evidence-based materials and services.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
- No Data -		

Source: Expert panel review.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Explanation: the FY 2005 data will establish the baseline. Targets for FY 2007 and beyond will be developed after FY 2005 data are reported.

Objective 5 of 5: *Investments in the Technology and Media Services Program will make validated, evidence-based technologies to improve results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with*

disabilities available for widespread use. (Long-term objective. Focus areas: assessment, literacy, behavior, instructional strategies, early intervention, and inclusive practices)

Indicator 5.1 of 1: The percentage of projects that make technologies that incorporate evidence-based practices available for widespread use.

Measure 5.1.1 of 1: The percentage of technology and media projects that make technologies that incorporate evidence-based practices available for widespread use.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Expert panel review.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.196 - Education for Homeless Children and Youth

Program Goal: To ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education as is provided to other children and youth.

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

Indicator 1.1 of 2: State assessment participation: Percentage of homeless students that participate annually in the state assessments in reading and mathematics will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of homeless children and youth, grades three through eight, included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics as reported by LEA subgrantees.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
2004	16	15		
2005	50	49	17	16
2006			53	52

Source: McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (MVHAA) Annual Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006
Data collected by state assessments are validated by the individual state's data quality standards procedures. Data will reflect information principally from LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

Limitations: For 2004 several states (less than 5) were unable to have their data system extract assessment information on homeless students or were impacted by the Summer 2005 hurricanes and unable to meet the data reporting deadline.

Explanation: FY 2002 data established the baseline from a one-time data collection. However, the 2002 results could not be dissaggregated by subject matter. Beginning with 2004, data were reported dissaggregated by subject matter. The data to be collected from states are from LEAs that have subgrantees and are capable of reporting such data. However, approximately 10 percent of all school districts receive subgrant funds.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: State assessment achievement: The percentage of homeless students meeting or exceeding state's proficiency level or standard in reading and mathematics.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of homeless students, grades three through eight, meeting or exceeding state proficiency standards in reading/language arts and mathematics.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
2002	30	24		
2004	36	36		
2005	42	41	34	26
2006			43	43

Source: McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (MVHAA) Annual Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: FY 2002 data established the baseline from a one-time data collection. Data were not collected in 2003. Data collected by state assessments are validated by the individual state's data quality standards procedures. Data will reflect information principally from LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants. Data was reported by 46 states in 2005. Several states impacted by the summer 2005 hurricanes were not able to produce data in time for this report.

VTEA: Tech-Prep Education State Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.243 - Tech-Prep Education

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

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that concentrators, including special populations, make successful transitions to further education and employment.*

Indicator 1.1 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.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Tech-Prep students who have completed high school and transitioned to postsecondary education.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education
2001	87			
2002	87			
2003	86	58		
2004	87	66		
2005			87	87
2006			88	61

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2007

Limitations: Under Perkins III, states are allowed maximum flexibility in their data collection methodologies and procedures. This flexibility limits data comparability at the national level.

Improvements: The State Administration and Accountability Group (SAAG) will conduct national and regional training institutes to improve data collection efforts especially in the areas of special populations and minority students. The SAAG will conduct targeted individual state technical assistance to improve performance for special populations and minority students. SAAG will collaborate with other divisions and agencies to improve the performance of CTE students and special population and minority students in particular.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: An increasing percentage of vocational concentrators, including special populations, will meet

state established academic standards.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of Tech-Prep students who meet state established academic standards.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Percentage of Tech-Prep students who meet state established academic standards	Percentage of Tech-Prep students who meet state established academic standards
2001	79	
2002	71	
2003	79	
2004	75	
2005		77
2006		78

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Reporting Format for OIE Formula Grants to LEAs.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2007

Limitations: Under Perkins III, states are allowed maximum flexibility in their data collection methodologies and procedures. This flexibility limits data comparability at the national level.

Improvements: The State Administration and Accountability Group (SAAG) will conduct national and regional training institutes to improve data collection efforts especially in the areas of special populations and minority students. The SAAG will conduct targeted individual state technical assistance to improve performance for special populations and minority students. SAAG will collaborate with other divisions and agencies to improve the performance of CTE students and special population and minority students in particular.

VTEA: Vocational Education National Programs - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.051 - Vocational Education National Programs

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

Objective 1 of 2: *The use of rigorous research findings to inform program direction and improve state and local practices, through the identification of research-based education practices and communicating what works to practitioners, parents and policy-makers, will increase.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Conduct quality research: All research studies conducted by the National Center for Research in Career and Technical education will represent rigorous design as defined by the Department's definition of evidence-based research.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of research studies with rigorous designs.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	71	
2003	83	
2004	100	100
2005		100
2006		100

Source: Independent review panel assessments.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2006

Explanation: During 2006, Perkins programs are expected to be reauthorized. Until then, the target set for FY 2005 will be maintained for FY 2006.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Disseminate quality research: Increasing numbers of customers will be using the products and services of the National Centers for Research and Dissimination in Career and Technical Education.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The number of customers receiving electronic and print materials or information from the Centers.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	Electronic	Print	Total	Electronic	Print	Total

2000	273,546		273,546			
2001	1,569,999	131,254	1,701,253			300,000
2002	3,004,898	219,729	3,224,627			350,000
2003	6,054,535	13,567	6,068,102			
2004	19,904,845	412,000	20,316,845	2,300,000	100,000	2,400,000
2005				2,300,000	50,000	2,350,000
2006				2,300,000	25,000	2,325,000

Source: National Centers Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2006

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

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

Indicator 2.1 of 1: All states will have data systems with the capacity to include information on all indicators and subindicators for secondary and postsecondary programs.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of states that have data systems with the capacity to include information on all indicators and subindicators for secondary and postsecondary programs.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Percentage of Performance	Percentage of Target
2001	92	
2002	97	
2003	98	
2004	98	100
2005		100
2006		100

Source: State Combined Annual Performance Reports - Data and Narrative

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
State Directors for Career and Technical Education attest to data. Data also are checked for accuracy and completeness through a five-step data auditing process by ED staff and an outside contractor.

Explanation: Actual performance is based on the percentage of States that were able to report data on each of the four core indicators included in the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act. It is important to note that Department does not gather information on what percentage of all school systems, school districts and community colleges are included in the states' data.

VTEA: Vocational Education State Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.048A - Vocational Education Basic Grants to States
84.048B - Pacific Vocational Education Improvement Program
84.101 - Vocational Education Indians Set-aside
84.259 - Native Hawaiian Vocational Education

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

Objective 1 of 4: *Vocational education state grants*

Indicator 1.1 of 4: Academic attainment: An increasing percentage of vocational concentrators, including special populations, will meet state established academic standards.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of vocational concentrators meeting state-established academic standards.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Percentage of vocational concentrators	Percentage of vocational concentrators
1998	33	
1999	45	
2000	44	
2001	70	
2002	71	72
2003	75	74
2004	75	76
2005		77
2006		78

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Limitations: 1) States have set their goals using a three-year rolling average. 2) States are allowed maximum flexibility in their data collection procedures and protocols, which limits data validity and reliability at the national level.

Improvements: The State Administration and Accountability Group (SAAG) will conduct national and regional training institutes to improve data collection efforts especially in the areas of special populations and minority students. The SAAG will also conduct targeted individual state technical assistance to improve performance for

special populations and minority students. SAAG will collaborate with other divisions and agencies to improve the performance of CTE students, particulary special population and minority students.

Indicator 1.2 of 4: Skills proficiencies: An increasing percentage of secondary and postsecondary vocational concentrators, including special populations, will meet state recognized skill standards.

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: (a) The percentage of secondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally adopted skill standards, using state recognized approaches.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Percentage of vocational concentrators	Percentage of vocational concentrators
2000	39	
2001	61	
2002	59	63
2003	64	65
2004	64	70
2005		79
2006		74

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: (b) The percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators meeting state/locally-adopted skill standards, using state recognized approaches.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Percentage of Postsecondary Vocational Concentrators	Percentage of Postsecondary Vocational Concentrators
2000	76	
2001	76	
2002	76	77
2003	77	78
2004	78	80
2005		79
2006		80

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Limitations: 1) States have set their goals using a three-year rolling average. 2) States are allowed maximum flexibility in their data collection procedures and protocols, which limits data validity and reliability at the national level.

Improvements: The State Administration and Accountability Group (SAAG) will conduct national and regional training institutes to improve data collection efforts especially in the areas of special populations and minority students. The SAAG will also conduct targeted individual state technical assistance to improve performance for special populations and minority students. SAAG will collaborate with other divisions and agencies to improve the performance of CTE students, particularly special population and minority students.

Indicator 1.3 of 4: Secondary Student Outcomes: An increasing proportion of vocational concentrators, including special populations, will attain high school diplomas, enter postsecondary programs, or attain employment.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of vocational concentrators who have completed high school and transitioned to postsecondary education or employment.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or Employment	High School Completion	Placement in Postsecondary Education and/or Employment
2000	80	79		
2001	84	84		
2002	84	84	85	85
2003	84	84	86	86
2004	84	87	88	87
2005			87	87
2006			88	88

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Limitations: 1) 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. 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 do not represent a national average nor the results of any single national assessment. 2) States have set their goals using a three-year rolling average. 3) States are allowed maximum flexibility in their data collection procedures and protocols, which limits data validity and reliability at the national level.

Improvements: The State Administration and Accountability Group (SAAG) will conduct national and regional training institutes to improve data collection efforts especially in the areas of special populations and minority students. The SAAG will also conduct targeted individual state technical assistance to improve performance for special populations and minority students. SAAG will collaborate with other divisions and agencies to improve the performance of CTE students, particularly special population and minority students.

Indicator 1.4 of 4: 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.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The percentage of postsecondary vocational concentrators who have completed postsecondary education and have a positive placement in military or employment.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Postsecondary Degree/Certificate/ Completion	Placement in Military or Employment	Postsecondary Degree/Certificate/ Completion	Placement in Military or Employment
2000	32	82		
2001	37	84		
2002	41	86	39	84
2003	41	83	42	85
2004	41	83	45	86
2005			44	88
2006			45	89

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Limitations: 1) States have set their goals using a three-year rolling average. 2) States are allowed maximum flexibility in their data collection procedures and protocols, which limits data validity and reliability at the national level.

Improvements: The State Administration and Accountability Group (SAAG) will conduct national and regional training institutes to improve data collection efforts especially in the areas of special populations and minority students. The SAAG will also conduct targeted individual state technical assistance to improve performance for special populations and minority students. SAAG will collaborate with other divisions and agencies to improve the performance of CTE students, particularly special population and minority students.

Objective 2 of 4: *Vocational Education State Grants - Native Hawaiian Vocational and Technical Education Program*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: An increasing number of Native Hawaiian vocational education students will attain high school diplomas.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Native Hawaiian vocational students attaining high school diplomas.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	97.25	
2004	97.14	98.25

2005	100	99.25
2006		100

Source: Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Explanation: The FY 2003 data were used to establish the baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: An increasing number of Native Hawaiian vocational students will become employed, enter postsecondary or advanced programs, or enter military service.

Measure 2.2.1 of 2: The number of Native Hawaiian vocational students who obtained employment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	41	
2004	38	42
2005	33	43
2006		30

Measure 2.2.2 of 2: The number of Native Hawaiian vocational students entering postsecondary or advanced programs.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	41	
2004	49	42
2005	59	43
2006		70

Source: Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Explanation: The FY 2003 data were used to establish the baseline.

Objective 3 of 4: *Vocational Education State Grants: Pacific Vocational Education Improvement Program*

Indicator 3.1 of 2: An increasing number of Pacific vocational students will obtain a high school diploma.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Pacific vocational students obtaining a high school diploma

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	87.20	
2004	82	89
2005	92	90
2006		94

Source: Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Limitations: Figures reported by areas.

Explanation: The FY 2003 data were used to establish a baseline.

Indicator 3.2 of 2: An increasing number of professional development opportunities will be provided to vocational education teachers in the Pacific outlying areas each year.

Measure 3.2.1 of 1: The percentage of Pacific vocational education teachers in Pacific outlying areas received professional development.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	56	
2004	75	5
2005	66	35
2006		70

Source: Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Limitations: Figure reported by areas.

Explanation: The FY 2003 data were used to establish the baseline.

Objective 4 of 4: *Vocational Education State Grants - Native American Vocational and Technical Education*

Indicator 4.1 of 2: Improved enrollment rate: An increasing number of Native American and Alaskan students will enroll in NAVTEP projects that offer vocational and technical education programs.

Measure 4.1.1 of 1: The number of students enrolled in NAVTEP projects.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

	Number enrolled	Number enrolled
2002	6,067	2,497
2003	6,381	6,100
2004	4,087	6,400
2005	4,274	
2006		4,500

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Limitations: Data is self-reported by grantee through a performance, statistical and evaluation report.

Improvements: Data will be checked by staff during on-site monitoring of projects. ED will continue to request increased enrollment numbers during clarification conferences with grantees for new and continuation awards.

Indicator 4.2 of 2: An increasing percentage of Native American and Alaska Native students in the NAVTEP will have positive outcomes in one or more of the following categories: attaining a vocational and technical education postsecondary certificate or degree, or placement in employment or the military services.

Measure 4.2.1 of 2: The number of NAVTEP students attaining a certificate or degree.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	664	
2003	728	690
2004	1,598	725
2005	1,478	
2006		1,598

Measure 4.2.2 of 2: The number of NAVTEP students placed in employment or military services.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	1,606	
2003	1,690	
2004	1,430	1,715
2005	1,387	
2006		1,430

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006
On-Site Monitoring By ED. ED program officers review data through NAVTEP grantee performance, statistical and evaluation reports.

Limitations: Data are self-reported by grantee through a performance, statistical and evaluation report.

Goal 3: Develop Safe and Drug-Free Schools

ESEA: Alcohol Abuse Reduction - FY 2006

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

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

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

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Reduce Binge Drinking: The extent to which students decrease their rate of binge drinking.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of grantees whose target students show a measurable decrease in binge drinking.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005				999		
2006					999	
2007						999

Source: Annual Grantee Performance Reports

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: Grantees will collect data concerning binge drinking behavior of students served by the grant. The FY 2005 target is to set a baseline for the 2004 cohort and the FY 2006 target is to set a baseline for the 2005 cohort.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Improve students' attitudes relative to alcohol abuse: The extent to which students' attitudes relative to alcohol abuse change.

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: The percentage of grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who believe that binge drinking is harmful to their health.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005				999		
2006					999	
2007						999

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: The percentage of grantees that show a measurable increase in the percentage of target students who disapprove of alcohol abuse.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005				999		
2006					999	
2007						999

Source: Annual Grantee Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: Grantees will collect information about the attitudes of students served under the program relative to perception of health risk and social disapproval of alcohol abuse. The FY 2005 target is to set a baseline for the 2004 cohort and the FY 2006 target is to set a baseline for the 2005 cohort.

ESEA: Character Education - FY 2006

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

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

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

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Partnerships in Character Education: Partnership in Character Education Program grantees will demonstrate improved student outcomes through valid, rigorous evaluations.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The proportion of Partnerships in Character Education projects demonstrating improved student outcomes through valid, rigorous evaluations.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2006				999		
2007					999	
2008						999

Source: Review of biennial evaluation reports included in program files. Because of different grant cohorts, information will be available each year for one or more cohorts, but data related to each cohort are collected biennially.

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: While all grantees are required to conduct evaluations, only those responding to the competitive preference for rigorous evaluations are actually conducting valid, rigorous evaluations. Thus, only a subset of Character Education grantees are actually reflected in the data collected under this measure. Evaluation results will be available after two years and at the completion of the each project.

Explanation: A subset of grantees evaluate their projects using either experimental or quasi-experimental designs. Evaluation reports will not be available annually. For each cohort, no target will be established for years in which evaluation reports are not due. Future year targets will be established as baseline data become available. The FY 2006 target is to set a baseline for the 2004 cohort, the FY 2007 target is to set a baseline for the 2005 cohort, and the FY 2008 target is to set the baseline for the 2006 cohort.

ESEA: Close-Up Fellowships - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.927A - Close-Up Fellowship Program

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

Objective 1 of 1: *Continue to work with corporations to multiply the impact of the Federally funded fellowships.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Increased private funding: The ratio of federal to non-federal funding that is allocated for teachers and economically disadvantaged students.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The ratio of federal to non-federal funding that is allocated for teachers and economically disadvantaged students.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	1.43	
2002	1.32	
2003	0.82	
2004	0.69	
2006		0.62
2007		0.59

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Close-Up Foundation Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
Data from audited program records.

Explanation: The ratio is the total federal appropriation divided by the total amount of non-federal funds raised by the Close-Up Foundation. For example, in FY2004, the Federal appropriation was $1,481,209, and the Close-Up Foundation raised $2,153,921 in non-Federal funds. The performance targets are based on the grantees' past performance in obtaining non-federal contributions. The goal is that , as federal funding remains constant, the amount of non-federal funding will increase.

ESEA: Elementary and Secondary School Counseling - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.215E - Elementary and Secondary School Counseling Discretionary Grants

Program Goal: To increase the availability of counseling programs and services in elementary schools.

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

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Student/Counselor ratio: Progress of grantees in reducing the student/counselor ratio to meet American School Health Association recommended ratios.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of grantees closing the gap between their student/mental health professional ratios and the student/mental health professional ratios recommended by the American School Health Association (ASHA).						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005				999		
2006					999	
2007						999

Source: Annual Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to set a baseline for the 2004 cohort, the FY 2006 target is to set a baseline for the 2005 cohort, and the FY 2007 target is to set a baseline for the 2006 cohort.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Student disciplinary actions: Number of referrals and suspensions in participating schools.

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: The number of referrals for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the program.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005		6,603			999	

2006		999
2007		999

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: The number of suspensions for disciplinary reasons in schools participating in the program.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005	1,440			999		
2006				999		
2007				999		

Source: Annual Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was to set a baseline for the 2004 cohort, the FY 2006 target is to set a baseline for the 2005 cohort, and the FY 2007 target is to set a baseline for the 2006 cohort.

ESEA: Excellence in Economic Education - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.215B - Excellence in Economic Education

Program Goal: To promote economic and financial literacy among all students in kindergarten through grade 12.

Objective 1 of 1: *To increase students' knowledge of, and achievement in economics to enable the students to become more productive and informed percentage of citizens.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The percentage of students of teachers trained under the grant project who demonstrate an improved understanding of personal finance and economics as compared to similiar students whose teachers have not had the training provided by the program.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of students taught by teachers trained under this grant who demonstrate improved understanding of personal finance issues.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Grantee Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Explanation: FY 2005 data will establish the baseline. The FY 2006 target is the baseline plus 1 percent.

ESEA: Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.215Y - Educational, Cultural, Apprenticeship, and Exchange Programs for Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, and their Historical Whaling and Trading Partners in Massachusetts

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

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

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Number of shared products, resources (including collections) and technical staff exchanges that result in new or enhanced capabilities among partner institutions that address programmatic goals.

Measure 1.1.1 of 5: a) The number of partnership exchanges		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	120	999
2005		132
2006		139

Measure 1.1.2 of 5: b) The number of new partner capabilities		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

Measure 1.1.3 of 5: c) The number of individual participants involved in educational and cultural enrichment activities (including online participants).		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	885,000	999
2005		973,500
2006		1,022,175

Measure 1.1.4 of 5: d) The number of schools, community groups, and family programs involved in educational and cultural enrichment activities.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004		999
2005		999
2006		999

Measure 1.1.5 of 5: e) The number of participants in a culturally based youth internship program involving career awareness, leadership and job skills development		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	120	999
2005		132
2006		139

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Historic Whaling Partnerships Grantee Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: February 2007

Limitations: Data are self-reported by grantees.

Explanation: The average frequency for participation is 3 per partner. The FY 2004 targets were to establish baselines. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 10%. FY 2004 data are not yet available for measures 2 and 4 as it is part of a larger data collection process that is currently underway. The targets for FY 2006 are an increase of 5 percent over the FY 2005 target.

ESEA: Mentoring Program - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.184B - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Mentoring Program

Program Goal: To support mentoring programs and activities for children who are at risk of educational failure, dropping out of school, or involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models.

