
Performance Details



PERFORMANCE DETAILS OVERVIEW

The Department presents measures and results for each of four strategic goals as defined by the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan* and refined in the *FY 2008 Performance and Accountability Report*. For each strategic goal, the Department has selected program measures centered on the desired outcomes. The chapter for each goal provides specific details about the performance progress for each measure. Department data indicate no significant non-achievement at the goal or objective levels and 11 of 81 measures that did not meet targets with no demonstrated improvement in real terms. All other measures for which data are available have shown improvement in real terms or deviation from target levels is slight.

How to Read This Report

Each goal includes a table that describes the measures, indicates the actual performance and summarizes the results.

Table. Provides trend data including the latest reported data. Years for Targets and Actual data are listed at the top of each table. When Baseline data vary as to year, the top of the table identifies those columns with the word (Years). Some targets have been adjusted since publication of the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan* after review and approval by program, budget and performance representatives.

Source. Provides bibliographic information.

Analysis of Progress. Provides insights into the Department's progress, including explanations for unmet targets and actions being taken or planned.

Data Quality and Timeliness. Incorporates information such as the universe included in the measure; definitions; the way data were collected, calculated and reviewed; data strengths and limitations; and plans for improved data quality.

Target Context. Explains the rationale for targets, especially where anomalies exist.

Not all measures will include all data fields described above.

Methodology for Program Performance Summary

In keeping with the *Government Performance and Results Act of 1993*, the Department has established program-specific annual plans with measures and targets for the majority of the grant and loan programs and has provided the corresponding program performance reports in conjunction with the publication of the *FY 2009 Annual Performance Report*. Each program that has measures supports at least one of the Department's strategic goals. Web-based tables provide a summary of each program's performance results.

Since 2002, performance plans and reports have been published on the Department's Web site at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/index.html?src=pn>.

GOAL 1: Improve Student Achievement, With a Focus on Bringing All Students to Grade Level in Reading and Mathematics by 2014

Measures for Objective 1.1: Percentage of students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.1.A. All Students	*	68.3	72.3	70.2	76.2	70.5	80.2	Sept. 2010	84.2	88.1
1.1.B. Low-Income Students	*	55.3	60.9	57.4	66.5	58.1	72.1	Sept. 2010	77.7	83.2
1.1.F. Students With Disabilities	*	38.7	51.8	41.5	54.0	42.2	61.7	Sept. 2010	69.4	77.0
1.1.G. Limited English Proficient Students	*	39.8	47.3	38.8	54.9	39.8	62.4	Sept. 2010	69.9	77.4
1.1.H. Career and Technical Education Concentrators***					61	68	64	May 2010	68	68
Students From Major Racial and Ethnic Groups**:										
1.1.C. American Indian/Alaska Native	*	60.1	65.1	62.4	70.1	62.2	75.1	Sept. 2010	80.1	85.0
1.1.D. African American	*	55.5	61.1	58.4	66.6	57.7	72.2	Sept. 2010	77.8	83.3
1.1.E. Hispanic	*	52.0	58.0	54.3	64.0	56.3	70.0	Sept. 2010	76.0	82.0

* New measure in 2007. 2006 actual data are reported as baseline for 2007 and 2008 targets.

** African American, American Indian/Alaska Native and Hispanic students when they are of a statistically significant number to be reported by the states.

*** This measure was a newly established performance measure under the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV). Formerly there was one measure for academic achievement under Perkins III that included a measure that combined student results on reading and mathematics assessments.

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Analysis of Progress: For most measures in Objective 1.1, the targets were not met but results improved for FY 2008. Measures 1.1.C and 1.1.D declined slightly. There was no effect on program performance. Targets adjusted prior to FY 2008 reporting since the *FY 2007-2012 Strategic Plan*.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is submitted annually to the Department by state educational agencies (SEAs) to report on multiple elementary and secondary programs. One purpose of this report is to integrate state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery. Data for school year 2009–2010 are expected in September 2010.

Target Context: In accordance with the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, as amended, the goal is for 100 percent of all students to achieve proficiency on state reading assessments by 2014. Starting in 2007 and ending in 2014, there are eight years to close the gap between the 2006 baseline and the 2014 ultimate goal of 100 percent. Therefore, targets for 2007 and 2008 were calculated by (1) subtracting the baseline percentage from 100 percent to determine the gap that must be closed, (2) dividing that gap by 8 to determine the annual improvement that would be needed if the gap were to be closed in a linear fashion, (3) adding that annual increment to the 2006 baseline to arrive at the 2007 target and (4) increasing the 2007 target by another annual incremental improvement to arrive at the 2008 target. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2008 as updates to the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*.

Measures for Objective 1.2: Percentage of students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.2.A. All Students	*	65.0	69.4	68.0	73.8	69.6	78.1	Sept. 2010	82.5	86.9
1.2.B. Low-Income Students	*	52.3	58.3	55.9	64.2	57.8	70.2	Sept. 2010	76.2	82.1
1.2.F. Students With Disabilities	*	37.8	52.2	41.9	53.3	42.5	61.1	Sept. 2010	68.9	76.7
1.2.G. Limited English Proficient Students	*	43.3	50.4	44.7	57.5	46.7	64.6	Sept. 2010	71.7	78.7
1.2.H. Career and Technical Education Concentrators***					54	62	57	May 2010	62	63
Students From Major Racial and Ethnic Groups**:										
1.2.C. American Indian/Alaska Native	*	53.2	59.1	56.8	64.9	58.6	70.8	Sept. 2010	76.6	82.5
1.2.D. African American	*	48.8	55.2	52.9	61.6	54.1	68.0	Sept. 2010	74.4	80.8
1.2.E. Hispanic	*	51.8	57.8	54.8	63.9	57.7	69.9	Sept. 2010	75.9	81.9

* New measure in 2007. 2006 actual data are reported as baseline for 2007 and 2008 targets.

** African American, American Indian/Alaska Native and Hispanic students when they are of a statistically significant number to be reported by the states.

*** This measure was a newly established performance measure under the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV). Formerly there was one measure for academic achievement under Perkins III that included a measure that combined student results on reading and mathematics assessments.