Objective 1 of 1: *Provide grants to community-based organizations and local school districts to support mentoring programs for high-risk youth.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Sustained mentoring matches: Proportion of student-mentor matches that are sustained for over one year.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of student-mentor matches that are sustained by the grantees for a period of 12 months.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2006			999	
2007				999

Source: Annual Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: No target is established for a cohort in the first year after award because grant sites will need to have operated for a minimum of 12 months in order to produce any student-mentor matches that meet the criteria established for this measure. The FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline for the 2004 cohort, and the FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline for the 2005 cohort.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Improved academic achievement: The proportion of mentored students demonstrating improved academic competencies.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of mentored students who demonstrate improvement in core academic subjects as measured by grade point average after 12 months.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort

2006		999
2007		999

Source: Annual Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort, and the FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Unexcused absences: Proportion of mentored students with unexcused absences.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of mentored students who have unexcused absences from school.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005				999		
2006					999	
2007						999

Source: Annual Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
This measure was stated as a unified measure for FY 2005, but has now been disaggregated by cohort.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort. The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline for the 2006 cohort.

ESEA: Physical Education Program - FY 2006

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

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

Objective 1 of 1: *Support the implementation of effective physical education programs and strategies.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Meeting state physical education standards: Program evaluations will demonstrate program activities are helping grantees meet state standards for physical education.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: The percentage of students served by the grant who make progress toward meeting state standards for physical education.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005				999		
2006					999	
2007						999

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: The percentage of students served by the grant actively participating in physical education activities.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005				999		
2006					999	
2007						999

Source: Annual Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish the baseline for the 2004 cohort, the FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline for the 2005 cohort, and the FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline for the 2006 cohort.

ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Other National Programs - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.184D - Student Drug Testing
84.184L - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Safe Schools/Healthy Students Program

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

Objective 1 of 2: *Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in improving student behaviors and school environments.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Safe Schools/Healthy Students: Extent to which grantees demonstrate substantial progress in improving student behaviors and school environments.

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that experience a decrease in the number of violent incidents at schools during the three-year grant period.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005				999		
2006				999		
2007				999		

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that experience a decrease in substance abuse during the three-year grant period.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005				999		
2006				999		
2007				999		

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that improve school attendance during the three-year grant period.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005				999		

2006		999
2007		999

Source: Annual Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2005

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: This measure was stated as a unified measure for FY 2005, but has now been disaggregated by cohort. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort. The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline for the 2006 cohort.

Objective 2 of 2: *Student drug testing grantees will make substantial progress in reducing substance abuse incidence among target students.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Student drug testing: Proportion of grantees that experience an annual reduction in the incidence of drug use by students in the target population.

Measure 2.1.1 of 2: The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a five percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-month drug use by students in the target population.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			999	
2006			999	

Measure 2.1.2 of 2: The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a five percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-year drug use by students in the target population.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort
2005			999	
2006			999	

Source: Annual Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: This measure was stated as a unified measure for FY 2005, but has now been disaggregated by cohort. The FY 2005 target was to establish a baseline for the 2003 cohort; however the FY 2005 data were not collected. Therefore, the FY 2006 target is to establish the baselines for the FY 2003 cohort. FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.

ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.186A - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: State and Local Educational Agency Program
84.186B - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Governors' Program

Program Goal: Develop safe, disciplined, and drug-free learning environments

Objective 1 of 1: *To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of programs that reflect scientifically-based research.*

Indicator 1.1 of 6: Illegal drugs at school: The proportion of students who were offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who were offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	29	
2003	29	29
2005		28
2007		27
2009		26
2011		25

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

Explanation: The FY 2001 data established the baseline. This is a long-term measure. Data are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis from a nationally representative sample of students.

Indicator 1.2 of 6: Students using marijuana: The percentage of students who used marijuana one or more times during the past 30 days.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who used marijuana one or more times during the past 30 days.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	24	

2003	22	
2005		21
2007		19
2009		18
2011		17

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control.

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

Explanation: The FY 2001 data established the baseline. Data are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.

Indicator 1.3 of 6: Binge drinking: The proportion of students who report engaging in episodic heavy (binge) drinking.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who had five or more drinks of alcohol in a row (that is, within a couple of hours) one or more times during the past 30 days.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	30	
2003	28	
2005		27
2007		26
2009		25
2011		24

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control.

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

Explanation: The FY 2001 data established the baseline. Data are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.

Indicator 1.4 of 6: Fights at school: Proportion of students reporting being involved in a fight at school.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who were in a physical fight on school property one or more times during the past 12 months.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	13	

2003	13	
2005		12
2007		12
2009		11
2011		11

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

Explanation: The FY 2001 data established the baseline. Data are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.

Indicator 1.5 of 6: Students carrying weapons to school: The proportion of students who carried a weapon on school property.

Measure 1.5.1 of 1: The percentage of students in grades 9-12 who carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property one or more times during the past 30 days.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	6	
2003	6	
2005		5
2007		5
2009		4
2011		4

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Centers for Disease Control

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.

Explanation: The FY 2001 data established the baseline. Data are collected on a calendar-year, not a school-year, basis from a nationally representative sample of students in grades 9-12.

Indicator 1.6 of 6: Use of research-based programs: The proportion of SDFSCA State Grants-funded programs and practices that are research-based.

Measure 1.6.1 of 2: (a) The percentage of drug and violence prevention programs/practices supported with SDFSCA State Grant funds that are research-based.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		ggg

2006		999

Measure 1.6.2 of 2: (b) The percentage of SDFSCA-funded research-based drug and violence prevention programs/practices that are implemented with fidelity.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Evaluation Study

Frequency: Annually.

Explanation: The FY 2005 data is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 targets are to maintain the baseline.

Next Data available for measure (a) will be November 2006; next data available for measure (b) will be September 2007.

Goal 4: Transform Education into an Evidence-Based Field

ESEA: Indian Education - National Activities - FY 2006

Program Goal: To prepare and train Indians to serve as teachers and school administrators.

Objective 1 of 1: *Indian Education National Activities focus on research, evaluation, collection, dissemination and analyses of the educational status, needs and effective approaches for the education of American Indian and Alaska Native children and adults.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: The number of annual hits on the NCES American Indian and Alaska Native Web based data tool and the OIE Web sites.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of annual hits on the NCES Web based data tool and the OIE Web site.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: New NCES Web site.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006
A Web based program will automatically count the hits on the Web site.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Increasing the representation of American Indian and Alaska Natives who are surveyed by high quality national educational studies.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of high quality national educational studies that oversample and report statistically reliable data on American Indian and Alaska Natives.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: New NCES Web-site.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.305 - Education Research

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

Objective 1 of 2: *Raise the quality of research funded or conducted by the Department.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: The percentage of new research proposals funded by Institute of Education Sciences that receive an average score of excellent or higher from an independent review panel of qualified scientists.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of new research proposals funded by the Department's National Center for Education Research that receive an average score of excellent or higher from an independent review panel of qualified scientists.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	88	
2004	97	
2005	100	100
2006		100

Source: Expert panel review

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006

Limitations: Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the peer review panel. Inclusion of senior scientists who are leading researchers in their fields ensures the quality of the data.

Explanation: The measure is calculated as the average panel review score for newly funded IES research proposals.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the Department's National Center of Education Research that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	32	32
2002	100	75

2003	97	75
2004	90	75
2005		75
2006		75

Source: IES researchers evaluate all research and evaluation proposals newly funded by IES.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006
Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as having two IES researchers independently evaluate a subset of proposals (with minimum inter-rater agreement of 90 percent), minimizes threats to the validity and reliability of data.

Limitations: Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the proposal reviewers.

Explanation: The 75 percent target for 2002-2006 recognizes that some high-quality research addressing causal questions will not be able to employ randomized experimental designs. Presence of a causal question is defined as instances in which the investigation is designed to examine the effects of one variable on a second variable. A causal relation might be expressed as one variable influencing, affecting, or changing another variable. A randomized experimental design is defined as instances in which there are (a) an experimental (treatment) group and one or more comparison groups, and (b) random assignment of participants to treatment and comparison groups, or random assignment of groups (e.g., classrooms or schools) to treatment and comparison conditions. If a proposal includes a design in which two or more groups of participants are compared, but the PI does not explicitly indicate that random assignment procedures will be used, the proposal is recorded as not using a randomized experimental design.

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

Indicator 2.1 of 3: The percentage of new research projects funded by IES that are deemed to be of high relevance to education practice as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of new research projects funded by the Department's National Center of Education Research that are deemed to be of high relevance as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	21	
2002	25	25
2003	60	37
2004	50	50
2005		65
2006		75

Source: External panel of qualified practitioners

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Limitations: Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel. Inclusion of experienced practitioners and administrators in education and special education assures the quality of the data.

Explanation: The target of 75 percent for 2006 recognizes that some important research may not seem immediately relevant but will make important contributions over the long term.

Indicator 2.2 of 3: The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse Web site.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse Web site.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	1,522,922	1,000,000
2004	4,249,668	2,000,000
2005	4,734,767	4,500,000
2006		5,000,000
2007		5,500,000

Source: What Works Clearinghouse.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006
A Web based program automatically counts the hits on this Web site.

Indicator 2.3 of 3: The percentage of WWC Web site users surveyed randomly who responded to the statement, "Evidence provided on the WWC Web site is useful in making decisions about education programs and practices" by checking "agree" or "strongly agree."

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: The percentage of WWC Web site users surveyed randomly who responded to the statement, "Evidence provided on the WWC Web site is useful in making decisions about education programs and practices" by checking "agree" or "strongly agree."		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	67	30
2006		31

Source: What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Web site survey.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

ESRA: Research in Special Education - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.324 - Research in Special Education

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

Objective 1 of 2: *Raise the quality of research funded or conducted by the Department.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: The percentage of new research proposals funded by the Institute of Education Sciences that receive an average score of excellent or higher from an independent review panel of qualified scientists.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of new research proposals funded by the Department's National Center for Special Education Research that receive an average score of excellent or higher from an independent review panel of qualified scientists.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Expert panel review

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Limitations: Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the peer review panel. Inclusion of senior scientists who are leading researchers in their fields ensures the quality of the data.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Of new research and evaluation projects (group evaluations) funded by the Department's National Center for Special Education Research that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: IES researchers evaluate all research and evaluation proposals newly funded by IES to identify projects that address causal questions and of those projects, those that use randomized experimental designs to answer those questions. Data will be collected annually.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006
Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as having two IES researchers independently evaluate a subset of proposals (with minimum inter-rater agreement of 90 percent), minimizes threats to the

validity and reliability of data.

Limitations: Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the proposal reviewers.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. Presence of a causal question is defined as instances in which the investigation is designed to examine the effects of one variable on a second variable. A causal relation might be expressed as one variable influencing, affecting, or changing another variable. A randomized experimental design is defined as instances in which there are (a) an experimental (treatment) group and one or more comparison groups, and (b) random assignment of participants to treatment and comparison groups, or random assignment of groups (e.g., classrooms or schools) to treatment and comparison conditions. If a proposal includes a design in which two or more groups of participants are compared, but the PI does not explicitly indicate that random assignment procedures will be used, the proposal is recorded as not using a randomized experimental design.

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

Indicator 2.1 of 1: The percentage of new research projects funded by IES that are deemed to be of high relevance to the needs of children with disabilities as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of new research projects funded by the Department's National Center for Special Education Research that are deemed to be of high relevance by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Expert panel review

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006
Inclusion of experienced practitioners and administrators in education and special education assures the quality of the data.

Limitations: Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

ESRA: Statistics - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.830 - Statistics

Program Goal: To collect, analyze, and disseminate information on the condition of education in the United States and to provide comparative international statistics.

Objective 1 of 1: *Provide timely, useful, and comprehensive data that are relevant to policy and educational improvement.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Customer satisfaction: The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data are timely, relevant, and comprehensive.

Measure 1.1.1 of 3: The percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES publications.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility
1997	88	72	86			
1999	91	77	89	85	85	85
2001	90	74	90	90	90	90
2004	90	78	90	90	90	90
2006				90	90	90
2008				90	90	90

Measure 1.1.2 of 3: The 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
2004	88	78	90	90
2006			90	90
2008			90	90

Measure 1.1.3 of 3: The percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES services.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness
1997		89		
1999	93	93	85	85
2001	83	88	90	90
2004	92	84	90	90
2006			90	90
2008			90	90

Source: NCES Customer Satisfaction Survey.

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data will be validated by using NCES review procedures and by applying NCES statistical standards.

Improvements: The NCES Monitoring System will yield annual updates on the use and applications of NCES data. NCES views Web release of its reports as a source of increased efficiency and is committed to releasing at least 90 percent of its reports on the Web.

Explanation: NCES expects that each year, all user manuals for NCES public-use data files will be available on the Web, at least 50 percent of its public-use data files will be available on the Web, and 75 percent of nonassessment surveys will be administered either through the use of computerized interviews or directly over the Web. The efficiency steps will facilitate easier, quicker, and wider access to NCES products.

RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research - FY 2006

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

Program Goal: To conduct high-quality research and related activities that lead to high-quality products.

Objective 1 of 4: *Advance knowledge through capacity building: Increase capacity to conduct and use high-quality and relevant disability and rehabilitation research and related activities designed to guide decision-making, change practice, and improve the lives of individuals with disabilities.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: The percentage of newly awarded NIDRR projects will be multisite, collaborative controlled studies of interventions and programs.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of new NIDRR projects will conduct multisite, collaborative controlled trials.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999
2015		10

Source: Contractor Performance Report, 1820-0642 Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees, RTI

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Limitations: This measure applies only to RERCs, RRTCs, Model Systems grants, and DRRPs.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was to establish a baseline; however, the recompetition was postponed. Therefore the FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline. This is an output-oriented capacity building measure. The FY 2015 target is for at least 10 percent of all new projects to be multisite, collaborative controlled studies.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Percentage of NIDRR-supported fellows, post-doctoral trainees, and doctoral students who publish results of NIDRR-sponsored research in refereed journals.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of NIDRR-supported fellows, postdoctoral trainees, and doctoral students who publish results of NIDRR-sponsored research in refereed journals.					
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**	
	Fellows	Post-Doc Trainees	Doctoral Students	Fellows	Post-Doc Trainees	Doctoral Students
2005				qqq	qqq	qqq

2006		999	999	999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTCs, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utillization Projects).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006
NIDRR is planning to work with other ED staff to conduct an audit of publications entered into the Web-based reporting system to verify grantees' self-reports of peer-reviewed journal articles.

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish the baseline; the FY 2006 target is baseline plus 1 percent. Data for this measure are collected for a calendar year, rather than fiscal year. The peer-reviewed status of publications is established using an accepted standard, such as the International Scientific Index (ISI). This is an output-oriented capacity building measure.

Objective 2 of 4: *Advance knowledge through research and related activities: Generate scientific-based knowledge, technologies, and applications to inform policy, change practice, and improve outcomes.*

Indicator 2.1 of 4: The number of accomplishments (e.g., new or improved tools, methods, discoveries, standards, interventions, programs, or devices) developed or tested with NIDRR funding that have been judged by expert panels to be of high quality and to advance the field.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The number of accomplishments (new or improved tools, methods, discoveries, standards, interventions, programs, or devices) developed and/or tested with NIDRR funding that have been judged by expert panels to be of high quality and to advance the field.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999
2015		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTCs, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utillization Projects).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2007

Explanation: This FY 2006 measure is a revision of a similar prior measure and its prior year data has been preserved. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline at the completion of the first three-year cycle of assessments, in which a judgmentally selected sample of grantee nominated "discoveries" will be reviewed. Approximately 1/3 of NIDRR's grants will be reviewed annually as part of the new portfolio assessment process. This is an outcome-oriented research and development measure. The FY 2015 target is the baseline plus at least 20 percent.

Indicator 2.2 of 4: Percentage of grantee research and development that has appropriate study design, meets rigorous standards of scientific and/or engineering methods, and builds on and contributes to knowledge in the field.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of NIDRR-funded grant applications that receive an average peer review score of 85 or higher.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2002	82	
2003	96	
2004	89	
2005	99	
2006		85

Source: Grant Applications.
Date Sponsored: 05/27/2005.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: This FY 2006 measure is a revision of a similar prior year measure, and its prior year data were recalculated using a new methodology. This is an activity-oriented research and development measure.

Indicator 2.3 of 4: Average number of publications per award based on NIDRR-funded research and development activities in refereed journals.

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: The number of publications per award published in refereed journals.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	2.91	
2003	3.38	8
2004	2.71	5
2005		5
2006		2

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTCs, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utillization Projects).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: An accepted standard, such as the International Scientific Index (ISI) will be used to determine peer-reviewed status. Data for publications will be collected over a calendar year, instead of fiscal year. Actual performance for prior years 2002 and 2003 was recalculated in FY 2005 to correct for duplications of publications within the same award. This is an output-oriented research and development measure.

Indicator 2.4 of 4: Percentage of new grants that include studies funded by NIDRR that assess the effectiveness of interventions, programs, and devices using rigorous and appropriate methods.

Measure 2.4.1 of 1: The percentage of new grants that assess the effectiveness of interventions, programs, and devices using rigorous and appropriate methods.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2002	65	
2003	59	
2004	59	
2005	49	
2006		65

Source: GAPS and review of grant applications.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: Beginning in FY 2006, preliminary data reported for 2002-2005 based on staff reviews of grants abstracts will be updated with external expert assessments to ensure "effectiveness studies" using "rigorous and appropriate methods." For FY 2005, 77 newly-funded grants contained at least 1 "effectiveness study." This is an output-oriented research and development measure.

Objective 3 of 4: *Advance knowledge through translation and dissemination: Promote the effective use of scientific-based knowledge, technologies, and applications to inform policy, improve practice, and enhance the lives of individuals with disabilities.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Number of new or improved assistive and universally-designed technologies, products, and devices developed and/or validated by grantees that are transferred to industry for potential commercialization.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The number of new or improved assistive and universally designed technologies, products, and devices transferred to industry for potential commercialization.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTCs, DBTACs, DRRPs, Model Systems, Dissemination & Utillization Projects).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish the baseline. The FY 2006 target is baseline plus 1 percent. Data will be collected over a calendar year, rather than fiscal year. This is an outcome-oriented knowledge translation measure.

Objective 4 of 4: *Enhance efficiency of NIDRR grant award process.*

Indicator 4.1 of 1: Notification: Notification of applicants.

Measure 4.1.1 of 2: The percentage of competitions announced by Oct. 1

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	21	
2004	23	
2005	8	
2006		25

Measure 4.1.2 of 2: The percentage of grant awards issued within 6 months of the competition closing date.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	70	
2004	83	
2005	57	
2006		90

Source: GAPS and Federal Register Notice.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

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

AEFLA: Adult Basic and Literacy State Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.002 - Adult Education State Grant Program

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

Objective 1 of 1: *Provide adult learners with opportunities to acquire basic foundation skills (including English language acquisition), complete secondary education, and transition to further education and training and to work.*

Indicator 1.1 of 5: Basic skill acquisition: The percentage of adults in adult basic education programs who acquire the level of basic skills needed (validated by standardized assessments) to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of adults in adult basic education programs who acquire the level of basic skills needed to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Percentage of adults	Percentage of adults
1997	40	
1998	31	
1999	44	
2000	26	40
2001	36	40
2002	37	40
2003	38	41
2004	38	42
2005		42
2006		39

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Limitations: As a third-tier recipient of these 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.

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

Explanation: As of 2000, data reflect the percentage 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.

Indicator 1.2 of 5: Basic English language acquisition: Percentage of adults enrolled in English literacy programs will acquire (validated by standardized assessment) the level of English language skills needed to complete the levels of instruction in which they enrolled.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of adults enrolled in English literacy programs who acquire the level of English language skills needed to complete the levels of instruction in which they enrolled.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1996	30	
1997	28	
1998	28	
1999	49	
2000	20	40
2001	31	40
2002	34	42
2003	36	44
2004	36	45
2005		45
2006		38

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
The 2003 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines.

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

Explanation: As of 2000, data reflect the percentage 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.

Indicator 1.3 of 5: Secondary completion: The percentage of adults with a high school completion goal and who exit during the program year that earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The percentage of adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Percent of adults	Percent of adults
1996	36	
1997	37	
1998	33	
1999	34	
2000	34	40
2001	33	40
2002	42	40
2003	44	41
2004	45	42
2005		46
2006		46

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
The 2003 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: As a third-tier recipient of this data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines.

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

Explanation: As of 2000, the performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners with a goal to complete high school in secondary level programs of instruction who, upon exit, had earned their high school diploma or GED credential within the reporting period.

Indicator 1.4 of 5: Transition to postsecondary education or training: The percentage of enrolled adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who exit during the program year that enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: The percentage of adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults	Number of adults	Percentage of adults
1996	175,255			
1997	178,520			
1998	158,167			
1999	148,803			
2000	161,650		300,000	
2001		25		
2002		30		25
2003		30		26
2004		30		27
2005				30
2006				33

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
The 2003 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines.

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

Explanation: As of 2001, the 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.

Indicator 1.5 of 5: Transition to work: The percentage of unemployed adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.

Measure 1.5.1 of 1: The percentage of adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults	Number of adults	Percentage of adults

1996	306,982	
1997	340,206	
1998	294,755	
1999	409,062	
2000	454,318	425,000
2001	36	
2002	39	36
2003	37	37
2004	36	38
2005		40
2006		40

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
The 2003 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines.

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

Explanation: As of 2001, performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners with an employment goal who, upon exit from an adult education program, obtain a job.

AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.191 - Adult Education National Leadership Activities

Program Goal: To support research, evaluation, information dissemination and other activities to help states improve adult education, and literacy programs.

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

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The National Reporting System (NRS), which supports performance-based reporting, will be fully implemented in all states to consistently provide high-quality learner assessment data.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of states yielding high-quality learner assessment data under NRS.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	50	
2003	65	75
2004	75	95
2005		96
2006		100

Source: State Annual Performance Reports - data and narrative.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Program monitoring and data review and analysis by ED and Data Quality Certification Process. Data will be verified by electronic checks and expert staff analysis, and by requiring confirmation and attestation of data by state directors. State data are also checked independently by ED/OVAE during onsite monitoring and state audit reviews.

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

AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.257 - National Institute for Literacy

Program Goal: To provide knowledge and resources to improve literacy instruction across the lifespan.

Objective 1 of 2: *Recipients state that information based on scientific research (or the most rigorous research available) provided by NIFL prepares them to improve instruction.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Technical assistance: The percentage of persons who receive NIFL technical assistance.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: (a) The percentage of recipients who receive information through NIFL technical assistance who report they are likely to implement instructional practices grounded in scientifically based research (or the most rigorous research available).		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: (b) The percentage of individuals who receive NIFL technical assistance who can demonstrate that they implemented instructional practices grounded in scientifically based research within six months of receiving the technical assistance.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Evaluations of technical assistance

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Limitations: Not everyone who receives technical assistance will complete an evaluation.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish baselines for these new measures.

Objective 2 of 2: *NIFL effectively disseminates high-quality information to improve instructional practice and/or service delivery.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Dissemination: The percentage of projects that are deemed to be of high quality.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of products that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent panel of qualified scientists.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Panel of experts to review a sample of products available on the NIFL Web site.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

ATA: Assistive Technology Alternative Financing - FY 2006

Program Goal: To increase availability of, funding for, access to, and provision of assistive technology (AT) devices and assistive technology services.

Objective 1 of 1: *Reduce barriers associated with the cost of assistive technology devices and services for individuals with disabilities.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Alternative Funding Program (AFP): The amount loaned per $1 million federal investment.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The amount loaned per $1 million federal investment.										
Year	**Actual Performance**					**Performance Targets**				
	Annual Fed Invest.	Annual Amount Loaned	Cum. Fed. Invest.	Cum Amount Loaned	Cum. Loaned per $1M (Cum. fed)	Annual Fed Invest.	Annual Amount Loaned	Cum. Fed. Invest.	Cum Amount Loaned	Cum. Loaned per $1M (Cum. fed)
2001	3.79	2.31	3.79	2.31	0.61					
2002	13.63	5.58	17.43	7.85	0.45					
2003	0	7.70	17.43	15.54	0.89					
2004	35.82	11.10	53.25	26.64	0.50					
2005	0		53.25							
2006	3.94		57.19							0.75
2007										0.75

Source: Additional Source Information: Annual web-based reporting system. The annual federal investment data are shown in the fiscal year following the year of actual appropriation. For example, the $3.79M shown in FY 2001 was appropriated in FY 2000.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: September 2006
TA provider verifies grantee data.

Limitations: Not all grantees reported in 2004. The data represents only 18 of 31 grantees. There were several reasons not all reported: (1) The data collection instrument was not OMB approved, so grantees were not required to report using the web-based system and some chose not to. Only the data of those who used the system is reported, so the number of loans and value of loans is underreported. (2) Many programs were not yet up and running so they could not provide loans.

Improvements: The data collection instrument was approved by OMB in 2005 and is now in use by almost all AFPs. However, a shutdown of the data system for many months has caused a backlog in data entry and the

loss of some data.

Explanation: FY 2001 was the first year that the AFP operated. The ATA was reauthorized in October 2004. This is a new efficiency measure for the Alternative Financing Program (AFP). The amount loaned by each state will vary greatly, depending on the type of loans states use to make alternative financing available (e.g., guaranteed loans, interest rate buy-down loans, non-guaranteed low interest loans, guaranteed and interest rate buy-down loans, and direct loans) and the difference in the amount paid from the AFP permanent account to cover administrative and program costs. The number of loans are FY 2001 = 247, FY 2002 = 594, FY 2003 = 753, FY 2004 = 1119.

ATA: Assistive Technology Programs - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.224 - Assistive Technology

Program Goal: To increase access to and acquisition of assistive technology for individuals with disabilities.

Objective 1 of 2: *To increase acquisition of assistive technology for individuals with disabilities.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: AT Acquisition for Education: Targeted individuals and entities as defined by the AT Act obtain AT devices or services in the domains of education, employment, and community living despite systemic and cost barriers.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who obtained AT for educational purposes through State financing activities or reutilization programs who would not have obtained the device or service.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Data collection system being developed.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The data collection system is being developed. Statewide AT Programs can conduct either state financing systems or device reutilization Programs (or both) to overcome cost, eligibility, and availability barriers to acquiring AT. Statewide AT programs will collect data from individuals using these programs to determine whether their services overcame these barriers.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: AT Acquisition for Employment: Targeted individuals and entities as defined by the AT Act obtain AT devices or services in the domains of education, employment, and community living despite systemic and cost barriers.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who obtained AT for employment purposes through State financing activities or reutilization programs who would not have obtained the device or service.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Data collection system being developed.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The data collection system is being developed. Statewide AT Programs can conduct either state financing systems or device reutilization Programs (or both) to

overcome cost, eligibility, and availability barriers to acquiring AT. Statewide AT programs will collect data from individuals using these programs to determine whether their services overcame these barriers.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: AT Acquisition for Community Living: Targeted individuals and entities as defined by the AT Act obtain AT devices or services in the domains of education, employment, and community living despite systemic and cost barriers.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who obtained AT for community living through State financing activities or reutilization programs who would not have obtained the device or service.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Data collection system being developed.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The data collection system is being developed. Statewide AT Programs can conduct either state financing systems or device reutilization Programs (or both) to overcome cost, eligibility, and availability barriers to acquiring AT. Statewide AT programs will collect data from individuals using these programs to determine whether their services overcame these barriers.

Objective 2 of 2: *To increase access to assistive technology for individuals with disabilities.*

Indicator 2.1 of 4: AT Access in Education: Targeted individuals and entities as defined by the AT Act have increased access to AT in the domains of education, employment, community living, and telecommunications/IT because of exposure to AT that enables them to make informed decisions.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who accessed device demonstration programs and/or device loan programs and made a decision about an AT device or service for educational purposes as a result of the assistance they received.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Data collection system being developed.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The data collection system is being developed. Statewide AT Programs can conduct either state financing systems or device reutilization Programs (or both) to overcome cost, eligibility, and availability barriers to acquiring AT. Statewide AT programs will collect data from individuals using these programs to determine whether their services overcame these barriers.

Indicator 2.2 of 4: AT Access for Employment: Targeted individuals and entities as defined by the AT Act have increased access to AT in the domains of education, employment, community living, and telecommunications/IT.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: Percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who accessed device demonstration programs and/or device loan programs and made a decision about an AT device or service for employment purposes as a result of the assistance they received.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Data collection system being developed.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The data collection system is being developed. Statewide AT Programs can conduct either state financing systems or device reutilization Programs (or both) to overcome cost, eligibility, and availability barriers to acquiring AT. Statewide AT programs will collect data from individuals using these programs to determine whether their services overcame these barriers.

Indicator 2.3 of 4: AT Access for Community Living: Targeted individuals and entities as defined by the AT Act have increased access to AT in the domains of education, employment, community living, and telecommunications/IT.

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: Percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who accessed device demonstration programs and/or device loan programs and made a decision about an AT device or service for community living as a result of the assistance they received.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Data collection system being developed.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The data collection system is being developed. Statewide AT Programs can conduct either state financing systems or device reutilization Programs (or both) to overcome cost, eligibility, and availability barriers to acquiring AT. Statewide AT programs will collect data from individuals using these programs to determine whether their services overcame these barriers.

Indicator 2.4 of 4: AT Access for IT: Targeted individuals and entities as defined by the AT Act have increased access to AT in the domains of education, employment, community living, and telecommunications/IT.

Measure 2.4.1 of 1: Percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who accessed device demonstration programs and/or device loan programs and made a decision about an AT device or service that meets an IT/telecommunications need as a result of the assistance they received.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Data collection system being developed.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The data collection system is being developed. Statewide AT Programs can conduct either state financing systems or device reutilization Programs (or both) to overcome cost, eligibility, and availability barriers to acquiring AT. Statewide AT programs will collect data from individuals using these programs to determine whether their services overcame these barriers.

EDA: Gallaudet University - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.910A - Gallaudet University Programs and Elementary and Secondary Education Programs
84.910B - Gallaudet University Endowment Grant
84.910D - Gallaudet University Construction Program

Program Goal: To challenge students who are deaf, graduate students who are deaf, and graduate students who are hearing to achieve their academic goals and obtain productive employment, provide leadership in setting the national standard for best practices in education of the deaf and hard of hearing, and establish a sustainable resource base.

Objective 1 of 3: *The University Programs and the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School will optimize the number of students completing programs of study.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Enrollment at Gallaudet University: Maintain minimum enrollment numbers in Gallaudet's undergraduate, graduate, and professional studies programs, as well as the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School as established by Gallaudet University.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: University enrollment in Gallaudet's programs and schools.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional Studies	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional Studies
1998	1,339	714	92			
1999	1,300	628	70	1,250	700	70
2000	1,318	541	86	1,250	700	70
2001	1,321	625	93	1,250	700	70
2002	1,243	517	92	1,250	700	70
2003	1,243	617	154	1,250	700	70
2004	1,236	506	70	1,250	700	70
2005	1,207	451	176	1,250	650	70
2006	1,274	466	173	1,250	650	175

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: Enrollment in Gallaudet's Clerc Center .

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets

	Model Sec. School	Kendall Elem. School	Model Sec. School	Kendall Elem. School
1998	224	137		
1999	209	117	225	140
2000	219	135	225	140
2001	205	148	225	140
2002	188	148	225	140
2003	190	152	225	140
2004	186	145	225	140
2005	182	142	225	140
2006	266	141	225	140

Source: Collegiate Office of Enrollment Services, and Clerc Center student database, FY 2006 enrollment as of October 2005, summarized in Gallaudet's FY 2005 annual report, submitted in 2006.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: Gallaudet has established minimum enrollment targets based on long-standing enrollment targets and historical trends, recognizing that actual figures vary from year to year. A degree-seeking student who is dually-enrolled in Professional Studies course is only counted under one of the categories.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Student persistence rate: Increase the undergraduate persistence rate and increase or maintain the graduate student persistence rate.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Persistence rates of university students served by Gallaudet.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Graduate
1998	72			
1999	73		75	
2000	72	78	76	80
2001	71	82	76	82
2002	73	98	76	
2003	71	86	79	
2004	73	89	79	86
2005	76	93	79	86
2006			79	86

2007		79	86
2008		80	88
2009		80	88
2010		80	88

Source: Collegiate Office of the Register records, summarized in the FY 2005 annual report, submitted in 2006.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: For FY 2006 this measure changed from retention rates to persistence rates. This measure was designated as a long-term measure for FY 2006.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Student graduation rates: By 2008 the undergraduate graduation rate will reach 48 percent; the graduate student and Model Secondary School student graduation rates will be increased or maintained.

Measure 1.3.1 of 2: Graduation rates of university students served by Gallaudet.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Graduate
1998	41			
1999	42		41	
2000	41	82	42	80
2001	41	82	43	80
2002	42	82	44	
2003	42	82	45	
2004	42	84	45	82
2005	42	86	46	83
2006			47	83
2007			47	
2008			48	

Measure 1.3.2 of 2: Model Secondary School graduation rate of Clerc Center students.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

	1st Year Seniors	2nd Year Seniors	Annual Graduation Rate	1st Year Seniors	2nd Year Seniors	Annual Graduation Rate
1998			93			
1999			88			94
2000			98			94
2001			90			94
2002	76	14	80			94
2003	68	21	71			94
2004	58	29	87			94
2005	71					94
2006						90

Source: Collegiate Office of the Registrar and the Clerc Center Office of Exemplary Programs and Research records, summarized in FY 2005 annual report, submitted in 2006.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The undergraduate graduation rates are calculated as the number of graduates in one year over the number of entering students six years previously. Graduation from MSSD is more than completion of required course work. Graduation signals that students have successfully met their IEP goals, so that graduation becomes an Individualized Education Program (IEP) decision. Students may graduate at the end of their senior year, or they may make the decision, as part of the IEP process, to return to MSSD for a fifth year to pursue their IEP goals. As of FY 2005, the graduate rate was disaggregated to show those who graduate after four years and those who exercise a 5th-year option. The FY 2005 data only reports those who graduated after their senior year. The second year seniors (5th-year option) for FY 2005 will be reported after June 2006; the Annual Graduation rate will be calculated at that time.

Objective 2 of 3: *Gallaudet works in partnership with others to develop and disseminate educational programs and materials for deaf and hard-of-hearing students.*

Indicator 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.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The number of programs adopting Model/Kendall innovative strategies/curricula.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1998	41	
1999	52	41
2000	62	41
2001	39	41

2002	56	41
2003	54	41
2004	91	50
2005	56	55
2006		55

Source: Records of the Clerc Center Office of Training and Professional Development, summarized in the Gallaudet FY 2005 Annual Report, submitted in January 2006.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: 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 for training and implementation activities.

Objective 3 of 3: *Curriculum and extracurricular activities prepare students to meet the skill requirements of the workplace or to continue their studies.*

Indicator 3.1 of 2: Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the university: Gallaudet's bachelor's graduates will either find employment commensurate with their training and education or attend advanced education or training programs during their first year after graduation.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of graduates who are employed or in advanced education or training during the first year after graduation.

Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Students Employed	Students in Advanced Education or Training	Not Engaged in Either Activity	Students Employed	Students in Advanced Education or Training	Not Engaged in Either Activity
2001	90	38		77	38	
2002	89	49				
2003	79	40				
2004	73	38		80	40	
2005	69	36		81	41	
2006				82	41	999

Source: Gallaudet University study on the status of graduates' employment and advanced studies, February, 2004

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target for the new category is to establish a baseline. Employed includes both full and part-time employment. Advanced education or training includes students enrolled in a master's or Ph.D. program, a vocational or technical program, or another type of program (e.g., law school or medical school).

Indicator 3.2 of 2: Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the Model Secondary School: A high percentage of the Model Secondary School graduates will either find jobs commensurate with their training or will attend postsecondary programs.

Measure 3.2.1 of 1: The percentage of Model Secondary School graduates who are in jobs or postsecondary programs four months after graduation.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	74	
2001	72	80
2002	90	80
2003	82	80
2004	83	80
2005	83	81
2006		83

Source: The follow-up survey is conducted by the Clerc Center Office of Exemplary Programs and Research, approximately three months following June graduation.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: In 2007, this will be changed to percentage of Model Secondary School graduates who are in jobs or postsecondary programs during first year after graduation. In addition we will disaggregate this indicator to three categories of students; those in post-secondary education or training, those employed, and those who are not engaged in either activity.

EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.908A - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Operations
84.908B - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Endowment Program
84.908C - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Construction Program

Program Goal: To provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate programs and professional studies with state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, undertake a program of applied research, share NTID expertise, and expand outside sources of revenue.

Objective 1 of 3: *Provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate and professional studies with outstanding state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, complemented by a strong arts and sciences curriculum and supplemented with appropriate student support services.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Enrollment: Maintain a minimum student body of undergraduates, graduates, and educational interpreters as established by NTID.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of students enrolled in NTID.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	Undergraduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.	Undergraduate	Educational Interpreter	Grad/Masters in Special Ed.
1996	1,038	59	27			
1997	1,069	72	32			
1998	1,085	84	36			
1999	1,135	93	50	1,080	100	50
2000	1,084	77	59	1,080	100	50
2001	1,089	75	55	1,080	100	50
2002	1,125	53	60	1,080	100	75
2003	1,093	65	73	1,080	100	75
2004	1,064	92	114	1,080	100	75
2005	1,055	100	126	1,080	100	90
2006	1,013	116	127	1,080	100	120

Source: National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office records, FY 2006 as of October 2005.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Objective 2 of 3: *Maximize the number of students successfully completing a program of study.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Graduation rate: Increase the baccalaureate and sub-baccalaureate rates.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The NTID baccalaureate and sub-baccalaureate graduation rates.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate
1997	50	51		
1998	50	57		
1999	50	61		
2000	50	63	51	61
2001	50	64	51	61
2002	54	66	52	61
2003	52	68	52	61
2004	51	68	52	69
2005	48	69	52	69
2006			53	70
2007			53	71
2008			54	72
2009			54	72
2010			54	72

Source: NTID Registrar Office records

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: For 2006, the long-term measures were re-worded to focus on the two graduation categories, rather than the aggregate figure.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Student retention rate: Maintain the first year baccalaureate and sub-baccalaureate retention rates.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of first-year baccalaureate and sub-baccalaureate retention rates.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Sub-Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate
1997	85	84		
1998	73	81		
1999	69	84		
2000	69	85	73	84
2001	68	86	74	84
2002	72	87	74	84
2003	70	86	74	84
2004	70	86	74	84
2005	70	85	74	86
2006			74	86
2007			74	86
2008			74	87
2009			74	87
2010			74	87

Source: NTID registrar office records.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: In FY 2006, this measure became a long-term measure.

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

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Placement rate: Maintain a high percentage of graduates placed in the workforce.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of NTID graduates who are employed or in advanced education or training during the first year after graduation.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

	Students Employed	Students in Advanced Education or Training	Not Engaged in Either Activity	Students Employed	Students in Advanced Education or Training	Not Engaged in Either Activity
1996	96					
1997	97					
1998	95					
1999	94			95		
2000	90			95		
2001	92			95		
2002	89			95		
2003	93			95		
2004	93			95		
2005				95		
2006				95	999	999
2007				95		
2008				95		
2009				95		
2010				95		

Source: National Technical Institute for the Deaf placement records for FY 2004.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: Placement rate data are reported the year after graduation. The institute believes that a 95 percent placement rate represents an appropriate ongoing target, but economic conditions have deteriorated to a point that it is affecting students' ability to find permanent placement. The students employed rate is calculated as the percentage of graduates who are employed among those who want to be employed. In 2006, the targets for the two new categories (Students in Advanced Education or Training, and Not Engaged in Either Activity) are to establish the baselines.

HEA: AID Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.031S - Title V Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program

Program Goal: To improve the capacity of minority-serving institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.

Objective 1 of 4: *Increase enrollments of Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs).*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Student enrollment: Full-time degree-seeking undergraduate enrollment at HSIs

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of full-time degree-seeking undergraduates enrolling at HSIs.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	734,212	
2003	773,859	
2004	825,492	
2005	845,045	
2009		813,326

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas/

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Fall enrollment data will be monitored annually to measure progress in meeting the long-term target, which is projected to be met in 2009. Target is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2002-03 -- which was 5.1%. Therefore, the HSI program actual enrollment of 773,859 in FY 2003 was multiplied by 1.051 to generate the target of 813,326.

Objective 2 of 4: *Increase the persistence rate for students enrolled at HSIs.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Persistence rate: First year persistence rate of students attending HSIs

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of full-time undergraduate students who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same HSI institution.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	66.50	
2005	66	
2006		67
2007		68
2008		68
2009		68
2010		68
2011		68

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas/

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: The FY 2004 data established the baseline. Institutions report a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for the HSI program is calculated as a median. Target is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2003-04 -- which was 1.12%. Therefore, the HSI program actual persistence rate of 67% in FY 2004 was multiplied by 1.0112 to generate the long-term target (for 2009) of 68%. Annual increases are estimated to be 0.2% each year through 2009 and 0.1% beginning in 2010.