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Analysis of Progress: For the measures in Objective 1.2, the targets were not met but results improved over prior years for FY 2008. There was no effect on overall program or activity performance. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2008 reporting to reflect trends since development of the *FY 2007-2012 Strategic Plan*.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report is submitted annually to the Department by state educational agencies to report on multiple elementary and secondary programs. One purpose of this report is to encourage the integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery. Measures were not in place for 2006; data for school year 2009–2010 are expected in September 2010.

Target Context: In accordance with the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)*, as amended, the goal is for 100 percent of all students to achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments by 2014. The baselines are the actual results in 2006. Starting in 2007 and ending in 2014, there are eight years to close the gap between the 2006 baseline and the 2014 ultimate goal of 100 percent. Therefore, targets for 2007 and 2008 were calculated by: (1) subtracting the baseline percentage from 100 percent to determine the gap that must be closed, (2) dividing that gap by 8 to determine the annual improvement that would be needed if the gap were to be closed in a straight-line fashion, (3) adding that annual increment to the 2006 baseline to arrive at the 2007 target and (4) increasing the 2007 target by another annual incremental improvement to arrive at the 2008 target.

Measures for Objective 1.3: Percentage of class type taught by highly qualified teachers

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.3.A. Total Core Academic Classes	*	91	100	94	100	95	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.B. Total Core Elementary Classes**	95	94	100	95.9	100	96.5	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.C. Core Elementary Classes in High-Poverty Schools	*	90.4	100	93.5	100	94.9	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.D. Core Elementary Classes in Low-Poverty Schools	*	95.8	100	96.6	100	97.5	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.E. Total Core Secondary Classes**	92	90.9	100	93	100	93.9	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.F. Core Secondary Classes in High-Poverty Schools	*	85.7	100	88.7	100	89.6	100	Mar 2010	100	100
1.3.G. Core Secondary Classes in Low-Poverty Schools	*	93.8	100	95.4	100	96	100	Mar 2010	100	100

* New measure in 2007.

** FY 2006 targets based on earlier measures.

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Analysis of Progress: For the measures in Objective 1.3, targets were not met but results improved over prior years. There was no effect on overall program or activity performance. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2008 reporting to reflect trends since development of the *FY 2007-2012 Strategic Plan*.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report is submitted annually to the Department by state educational agencies to report on multiple elementary and secondary programs. One purpose of this report is to encourage the integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery.

Target Context: The targets are based on legislative initiatives, including the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, as amended.

Measures for Objective 1.4: Promoting safe, disciplined and drug-free learning environments

Percentage of Students in Grades 9 Through 12 Who:	Results*								Plan	
	FY 2003		FY 2005		FY 2007		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.4.A. Carried a Weapon (Such as a Knife, Gun, or Club) on School Property One or More Times During the Past 30 Days	N/A	6.1	5.0	6.5	5.0	5.9	4.0	August 2010	N/A*	4.0
1.4.B. Missed One or More Days of School During the Past 30 Days Because They Felt Unsafe at School, or on Their Way to and from School	N/A	5.4	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.5	5.0	August 2010	N/A*	4.0
1.4.C. Were Offered, Given, or Sold an Illegal Drug by Someone on School Property in the Past Year	N/A	28.7	28.0	25.4	27.0	22.3	26.0	August 2010	N/A*	25.0

N/A = Not Available.

*Data gathered only in odd-numbered years.

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System, supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, part of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Analysis of Progress: For FY 2007, targets were not met but results generally improved over prior years for measures 1.4.A. and 1.4.B. The results for measure 1.4.C. exceeded the target. Desired results are declines in reported activities.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System, a data collection supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The survey monitors six categories of priority health risk behaviors among youth, including violence and alcohol and other drug use. Data reported for these measures come from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System National Survey; data for this survey are collected in odd years and reported in the following even year. Details about the methods used to select the sample and other issues are available at <http://www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/yrbs/index.htm>. Data from the FY 2009 survey will be available in summer 2010.

Target Context: Lower percentages indicate improvement on these measures. Data are based on a biennial survey and gathered only in odd-numbered years.

Measures for Objective 1.5: Increasing information and options for parents

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.5.A. Percentage of Eligible Students Exercising Choice	N/A	1.2	N/A	2.2	2.4	2.3	N/A	Jan. 2010	3.6	N/A
1.5.B. Percentage of Eligible Students Participating in Supplemental Educational Services	N/A	14	15.4	14.5	16.8	13.8	18.2	Jan. 2010	19.6	20.3
1.5.C. Number of Charter Schools in Operation	3,600	3,997	3,900	4,155	4,290	4,376	4,720	Feb. 2010	5,190	5,710

BL = Baseline, N/A = Not Available.

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Measure 1.5.A.: Percentage of Eligible Students Exercising Choice

Analysis of Progress: Target not fully met in FY 2008 but improved over prior years. No target set for FY 2009. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2008 reporting to reflect trends since development of the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is submitted annually by states to the U.S. Department of Education to report on multiple programs. A purpose of the report is to encourage integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery.

Target Context: The 2006 actual serves as the baseline. Targets for this measure were developed for every two years from the baseline year (2006). Accordingly, there is no target for 2007, 2009, or 2011. The target for 2008 is the baseline times two (2006 actual x 2). The target for 2010 is the baseline times 3 (2006 actual x 3).

Measure 1.5.B.: Percentage of Eligible Students Participating in Supplemental Educational Services

Analysis of Progress: Target not met in FY 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is submitted annually by states to the U.S. Department of Education to report on multiple programs. A purpose of the report is to encourage integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery.

Target Context: The 2006 actual serves as the baseline. The target for 2007 is the baseline times 1.1 (1.1 x 2006 actual). The target for 2008 is the baseline times 1.2 (1.2 x 2006 actual). The target for 2009 is the baseline times 1.3 (2006 actual x 1.3). The target for 2010 is the baseline times 1.4 (2006 actual x 1.4). The target for 2011 is the baseline times 1.45 (2006 actual x 1.45).

Measure 1.5.C.: Number of Charter Schools in Operation

Analysis of Progress: Target exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is submitted annually by states to the U.S. Department of Education to report on multiple programs. A purpose of the report is to encourage integration of state, local and federal programs in planning and service delivery.

Target Context: FY 2007 and FY 2008. Source: U.S. Department of Education, Education Data Exchange Network (EDFacts). Prior years' data were reported by the Center for Education Reform. The performance goal for the Charter Schools program is to increase the number of charter schools in operation by 10 percent each year beginning in 2005.

Measures for Objective 1.6: Percentage of 18–24-Year-Olds Who Have Completed High School¹

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
1.6.A. Total	87.6	87.8	87.3	89.0	87.4	July 2010	87.6	July 2011	87.8	88.0
1.6.B. African American	83.4	84.8	85.3	88.8	85.5	July 2010	85.8	July 2011	86.0	86.3
1.6.C. Hispanic	70.2	70.8*	70.1	72.7	70.3	July 2010	70.6	July 2011	71.0	71.5
1.6.D. Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate ²	74.3	73.2*	75.2	73.9	76.6	July 2010	77.9	July 2011	79.3	80.8

Sources:

*Adjusted totals

¹U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey. Data are collected annually.

²U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, State Non-fiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education. Data are collected annually. Averaged freshman graduation rate is a Common Core of Data measure that provides an estimate of the percentage of high school students who graduate on time by dividing the number of graduates with regular diplomas by the size of the incoming class four years earlier.

Measures 1.6.A., 1.6.B. and 1.6.C.: Total, African American and Hispanic

Analysis of Progress: Most targets were exceeded in FY 2006 and FY 2007. Data for FY 2008 and FY 2009 are not yet available and thus unable to be assessed. Targets have been adjusted to reflect trends since development of the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data for column “FY 2006” in the table were based on data for the 2005–2006 school year, released in September 2008. Data for the 2006–2007 school year (column “FY 2007” in the table) were released in September 2009. Data for the 2007–2008 school year (column “FY 2008”) are not expected for release until July 2010. Data for the 2008–2009 school year (column “FY 2009”) are not expected for release until July 2011.

Measure 1.6.D.: Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate

Analysis of Progress: Data for FY 2008 and FY 2009 are not yet available and are unable to be assessed. Targets were not met for FY 2006 or FY 2007, but improvement is shown.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The *Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2007–2012*, published in May 2007, included measures developed in 2006. The 2005–2006 (column “FY 2006” in this table) data were released in July 2008. Data for the 2006–2007 school year (column “FY 2007”) were released in September 2009. Data for the 2007–2008 school year (column “FY 2008”) are not expected for release until July 2010. Data for the 2008–2009 school year (column “FY 2009”) are not expected for release until July 2011.

Target Context: As of July 2009, 20 states reported adjusted cohort graduation rates. The rates track students from when they enter high school to when they leave. Other states used measures based on annually reported aggregate data that did not follow the progress of individual students over time. Twenty-eight states estimated graduation rates by dividing the number of graduates in a given year by the number of graduates plus estimates of dropouts over the preceding 4 years. This rate has been referred to as the leaver rate. The remaining states used other measures to fulfill this reporting requirement. Because of the lack of comparability in the different approaches taken to reporting on-time graduation rates and because of limitations in the leaver rate for measuring on-time graduation, the Department publishes a rate designed to estimate on-time graduation for all states using a common data source: the Common Core of Data, produced by the National Center for Education Statistics. That rate, technically referred to as the averaged freshman graduation rate, uses aggregate data to estimate the number of first-time 9th graders in the fall 4 years prior to the graduation year being reported and divides that into the number of diplomas awarded in the reporting year.

Measures for Objective 1.7: Transforming education into an evidence-based field

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
Number of Department-Supported Programs and Practices with Evidence of Efficacy Using WWC Standards:										
1.7.A. Reading or Writing	3	3	6	6	11	11	13	13	15	17
1.7.B. Mathematics or Science	1	1	3	4	7	8	10	11	12	15
1.7.C. Teacher Quality	1	1	3	3	5	5	7	7	10	12
1.7.D. Number of Visits to the WWC** Website			*	482,000	530,000	531,162	583,000	772,154	641,000	705,000

* New measure in 2007. The 2007 actual serves as the baseline.
 **WWC = What Works Clearinghouse.

Measures 1.7.A., 1.7.B. and 1.7.C.: Reading or Writing, Mathematics or Science and Teacher Quality

Analysis of Progress: In fiscal years 2007, 2008 and 2009, targets for reading, writing and teacher quality were met and targets for mathematics or science were exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data were self-reported by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES).

Target Context: The Department’s measures for evaluating progress toward the goal of transforming education into an evidence-based field are tied to the clearinghouse. The measures assess the productivity of IES’s investments in producing scientifically valid research on teaching and instruction with respect to the core academic competencies of reading/writing and mathematics/science. The measure that is tracked is the number of programs and practices on these topics that have been developed with IES funding and that have been shown to be effective in raising student achievement under the research quality standards of the clearinghouse. As shown by clearinghouse reviews of existing research on program effectiveness in reading/writing and mathematics, few older studies meet the clearinghouse quality standards. Thus the targets under this measure are ambitious and will, if met, result in a doubling—or more—of the existing base of research-proven programs and practices. Targets are based on the number of grants awarded in the subject areas and the maturation of the grants and the numbers are cumulative.

Measure 1.7.D.: Number of Visits to the WWC Web site

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2007 target of setting a baseline was met. The FY 2008 and FY 2009 targets were exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data were self-reported by IES.

Target Context: This is a measure of utilization. It addresses the degree to which work that the clearinghouse has identified as effective is being accessed. The clearinghouse Web site is already heavily visited. The targets were set in 2007 using FY 2006 actual data as a baseline.