Objective 3 of 4: *Increase the graduation rate for students enrolled at HSIs*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Graduation rate: The graduation rate of students enrolled at HSIs will increase.

Measure 3.1.1 of 2: The percentage of students enrolled at four-year HSIs graduating within six years of enrollment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	35	
2004	36	
2006		34
2007		35
2008		35
2009		35

2010		35
2011		35

Measure 3.1.2 of 2: The percentage of students enrolled at HSI institutions who graduate from two-year institutions within three years of enrollment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	21	
2004	22	
2006		36
2007		36
2008		36
2009		36
2010		36
2011		36

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas/

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Data for FY 2003 was recalculated and is now more accurate than previously reported. Target for four-year graduation rate is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2002-03 -- which was 3.54%. Therefore, the HSI program actual four-year graduation rate of 35% in FY 2003 was multiplied by 1.0354 to generate the long-term target (for 2009) of 36%. Annual increases are estimated to be 0.6% through 2009 and 0.3% beginning in 2010. For the two-year graduation rate projections, program experience was used to estimate targets. An increase of 0.5% was used to generate annual targets each year through 2009 and an increase of 0.3% was used beginning in 2010.

Objective 4 of 4: *Improve the efficiency of service delivery to HSI students.*

Indicator 4.1 of 1: Efficiency measure: Cost per successful program outcome.

Measure 4.1.1 of 1: Federal cost for undergraduate and graduate degrees at institutions in the Developing HSI program.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	1,058	
2004	1,030	

Survey/Assessment: Adult Literacy and Lifeskills Survey.

Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: This measure is calculated as the appropriation for the Developing HSIs program divided by the number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded. This is a new efficiency measure. The 2003 actual value reflects an appropriation of $92.396 million divided by 87,326 graduates. The actual FY 2004 value reflects an appropriation of $93.993 million divided by 92,216 graduates.

HEA: AID Minority Science and Engineering Improvement - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.120A - Minority Science and Engineering Improvement

Program Goal: To improve the capacity of minority-serving institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.

Objective 1 of 3: *To increase enrollment of minority undergraduates in the fields of engineering or physical and biological sciences at minority-serving institutions over the long term.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Enrollment number: The number of students in engineering, biological or physical sciences at minority-serving institutions.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of full-time degree-seeking minority undergraduates enrolling in fields of engineering or physical and biological sciences at minority-serving grantee institutions.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Fall enrollment data, will be monitored annually to measure progress in meeting the long-term goal. The FY 2005 data will set the baseline. the FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.

Objective 2 of 3: *To increase the persistence rate for minority students in the fields of engineering or biological and physical sciences at minority-serving institutions.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Persistence rate: The first-year persistence rate of minority students in the fields of engineering or biological and physical sciences at minority-serving institutions.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of full-time undergraduate minority students who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution in the fields of engineering or physical and biological sciences

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2006		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Reporting Format for OIE Formula Grants to LEAs.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 data will be used as the baseline. FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.

Objective 3 of 3: *To increase the graduation rate for students in the fields of engineering, or physical and biological sciences, at minority-serving institutions.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Graduation rate: The graduation rate of minority students in engineering or physical and biological sciences at minority-serving institutions.

Measure 3.1.1 of 2: The percentage of minority students enrolled at four-year minority-serving institutions, in the fields of engineering or physical or biological sciences, who graduate within six years of enrollment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Measure 3.1.2 of 2: The percentage of minority students enrolled at two-year minority-serving institutions, in the fields of engineering or physical or biological sciences, who graduate within three years of enrollment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: The FY 2005 data will be used as baselines. FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.

HEA: AID Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.031N - Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions

Program Goal: To improve the capacity of minority-serving institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.

Objective 1 of 4: *Maintain or increase enrollments at Alaska Native and Native-Hawaiian Serving Institutions over the long term.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Student enrollment: Full-time degree seeking undergraduate enrollment at Alaska Native and Native -Hawaiian serving institutions (AN/NH) will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of full-time degree-seeking undergraduates enrolling at AN/NH institutions.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	13,739	
2009		13,700

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Fall enrollment data will be monitored annually to measure progress toward the long-term target, which is projected to be met in 2009.

Objective 2 of 4: *Maintain or increase the persistence rate for students at Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian serving institutions.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Persistence rate: The first-year persistence rate of full-time, first time undergraduate students at AN/NH institutions.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of full-time undergraduate students who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same AN/NH institution.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	46	
2006		46
2007		46
2008		46
2009		46
2010		46
2011		46

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Institutions report a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for AN/NH institutions is calculated as a median.

Objective 3 of 4: *Maintain or increase the graduation rate at Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian serving institutions.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Graduation rate: The percentage of undergraduate students at four-year AN/NH institutions

Measure 3.1.1 of 2: The percentage of undergraduate students at AN/NH institutions who graduate within six years of enrollment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	27	
2006		27
2007		27
2008		27
2009		27
2010		27

2011		27

Measure 3.1.2 of 2: The percentage o\f students enrolled at two-year AN/NH institutions who graduate within three years of enrollment		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	16	
2006		16
2007		16
2008		16
2009		16
2010		16
2011		16

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Objective 4 of 4: *Improve the efficiency of service delivery to AN/NH students.*

Indicator 4.1 of 1: Efficiency measure: Cost per successful program outcome

Measure 4.1.1 of 1: Federal cost for undergraduate and graduate degree at AN/NH institution.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	1,940	

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which verify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: This measure is calculated as the appropriation for the Strengthening AN/NH Institutions program divided by the number of undergraduate and graduate degrees earned. This is a new efficiency measure. Data for 2004-2005 are estimated to be available in November 2006. The 2003 value reflects an appropriation of $8,180,479 divided by 4,216 graduates.

HEA: AID Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.031B - Strengthening HBCUs and Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions

Program Goal: To improve the capacity of minority-serving institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.

Objective 1 of 4: *Increase enrollments at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs).*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Student enrollment: Full-time degree-seeking undergraduate enrollment at HBCUs will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of full-time degree-seeking undergraduates enrolling at HBCUs.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	188,259	
2003	206,332	
2004	221,254	
2005	223,933	
2009		231,443

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Limitations: Data are self-reported

Explanation: Fall enrollment data will be monitored annually to measure progress in meeting the long-term target, which is projected to be met in 2009. Target is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2002-03 -- which was 12.1%. Therefore, the HBCU program actual enrollment of 206,332 in FY 2003 was multiplied by 1.121 to generate the long-term target of 231,443.

Objective 2 of 4: *Increase the persistence rate for students enrolled at HBCUs.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Persistence rate: First-year persistence rate of students attending HBCUs will increase.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of full-time undergraduate students who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same HBCU institution.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	64	
2005	65	
2006		65
2007		66
2008		66
2009		66
2010		67
2011		67

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Institutions report a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for the HBCU program is calculated as a median. Target is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2002-03 -- which was 3.6%. Therefore, the HBCU program actual persistence rate of 64% in FY 2003 was multiplied by 1.0363 to generate the long-term target (for 2009) of 66%. Annual increases are estimated to be 0.6% each year through 2009 and 0.3% beginning in 2010. Data for 2004-05 will be available in November 2006. Data values for 2004 had previously been erroneously assigned to 2003.

Objective 3 of 4: *Increase the graduation rate for students enrolled at HBCUs.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Graduation rate: The graduation rate of students enrolled at HBCUs will increase.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of students enrolled at four-year HBCUs graduating within six years of enrollment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	36	
2003	39	
2004	39	
2006		37
2007		37

2008		37
2009		37
2010		37
2011		37

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: The target for four-year graduation rate is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2002-03 -- which was 1.4%. Therefore, the HBCU program actual four-year graduation rate of 36% in FY 2003 was multiplied by 1.0141 to generate the long-term target (for 2009) of 37%. Annual increases are estimated to be 0.25% through 2009 and 0.1% beginning in 2010.

Objective 4 of 4: *Improve the efficiency of institutional services delivery to HBCU students.*

Indicator 4.1 of 1: Efficiency measure: Cost per successful program outcome.

Measure 4.1.1 of 1: Federal cost of HBCU undergraduate and graduate degree.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	8,631	
2004	8,982	

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: This measure is calculated as the appropriation for the Strengthening HBCUs program divided by the number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded. This is a new efficiency measure. The 2003 actual value reflects an appropriation of $214.01million divided by 24,796 graduates. The 2004 actual value of $8,982 reflects an appropriation of $222.8 million divided by 24,804 graduates. The numbers of graduates for 2003 and 2004 were computed from a sample of HBCU institutions.

HEA: AID Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions - FY 2006

Program Goal: To improve the capacity of minority-serving institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.

Objective 1 of 3: *Increase enrollment at historically Black graduate institutions (HBGIs).*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Graduate student enrollment: The number of full-time graduate students enrolled at HBGIs will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of full-time graduate students enrolled at HBGIs.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	12,648	
2003	13,328	
2004	14,832	
2005	14,687	
2009		14,148

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Fall enrollment data are monitored annually to measure progress toward meeting the long-term target, which is projected to be met in 2009. Target is derived by applying an estimated annual rate of increase based on program experience to the period between FY 2003 and FY 2009. Annual increases are estimated to be 1.0% through 2009 and 0.5% beginning in 2010.

Objective 2 of 3: *Increase the number of graduate degrees awarded at HBGIs.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: I Graduate awards: The number of Ph.D.s, first professional, and Master's degrees awarded at HBGIs.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The number of Ph.D., first professional, and Master's degrees awarded at HBGIs.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	4,055	
2004	4,219	
2006		4,178
2007		4,220
2008		4,262
2009		4,305
2010		4,327
2011		4,349

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Program experience indicates that an annual increase of 1.0% is an ambitious goal. Targets are derived by applying an estimated annual increase rate of 1.0% through 2009 and an increase rate of 0.5% beginning in 2010. Data for 2004-05 will be available in November 2006.

Objective 3 of 3: *Improve the efficiency of institutional service delivery to HBGI students.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Efficiency measure: Cost per successful program outcome.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: Federal cost per HBGI graduate.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	13,173	
2004	12,586	

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: The measure is calculated as the appropriation for the Strengthening HBGIs program divided by the number of graduate degrees awarded. This is a new efficiency measure. The 2003 actual value reflects an appropriation of $53.415 million divided by 4,055 graduates. The 2004 actual value reflects an appropriation of 53.1 million divided by 4,219 degrees.

HEA: AID Strengthening Institutions - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.031A - Strengthening Institutions Program--Development Grants, Planning Grants

Program Goal: To improve the capacity of minority-serving institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.

Objective 1 of 4: *Increase enrollments of Strengthening Institutions Program (SIP) institutions.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Student enrollment: Full-time degree-seeking undergraduate enrollment at SIP Institutions will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of full-time degree-seeking undergraduates enrolling at SIP institutions.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	176,304	
2003	200,345	
2009		253,500

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Fall enrollment data will be monitored annually to measure progress in meeting the long-term target, which is projected to be met in 2009. Target is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2002-03 (about 25%) -- which results in a long-term target of 253,500. Data for 2004-05 will be available in November 2006.

Objective 2 of 4: *Increase the persistence rate for students enrolled at SIP Institutions.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Persistence rate: First year persistence rate of students attending SIP Institutions will increase.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of full-time undergraduate students who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same SIP institution.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	67	
2006		68
2007		68
2008		68
2009		68
2010		68
2011		68

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Institutions report a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for the SIP program is calculated as a median. Target is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual values for school year 2002-03 -- which was 1.67%. Therefore, the SIP program actual persistence rate of 67% in FY 2003 was multiplied by 1.0167 to generate the long-term target (for 2009) of 68%. Annual increases are estimated to be 0.3% each year through 2009 and 0.2% beginning in 2010. Data for 2004-05 will be available in November 2006.

Objective 3 of 4: *Increase the graduation rate for students enrolled at SIP Institutions.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Graduation rate: The graduation rate of students enrolled at SIP Institutions will increase.

Measure 3.1.1 of 2: The percentage of students enrolled at four-year SIPs graduating within six years of enrollment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	45	
2006		47
2007		47
2008		48
2009		48

2010		48
2011		48

Measure 3.1.2 of 2: The percentage of students enrolled at two-year SIPs who graduate within three years of enrollment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	25	
2006		25
2007		26
2008		26
2009		26
2010		26
2011		26

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Target for four-year graduation rate is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual values for school year 2002-03 -- which was 6.33%. Therefore, the SIP program actual four-year graduation rate of 45% in FY 2003 was multiplied by 1.0633 to generate the long-term target (for 2009) of 48%. Annual increases are estimated to be 1% through 2009 and 0.5% beginning in 2010. For the two-year graduation rate projections, program experience was used to estimate targets. An increase of 0.5% was used to generate annual targets each year through 2009 and an increase of 0.3% was used beginning in 2010. Data for 2004-05 will be available in November 2006.

Objective 4 of 4: *Improve the efficiency of service delivery to SIP students.*

Indicator 4.1 of 1: Efficiency measure: Cost per successful program outcome.

Measure 4.1.1 of 1: Federal cost for undergraduate and graduate degrees at SIP institutions.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	3,975	

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2005

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: This measure is calculated as the appropriation for the Strengthening Institutions Program divided by the number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded. This is a new efficiency measure. Data for 2004-05 are estimated to be available in November 2006. The 2003 actual value reflects an appropriation of $81.467 million divided by 20,495 graduates.

HEA: AID Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.031T - Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities

Program Goal: To improve the capacity of minority-serving institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.

Objective 1 of 4: *Maintain or increase enrollments of Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities (TCCUs).*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Student enrollment: Full-time degree-seeking undergraduate enrollment at TCCUs will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of full-time degree-seeking undergraduates enrolling at TCCUs.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	7,625	
2004	9,456	
2005	9,736	
2009		10,000

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Fall enrollment data will be monitored annually to measure progress in meeting the long-term target, which is projected to be met in 2009.

Objective 2 of 4: *Maintain or increase the persistence rate for students enrolled at TCCUs.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Persistence rate: First year persistence rate of students attending TCCUs will increase.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of full-time undergraduate students who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same TCCU institution

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2004	41	
2005	48	
2006		41
2007		41
2008		41
2009		41
2010		41
2011		41

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Institutions report a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for the TCCUs is calculated as a median.

Objective 3 of 4: *Maintain or increase the graduation rate for students enrolled at TCCUs.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Graduation rate: The graduation rate of students enrolled at TCCUs will increase.

Measure 3.1.1 of 2: The percentage of students enrolled at four-year TCCUs graduating within six years of enrollment.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	23	
2004	32	
2006		32
2007		32
2008		32
2009		32
2010		32
2011		32

Measure 3.1.2 of 2: The percentage of students enrolled at two-year TCCUs who graduate within three years of enrollment.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2003	40	
2004	34	
2006		29
2007		29
2008		29
2009		29
2010		29
2011		29

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Objective 4 of 4: *Maintain or improve the efficiency of service delivery to TCCU students.*

Indicator 4.1 of 1: Efficiency measure: Cost per successful program outcome.

Measure 4.1.1 of 1: Federal cost for undergraduate enrollments at TCCU institutions.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	14,353	
2004	12,386	

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: The calculation is the appropriation for the Strengthening TCCU program divided by the number of undergraduate enrollments. The $14,353 cost for the FY 2003 value reflects an appropriation of $22.850 million divided by 1,592 graduates. The FY 2004 value reflects an appropriation of 23.3 million divided by 1,880 graduates. The majority of the funds appropriated for this program are used for construction.

HEA: B.J. Stupak Olympic Scholarships - FY 2006

Program Goal: To provide financial assistance to those athletes under training at U.S.Olympic centers while pursuing postsecondary education.

Objective 1 of 2: *To enable Stupak scholars attending the Olympic training centers to pursue postsecondary education.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Persistence rate: The percentage of athletes receiving Stupak scholarships who persist in postsecondary education.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Stupak scholarship recipients who persist in their postsecondary institution.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Initially, data will be collected from Northern Michigan University, which has the largest population of Stupak scholars. In subsequent years, data will be collected for all recipients through grantees' Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Completion rate for seniors: The percentage of Stupak scholars in their senior year of study that graduate.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of Stupak scholarship recipients in their senior year of study that graduate.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Initially data will be collected from Northern Michigan University, which has the largest population of Stupak scholars. In subsequent years, data will be collected for all recipients through grantees' Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 2 of 2: *The Stupak Scholarship Program will increase its program efficiency.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Efficiency measure: The cost per successful outcome for Stupak scholarship recipients.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The cost for each Stupak scholarship recipient that persists in school or graduates.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Northern Michigan University (currently the largest population of scholars; in subsequent years, data will be collected for all recipients via Annual Performance Report.)

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: This is a new efficiency measure that is calculated by dividing the total appropriation for this program by the number of Stupak scholarship recipients who persist in school or graduate. The FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.

HEA: Byrd Honors Scholarships - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.185 - Byrd Honors Scholarships

Program Goal: To promote student excellence and to recognize exceptionally able students who show promise of continued excellence

Objective 1 of 3: *Byrd Honor Scholars will successfully complete postsecondary education programs at high rates.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The graduation rate of Byrd scholars who successfully complete postsecondary education programs within 4 years will improve.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Byrd scholars graduating within 4 years.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	98	90
2003	98	26
2004	92	26
2005		92
2006		93
2007		93
2008		93
2009		94
2010		94
2011		94

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Robert C. Bryd Honors Scholarship Program Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Limitations: Data are based on state reports of varying quality and accuracy.

Improvements: OPE refined its data collection form in 2004 and is further revising the form to improve the quality and comprehensiveness of data.

Explanation: Beginning in 2004, this calculation was based on all Byrd scholars. The previous calculation included those who received funds for four consecutive years, and was deemed to generate an artificially high rate. Therefore, the 92% four-year graduation rate in FY 2004 for all Byrd scholars does not necessarily represent a real decline in performance. The reduction in the rate is likely due to the new calculation.

Objective 2 of 3: *Byrd Scholars will successfully persist from one school year to the next at high rates.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: The persistance rate of Byrd scholars who remain in school will improve.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Byrd Scholars remaining in school after 3 years of study.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	98	
2005		98
2006		98
2007		98
2008		98
2009		98
2010		98
2011		98

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Robert C. Bryd Honors Scholarship Program Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Limitations: Data are based on state reports of varying quality and accuracy.

Improvements: OPE refined its data collection form in 2004 and is further revising the form to improve the quality and comprehensiveness of data.

Explanation: FY 2004 data established the baseline. The calculation is the number of scholars in their first three years of study who are enrolled at the end of the academic year divided by the total number of scholars enrolled at the beginning of their first three years of study.

Objective 3 of 3: *The Byrd Honors Scholarships Program will increase its efficiency.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Efficiency measure: The cost per successful outcome.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The cost per Byrd recipient who successfully persists or graduates.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	1,866	

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Robert C. Bryd Honors Scholarship Program Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Limitations: Data are based on state reports of varying quality and accuracy.

Improvements: OPE refined its data collection form in 2004 and is further revising the form to improve the quality and comprehensiveness of data.

Explanation: The efficiency measure for Byrd Honors Scholarships for FY 2004 was calculated by dividing the appropriation for FY 2003 by the number of students persisting and completing during the 2003-2004 school year. $40,734,493/21,830 = $1,886.

HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.149A - College Assistance Migrant Program

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

Objective 1 of 2: *All CAMP students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: CAMP first year completion: Increasing percentages of CAMP participants will successfully complete the first academic year of study at a postsecondary institution.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of CAMP participants completing the first year of their academic or postsecondary program.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	82	
2002	80	
2004		83
2005		85
2006		86

Source: HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The FY 2001 data was used to establish a baseline. Although no target was established for FY 2003, data will be collected.

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

Indicator 2.1 of 1: CAMP students continue in Postsecondary: By 2010, 85 percent of CAMP participants who successfully complete their first year of college will continue in postsecondary education.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of CAMP students who, after completing first year, continue their postsecondary education.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	78	
2002	75	
2004		79
2005		80
2006		81
2010		85

Source: HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Explanation: The FY 2001 data was used to establish a baseline. Although no target was established for FY 2003, data will be collected.