GOAL 2: Increase the Academic Achievement of All High School Students

Measures for Objective 2.1: Increase the proportion of high school students taking a rigorous curriculum

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
2.1.A. Percentage of Low-Income Students Who Qualify for Academic Competitiveness Grants** ¹	N/A		*	35	42	26	49	Sept. 2010	56	63
2.1.B. Number of Advanced Placement Classes Available Nationwide ²	N/A		*	Not Collected	PY +10%	Not Collected	PY +10%	Not Collected	PY +10%	PY +10%
Number of Advanced Placement Tests Taken by Public School Students*** ³										
2.1.C. Total	N/A	1,943,565	1,953,000	2,133,594	2,168,000	2,321,311	2,406,000	2,495,252	2,671,000	2,965,000
2.1.D. Low-Income	209,411	267,286	230,352	286,028	328,932	308,072	378,272	387,986	435,013	500,265
2.1.E. Minorities (Black, Hispanic, Native American) [†]	336,000	359,372	376,000	413,847	421,000	471,898	544,716	538,249	626,423	575,520
2.1.F. Number of Teachers Trained Through Advanced Placement Incentive Grants to Teach Advanced Placement Classes ⁴	N/A		*	Not Collected	PY +5%	Not Collected	PY +10%	Not Collected	PY +10%	PY +10%

N/A = Not Available, PY = Prior Year.

* New measure in 2007. The 2007 actual served as the baseline.

** Academic Competitiveness Grants sunset after 2011.

*** New measure in 2005. The 2005 actual served as the baseline.

† Advanced Placement measures use the definitional term Black.

Sources:

¹National Center for Education Statistics, 2007-08 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:08).

²The College Board, Ledger of Authorized Advanced Placement Courses. Data are reported annually.

³The College Board, Freeze File Report. Data are reported annually.

⁴U.S. Department of Education, Advanced Placement Incentive Program, Annual Performance Reports.

Measure 2.1.A.: Percentage of Low-Income Students Who Qualify for Academic Competitiveness Grants

Analysis of Progress: The American Competitiveness Initiative is a comprehensive strategy to keep this nation the most innovative in the world. Its goal is to strengthen high schools and prepare students for college or the workforce. The Department is committed to expanding Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) programs to increase teacher training in mathematics, science and critical foreign languages; to increase the number of students taking AP and IB mathematics, science and critical foreign language exams; and to triple the number of students passing AP and IB tests. Academic Competitiveness Grants (ACGs) provide financial incentives for students to take a rigorous course of study in high school and college. To qualify for ACGs, students must complete rigorous course-work, maintain good grades, be full-time students and be eligible for Federal Pell Grants.

The measure for 2008 considered first- and second-year undergraduate students less than 21 years of age at two- and four-year postsecondary institutions and compared ACG recipients to the total number of Pell Grant-qualified students (those who got Pell Grants plus ACG recipients). The program is scheduled to close in FY 2011.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data for FY 2009 are expected in September 2010 through the National Student Loan Data System via Common Origination and Disbursement system data.

Target Context: FY 2007 was the first year of the Academic Competitiveness Grants program. Targets for future years were developed as follows: the numerator was determined through a review of Financial Student Aid records and the denominator was developed from high school graduation records for the 2004–05 and 2005–06 school years, with the estimates narrowed for low-income students by use of the 2003–04 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) and state estimates of the proportion of students taking rigorous curricula. The target is a challenging goal for the program—a 20 percent increase annually in the proportion of qualified students given ACG grants, potentially leading to doubling the proportion of students by FY 2011.

Measure 2.1.B.: Number of Advanced Placement Classes Available Nationwide

Analysis of Progress: Data for this measure were not collected for FY 2007, FY 2008 or FY 2009. The measure indicates number of Advanced Placement classes available nationwide for which no calculation is possible, in that individual classes are not identified for each school participating in the AP program.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Ledger of Authorized Advanced Placement Courses was initiated in 2007 and tracks only the number of courses offered, not the number of classes.

Measures 2.1.C., 2.1.D. and 2.1.E.: Number of Advanced Placement Tests Taken by Public School Students (Total, Low-Income and Minorities)

Analysis of Progress: Targets were originally established by the Department's program office and in the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*. Data are supplied by the College Board. The Department exceeded its targets for FY 2008 and FY 2009 for the total number of AP tests taken by public school students. It did not meet its target for low-income students for FY 2008 but did exceed it for FY 2009. For minority students, the Department exceeded its target for FY 2008 but did not meet the target for FY 2009. The Department continues to see growth in the overall numbers of AP courses and tests taken by public school students, especially low-income and minority students. Low-income is defined as those students who meet the requirements for free or reduced-price lunches.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are reported annually. Data are analyzed by the College Board and by the Department.

Target Context: These measures were not in place as strategic measures prior to 2005; 2005 actual data were used to set baselines and establish future targets.

Measure 2.1.F.: Number of Teachers Trained Through Advanced Placement Incentive Grants to Teach Advanced Placement Classes

Analysis of Progress: No data have been collected for this measure.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Originally, these data were not collected because of a delay in proposed rulemaking. Funds were not appropriated for the Advanced Placement Incentive program as authorized by the *America COMPETES Act*.

Measures for Objective 2.2: Promote advanced proficiency in mathematics and science for all students

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
Number of Advanced Placement Tests in Mathematics and Science Taken Nationwide by Public School Students: ¹										
2.2.A. Total	*	589,701	631,000	644,550	681,000	692,210	736,000	734,425	802,000	882,000
2.2.B. Low-Income	*	60,692	65,000	66,337	70,000	73,710	76,000	91,927	84,000	93,000
2.2.C. Minorities (Black, Hispanic, Native American) ^{***}	*	74,762	80,000	86,061	86,000	98,718	94,171	111,532	104,000	115,000
2.2.D. Number of Teachers Trained Through Advanced Placement Incentive Grants to Teach Advanced Placement Classes in Mathematics and Science ²	N/A		Estab. BL	Not Collected	PY +5%	Not Collected	PY +10%	Not Collected	PY +10%	PY +10%

BL = Baseline, N/A = Not Available, PY = Prior Year.

***Advanced Placement measures use the definitional term Black.

Sources:

¹The College Board, Freeze File Report. Data are reported annually.

²U.S. Department of Education, Advanced Placement Incentive Program, Annual Performance Reports.

Measures 2.2.A., 2.2.B. and 2.2.C.: Number of Advanced Placement Tests in Mathematics and Science Taken Nationwide by Public School Students (Total, Low-Income and Minorities)

Analysis of Progress: Targets are established by the program office and by the Department's *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*. Data are supplied by the College Board. The Department exceeded its 2008 target for the total number of AP tests in mathematics and science taken by public school students, but did not meet its FY 2009 target. For low-income students, the Department exceeded its targets for FY 2008 and FY 2009. For minority students, it exceeded its FY 2008 and FY 2009 targets. The number of AP tests in mathematics and science taken nationwide continues to increase, especially for low-income students and minority students. Low-income students are defined as those students who qualify for free or reduced-price lunches.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are reported annually.