HEA: Demonstration Projects to Ensure Quality Higher Education for Students with Disabilities - FY 2006

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

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

Objective 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 1.1 of 2: Teacher Training: Faculty trained through project activities in working with students with disabilities use the training in their teaching.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of faculty trained in project activities who incorporate elements of their training into their classroom teaching.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Improvements: Program staff are developing a new annual report which is expected to capture data for this measure.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to set the baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Student course completion: Students with disabilities will complete courses with faculty trained through the project.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The difference between the rate at which students with documented disabilities complete courses taught by faculty trained through project activities, and the rate at which other students complete the same courses.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Grantee Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Improvements: Program staff are developing a new annual report which is expected to capture data for this measure.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to set the baseline.

HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education - FY 2006

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

Program Goal: To improve postsecondary education by making grants to institutions in support of reform and innovation.

Objective 1 of 2: *Promote reforms that improve the quality of teaching and learning and postsecondary institutions.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Replication of projects: The percentage of projects that are adapted in full or in part, or whose materials are used by other institutions.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of FIPSE grantees reporting project dissemination to others.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1998	92	
1999	100	
2000	83	100
2001	96	85
2002	95	95
2003	88	95
2004	88	95
2005		95
2006		90

Source: Final Report Scorecard

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006
Similar results from annual report and site visit scorecards.

Explanation: FIPSE has shifted to a new online data collection instrument that allows for more accurate calculation of the measure. FIPSE has revised the target for this measure to reflect the changes in data collection.

Objective 2 of 2: *The institutionalization of FIPSE programs.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Projects sustained: The percentage of projects sustained beyond federal funding.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of FIPSE projects reporting institutionalization on their home campuses.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1998	93	
1999	96	
2000	94	100
2001	100	95
2002	96	95
2003	96	95
2004	90	95
2005		95
2006		91

Source: Final Report Scorecard. Assessment of projects based on review of final reports sent within 90 days after the completion of projects.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006
Similar data from annual reports and site visit score cards. Assessment of project drawn from on site visitation and evaluation of projects.

Explanation: FIPSE's emphasis on institutional contributions to projects and development of long-term continuation plans are designed to embed projects within campus structures. FIPSE has changed the way that it collects data through a new on-line data collection and scoring system, and has reset its FY 2006 target for institutionalization accordingly.

HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.334 - Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs
84.334A - GEAR-UP Partnership Grants
84.334S - GEAR-UP State Grants

Program Goal: To significantly increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education.

Objective 1 of 3: *Increase the academic performance and preparation for postsecondary education of GEAR UP students.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Completion of academically challenging curricula: The percentage of GEAR UP students who passed prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade and Algebra 1 by the end of the 9th grade.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of GEAR UP students who passed prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade and the percentage of GEAR UP students who passed Algebra 1 by the end of the 9th grade.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Prealgebra	Algebra 1	Prealgebra	Algebra 1
2001	18			
2002	18			
2003	22	30	19	19
2004	29	21	20	20
2005	37.95	51.69	25	50
2006			30	25

Source: Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006
GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.

Explanation: Historical performance data through 2002 show the percentages of GEAR UP students who were enrolled in prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade. Data for 2003 reflect the percentage of GEAR UP students who were enrolled in prealgebra by the end of the 7th grade and in Algebra 1 by the end of the 9th grade. Data beginning in 2004 are collected on successful completion of core academic subjects and other college preparatory courses. 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. Data for each year were obtained from the GEAR UP annual performance reports. For example: data for year 2004 were obtained from the GEAR UP Annual Performance Report covering April 2003 - March 2004.

Objective 2 of 3: *Increase the rate of high school graduation and enrollment in postsecondary education of GEAR UP students.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: High school graduation and enrollment in postsecondary education: GEAR UP students will have high rates of high school graduation and postsecondary education enrollment.

Measure 2.1.1 of 2: The percentage of GEAR UP students who graduated from high school.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2007		73
2008		73.50
2009		74
2010		74.50

Measure 2.1.2 of 2: The percentage of former GEAR UP students who are enrolled in college.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2007		65
2008		65.50
2009		66
2010		66.50

Source: Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2008
GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.

Explanation: Long-term targets were developed using data from NCES to close the gap between low-income students and their peers in high school completion and college enrollment. Once baseline data become available, targets may need to be adjusted to reflect differences between GEAR UP students and other low-income students.

Objective 3 of 3: *Increase GEAR UP students' and their families' knowledge of postsecondary education options, preparation, and financing.*

Indicator 3.1 of 2: Knowledge of postsecondary education: GEAR UP students and their families who report having knowledge of available financial aid and necessary academic preparation for college.

Measure 3.1.1 of 2: The percentage of parents of GEAR UP students who have knowledge of available financial aid.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Parents: Aid	Parents: Aid

2001	24	
2002	31	
2003	35	32
2004	34	33
2005	34	35
2006		37

Measure 3.1.2 of 2: The percentage of GEAR UP students and their families who have knowledge of necessary academic preparation for college.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Students: Prep	Parents: Prep	Students: Prep	Parents: Prep
2001	50	31		
2002	53	39		
2003	57	43	54	40
2004	62	42	56	42
2005	63	49	61	46
2006			64	47
2007			75	

Source: Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006
GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.

Explanation: Data reflect the percentages of GEAR UP students and their parents who have talked to school counselors, advisors, or someone else about academic preparation for college and college entrance requirements as well as the percentages of GEAR UP students' parents who have talked to school counselors, advisors, or someone else about availability of financial assistance. Data will continue to be collected on students' and parents' knowledge of postsecondary education entrance requirements, costs of attendance, and financial aid opportunities.

Indicator 3.2 of 2: Effciency measure: Cost per successful outcome

Measure 3.2.1 of 1: The average cost (federal funds) per GEAR UP student who immediately enrolls in college after high school graduation.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2008		999

Source: Annual program performance reports, program evaluation study, and Grants Administration and Payment System (GAPS)

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2008
GEAR UP staff review performance report data for quality, clarity, and consistency and to assess extent to which project objectives are being accomplished.

Explanation: In SY 2007-2008, the program will begin to collect data on college enrollment rates. The FY 2008 target is to establish a baseline.

HEA: Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) - FY 2006

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

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

Objective 1 of 1: *To increase the number of students of superior academic ability completing a terminal degree in designated areas of national need in order to alleviate that need.*

Indicator 1.1 of 4: Graduate school completion: The percentage of GAANN fellows who obtain a terminal degree in an area of national need will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of GAANN fellows completing a terminal degree in the designated areas of national need.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	12	12
2002	28	12
2003	47	
2004	51	
2005		28
2006		45
2007		46
2008		47
2009		48
2010		49
2011		50

Source: Grantee Performance Report, GAANN Final Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
The National Science Foundation is responsible for accuracy of the Survey of Earned Doctorates. Program data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: The program office developed a database to collect this information. Performance data includes degree completion as well as fellows passing preliminary examinations. The 2002 year information contains

data from the 1997 cohort only. Successive years combine two cohorts: 2003 information contains data from the 1998 cohort, and from those fellows in the 2000 cohort that finished in 2003. No new grants are awarded each third year, so that there were no cohorts of new fellows in 1999 or 2002. Data for 2004 includes completers and people passing preliminary examinations from both the 2000 and 2001 cohorts.

Indicator 1.2 of 4: Enrollment of underrepresented populations: Percentage of fellows from traditionally underrepresented groups by grantee cohort enrolled in a terminal degree program in the designated areas of national need will increase.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of fellows from traditionally underrepresented groups by grantee cohort enrolled in a terminal degree program in the designated areas of national need.

Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets				
	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Women	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Women
1999	1	10	7	4	37					
2001	0	7	7	7	39					
2002	1	11	10	5	38					
2003	0	6	7	2	35	999	999	999	999	999
2004	1	9	7	9	41	0	6	7	2	35
2005						1	8	7	6	39
2006						1	11	10	5	39
2007						1	11	10	5	40
2008						1	11	10	5	40
2009						1	11	10	5	41
2010						1	11	10	5	41
2011						1	11	10	5	42

Source: Grantee Performance Report, GAANN Final Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
The National Science Foundation is responsible for accuracy of the Survey of Earned Doctorates. Program data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Limitations: The performance of the GAANN program is limited in that the authorizing legislation recommends, but does not mandate that grantees seek individuals from traditionally underrepresented groups when awarding fellowships. However, in responding to the selection criteria, grantees must address plans to include students from underrepresented groups.

Explanation: The program office developed a database to collect this information. Performance data includes degree completion as well as fellows passing preliminary examinations. The 2002 year information contains data from the 1997 cohort only. Successive years combine two cohorts: 2003 information contains data from the 1998 cohort, and from those fellows in the 2000 cohort that finished in 2003. No new grants are awarded each third year, so that there were no cohorts of new fellows in 1999 or 2002. Data for 2004 includes completers and people passing preliminary examinations from both the 2000 and 2001 cohorts. This is a long term measure.

Indicator 1.3 of 4: Time for program completion: The median time from entering graduate school until degree completion will be less than that of comparable doctoral students as identified annually in the Survey of Earned Doctorates.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Median time to completion of doctorate for GAANN student.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	6.50	
2003	7.10	
2004	5.92	
2005		6.45
2006		7
2007		7
2008		7
2009		7
2010		7
2011		7

Source: NSF,Survey of Earned Doctorate
References: .
Web Site: http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/ssed/start.htm.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
The National Science Foundation is responsible for accuracy of the Survey of Earned Doctorates. Program data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Actual performance is compared to the National Research Council's Survey of Earned Doctorates in which the current median time to degree for comparable degrees ranges from 6.8 to 7 years. Contract for study of graduate fellowship programs has been awarded; the study is expected to begin in October 2005 and be completed by September 2007. Study results are expected in November 2007.

Indicator 1.4 of 4: Efficiency measure: The cost per successful GAANN fellow.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: Federal cost of GAANN Ph.D. and those who pass preliminary exams over the life of the grant.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	92,557	
2003	127,514	
2006		127,500
2007		127,500
2008		127,500
2009		127,500
2010		127,500
2011		127,500

Source: Grantee Performance Report, GAANN Final Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006
Data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: The program office has developed a database to collect this information. This measure is derived by taking the total funding for years one, two, and three divided by the number of GAANN Ph.D.s and those that pass preliminary exams during that period. The FY 2002 data establish the baseline. The 2002 information is based on the 1997 cohort. The 2003 information was based on the 1998 cohort and 2000 cohorts; information for 2004 was based on 2000 and 2001 cohorts. No new grants are awarded each third year, so that there were no cohorts of new fellows in 1999 or 2002.

HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Domestic Programs - FY 2006

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
84.153A - Business and International Education Program
84.220 - Centers for International Business Education
84.229A - Language Resource Centers
84.274A - American Overseas Research Centers
84.337 - Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access

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

Objective 1 of 9: *The National Resource Centers (NRC) Program provides grants to institutions of higher education or consortia of institutions of higher education to establish, strengthen, and operate comprehensive and undergraduate language and area/international studies centers.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Employment in field of study: The percentage of NRC Ph.D. graduates finding employment in higher education, government, and national security will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of National Resource Center Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government, and national security.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	48.50	
2002	53.70	
2003	55	
2004	71.80	47
2005		47.50
2006		48
2007		48.50
2008		49
2009		49.50
2010		50
2011		50.50

Source: EELIAS, National Resource Center Annual and Final Reports
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: Government employment reflects employment in federal government. Employment in national security is represented by military employment. This is a long-term measure.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Expansion of critical languages: The percentage of critical languages taught, as reflected by the list of critical languages referenced in the Title VI program statute

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of critical languages taught, as reflected by the list of critical languages referenced in the Title VI program statute.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	56	
2004	56	
2005		74
2006		60
2007		63
2008		66
2015		80

Source: EELIAS, National Resource Center Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: Previously reported actual data for FY 2003 were incorrectly reported at 71%. FY 2003 and FY 2004 data have been recalculated. The list of critical languages included in the Title VI statute comprises 171 languages. This is a long-term measure.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Federal cost for NRC fellow finding employment in government, military and higher education.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	20,169	

Source: EELIAS, National Resource Center Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: The calculation is the annual appropriation for NRC divided by the number of NRC fellows finding employment in the fields of government service, military, and higher education. FY 2004 data was used to establish a baseline.

Objective 2 of 9: *The Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowship Program provides academic year and summer fellowships to institutions of higher education to assist graduate students in foreign language and either area or international studies.*

Indicator 2.1 of 3: Improved language competency: Average competency score of FLAS Fellowship recipients at the end of one full year of instruction will be at least one competency level higher than their average score at the beginning of the year.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The average competency score of FLAS Fellowship recipients at the end of one full year of instruction minus the average score at the beginning of the year.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	1.30	
2004	1.20	
2005	1.20	1.20
2006		1.20
2007		1.20
2008		1.20

Source: EELIAS, FLAS Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: Overall change in the language competency self-assessment reflects a mix of different levels of improvement at all stages (beginner, intermediate, advanced) of the three modalities of language acquisition that the assessment measures (reading, writing, speaking). Beginning language students may be expected to make larger advances over a given time period (and therefore have larger change scores) than more advanced students. A target value of 1.20 for change over the year reflects an ambitious overall goal for the program.

Indicator 2.2 of 3: Employment in field of study: The percentage of FLAS Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government, and national security will increase.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of FLAS Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government, and national security.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	16	
2006		17
2007		18

Source: EELIAS, FLAS Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: The FY 2004 data established the baseline. Government employment reflects employment in federal government. Employment in national security is represented by military employment.

Indicator 2.3 of 3: Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: Federal cost for FLAS fellowship recipient to increase their average competency score by at least one point from pre- to post-test.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	17,439	

Source: EELIAS, FLAS Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: The FY 2004 data established the baseline. The calculation is the annual appropriation for FLAS divided by the number of FLAS fellowship recipients increasing their average competency score by at least one point from pre- to post-test.

Objective 3 of 9: *Centers for International Business Education (CIBE) provide funding to schools of business for curriculum development, research, and training on issues of importance to United States trade and competitiveness.*

Indicator 3.1 of 2: Employment in field of study: Percentage of CIBE Masters and PhD graduates who find employment in field will be maintained or increase.

Measure 3.1.1 of 2: Percentage of CIBE Masters graduates who find employment in business.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	94	
2006		94

Measure 3.1.2 of 2: Percentage of CIBE PhD graduates who find employment in higher education and government.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	77.90	
2006		77.90

Source: EELIAS, CIBE Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system

Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Explanation: FY 2004 data established the baselines for these measures. Government employment reflects employment in federal government.

Indicator 3.2 of 2: Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome

Measure 3.2.1 of 1: Federal cost of CIBE Master's graduates who find employment in business and CIBE Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education and government.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	3,695	

Source: EELIAS, CIBE Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Explanation: The FY 2004 data established the baseline. The measure is calculated as the annual appropriation for CIBE divided by the sum of the number of CIBE Masters graduates who find employment in business and the number of CIBE PhD graduates who find employment in higher education and government.

Objective 4 of 9: *The International Research and Studies (IRS) Program supports surveys, studies, and instructional materials development to improve and strengthen instruction in modern foreign languages, area studies, and other international fields to provide full understanding of the places in which the foreign languages are commonly used.*

Indicator 4.1 of 3: Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

Measure 4.1.1 of 1: The percentage of all IRS projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, IRS Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: FY 2004 data will be used to establish the baseline. The target for FY 2006 will be to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 4.2 of 3: Outreach effectiveness: The percentage of IRS participant project-related activities that result in adoption or further dissemination will be maintained or increase.

Measure 4.2.1 of 1: The number of project activities that result in adoption or further dissemination within a year, divided by the total number of IRS grantees submitting reports in that year.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, IRS Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2007

Explanation: FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 4.3 of 3: Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome

Measure 4.3.1 of 1: Federal cost for successfully completed IRS project.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, IRS Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: The calculation is the annual appropriation for IRS divided by the number of IRS projects successfully completed. FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is maintain the baseline.

Objective 5 of 9: *Language Resource Centers (LRCs) provide grants for establishing, strengthening, and operating centers that serve as resources for improving the nation's capacity for teaching and learning foreign languages through teacher training, research, materials development, and dissemination projects.*

Indicator 5.1 of 3: Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

Measure 5.1.1 of 1: The percentage of all LRC projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, LRC Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 5.2 of 3: Outreach effectiveness: The percentage of LRC participant project-related activities that result in adoption or further dissemination will be maintained or increase.

Measure 5.2.1 of 1: Cost of LRC project that results in adoption or further dissemination within a year.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, LRC Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2007

Explanation: The calculation is the number of project activities that result in adoption or further dissemination within a year, divided by the total number of LRC projects funded in the same year. FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 5.3 of 3: Efficiency measure: Cost per successful outcome

Measure 5.3.1 of 1: Federal cost for successful LRC projects.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, LRC Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: The calculation is the annual appropriation for the LRCs divided by the number of LRC projects successfully completed. FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline level.

Objective 6 of 9: *The Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language (UISFL) program provides funds to institutions of higher education, a combination of such institutions, or partnerships between nonprofit educational organizations and institutions of higher education to plan, develop, and carry out programs to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages.*

Indicator 6.1 of 3: Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

Measure 6.1.1 of 1: The percentage of all UISFL projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, UISFL Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 6.2 of 3: Institutionalization: The number of critical languages addressed by courses or programs developed by UISFL grantees will increase.

Measure 6.2.1 of 1: The number of critical languages for which language courses or language training programs are developed using UISFL grant funds.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, UISFL Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 will be to increase the baseline level by one language.

Indicator 6.3 of 3: Efficiency measure: Cost per successful outcome

Measure 6.3.1 of 1: Federal cost of successful UISFL project.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, UISFL Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: The calculation is the annual appropriation for the UISFL divided by the number of UISFL

projects successfully completed. FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline.

Objective 7 of 9: *The Business and International Education (BIE) Program provides funds to institutions of higher education that enter into an agreement with a trade association and/or business for two purposes: to improve the academic teaching of the business curriculum and to conduct outreach activities that expand the capacity of the business community to engage in international economic activities.*

Indicator 7.1 of 3: Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

Measure 7.1.1 of 1: The percentage of all BIE projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, BIE Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 7.2 of 3: Outreach effectiveness: The percentage of BIE participant project-related activities that result in adoption or further dissemination will be maintained or increase.

Measure 7.2.1 of 1: The percentage of BIE participant project-related activities that result in adoption or further dissemination.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, BIE Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2007

Explanation: The calculation is the number of outreach activities that result in adoption or further dissemination within a year, divided by the total number of BIE participant project-related outreach activities during the current year. FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 7.3 of 3: Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome

Measure 7.3.1 of 1: Federal cost for successful BIE project.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, BIE Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: The calculation is the annual appropriation for the BIE program divided by the number of BIE projects successfully completed. FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline level.

Objective 8 of 9: *The Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access (TICFIA) Program supports projects that will develop innovative techniques or programs using new electronic technologies to collect information from foreign sources. Grants are made to access, collect, organize, preserve, and widely disseminate information on world regions and countries other than the United States that address our nation's teaching and research needs in international education and foreign languages.*

Indicator 8.1 of 3: Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

Measure 8.1.1 of 1: The percentage of all TICFIA projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, TICFIA Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 8.2 of 3: Outreach effectiveness: The percentage of TICFIA participant project-related activities that result in adoption or further dissemination will be maintained or increase.

Measure 8.2.1 of 1: Percentage of TICFIA activities that are adopted or further disseminated.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, TICFIA Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2007

Explanation: The calculation is the number of outreach activities that result in adoption or further dissemination within a year, divided by the number of TICFIA projects funded during the current year. FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 8.3 of 3: Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome

Measure 8.3.1 of 1: Federal cost for successful TICFIA project.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, TICFIA Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: The calculation is the annual appropriation for the TICFIA program divided by the number of TICFIA projects successfully completed. FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline level.

Objective 9 of 9: *The American Overseas Research Centers (AORCs) provides grants to consortia United States institutions of higher education to establish or operate overseas research centers that promote postgraduate research, exchanges, and area studies.*

Indicator 9.1 of 3: Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

Measure 9.1.1 of 1: The percentage of AORC projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, AORC Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 9.2 of 3: Customer (scholar) satisfaction: The level of visiting scholar satisfaction with AORC support and services will increase.

Measure 9.2.1 of 1: Ratings by visiting scholars on a customer satisfaction scale.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, AORC Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2007

Explanation: FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 9.3 of 3: Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome

Measure 9.3.1 of 1: Federal cost for successful AORC project.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, AORC Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: The calculation is the annual appropriation for the AORCs divided by the number of AORC projects successfully completed. FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline level.

HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Institute for International Public Policy - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.269 - Institute for International Public Policy

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

Objective 1 of 2: *Maintain a U.S. higher education system able to produce experts in less commonly taught languages and area studies who are capable of contributing to the needs of the U.S. Government, and national security.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Employment: The percentage of Institute for International Public Policy (IIPP) graduates who find employment in government service and national security will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of IIPP Master's degree graduates who find employment in federal government and military service.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999
2007		999

Source: EELIAS, IIPP Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system.
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: FY 2005 data will be will be used to establish a baseline. The targets for 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

Objective 2 of 2: *Completion of Master's and other graduate degrees by program participants.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Degree completion: The number of Master's and other graduate degrees obtained by participants in the IIPP program will increase.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Number of Master's degrees obtained by IIPP program participants.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2006		999
2007		999

Source: EELIAS, IIPP Annual and Final Performance Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system.
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The targets for 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Efficiency measure: Cost per successful outcome.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: Federal cost of Master's degree for IIPP participants.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999
2007		999

Source: EELIAS, IIPP Annual and Final Performance Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system.
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org..

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: The calculation is the grant allocation amount divided by the numbers of Master's degrees completed by program participants. FY 2005 data will be used to establish a baseline. The targets for 2006 and 2007 are to maintain the baseline.

HEA: Javits Fellowships - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.170 - Javits Fellowships

Program Goal: To provide financial assistance to graduate students who have demonstrated superior academic ability, achievement, and exceptional promise.

Objective 1 of 1: *To enable students of superior ability in the arts, humanities, and social sciences to complete their terminal degree.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Graduate school completion: The percentage of Javits fellows who complete a terminal degree within seven years.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Javits fellows who complete a doctorate degree within seven years.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1998	30	
1999	26	
2003	31	29
2004	30	30
2005		31
2006		31
2007		32
2008		32
2009		33
2010		33
2011		34

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Performance Report for the Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Program.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006
Program data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: This is a long term measure. The program office collects cohort-specific data on fellows' performance to assemble this information.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Time to degree completion: Average time to degree completion for Javits fellows will be less than

the national values.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The average time to degree completion for Javits fellows.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	6.30	
2004	6.30	
2005		6.30
2006		6.30
2007		6.20
2008		6.20
2009		6.10
2010		6.10
2011		6

Source: Annual Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.
The National Science Foundation is responsible for accuracy of the Survey of Earned Doctorates. Program data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: This is a long term measure.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Efficiency Measure: Cost per terminal degree (MFA/PhD) awarded.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Federal cost per terminal degree (PhD/MFA) for the Javits Fellowship Program.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	109,873	
2004	110,000	

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Performance Report for the Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Program.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006
Program data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: FY 2003 data was used to establish the baseline. Efficiency data are determined by calculating the total dollars allocated to the cohorts divided by the total number of Javits Fellows receiving a terminal degree during this same time frame. The baseline was calculated using appropriation amounts for fiscal years 1998 through 2001, and school year data for 1998-99 through 2001-02. Over time, the uses for this efficiency measure may include examining the cost per successful outcome for the Javits Program as compared with other comparable programs.

HEA: SFA Federal Pell Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.063 - Federal Pell Grant Program

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

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that low- and middle-income students will have the same access to postsecondary education that high-income students do.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: 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 the poverty line.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Pell Grant funds going to students below 150 percent of the poverty line.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1997	82	
1998	80	
1999	78	75
2000	78	75
2001	79	75
2002	78	75
2003	76	75
2004	76	75
2005		75
2006		75
2007		78
2008		79
2009		79
2010		80

Source: Pell Grant Applicant/Recipient File..
Date Sponsored: 03/30/2004.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: August 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

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. This is a long-term measure.

HEA: Student Aid Administration - FY 2006

Program Goal: To administer the student aid programs, including efforts to modernize student aid delivery and management systems, improve service to students and other student aid program participants, reduce the cost of student aid administration, and improve accountability and program integrity.

Objective 1 of 1: *Student Aid Administration*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Reduce FSA Business Process Cost

Measure 1.1.1 of 4: (a) Percent reduction of electronic FAFSA unit costs		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999
2008		999
2010		999

Measure 1.1.2 of 4: (b) Percent reduction of origination and disbursement unit costs		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999
2008		999
2010		999

Measure 1.1.3 of 4: (c) Percent reduction of Direct Loan Servicing unit costs		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999
2008		999
2010		999

Measure 1.1.4 of 4: (d) Percent reduction of Collections unit costs		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999
2008		999
2010		999

Source: FSA Activity-Based Cost Model (ABC)

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2007
Numerous internal controls

Explanation: In FY 2004, FSA defined and validated its Activity-Based Costing (ABC) model to measure the success of its cost-reduction strategies. In FY 2005, FSA continued to enhance the ABC model to yield improved cost data and in FY 2006 will develop baseline reduction percentages. The FSA Activity-Based Costing Model was used to produce unit cost data for FY2003 and FY2004. FY2005 unit cost data will be finalized by the second quarter of FY2006. The FY 2006 target for measures a through d is to establish the baselines (BL). For measure (a), the FY 2008 target is BL minus 20%; 2010 target is BL minus 25%. For measure (b), the FY 2008 target is BL minus 10%; 2010 target is BL minus 15%. For measure (c), the FY 2008 target is BL minus 12%; 2010 target is BL minus 12%. For measure (d), the FY 2008 target is BL minus 14%; 2010 target is BL minus 14%.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Eliminate improper payments

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Improper Payments PMA Scorecard Rating		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	1	
2006		2
2010		3

Source: President's Management Agenda Scorecard.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: In the first quarter of FY 2005, OMB introduced a new President's Management Agenda (PMA) initiative, Eliminating Improper Payments, to support agency efforts to meet the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (IPIA) reporting requirements. This initiative makes it easier for agencies to track the progress of activities aimed at identifying, reporting on and reducing improper payments. At the same time, it provides for more comprehensive agency accountability to OMB through quarterly PMA scorecards. As such, Federal Student Aid is working closely with OMB and the Department to develop an action plan designed to (a) reduce the amount of improper payments in our programs, (b) lower the risk of improper payments in our programs and (c) improve the accuracy of our improper payment estimates. In FY 2005, FSA received red and the FY 2006 target is yellow and the FY 2010 target is green.

In the table: 1 = Red; 2 = Yellow; 3 = Green

HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.066 - TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers

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

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

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of EOC participants enrolling in college.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers participants enrolling in college.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	57	
2001	66	
2002	66	
2003	57	
2004	57.40	57
2005		57.50
2006		58
2007		58.50
2008		59
2009		59.50
2010		60
2011		60.50

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Talent Search and Education Opportunity Centers Programs Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006
The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Explanation: FY 2000 data established the baseline.

HEA: TRIO McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.217A - TRIO - McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement

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

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

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Graduate school enrollment and persistence: Percentages of McNair participants enrolling and persisting in graduate school.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentages of TRIO McNair participants enrolling and persisting in graduate school.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Enrollment	Persistence	Enrollment	Persistence
1999	35	48		
2000	35	75	35	48
2001	40	66	35	48
2002	39	65	35	48
2003	36	78	36	75
2004	45.30	77.70	36	75
2005			36	70
2006			37	79
2007			37	79
2008			37.50	79.50
2009			37.50	79.50
2010			38	80
2011			38	80

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Performance Report for the Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement Program.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Limitations: The primary data source is the annual performance report that comprises self-reported data.

Explanation: Enrollment refers to immediate enrollment in graduate school for B.A. recipients. This is a long term measure.

HEA: TRIO Student Support Services - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.042A - TRIO Student Support Services

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

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

Indicator 1.1 of 4: Postsecondary persistence: Percentage of Student Support Services participants persisting at the same institution will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of TRIO Student Support Services participants persisting at the same institution.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1999	67	
2000	67	67
2001	70	67
2002	72	67
2003	72	68
2004	73.10	68.50
2005		69
2006		72
2007		73
2008		73
2009		73.50
2010		73.50
2011		74

Source: Evaluation, Higher Education.
Section: The National Evaluation of Upward Bound: Summary of First-year Impacts and Program Operations (1997) .

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006
The annual performance report is based on self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Explanation: Data from the national study of the Student Support Services Program provided the baseline data (1999 actual performance). Subsequent data is from the Annual Performance Reports. Targets for FY 2006 and beyond were recalculated in FY 2006, as the persistence rate has increased since the baseline year.

Indicator 1.2 of 4: Postsecondary completion-two year schools: Percentage of Student Support Services freshmen completing an Associates degree at original institution or transferring to a four-year institution within three years will increase.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Percentage of Student Support Services freshmen completing an Associates degree at original institution or transferring to a four-year institution within three years.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	23.10	
2002	26	
2003	27.70	
2004	25.60	
2006		27
2007		27.50
2008		27.50
2009		28
2010		28
2011		28.50

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Report for the Student Support Services (SSS) Program.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006
The annual performance report is based on self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Explanation: 2001-2004 data are being reported for the first time as the graduate rate measure is now being provided separately for two- and four-year schools. Previously reported FY 2004 data has been recalculated to be more accurate.

Indicator 1.3 of 4: Postsecondary completion-four year schools: Percentage of Student Support Services freshmen completing an Bachelors degree at original institution within six years will increase.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Percentage of Student Support Services freshmen completing an Bachelors degree at original institution within six years.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	28.10	
2006		28
2007		29
2008		29

2009		29.50
2010		29.50
2011		29.50

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Report for the Student Support Services (SSS) Program.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006
The annual performance report is comprised of self-reported data. However, a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Explanation: 2004 is first year for which graduation data for four-year schools were available from the annual performance reports. Previously reported FY 2004 data has been recalculated to be more accurate.

Indicator 1.4 of 4: Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome.

Measure 1.4.1 of 1: Cost of Student Support Services program completers, transfers to another institution, or persisters in the same school.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	1,528	
2004	1,516	

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Report for the Student Support Services (SSS) Program.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Improvements: Actual allocations of the annual appropriation are now used instead of the overall appropriation.

Explanation: The efficiency is derived by dividing the annual appropriation by the number of students persisting at the same institution during that specific school year.

HEA: TRIO Talent Search - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.044 - TRIO Talent Search

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

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

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of Talent Search participants enrolling in college.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of TRIO Talent Search participants enrolling in college.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2000	73	
2001	77	
2002	78	
2003	79	
2004	77.60	73.50
2005		74
2006		78.50
2007		79
2008		79
2009		79.50
2010		79.50
2011		80

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Talent Search and Education Opportunity Centers Programs Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006
The annual performance report is comprised of self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Explanation: FY 2000 data established the baseline. Future targets were recalculated in FY 2006 as the enrollment rate has increased significantly from 2000, the year from which the targets were initially set.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Applying for financal aid: The percentage of TRIO Talent Search participants applying for financial aid.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of TRIO Talent Search participants applying for financial aid

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	82	
2001	86	
2002	86	
2003	86	
2004	85.10	
2006		86
2007		86.50
2008		86.50
2009		87
2010		87
2011		87.50

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Talent Search and Education Opportunity Centers Programs Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006
The annual performance report is comprised of self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Explanation: FY 2000 data established the baseline. Targets were set for financial aid application in FY 2006.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The annual allocated appropriation for Talent Search divided by the number of students that persist in high school or enroll in college.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	379	
2004	367	

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Talent Search and Education Opportunity Centers Programs Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006
The annual performance report is comprised of self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Improvements: Actual allocations of the annual appropropriation are now used instead of the overall appropriation.

Explanation: The 2003-2004 data established the baseline.

HEA: TRIO Upward Bound - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.047 - TRIO Upward Bound
84.047M - TRIO Upward Bound Math/Science

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

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

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Postsecondary enrollment: The percentage of Upward Bound participants enrolling in college will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Upward Bound participants and higher-risk participants enrolling in college.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Overall Enrollment	High-Risk Enrollment	Overall Enrollment	High-Risk Enrollment
2000	65	34		
2003	69.30		65	35
2004			65	35.50
2005			65	36
2006			65	36.50
2007			65	37

Source: Evaluation, Higher Education.
Section: The National Evaluation of Upward Bound: Summary of First-year Impacts and Program Operations (1997) .

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006
The annual performance report is comprised of self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Limitations: The definition of higher-risk student used in the national evaluation is somewhat different than the criteria used by Upward Bound projects funded under the Upward Bound Initiative.

Explanation: This measure tracks separately the effect of the program on higher risk students. This reflects: (1) the findings of the national evaluation of the Upward Bound Program, which found the program has significant effects on higher-risk students; and (2) recent funding initiatives encouraging Upward Bound projects to serve more higher risk students. With a greater proportion of Upward Bound participants being higher-risk students, continual program improvements will be required to maintain the college enrollment rate at current levels. Program experience has led to collecting enrollment data one year after enrollment, since enrollment rates are consistently higher than preliminary values. Primarily for this reason, data for 2002-03 were revised for FY 2006 from 54.5% to 71.3%.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Cost of program completers: persisters in high school or enrollees in college and the gap between cost per successful outcome and cost per participant.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Cost per successful outcome	Gap between cost per outcome and cost per output	Cost per successful outcome	Gap between cost per outcome and cost per output
2003	6,340			
2004	6,579			

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Annual Performance Report for the Upward Bound, Upward Bound Math/Science, and Veterans Upward Bound Programs.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006
The annual performance report is comprised of self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Improvements: Actual allocations of the annual appropriation are now used instead of the overall appropriation.

Explanation: The calculation is the annual allocated appropriation divided by the number of students that persist in high school and enroll in college. The appropriation number used for 2003-04 is $276,310,780, which is adjusted from the total appropriation ($299,949,888) by removing funding for those projects that were in their first year and therefore could not have any persisting participants. The cost/outcome measure value for 2002-03 is revised in FY 2006 to use the same approach as for 2003-04; projects not funded in 2003-04 are not included. The measure value changed from $6,381 to $6,340 per successful outcome.

HEA: Underground Railroad Program - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.345 - Underground Railroad Educational and Cultural Program

Program Goal: To provide grants to support research, exhibition, interpretation, and collection of artifacts related to the history of the Underground Railroad.

Objective 1 of 1: *To measure support for research and education related to the history of the Underground Railroad.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Projects sustained: The percentage of projects sustained beyond Federal funding.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of projects sustained beyond Federal funding.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005		999
2006		999

Source: Annual Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target was to establish the baseline, but data were not collected. The 2006 target is to set the baseline. Determination of outcome of this measure can only be made after end of grant period. Grantees are either on an October 2003-September 2006 or an October 2004-September 2007 grant period. For those on the former schedule, we will be able to report in October 2006; for those on the latter schedule, we will be able to report in October 2007.

HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.904A - Helen Keller National Center

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

Objective 1 of 2: *Individuals who are deaf-blind received the specialized services and training they need to become as independent and self-sufficient as possible.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Services to consumers at headquarters: By 2008, the training program at Helen Keller National Center (HKNC) headquarters will increase the number of adult consumers who have achieved successful employment to 45 percent, less restrictive setting outcomes to 75 percent, and identified training goals to 85 percent.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of HKNC adult consumers who successfully achieve/maintain employment and independent living outcomes.

Year	Actual Performance				Performance Targets			
	# Adult consumers	% Training goals met	% in Less Restrictive Settings	% Placed in Employment Settings	% Adult consumers	% Training goals met	% in Less Restrictive Settings	% Placed in Employment Settings
1999	75			45	85			38
2000	82			52	90			45
2001	87	92	71	38	90	86	59	45
2002	85	90	80	27			59	45
2003	100	88	70	42.50				
2004	98	90	69	46	95	88	70	45
2005	100	89	95	42	95	88	70	45
2006					95	88	72	45
2007					95	90	75	45
2008					95	90	75	45

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

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006
Final transition plans for each client will include the employment and living situations each client will be entering upon completion of training.

Limitations: Data are based upon self-reported 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.

Explanation: For FY 2006, this measure was reworded to more accurately reflect the elements being measured.

Objective 2 of 2: *Increase the capacity of deaf-blind consumers to function more independently in the home community.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Impact of professional training: State and local service providers will demonstrate improved knowledge and skills to meet the needs of HKNC consumers.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of service providers who demonstrate knowledge/skill acquisition six months after HKNC training.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: HKNC Annual Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006
HKNC regional representatives maintain client case summary files that indicate 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.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Consumer outcomes: Improved vocational and independent living outcomes

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of HKNC consumers who successfully achieve/maintain employment or independent living outcomes.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	Secure Employment	Retain Employment	Independent Living	Secure Employment	Retain Employment	Independent Living
2006				999	999	999

Source: HKNC Annual Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Explanation: This is a new measure. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

MECEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Overseas Programs - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 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

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

Objective 1 of 4: *Through the Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad (DDRA) program, OPE provides grants to colleges and universities to fund individual doctoral students to conduct research in other countries in modern foreign languages and area studies for periods of 6 to 12 months.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Improved language competency: Average competency score of DDRA fellowship recipients at the end of their period of instruction will be higher than their average score at the beginning of the period.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The average language competency score of DDRA fellowship recipients at the end of their period of instruction minus their average score at the beginning of the period		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: 2004-05 data will be available in March 2006 and will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 will be to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of all DDRA projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: 2004-05 data will be available in March 2006 and will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 will be to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The annual appropriation for DDRA divided by the number of DDRA recipients increasing their average language competency by at least one level at the end of their period of instruction.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: 2004-05 data will be available in March 2006 and will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 will be to maintain the baseline.

Objective 2 of 4: *Through the Fulbright-Hays Faculty Research Abroad (FRA) program, OPE provides grants to institutions of higher education to fund faculty to maintain and improve their area studies and language skills by conducting research abroad for periods of 3 to 12 months.*

Indicator 2.1 of 3: Improved language competency: Average language competency of FRA recipients at the end of their period of instruction will be higher than their competency at the beginning of the period.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The average language competency score of FRA recipients at the end of their period of instruction minus their average language competency at the beginning of the period.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	0.38	
2006		0.38

Source: EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: the FY 2004 data was used to establish the baseline.

Indicator 2.2 of 3: Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: The percentage of all FRA projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: 2004-05 data will be available in November 2006 and will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 will be to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 2.3 of 3: Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome.

Measure 2.3.1 of 1: The annual appropriation for FRA divided by the number of FRA recipients who increase their language proficiency by at least one level in any of the three components of the language proficiency assessment by the end of their period of instruction.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: November 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: 2004-05 data will be available in November 2006 and will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 will be to maintain the baseline.

Objective 3 of 4: *Through the Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad (GPA) Program, OPE provides grants to support overseas projects in training, research, and curriculum development in modern foreign languages and area studies by teachers, students, and faculty engaged in a common*

endeavor.

Indicator 3.1 of 3: Improved language competency: The average competency score of GPA recipients at the end of their period of instruction will be higher than their score at the beginning of the period.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The average competency of GPA recipients at the end of their period of instruction minus their average competency at the beginning of the period		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: 2004-05 data will be available in March 2006 and will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 will be to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 3.2 of 3: Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

Measure 3.2.1 of 1: The percentage of all GPA projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: 2004-05 data will be available in March 2006 and will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 will be to maintain the baseline level.

Indicator 3.3 of 3: Efficiency measure: Cost per successful outcome.

Measure 3.3.1 of 1: The annual appropriation for GPA divided by the number of FRA recipients who increase their language competency score by at least one level from pre-test to post-test.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2006		999

Source: EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: 2004-05 data will be available in March 2006 and will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 will be to maintain baseline.

Objective 4 of 4: *Through the Fulbright-Hays Seminars Abroad (SA) program, OPE provides short-term study and travel seminars abroad for U.S. educators in the social sciences and humanities for the purpose of improving their understanding and knowledge of the peoples and cultures of other countries.*

Indicator 4.1 of 3: Successful completion of quality projects: The percentage of projects successfully completed by program grantees will be maintained or increase.

Measure 4.1.1 of 1: The percentage of all SA projects that are assessed as being successfully completed each year by the program officer.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: 2004-05 data will be available in March 2006 and will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 will be to maintain the baseline.

Indicator 4.2 of 3: Outreach effectiveness: The percentage of SA participant project-related accomplishments that are replicated beyond the project will be maintained or increase.

Measure 4.2.1 of 1: The number of accomplishments replicated beyond the project level, within a year, divided by the number of SA participant project-related accomplishments during the current year.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System

Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: 2004-05 data will be available in March 2006 and will be used to establish a baseline. The target for 2006 will be to maintain baseline.

Indicator 4.3 of 3: Efficiency Measure: Cost per successful outcome.