Target Context: FY 2006 served as the baseline. The Department established future targets based on the 2006 actual data.

Measure 2.2.D.: Number of Teachers Trained Through Advanced Placement Incentive Grants to Teach Advanced Placement Classes in Mathematics and Science

Analysis of Progress: Data on this measure were not collected.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Originally, these data were not collected because of a delay in proposed rulemaking. Data for this measure were not collected because there were no funds appropriated for the Advanced Placement Incentive program authorized under the *America COMPETES Act*.

Measures for Objective 2.3: Increase proficiency in critical foreign languages

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
2.3.A. Combined Total of Advanced Placement ¹ and International Baccalaureate ² Tests in Critical Foreign Languages Passed by Public School Students	N/A		Estab. BL	3,557	4,091	4,033	4,638	4,642	5,338	PY +15%

BL = Baseline, N/A = Not Available, PY = Prior Year.

Sources:

¹The College Board, Freeze File Report. Data are reported annually.

²International Baccalaureate North America, Examination Review and Data Summary. Data are reported annually.

Measures 2.3.A.: Increase proficiency in critical foreign languages

Analysis of Progress: In 2007, 2008 and 2009, the College Board tested in AP for critical languages for Chinese and Japanese. In 2007 and 2008, International Baccalaureate of North America tested the critical languages of Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Russian and Turkish, but did not test for Turkish in 2009.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are reported annually by the International Baccalaureate of North America and by the College Board.

Target Context: The Department used the FY 2007 actual to set the baseline. It did not meet its target for FY 2008 and exceeded the target only moderately for FY 2009. Targets are set at an increase of 15 percent over the actual values for the prior year. Targets and actuals are based on a total of all tests passed, regardless of score received.

GOAL 3: Ensure the Accessibility, Affordability and Accountability of Higher Education and Better Prepare Students and Adults for Employment and Future Learning

Measures for Objective 3.1: Increase success in and completion of quality postsecondary education

	Results								Plan	
	(Years)*		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
Postsecondary Enrollment										
3.1.A. Percentage of High School Graduates Aged 16–24 Enrolling Immediately in College ¹	(2006)	68.6	68	66	68	67.2	68	Dec. 2010	69	69
3.1.B. Percentage of Upward Bound Participants Enrolling in College ²	(2006)	79.0	65	77.4	70	Dec. 2010	75	Dec. 2011	75	76
3.1.C. Percentage of Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Transitioned to Postsecondary Education or Employment by December of the Year of Graduation ³	(2005)	87	89	86	90	Dec. 2010	**	**	**	**
Postsecondary Persistence										
3.1.D. Percentage of Full-Time Degree-Seeking Undergraduate Students at Title IV Institutions Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution ⁴	(2006)	70	71	70	71	71.1	71	Dec. 2010	72	72
3.1.E. Percentage of Full-Time Undergraduate Students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution ⁴	(2005)	65	66	62	66	65	66	Dec. 2010	67	67
3.1.F. Percentage of Full-Time Undergraduate Students at Hispanic-Serving Institutions Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution ⁴	(2004)	64	68	63.5	68	69	68	Dec. 2010	69	69
Postsecondary Completion										
3.1.G. Percentage of Students Enrolled at All Title IV Institutions Completing a Four-Year Degree Within Six Years of Enrollment ⁵	(2005)	57.1	57	57.3	57	58	57	Jan. 2011	58	58
3.1.H. Percentage of Freshmen Participating in Student Support Services Who Complete an Associate's Degree at Original Institution or Transfer to a Four-Year Institution Within Three Years ²	(2006)	24.6	27.5	25.1	27.5	27.8	28.0	Dec. 2010	28.0	28.5
3.1.I. Percentage of Students Enrolled at Four-Year Historically Black Colleges and Universities Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment ⁵	(2005)	38	39	35	39	35	40	Dec. 2010	40	40
3.1.J. Percentage of Students Enrolled at Four-Year Hispanic-Serving Institutions Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment ⁵	(2006)	35	37	44	37	42	44	Dec. 2010	45	45
3.1.K. Percentage of Postsecondary Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Completed a Postsecondary Degree or Certification ³	(2005)	42	46	40	47	Dec. 2010	**	**	**	**

*Year indicates the year that baseline target was established.

**Amended measure and new baseline will be established under *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV) guidance

Sources:

¹U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey.

²U.S. Department of Education, TRIO Annual Performance Report.

³Career and Technical Education Annual Performance Report and Grantee Performance Reports.

⁴U.S. Department of Education, NCES. Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, Enrollment Survey. Persistence measures the percentage of full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students at Title IV institutions who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution.

⁵U.S. Department of Education, NCES. Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, Graduation Rate Survey.

Measure 3.1.A.: Percentage of High School Graduates Aged 16–24 Enrolling Immediately in College

Analysis of Progress: The enrollment rate increased slightly from 2007 to 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The *Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2007–2012*, published in May 2007, included measures developed in FY 2006. Data for the 2007–2008 school year (column “2008” in the table) are expected for release in December 2010.

Target Context: The Department did not meet its 2008 target of 68 percent, although enrollment increased from 66.0 percent in FY 2007 to 67.2 percent in FY 2008.

Measure 3.1.B.: Percentage of Upward Bound Participants Enrolling in College

Analysis of Progress: Based on actual data significantly increasing over recent years, targets beyond 2008 have been increased.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The annual performance report comprises self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Target Context: Based on consecutive years of performance exceeding targets, the targets were increased to 70 percent for 2008 and 75 percent for 2009. The target for FY 2008 was increased to 70 percent as part of the fall 2006 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) update and to 75 percent for 2009 in the spring 2007 PART update.

Measure 3.1.C.: Percentage of Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Transitioned to Postsecondary Education or Employment by December of the Year of Graduation

Analysis of Progress: Data for FY 2009 and FY 2008 will reflect changes in legislative requirements.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Actual data are entered through FY 2007. Data for FY 2008 are expected in March 2010 and a new baseline will be established under *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV) guidance. States submit their reports to the Department each year through an electronic system. At that time, each grant recipient must attest to the accuracy and completeness of submissions by entering an Electronic Personal Identification Number that is supplied to them by the Department. The Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) staff then completes a check on the accuracy and completeness of the data and follows up with states as necessary.