Measure 4.3.1 of 1: The annual appropriation for SA divided by the number of SA projects successfully completed.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: EELIAS, Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS Reporting System
Web Site: http://www.eelias.org.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Explanation: 2004-05 data will be available in March 2006 and will be used to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 will be to maintain baseline.

RA: Client Assistance State Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.161 - Rehabilitation Services_Client Assistance Program

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

Objective 1 of 2: *Resolve cases at lowest possible level.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Alternative dispute resolution (ADR): Through FY 2009, the percentage of cases resolved through the use of alternate dispute resolution (ADR) will be maintained at a rate of 84 percent.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of cases resolved through alternative dispute resolution (ADR).		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	84	
2002	85	
2003	82	
2004	82	84
2005		84
2006		84
2007		84
2008		84
2009		84

Source: CAP performance report, RSA-227.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006
Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialists. Onsite reviews of individual programs are conducted when resources permit, and random sampling of onsite files is cross-checked with reported data for verification.

Objective 2 of 2: *Accurately identify problem areas requiring systemic change and engage in systemic activity to improve services under the Rehabilitation Act.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Effects of systemic change: By FY 2009, the percentage of Client Assist Programs (CAPs) that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will increase to a rate of 60 percent.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Client Assist Programs (CAPs) that reported that their systemic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1999	43	
2000	44	44
2001	45	45
2002	54	46
2003	48	47
2004	57	49
2005		50
2006		54
2007		60
2008		60
2009		60

Source: CAP performance report, RSA-227, narrative section.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006
Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialists. Onsite reviews of individual programs are conducted when resources permit, and random sampling of onsite files is cross-checked with reported data for verification.

Explanation: Performance percentage is based on the reporting of successful systemic change activity. FY 1999 data established the baseline.

RA: Independent Living Centers - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.132 - Centers for Independent Living

Program Goal: To promote and support a philosophy of independent living, including a philosophy of consumer control, peer support, self-help, self-determination, equal access, and individual and system advocacy, in order to maximize the leadership, empowerment, independence, and productivity of individuals with disabilities, and the integration and full inclusion of individuals with disabilities into the mainstream of American society.

Objective 1 of 3: *Through the provision of IL services (including the four IL core services), increase the percentage of CIL consumers who report having access to services needed to improve their ability to live more independently and participate fully in their communities.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Increase the percentage of CIL consumers who report having access to previously unavailable transportation, health care, and assistive technology.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: As a result of direct services provided by a CIL (including referral to another service provider), the percentage of CIL consumers who report having access to previously unavailable transportation, appropriate accommodations to receive health care services, and/or assistive technology resulting in increased independence in at least one significant life area.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	Transportation	Appropriate Accommodations for Health Care Services	Assistive Technology	Transportation	Appropriate Accommodations for Health Care Services	Assistive Technology
2006				999	999	999

Source: RSA Annual Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2007

Limitations: Data are self-reported.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Increase the percentage of CIL consumers moving out of institutions.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: Through the provision of IL services (including the four IL core services) the percentage of CIL consumers who move out of institutions into a community-based setting.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

	Percentage of CIL consumer moving out of institutions	Percentage of CIL consumer moving out of institutions
2006		999

Source: RSA Annual (704 Part 1).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2007

Limitations: Data is self-reported by CILs.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 2 of 3: *Increase the percentage of community services available to persons with disabilities.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Increase the percentage of community services available to persons with disabilities.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of CILs with CIL staff, board members and/or consumers creating/participating on community committees, in advocacy initiatives, in public information campaigns, and/or other community events designed to increase the accessibility to transportation, develop relationships with health care providers, increase the availability /access to assistive technology and/or increase the compliance with applicable laws/regulations governing the number of affordable accessible housing units within the community.							
Year	**Actual Performance**				**Performance Targets**			
	Transportation	Appropriate Accommodations	Health Care	Assistive Technology	Housing	Transportation	Appropriate Accommodations	Health Care	Assistive Technology	Housing
2006						999	999	999	999

Source: RSA Annual Performance Report (704 Report).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2007

Limitations: Data are self-reported.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for each category.

Objective 3 of 3: *Improve the efficiency and transparency of the Centers for Independent Living Program.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Improve the efficiency and transparency of the Centers for Independent Living Program.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The number of months from due date to the release of CIL data to the public.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2004	7	
2005		5
2006		5

Source: Office records and files.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2006

Explanation: FY 2004 data established the baseline.

RA: Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.177 - Rehabilitation Services Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who are Blind

Program Goal: Support individuals with significant disabilities, including older blind individuals, served by Independent Living programs, in the achievement of their independent living goals.

Objective 1 of 2: *Through the provision of services (either directly or through contracts), increase the percentage of consumers receiving services funded through OB Title VII, Chapter 2 funds who have access to services needed to improve their ability to live more independently and participate fully in their communities.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Older blind individuals served by the program: Increase the percentage of Title VII, Chapter 2 consumers who have access to previously unavailable assistive technology aids and devices, and increase the percentage of Title VII, Chapter 2 consumers who report improved ADL skills.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Title VII, Chapter 2, consumers who have access to previously unavailable assistive technology aids and devices; and the percentage of Title VII, Chapter 2, consumers who have improved ADL skills.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	AT	ADL	AT	ADL
2005			999	999
2006			999	999

Source: Annual 7-OB reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Explanation: The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is the baseline plus 1 percent.

Objective 2 of 2: *Improve the efficiency and transparency of the IL Title VII, Chapter 2 Older Blind Program*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Make Title VII, Chapter 2 data available to the public.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The number of months from data due to the release of the data to the public.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

2005		7
2006		5

Source: Annual 7-OB Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

RA: Independent Living State Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.169 - Independent Living State Grants

Program Goal: To promote and support a philosophy of independent living, including a philosophy of consumer control, peer support, self-help, self-determination, equal access, and individual and system advocacy, in order to maximize the leadership, empowerment, independence, and productivity of individuals with disabilities, and the integration and full inclusion of individuals with disabilities into the mainstream of American society.

Objective 1 of 2: *Through the provision of services (either directly or through grants and/or contracts), increase the percentage of consumers receiving services funded through IL Title VII, Part B funds who report having access to services needed to improve their ability to live more independently and participate fully in their communities.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: The percentage of Part B consumers who report having access to previously unavailable transportation, health care, and assistive technology provided by the DSU will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of Part B consumers who report having access to (previously unavailable) transportation, appropriate accommodations to receive health care services, and/or assistive technology resulting in increased independence in at least one significant life area.						
Year	**Actual Performance**			**Performance Targets**		
	Transportation	Appropriate Accommodations for Health Care Services	Assistive Technology	Transportation	Appropriate Accommodations for Health Care Services	Assistive Technology
2006				999	999	999

Source: Source: RSA Annual 704 Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2007

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Data are self-reported.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Increase the percentage of consumers reporting satisfaction with IL services.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of consumers receiving/who have received IL services reporting satisfaction with IL services received.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: State's consumer satisfaction survey (required by 34 CFR 364.38) collected every three years as an attachment to the State Plan for Independent Living.

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: March 2007

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Data are self-reported.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.

Objective 2 of 2: *Improve the efficiency and transparency of the IL Title VII, Part B Independent Living Program.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Make Title VII, Part B data available to the public.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The number of months from data due date to the release of data to the public.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	7	
2005		5
2006		5

Source: Annual Part 1 704 Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: May 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Data are self-reported.

Explanation: The 2004 data established the baseline.

RA: Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.128G - Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Program

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

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that eligible Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers with disabilities receive Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) services and achieve employment.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Individuals who achieve employment outcomes: Within project-funded states, the percentage of migrant or seasonal farmworkers with disabilities served by vocational rehabilitation (VR) and the projects, who achieve employment outcomes is higher than those who do not access the project.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of individuals served who were placed in employment outcomes.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	VR & Project	VR Only	VR & Project	VR Only
2002	65	53.10		
2003	66	59		
2004	60	65	62	53
2005			65	53
2006			65	53

Source: Rehabilitation Services Administration agency state data from the RSA-911 and grantee performance reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Explanation: FY 2002 data established the baseline. The focus of these projects is to improve the performance for individuals served by both VR and the projects.

RA: Projects With Industry - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.234 - Projects with Industry

Program Goal: To create and expand job and career opportunities for individuals with disabilities in the competitive labor market by engaging the participation of business and industry in the rehabilitation process.

Objective 1 of 2: *Ensure that Project with Industry (PWI) services (through partnerships with business and industry) result in competitive employment, increased wages, and job retention for individuals with disabilties.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Placement rate of individuals with disabilities into competitive employment: The percentage of individuals served who are placed in competitive employment will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of individuals served by PWI who were placed in competitive employment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1997	59	
1998	49	
1999	59	61
2000	61.90	61
2001	62.40	62
2002	63.20	62.20
2003	54.20	62.40
2004	61.50	62.70
2005		63
2006		63

Source: Compliance Indicator and Annual Evaluation Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006
Web based automatic edit checks. Staff also check data for "reasonableness."

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.

Explanation: Fiscal Year 2006 data is the beginning of a new 3-year grant cycle.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Program participant exit: The percentage of PWI participants exiting the program who are placed in competitive employment.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of PWI participants exiting who are placed in competitive employment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Compliance Indicator and Annual Evaluation Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. This is a new measure for FY 2006, based on PART recommendations. The measure will be calculated by dividing the number of participants placed in competitive employment by the total number of participants who exited the program.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Earnings for individuals placed in competitive employment: By FY 2008, PWI projects will report that participants placed in competitive employment increase earning by an average of $250 per week.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: The average dollar increase in weekly earnings.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1997	207	
1998	209	
1999	226	209
2000	252	218
2001	236	218
2002	234	226
2003	242	231
2004	247	233
2005		238
2006		245
2007		248
2008		250

Source: Compliance Indicator and Annual Evaluation Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006
Web based reporting system conducts automatic edit checks.

Explanation: FY 2006 data is the beginning of a new 3-year grant cycle.

Objective 2 of 2: *Ensure that all PWI projects demonstrate effective fiscal management.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: The Cost per employment outcome: the percentage of projects whose cost per placement outcome is within a specified range.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of PWI projects whose cost per placement outcomes is within a specified range.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Web-Based Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for this new measure based on PART recommendations. Cost per employment outcome is calculated by dividing the total federal grant funds by the number of individuals with employment outcomes.

RA: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights - FY 2006

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

Program Goal: To support the protection and advocacy system in each state to protect the legal and human rights of individuals with disabilities.

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

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Policy changes: By FY 2009, the percentage of PAIRs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will be increase to a rate of 81 percent.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of PAIRs that reported that their systemic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2000	54	
2001	68	
2002	81	
2003	75	
2004	86	77
2005		79
2006		80
2007		81
2008		81
2009		81

Source: Grantee Performance Report, Annual Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) Program Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006
Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialist. Onsite reviews of individual programs are conducted when resources permit, and random sampling of onsite files is cross-checked with reported data for verification.

RA: Supported Employment State Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.187 - Supported Employment Services for Individuals with Severe Disabilities

Program Goal: Individuals with significant disabilities with a supported employment goal will achieve high quality employment.

Objective 1 of 1: *Individuals with significant disabilities with a supported employment goal will achieve high quality employment.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal achieving competitive employment: Increase the percentage of individuals with significant disabilities who have a supported employment goal who achieve a competitive employment outcome, including individuals who receive supported employment services funded under the VR State Grants program and/or the Supported Employment State Grants Program.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieve a competitive employment outcome.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1997	69.60	
1998	69.10	
1999	73.30	71
2000	77.30	71.50
2001	79.20	77.40
2002	90.50	77.60
2003	92.70	77.80
2004	92.80	78
2005		93
2006		93

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

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from grantees.

Improvements: RSA staff have worked with grantees to improve the accuracy and timeliness of RSA-911 data. The FY 2004 database was available six months after the close of the fiscal year, a significant improvement over previous years.

Explanation: With this measure, RSA examines State agency performance regarding supported employment for individuals with the most significant disabilities. Individuals in supported employment can achieve competitive employment (with wages at or above the minimum wage), although not all individuals in supported employment do achieve these competitive wages.

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.235 - Rehabilitation Services Demonstration and Training Special Demonstration Programs

Program Goal: To expand, improve or further the purposes of activities authorized under the Act.

Objective 1 of 1: *Expand and improve the provision of rehabilitation services that lead to employment outcomes.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Expansion: Projects will be judged to have successfully implemented strategies that contribute to the expansion of services for the employment of individuals with disabilities according to the percentage of individuals served and placed into employment by the projects.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of individuals who were provided employment services through projects and who were placed into employment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Percent of individuals placed into employment	Percent of individuals placed into employment
2001	14.20	
2002	27.86	
2003	38.62	
2004	35.97	
2005		24
2006		34

Source: Web-based Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Limitations: The Web-based system that grantees use for reporting provides raw data but does not aggregate all the numbers needed, which has resulted in hand counting to obtain the information required.

Explanation: Actual performance data were re-calculated for FY 2001 through 2004 to include only projects with employment outcomes.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Improvement: The percentage of individuals referred to or from VR agencies will be maintained or increased as a result of interactions with, presentations to, and information provided to VR agencies.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of referrals to and from state VR agencies and projects.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	Referrals to VR from Projects	Referrals from VR to Projects	Referrals to VR from Projects	Referrals from VR to Projects
2001	17.50	35.64		
2002	17.47	37.34	10	58
2003	11.22	27.55	10	60
2004	9.22	31.44	10	62
2005			13	33
2006			13	33

Source: Web-based Annual Performance Reports.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: The Web-based system that grantees use for reporting provides raw data but does not aggregate all the numbers needed, which has resulted in hand counting to obtain the information required.

Explanation: FY 2001 data was used to establish the baseline. Actual performance data were re-calculated for FY 2001 through 2004 to include only projects with employment outcomes.

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Grants for Indians - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.250 - Rehabilitation Services American Indians with Disabilities

Program Goal: To improve employment outcomes of American Indians with disabilities who live on or near reservations by providing effective tribal vocational rehabilitation services.

Objective 1 of 2: *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 1.1 of 1: The percentage of individuals who leave the program with employment outcomes: At least 65 percent of all eligible individuals who exit the program after receiving services under an individualized plan for employment will achieve an employment outcome.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of individuals who leave the AIVRS program with employment outcomes.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1998	58	
1999	61	
2000	62	61
2001	65	62
2002	64	62
2003	66	64.10
2004	62	64.50
2005		65
2006		65
2007		65
2008		65

Source: Web-based Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Improvements: Continued technical assistance will ensure that grantees are providing uniform data.

Objective 2 of 2: *Ensure that all AIVRS projects demonstrate effective fiscal management.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: The cost per employment outcome: The percentage of projects whose cost per employment outcome is within a specified range.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: Percentage of AIVRS projects whose cost per employment outcomes is within a specified range.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Web-based Performance Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for this new efficiency measure. Cost per employment outcome is calculated by dividing the total federal grant funds by the number of individuals served with employment outcomes.

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Recreational Programs - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.128J - Recreational Programs

Program Goal: To provide individuals with disabilities recreational activities and related experience that can be expected to aid in their employment, mobility, socialization, independence and community integration.

Objective 1 of 1: *Recreational Programs*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Project Continuation: The percentage of recreation programs sustained after federal funding ceases.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of projects in operation one, two, or three years after federal funding ceases.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2001	66	
2002	80	
2003	75	
2004	83	66
2005	78.60	66
2006		79

Source: Telephone monitoring.
Date Sponsored: 12/31/2003.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: December 2006

Data Validated By: No Formal Verification.

Limitations: Contacting past grantees.

Explanation: This measure indicates the cumulative number of programs in existence one, two, or three years following the end of federal funding. Number of programs being tracked after federal funding ceased. (FY 1999= 11; FY 2000=10; FY 2001=6) Twenty-one of the 27 projects from FY 1999-2001 continued after Federal funding ceased.

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.126A - Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants

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

Objective 1 of 2: *Ensure that individuals with disabilities who are served by the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) State Grants program achieve employment consistent with their particular strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, abilities, capabilities, interests, and informed choice.*

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Employment outcomes: The percentage of (a) general and combined state VR agencies that assist at least 55.8 percent of individuals who receive services to achieve employment outcomes, and (b) state VR agencies for the blind that assist at least 68.9 percent of individuals who receive services to achieve employment outcomes will increase.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: (a) The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies that assist at least 55.8 percent of individuals receiving services to achieve employment.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	75	
2002	75	
2003	66	
2004	66	83
2005		75
2006		70

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: (b) The percentage of state VR agencies for the blind that assist at least 68.9 percent of individuals receiving services to achieve employment.

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	75	
2002	75	
2003	58	
2004	63	83
2005		75
2006		70

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

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from grantees.

Explanation: This indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on Indicator 1.2 in Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve employment of all individuals whose cases were closed after receiving services.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Competitive employment for individuals with significant disabilities: The percentage of (a) general and combined state VR agencies for which at least 80 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities, and (b) state VR agencies for the blind for which at least 90 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities will increase.

Measure 1.2.1 of 2: (a) The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies for which at least 80 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	75	
2003	82	
2004	86	
2006		88

Measure 1.2.2 of 2: (b) The percentage of state VR agencies for the blind for which at least 90 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	88	
2003	88	
2004	100	
2006		96

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

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from grantees.

Explanation: This indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on indicator 1.4, in Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals achieving competitive employment who have significant disabilities. To pass the Section 106 indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 62.4 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 89 percent. For purposes of this measure, beginning with the FY 2006, RSA decided that the criteria were too low, and therefore has increased the rates to 80 percent for general and combined agencies and 90 percent for agencies

for the blind. FY 2002 and 2003 data were recalculated to reflect this new criteria.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Competitive employment: By 2009 (a) 98 percent of general and combined state VR agencies will assist at least 85 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment, and (b) 79 percent of state VR agencies for the blind will assist at least 65 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment.

Measure 1.3.1 of 2: (a) The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies assisting at least 85 percent of individuals to achieve competitive employment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	88	
2003	93	
2004	95	67
2005		89
2006		96
2007		98
2008		98
2009		98

Measure 1.3.2 of 2: (b) The percentage of state VR agencies for the blind assisting at least 65 percent of individuals to achieve competitive employment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	50	
2003	54	
2004	71	48
2005		54
2006		71
2007		75
2008		75
2009		79

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

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluation Program Performance Data.

Limitations: Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from grantees.

Explanation: This long-term indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on indicator 1.3 in Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve competitive employment of all individuals who achieve employment. To pass the Section 106 indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 72.6 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 35.4 percent. For purposes of this measure, beginning with the FY 2004 plan, RSA decided that the criteria were too low, and therefore increased the rates to 85 percent for general and combined VR agencies and 65 percent for agencies for the blind. For measure (a), the FY 2002 and 2003 data were incorrectly calculated and have been corrected.

Objective 2 of 2: *Ensure that state VR agencies demonstrate effective fiscal management.*

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Cost per employment outcome: The percentage of State VR agencies whose cost per employment outcome is within a specified range.

Measure 2.1.1 of 2: The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies whose cost per employment outcome is within a specified range.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
- No Data -		

Measure 2.1.2 of 2: The percentage of state VR agencies for the blind whose cost per employment outcome is within a specified range.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
- No Data -		

Source: RSA state agency data from the RSA-911 report and RSA final state agency allocation tables.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: April 2007

Explanation: During FY 2006, the Department will identify the specific performance range needed to meet these measures. These are new efficiency measures. Cost per employment outcome is calculated by dividing the total federal grant funds by the number of individuals achieving employment outcomes in the fiscal year.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Consumer Service Expenditure Rate: The percentage of state VR agencies whose consumer service expenditure rate is at or above a specified level.

Measure 2.2.1 of 2: The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies whose consumer service expenditure rate is at or above a specified level.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
- No Data -		

Measure 2.2.2 of 2: The percentage of state VR agencies for the blind whose consumer service expenditure rate is at or above a specified level.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
- No Data -		

Source: State VR agency data from the RSA-2 Cost Report

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: July 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish the baselines for these new efficiency measures. During FY 2006 the Department will identify the specific performance level needed to meet these measures. Consumer service expenditure rate is calculated by dividing the state VR agency's total program expenditures by consumer service expenditures.

RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.129 - Rehabilitation Long-Term Training
84.246 - Rehabilitation Short-Term Training
84.264 - Rehabilitation Training_Continuing Education
84.275 - Rehabilitation Training_General Training

Program Goal: To provide the public vocational rehabilitation (VR) sector with well-trained staff and to maintain and upgrade the skills of current staff through continuing education.

Objective 1 of 3: *To provide graduates who work within the vocational rehabilitation (VR) system to help individuals with disabilities achieve their goals.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: Numbers trained: The number of students supported by RSA scholarships and the number of RSA scholars graduating will remain stable.

Measure 1.1.1 of 2: The number of scholars supported by RSA scholarships.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1997	1,600	
1998	1,550	
1999	1,665	1,473
2000	2,390	2,000
2001	2,540	2,000
2002	2,232	2,000
2003	2,378	2,050
2004	1,789	2,050
2005		2,100
2006		2,000
2007		2,000

Measure 1.1.2 of 2: The number of scholars RSA-supported graduating.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1997	800	
1998	817	
1999	832	729

2000	764	688
2001	841	700
2002	817	700
2003	802	725
2004	598	725
2005		725
2006		725

Source: Annual grantee reporting form.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Indicator 1.2 of 2: Percentage working: The percentage of graduates fulfilling their payback requirements through acceptable employment will increase annually.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of RSA-supported graduates fulfilling their payback requirements through acceptable employment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2000	72	70
2001	71	71
2002	85	72
2003	82	72
2004	81	74
2005		73
2006		83

Source: Annual grantee reporting form.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Objective 2 of 3: *Maintain and upgrade the knowledge and skills of personnel currently employed in the public VR system.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Qualified personnel: The percentage of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their state's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standard will increase annually.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their state's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standards.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2000	69	
2001	71	70
2002	63	75
2003	67	77
2004		79
2005		70
2006		70

Source: Inservice Annual Grantee Progress Report

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: March 2006

Explanation: Anticipate a leveling off in performance as staff turnover is at an all-time high due to retirements, and there is an insufficient pool of qualified candidates to replenish the staff positions. The FY 2002 actual value has been updated to reflect final evaluation report.

Objective 3 of 3: *To provide existing staff of the public vocational rehabilitation sector with continuing education to maintain and upgrade skills and knowledge.*

Indicator 3.1 of 2: Knowledge and skills development: Continuing education activities are consistent with the regional needs assessment.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of public vocational rehabilitation participants who report an improvement in their knowledge and skills acquisition.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Source: Project annual report Evaluation Instrument.
Date Sponsored: 06/30/2006.

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: November 2007

Limitations: Evaluation instruments vary across projects.

Improvements: Plan to develop common data collection instrument during FY 2005-2006 for use in all future years.

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. Out year targets will be set after baseline data

have been collected.

Indicator 3.2 of 2: Continuing education activities consistent with the regional needs assessment

Measure 3.2.1 of 1: The percentage of continuing education activities that are consistent with the regional needs assessment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		999

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: November 2007

Explanation: The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. Out year targets will be set after baseline data have been collected.

USC: Howard University - FY 2006

Program Goal: To assist Howard University with financial resources needed to carry out its educational mission.

Objective 1 of 3: *Increase student enrollment over the long term.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Increased enrollment: Annual enrollment rate

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of full-time undergraduate students enrolling at Howard University.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	6,841	
2009		7,344

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Fall enrollment data will be monitored and reported annually to measure progress toward meeting the long-term target, which is projected to be met in 2009. Target is derived from project experience and applies an estimated 1.0% annual rate of increase to the period between FY 2003 and FY 2009. Data for 2004-05 will be available in November 2006.

Objective 2 of 3: *Increase the retention of full-time undergraduate students.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: Persistence rate: Year-to year persistence of full-time, first time students.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of full-time undergraduate students who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	90	
2006		90
2007		90
2008		90

2009		90
2010		90
2011		90

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
References: .
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by the institution, which certifies the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: Institutions only report a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for the Howard University is calculated as a median. The persistence rate for Howard is high compared to other institutions, so that maintaining the present rate is viewed as an ambitious goal. Data for 2004-05 will be available in November 2006.

Objective 3 of 3: *Increase the undergraduate graduation rate.*

Indicator 3.1 of 1: Graduation rate: Graduation within six years of enrollment.

Measure 3.1.1 of 1: The percentage of students enrolled at Howard University who graduate within six years of enrollment.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	68	
2007		69
2008		69
2009		70
2010		70
2011		70

Survey/Assessment: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.
Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data supplied by the institution, which certifies the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: The graduation rate for Howard is high compared to other institutions, so that maintaining (or slightly increasing) the present rate is viewed as an ambitious goal. Graduation data will be monitored and reported annually. Data for 2004-05 will be available in November 2006.

VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.245 - Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions

Program Goal: To increase access to and improve vocational education that will strengthen workforce preparation, employment opportunities, and lifelong learning in the Indian community.

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that vocational students served in tribally controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institutions make successful transitions to work or continuing education.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Postsecondary outcomes: An increasing percentage of vocational education students in the TCPVIP will receive an A.A. degree or certificate.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of vocational students in the TCPVIP who earn an A.A. degree or certificate.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
	Percentage of students	Percentage of students
1999	23	
2000	57	25
2001	82	59
2002	46	65
2003	48	47
2004	44	49
2005	49	52
2006		57

Source: Program Performance Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2006

Limitations: Data are self-reported by the grantees using lists of graduates and enrollees.

Explanation: Calculations of completions are based on the number of students receiving degrees relative to all students available to graduate (i.e., students in their final semester).

Goal 6: Establish Management Excellence

DEOA: Office for Civil Rights - FY 2006

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

Objective 1 of 2: *To provide high-quality customer service throughout the case-resolution process.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Customer response: Mean score of responses to OCR's Customer Service Survey.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Mean score of OCR's customer survey responses.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	3.66	999
2006		3.66

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: October 2006
Staff involved in investigative activities do not participate in survey data collection. All survey forms are generated electronically and mailed from headquarters. All manual data entry is conducted at headquarters. Electronic data recording ensures data integrity.

Explanation: In setting the baseline, which was the 2005 target, we determined that the mean score is a more appropriate measure than percentage satisfied and we have adjusted the measure statement to reflect that metric. OCR's baseline mean score of 3.66, out of a possible 5.0, was derived from survey data collected in the last quarter of FY 2004 and the first three quarters of FY 2005. Because we have only a limited amount of trend data (four quarters), OCR is using the baseline score as the FY 2006 performance target.

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

Indicator 2.1 of 2: Resolution of New Complaints: The percentage of new complaints resolved within 180 days of receipt.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: The percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1997	80	
1998	81	
1999	80	80
2000	78	80
2001	84	80
2002	89	80

2003	91	80
2004	92	80
2005	92	80
2006		80

Source: Data are collected in OCR's Case Management System throughout the fiscal year (October 1-September 30).

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Indicator 2.2 of 2: Resolution of Complaints over 180 days old: The percentage of pending complaint caseload over 180 days old.

Measure 2.2.1 of 1: Percentage of pending civil rights complaints that are over 180 days old.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		25

Source: Data are collected in OCR's Case Management System throughout the fiscal year (October 1-September 30)

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: October 2006

Data Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.

Explanation: This is a new efficiency measure for 2006. While OCR is able to resolve the majority of complaints in 180 days, some cases are so complex and/or sensitive that they cannot be resolved within that timeframe. OCR wants no more than 25% of its pending complaint caseload to be over 180 days.

DEOA: Office of Inspector General - FY 2006

Program Goal: To promote the efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity of the Department's programs and operations by conducting independent and objective audits, investigations, inspections, and other activities.

Objective 1 of 2: *To improve the Department's programs and operations.*

Indicator 1.1 of 2: The percentage of significant recommendations implemented within one year of acceptance by the Department.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Percentage of significant recommendations accepted by the Department each year.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2006		70

Source: OIG audit and inspection reports. Reports will be tracked principally in the OIG Audit Tracking System (ATS). There may be additional tracking information available fro the department's Audit Accountability and Resolution System (ARTS).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006
Validation is done internally.

Limitations: The measure includes only recommendations from audit and inspection reports. Recommendations from other OIG services, as quick response projects and advice and technical assistance, are not included in this measure.

Explanation: This measure has been modified from 2005 to measure recommendations accepted v. implemented.

Indicator 1.2 of 2: The percentage of written reports that meet OIG timeliness standards.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The percentage of written reports that meet OIG timeliness standards.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	67	75
2006		75

Source: Audit Services, Investigative Services, Evaluation, Inspection, and Management Services.

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006
Validation done internally by each OIG component.

Objective 2 of 2: *To protect the integrity of the Department's programs and operations.*

Indicator 2.1 of 1: OIG monetary recoveries will exceed the OIG annual budget by an average of 100% over a five-year period.

Measure 2.1.1 of 1: OIG monetary recoveries will exceed the OIG annual budget by an average of 100% over a five-year period.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2005	120	125
2006		100

Source: Semiannual report to Congress (Audit Tracking System, Investigative Case Tracking System, and the Department of Justice).

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: October 2006
The numbers are validated internally and some are provided by the Department of Justice.

Explanation: The calculation is the percentage by which the five-year rolling average of OIG monetary recoveries exceeds the OIG annual budget. The measure has been reworded slightly from 2005. The OIG budget will be compared to the five-year average of: court and administratively assessed fines, penalties, restitutions, civil settlements/judgments, savings/recoveries, seized/forfeited property, sustained questioned costs, and sustained unsupported costs.

Ongoing Plans Without FY 2006 Measures

ESEA: Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.060 - Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies

Program Goal: To help American Indian and Alaska Native children achieve to the same challenging standards expected of all students by supporting access to programs that meet their unique educational and culturally related academic need.

Objective 1 of 1: *American Indian and Alaska Native students served by LEAs' receiving Indian Education Formula Grants will progress at rates similar to those for all students in achievement to standards, promotion, and graduation.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Student achievement: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native students will meet or exceed the performance standards established by national assessments.

Measure 1.1.1 of 4: The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade four who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2000	63	
2002	51	60
2003	47	62
2005		53
2007		60

Measure 1.1.2 of 4: The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade eight who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2002	61	
2003	57	66
2005		63
2007		65

Measure 1.1.3 of 4: The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade four who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**

1996	57	
2000	40	
2002		64
2003	64	66
2005		66
2007		70

Measure 1.1.4 of 4: The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade eight who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
1996	51	
2000	47	
2002		62
2003	52	64
2005		54
2007		60

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

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: February 2006

Data Validated By: NCES.
Data validated by National Center for Education Statistics review procedures and statistical standards.

Limitations: The small sample (for the subpopulation 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.

Explanation: NAEP assessments for reading and mathematics are not administered annually. American Indian and Alaska Native students were oversampled for the 2005 NAEP assessments in reading and mathematics to increase the reliability of the data.

ESRA: National Assessment - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.902 - Assessments

Program Goal: To collect, analyze, and disseminate information on the condition of education in the United States and to provide comparative international statistics.

Objective 1 of 1: *Timeliness of NAEP data for reading and mathematics assessment in support of the President's No Child Left Behind Initiative.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: The time from the end of data collection to initial public release of results in reading and mathematics assessments shall be reduced from 15 months to 6 months.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The number of months from the end of data collection to the initial public release of results.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2003	8	6
2005	6	6
2007		6

Frequency: Biennially.

Next Data Available: October 2007

Data Validated By: NCES.

Explanation: Data will be calculated by determining number of months between actual end of data collection and the release date.

HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents in School - FY 2006

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

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

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

Indicator 1.1 of 3: Persistence rate: The percentage of program participants who persist in postsecondary education.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The percentage of CCAMPIS program participants receiving child care services who remain in postsecondary education at the end of the academic year.

Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	18 month report	36 month report	18 month report	36 month report
2002		79		
2003	64			
2004	66	74	64.50	79.50
2005		67		80
2007			65	
2008			65.50	81
2009				81.50
2010			66	
2011				82

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 18 and 36 months Performance Reports for the Child Care Access Parents in Schools Program.

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Limitations: Data are supplied by grantee institutions with no formal verification procedure provided. Grantees attest to accuracy of data.

Explanation: This measure has been reformatted to display performance by year without regard to cohort. Data are collected, per program statute, from 18-month and 36-month performance reports. Although data from the 36-month reports are more meaningful for reporting on persistence, data are also presented and projected from 18-month reports. This enables regular annual reporting on program activity. Updated persistence rate data from the 36-month performance report covering performance through 2005 will be available in December 2005. The calendar for data collection with reports at 18 and 36 months means that data are not collected in FY 2006, as there were no new competitions in 2003 or 2004.

Indicator 1.2 of 3: Graduation rate: The percentage of program participants, not including those at four-year institutions, who complete their program of study.

Measure 1.2.1 of 1: The graduation rate of program participants in postsecondary education other than four-year schools.				
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**	
	18 month report	36 month report	18 month report	36 month report
2002		22		
2003	17			
2004	18	30	17.50	22.50
2005		24		23
2007			18	
2008			18.50	23.50
2009				24

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 18 and 36 months Performance Reports for the Child Care Access Parents in Schools Program.

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Limitations: Data are supplied by grantees with no formal verification procedure provided. Grantees attest to the accuracy of the data.

Explanation: In FY 2006, this measure has been reworded to more accurately reflect the data. Data are collected, per program statute, from 18-month and 36-month performance reports. Although data from the 36-month reports are more meaningful for reporting on persistence, data are also presented and projected from 18-month reports. This enables regular annual reporting on program activity. Updated graduation rate data from the 36-month performance report covering performance through 2005 will be available in December 2005. The calendar for data collection with reports at 18 and 36 months means that data are not collected in FY 2006, as there were no new competitions in 2003 or 2004.

Indicator 1.3 of 3: Efficiency measure: Cost per successful CCAMPIS outcome.

Measure 1.3.1 of 1: Federal cost of CCAMPIS student who persists in or graduates from an institution of higher education.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2004	1,097	

Source: Grantee Performance Report, 18 and 36 months Performance Reports for the Child Care Access Parents in Schools Program.

Frequency: Other.

Next Data Available: January 2006

Improvements: Program is currently revising Annual Performance Report , which will generate more accurate counts of persistence and completion beginning in 2007.

Explanation: The measure is calculated as the annual appropriation divided by the number of CCAMPIS students persisting in and graduating from school during that specific school year.

HEA: SFA Federal Direct Student Loans - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.268 - Federal Direct Student Loans

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

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that persistence rates will increase for low- and middle-income students.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Student persistence.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Student persistence rate in postsecondary education for FDSL recipients.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2007		999

Source: IPEDS

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2008

Explanation: The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. Providing program-specific data for this program will become feasible when individual student enrollment information is collected. The collection of student data at the individual unit record level will provide the information needed to calculate retention and completion rates for the individual FSA programs. OPE management has been actively involved in the technical review panel for the IPEDS Student Unit Record Feasibility Study. The study is being conducted to review the feasibility of redesigning the IPEDS collection of student-related data to incorporate individual student unit records. Although it is premature to anticipate when, and if, unit record data will become available, 2008 would likely be the earliest possible date for reporting since field testing is anticipated in FY 2006 and implementation would probably not occur until FY 2007. Given that the unit record project study outcome is not yet known, OPE also is exploring the feasibility of obtaining program data on persistence and completion by drawing an alternative sample from the merged applicant/recipient file and conducting a survey of this group.

HEA: SFA Federal Family Education Loan Program & Liquidating - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.032 - Federal Family Education Loans

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

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that persistence rates will increase for low- and middle-income students.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Student persistence.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Student persistence rates in postsecondary education for FFEL recipients.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2007		999

Source: IPEDS

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2008

Explanation: The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. Providing program-specific data for this program will become feasible when individual student enrollment information is collected. The collection of student data at the individual unit record level will provide the information needed to calculate retention and completion rates for the individual FSA programs. OPE management has been actively involved in the technical review panel for the IPEDS Student Unit Record Feasibility Study. The study is being conducted to review the feasibility of redesigning the IPEDS collection of student-related data to incorporate individual student unit records. Although it is premature to anticipate when, and if, unit record data will become available, 2008 would likely be the earliest possible date for reporting since field testing is anticipated in FY 2006 and implementation would probably not occur until FY 2007. Given that the unit record project study outcome is not yet known, OPE also is exploring the feasibility of obtaining program data on persistence and completion by drawing an alternative sample from the merged applicant/recipient file and conducting a survey of this group.

HEA: SFA Federal Perkins Loans - FY 2006

CFDA Numbers: 84.037 - Perkins Loan Cancellations
84.038 - Federal Perkins Loan Program Federal Capital Contributions

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

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that persistence rates will increase for low- and middle-income students.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Student persistence

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Student persistence rates for Perkins Loans borrowers.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2007		999

Source: IPEDS

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2008

Explanation: The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. Providing program-specific data for this program will become feasible when individual student enrollment information is collected. The collection of student data at the individual unit record level will provide the information needed to calculate retention and completion rates for the individual FSA programs. OPE management has been actively involved in the technical review panel for IPEDS Student Unit Record Feasibility Study. The study is being conducted to review the feasibility of redesigning the IPEDS collection of student-related data to incorporate individual, student unit records. Although it is premature to anticipate when, and if, unit record data will become available, FY 2008 would likely be the earliest possible date for reporting since field testing is anticipated in FY 2006 and implementation would probably not occur until FY 2007. Given that the unit record project study outcome is not yet known, OPE also is exploring the feasibility of obtaining program data on persistence and completion by drawing an alternative sample from the merged applicant/recipient file and conducting a survey of this group.

HEA: SFA Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.007 - Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants

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

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that persistence rates will increase for low- and middle-income students.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Student Persistence.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Student persistence rates for SEOG recipients.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2007		999

Source: IPEDS

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2008

Explanation: The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. Providing program-specific data for this program will become feasible when individual student enrollment information is collected. The collection of student data at the individual unit record level will provide the information needed to calculate retention and completion rates for the individual FSA programs. OPE management has been actively involved in the technical review panel for the IPEDS Student Unit Record Feasibility Study. The study is being conducted to review the feasibility of redesigning the IPEDS collection of student-related data to incorporate individual student unit records. Although it is premature to anticipate when, and if, unit record data will become available, 2008 would likely be the earliest possible date for reporting since field testing is anticipated in FY 2006 and implementation would probably not occur until FY 2007. Given that the unit record project study outcome is not yet known, OPE also is exploring the feasibility of obtaining program data on persistence and completion by drawing an alternative sample from the merged applicant/recipient file and conducting a survey of this group.

HEA: SFA Federal Work-Study - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.033 - Federal Work-Study Program

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

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that persistence rates will increase for low- and middle-income students.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Student persistence.

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: Student Persistence rate for FWS recipients.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2007		999

Source: Integrated Postsecondary education Data System (IPEDS)

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2008

Explanation: The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. Providing program-specific data for this program will become feasible when individual student enrollment information is collected. The collection of student data at the individual unit record level will provide the information needed to calculate retention and completion rates for the individual FSA programs. OPE management has been actively involved in the technical review panel for the IPEDS Student Unit Record Feasibility Study. The study is being conducted to review the feasibility of redesigning the IPEDS collection of student-related data to incorporate individual student unit records. Although it is premature to anticipate when, and if, unit record data will become available, 2008 would likely be the earliest possible date for reporting since field testing is anticipated in FY 2006 and implementation would probably not occur until FY 2007. Given that the unit record project study outcome is not yet known, OPE also is exploring the feasibility of obtaining program data on persistence and completion by drawing an alternative sample from the merged applicant/recipient file and conducting a survey of this group.

HEA: SFA Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnerships - FY 2006

CFDA Number: 84.069 - Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership

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

Objective 1 of 1: *Ensure that the persistence rate will increase for low- and middle-income students.*

Indicator 1.1 of 1: Student Persistence

Measure 1.1.1 of 1: The student persistence rate for LEAP recipients.		
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**
2007		999

Source: IPEDS

Frequency: Annually.

Next Data Available: June 2008

Explanation: FY 2007 data will set the baseline. Providing program-specific data for this program will become feasible when individual student enrollment information is collected. The collection of student data at the individual unit record level will provide the information needed to calculate retention and completion rates for the individual FSA programs. OPE management has been actively involved in the technical review panel for IPEDS Student Unit Record Feasibility Study. The study is being conducted to review the feasibility of redesigning the IPEDS collection of student-related data to incorporate individual, student unit records. Although it is premature to anticipate when, and if, unit record data will become available, FY 2008 would likely be the earliest possible date since field testing is anticipated in FY 2006 and implementation would probably not occur until FY 2007. Given that the unit record project study outcome is not yet known, OPE also is exploring the feasibility of obtaining program data on persistence and completion by drawing an alternative sample from the merged applicant/recipient file and conducting a survey of this group.