Target Context: The Department met its 2005 target of setting the baseline. The FY 2008 and FY 2009 targets are based on state-adjusted performance levels that were negotiated with and approved by the Department.

Measure 3.1.D.: Percentage of Full-Time Degree-Seeking Undergraduate Students at Title IV Institutions Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution

Analysis of Progress: The rates declined slightly between FY 2007 and FY 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Beginning in FY 2008, persistence was reported for the first time along with the numerator and denominator generating the percentage. Therefore, the rate established for any program can be aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

Target Context: The Department met its 2006 target of setting the baseline. It did not meet the 2007 national target of 71 percent. It met its 2008 target of 71 percent. Data for FY 2009 are expected in December 2010.

Measure 3.1.E.: Percentage of Full-Time Undergraduate Students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution

Analysis of Progress: The rates declined slightly between FY 2007 and FY 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by NCES. Beginning with FY 2008, persistence was reported for the first time along with the numerator and denominator generating the percentage. Therefore, the rate established for any program can be aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

Target Context: Through FY 2007, institutions had reported a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) program was calculated as a median. The 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 3.6 percent. The reason for decline in persistence is unknown. The Department is beginning to analyze grantee performance for this program, which may provide some insight into factors behind this decline.

Measure 3.1.F.: Percentage of Full-Time Undergraduate Students at Hispanic-Serving Institutions Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution

Analysis of Progress: The rates increased slightly between FY 2007 and FY 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a review process by NCES. Beginning with FY 2008, persistence was reported for the first time along with the numerator and denominator generating the percentage. Therefore, the rate established for any program can be aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

Target Context: The long-term target for FY 2009 is 68 percent.

Measure 3.1.G.: Percentage of Students Enrolled at All Title IV Institutions Completing a Four-Year Degree Within Six Years of Enrollment

Analysis of Progress: The Department exceeded its FY 2007 target of 57 percent. The percentage of bachelor's degree-seeking students completing a four-year degree within six years of enrollment improved, increasing to 57.5 percent (58%) in FY 2008 from 57.3 percent in FY 2007.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by NCES. Beginning with FY 2008, persistence was reported for the first time along with the numerator and denominator generating the percentage. Therefore, the rate established for any program can be aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

Measure 3.1.H.: Percentage of Freshmen Participating in Student Support Services Who Complete an Associate’s Degree at Original Institution or Transfer to a Four-Year Institution Within Three Years

Analysis of Progress: The Department met its FY 2007 target of 27.5 percent. The percentage of Student Support Service participants completing an associate's degree at original institution or transferring to a four-year institution increased substantially from 2006 to 2007.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The annual performance report collects self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

Measure 3.1.I.: Percentage of Students Enrolled at Four-Year Historically Black Colleges and Universities Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment

Analysis of Progress: The percentage of students enrolled at four-year Historically Black Colleges and Universities graduating within six years of enrollment remained at 35 percent in 2007.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

Measure 3.1.J.: Percentage of Students Enrolled at Four-Year Hispanic-Serving Institutions Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment

Analysis of Progress: The Department significantly exceeded its FY 2008 target of 37 percent. The percentage of students enrolled at four-year Hispanic-Serving Institutions graduating within six years of enrollment increased from 2007.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

Measure 3.1.K.: Percentage of Postsecondary Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Completed a Postsecondary Degree or Certification

Analysis of Progress: Data for FY 2009 and FY 2008 will reflect changes in legislative requirements.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Actual data are entered through FY 2007. Data for 2008 are expected in March 2010 and a new baseline will be established under *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV) guidance. States submit their reports to the Department each year through an electronic system. At that time, each grant recipient must attest to the accuracy and completeness of submission by entering an Electronic Personal Identification Number that is supplied to them by the Department. The Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) staff then completes a check on the accuracy and completeness of the data and follows up with states as necessary.

Target Context: The Department met its 2005 target of setting the baseline. The FY 2008 and FY 2009 targets are based on state-adjusted performance levels that were negotiated with and approved by the Department.

Measures for Objective 3.2: Deliver student financial aid to students and parents effectively and efficiently

	Results *								Plan	
	(Years**)		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
3.2.A. Direct Administrative Unit Costs for Origination and Disbursement of Student Aid ¹ (<i>Total Cost per Transaction</i>)	(2006)	\$4.24	\$4.25	\$4.03	\$4.15	\$3.65	\$4.00	\$3.60	\$4.00	\$4.00
3.2.B. Customer Service Level on the American Consumer Satisfaction Index for the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web ²	(2005)	81	82	80	83	83	84	84	85	85
3.2.C. Pell Grant Improper Payments Rate	(2006)	3.48%	3.48%	4.11%	3.48%	3.69%	3.41%	3.50%	3.35%	3.28%
3.2.D. Direct Loan Recovery Rate ³	(2006)	19.00%	19.50%	20.8%	19.75%	21%	20.00%	18.0%	20.25%	20.50%
3.2.E. FFEL Recovery Rate	(2006)	19.3%	19.50%	19.60%	19.50%	23.6%	19.75%	19.70%	20.00%	20.25%

* Targets are based on the Department's *Strategic Plan* and may differ from the targets presented in the *FSA Annual Report*

**Year indicates the year that baseline target was established.

FFEL = Federal Family Education Loan.

Sources:

¹Unit costs are derived from the Department's Activity-Based Management program using direct administrative costs. They do not include administrative overhead or investment/development costs.

²Based upon annual American Customer Satisfaction Index scores obtained through the CFI Group.

³The recovery rate equals the sum of collections on defaulted loans divided by the outstanding default portfolio at the end of the previous year.

Measure 3.2.A.: Direct Administrative Unit Costs for Origination and Disbursement of Student Aid

Analysis of Progress: Federal Student Aid has made significant progress in its efforts to reduce the administrative unit costs. The actual unit cost for origination and disbursement is significantly lower than the baseline amount set in FY 2006. The Department anticipates an increase in costs and workload volumes in the coming years, as part of the new Direct Loan Initiative.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The actuals are the data reported as final in the current fiscal year. Because it takes some time after the closeout of the fiscal year to receive completed data and to validate results, the data lag by one year. For example, in FY 2009, the unit costs were based on data from FY 2008. To calculate the unit cost of Origination and Disbursement of Student Aid, the total amount spent on originating and disbursing Direct Loans and Grants is divided by the total number of Direct Loan and Grant disbursements.

Target Context: The target for this measure is expected to remain flat for FY 2010. Targets will be reviewed for the new *Strategic Plan*.

Measure 3.2.B.: Customer Service Level on the American Consumer Satisfaction Index for the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web

Analysis of Progress: The target was met for 2008. With an American Customer Satisfaction Index score of 83 (on a 1–100 scale), Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web scores in

the "Excellent" range in comparison to other entities that appear in the index. This category includes such high-performing companies as UPS, Amazon and Mercedes.

Data Quality and Timeliness: In 2008, the student aid applicants were asked through an electronic surveying capability their opinions about the experience directly after completing the online aid application. This new capability allowed the Department to obtain opinions directly after the experience rather than a month or more down the road and allowed it to expand the sample universe, yielding more accurate results.

Target Context: Targets are based upon American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) customer satisfaction scores and the Department expects to show slight improvement in the out years.

Measure 3.2.C.: Pell Grant Improper Payments Rate

Analysis of Progress: The Department did not meet its target. The improper payment rate that results from the Internal Revenue Service study is based on a randomly selected group of applicants each year. As such, the rate is subject to arbitrary fluctuations that reflect the randomness of the sample for any given year. The Department continues to make refinements to the application process that, based on the results of the study, will ultimately lead to a lower level of improper payments.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The FY 2009 Pell error rate is final at 3.5 percent.

Target Context: Target remains the same from FY 2006 to FY 2008. The FY 2009 target was not realized and 2010–2011 targets remain constant at 3.5 percent.

Measure 3.2.D.: Direct Loan Recovery Rate

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target of 20 percent was not met. This target was based, in part, on the expectation that a new collection system would be in place in 2009. The new system would have included more sophisticated collection tools. Data will now be collected through another process, with implementation during FY 2011.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are reported through the end of FY 2009 using the Default Management and Collections System (DMCS). A new service, which will include a new system, is being procured. The new service will enable FSA to manage its portfolio using methodologies, such as segmenting the portfolio and increasing overall collections. The new service is expected to improve FSA's productivity by streamlining processes, including invoices and workflow.

Target Context: The recovery rate equals the sum of collections on defaulted loans divided by the outstanding default portfolio at the end of the previous year. The full extent of the economic downturn was not considered when the targets were originally established. This measure and out-year targets will be re-evaluated when developing the next *Strategic Plan*.

Measure 3.2.E.: FFEL Recovery Rate

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target of 19.75 percent was almost met, as reflected in the actual results of 19.70 percent.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are through the end of FY 2008.

Target Context: The recovery rate equals the sum of collections on defaulted loans divided by the outstanding default portfolio at the end of the previous year. The full extent of the economic downturn was not considered when the targets were originally established and loan sales were not as high as expected.

Measures for Objective 3.3: Prepare adult learners and individuals with disabilities for higher education, employment and productive lives

	Results								Plan	
	(Years*)		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
3.3.A. Percentage of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies That Meet the Employment Outcome Standard for the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants Program**	(2004)	66	71	82	76	79	78	Apr. 2010	80	82
3.3.B. Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With a High School Completion Goal Who Earn a High School Diploma or Recognized Equivalent	(2005) 46	51	52	59	53	62	54	Feb. 2010	55	56
3.3.C. Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With a Goal to Enter Postsecondary Education or Training Who Enroll in a Postsecondary Education or Training Program	(2005) 30	34	37	55	39	55	41	Feb. 2010	43	45
3.3.D. Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With an Employment Goal Who Obtain a Job by the End of the First Quarter After Their Program Exit Quarter	(2005) 40	37	41	61	41	61	42	Feb. 2010	42	43

*Year indicates the year that baseline target was established.

**A state vocational rehabilitation agency meets the standard if at least 55.8 percent of individuals who have received services achieve an employment outcome.

Source: Vocational Rehabilitation agency data submitted to the Department's Rehabilitation Services Administration; Adult Education Annual Performance Report and Grantee Performance Reports.

Measure 3.3.A.: Percentage of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies That Meet the Employment Outcome Standard for the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants Program

Analysis of Progress: In fiscal years 2007 and 2008, the percentage of general or combined state vocational rehabilitation agencies that met the performance criterion remained relatively constant at 82 percent and 79 percent, respectively. The percentage of general and combined vocational rehabilitation agencies that met the employment outcome standard in FY 2008 declined from 82 to 79 percent because two fewer agencies passed the standard due to more challenging economic conditions as well as a more difficult disability population being served. (Note: the FY 2006 number reported for FY 2007 in last year's report was 66 percent rather than 82 percent. The percentage was revised as a result of a miscalculation in prior years.)

Data Quality and Timeliness: State vocational rehabilitation agencies are required to submit their Rehabilitation Services Administration RSA-911 data by November 30 for the previous fiscal year. The data are considered very reliable because of the RSA editing process to which agency data are submitted. Data quality and timeliness have improved significantly in recent years. The RSA-911 database for fiscal years 2005 and 2006 was complete within 5 months of the close of fiscal year. Completion of the 2007 database was delayed because of late data submissions; however, RSA is working to ensure that the 2009 database is complete by February 2010 and available for timely analysis of performance data. Vocational rehabilitation data will be available in April 2010.

Target Context: The decline in employment outcomes had stabilized in 2005 with improving economic conditions and performance targets for 2008 and future years were raised, but they may have to be revisited with the current economic crisis, especially in employment.

Measure 3.3.B.: Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With a High School Completion Goal Who Earn a High School Diploma or Recognized Equivalent

Analysis of Progress: The program exceeded its 2008 target as well as the 2007 actual performance data. Part of the explanation for the increase may stem from improved data collection methods used by states to collect and report on this measure through the National Reporting System for Adult Education.

Data Quality and Timeliness: As a third-tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

Target Context: The Department negotiated approved targets with OMB for a 15-year period.

Measure 3.3.C.: Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With a Goal to Enter Postsecondary Education or Training Who Enroll in a Postsecondary Education or Training Program

Analysis of Progress: The target has been met. There was a spike in the 2007 actual data. Factors include (1) improved follow-up methodologies implemented the states and (2) training and technical assistance by OVAE in providing support to states regarding methodologies related to transitioning adult students into postsecondary education and training opportunities.

During 2009, states maintained their data methodologies to support local entities and OVAE maintained its technical assistance in providing support to states regarding methodologies related to transitioning adult students into postsecondary education and training opportunities.

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

Target Context: The Department negotiated approved targets with OMB for a 15-year period.

Measure 3.3.D.: Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With an Employment Goal Who Obtain a Job by the End of the First Quarter After Their Program Exit Quarter

Analysis of Progress: The target has been met. The actual data for 2008 exceeded the target and remained consistent with the actual data for 2007. There was a spike in the 2007 actual data. Factors include improved follow-up methodologies implemented by the states to collect and report employment. Prior to 2007, the performance data reflected the percentage of adult learners with an employment goal who, upon exit from an adult education program, obtained a job. States maintained their follow-up methodologies during 2009.

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

Target Context: The Department negotiated approved targets with OMB for a 15-year period.

CROSS-GOAL STRATEGY ON MANAGEMENT

Measures for Cross-Goal Strategy, Objective 4.1: Maintain and strengthen financial integrity and management and internal controls

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
4.1.A. Maintain an Unqualified (Clean) Audit Opinion ¹	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
4.1.B. Achieve and Maintain Compliance With the <i>Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002</i> ²	*	NC	NC	NC	C	NC	C	NC	C	C
4.1.C. Percentage of New Discretionary Grants Awarded by June 30 ³	*	40	60	66	70	61	80	36	90	90

U = Unqualified (clean), NC = Non-compliant, C = Compliant.

*New Measures in FY 2007

Sources:

¹Independent Auditors' annual financial statement audit report and related reports on internal control and compliance with laws and regulations.

²U.S. Department of Education, Office of Inspector General, annual *Federal Information Security Management Act* audit.

³U.S. Department of Education's Grant Administration and Payment System.

Measure 4.1.A.: Maintain an Unqualified (Clean) Audit Opinion

Analysis of Progress: The Department earned an eighth consecutive unqualified or "clean" audit opinion from independent auditors, thus meeting the FY 2009 target for this measure.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Independent auditors follow professional standards and conduct the audit under the oversight of the Department's Office of Inspector General. There are no data limitations.

Target Context: An unqualified or "clean" opinion means that the Department's financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Department in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States.

Measure 4.1.B.: Achieve and Maintain Compliance With the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002*

Analysis of Progress: The Department's Office of Inspector General has determined the Department to be noncompliant in fulfilling the requirements of the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002* each year since the first evaluation in FY 2003 and this determination means that the Department did not meet its target. The Department is making progress in addressing OIG's concerns, having resolved fully more than 70 percent of the audit recommendations from FY 2005 through 2007.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. § 3545, the Department's Office of Inspector General (OIG) annually evaluates the effectiveness of the Department's information security program and practices. The evaluation includes testing of the effectiveness of information security policies, procedures and practices of a representative subset of the agency's information systems, as well as an assessment of compliance with requirements of the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002* and related information security policies based upon the testing performed.

Target Context: The Department has made significant progress in addressing OIG's concerns over the years. In instances where OIG has identified areas where improvements were needed, the Department has provided remediation to put in place effective security policies and procedures to protect the Department's IT assets.

Measure 4.1.C.: Percentage of New Discretionary Grants Awarded by June 30

Analysis of Progress: Concerted efforts by Department program managers to award new discretionary grants earlier in the fiscal year resulted in 66 percent of new FY 2007 awards being issued by June 30 of that fiscal year (three-fourths of the year complete). This exceeded the 60 percent FY 2007 target for this measure. In the previous four fiscal years, no more than 49 percent of new discretionary grants had been awarded by June 30. In FY 2008, the ambitious 70 percent target was not achieved by June 30, but the 61 percent award rate far exceeded the rates prior to FY 2007. In FY 2009, factors lowering the percentage were the addition of the *Recovery Act* funding administered by the same personnel as the Department grants, presidential transition and budgetary considerations associated with operation under a continuing resolution for the first quarter and part of the second quarter of FY 2009. Despite the percentage of grant awards at the June 30 mark, by August 31, 78 percent of discretionary grants were awarded, compared with 82 percent in FY 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Department's Office of the Chief Financial Officer regularly collects data via the Grant Administration and Payment System from principal offices with responsibilities for directing discretionary grant programs. During the second half of the fiscal year, data are distributed frequently to senior Department officials to ensure that planned award deadlines are met successfully.

Target Context: The Department has made a concerted effort in the past three years to expedite the processing of new discretionary grant awards. The Department aims to streamline the process further in future years to enable program staff to spend more time on program monitoring and performance improvements. The 2006 actual data served as the baseline for this measure.

Measures for Cross-Goal Strategy, Objective 4.2: Improve the strategic management of the Department's human capital

	Results								Plan	
	(Years ^{***})		FY 2007 ²		FY 2008 ¹		FY 2009 ²		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
Percentage of Employees Believing That:										
4.2.A. Leaders Generate High Levels of Motivation and Commitment*	(2006 ¹)	28	31	37	34	33	40	37	43	46
4.2.B. Managers Review and Evaluate the Organization's Progress Towards Meeting Its Goals and Objectives*	(2006)	53	56	58	59	56	68	51	71	74
4.2.C. Steps Are Taken to Deal With a Poor Performer Who Cannot or Will Not Improve*	(2006)	25	28	29	31	28	34	26	37	40
4.2.D. Department Policies and Programs Promote Diversity in the Workplace*	(2006)	46	49	48	52	51	56	48	59	62
4.2.E. They Are Held Accountable for Achieving Results*	(2006)	81	82	82	83	84	85	84	86	87
4.2.F. The Workforce Has the Job-Relevant Knowledge and Skills Necessary to Accomplish Organizational Goals*	(2006)	67	69	70	71	70	72	68	74	76
4.2.G. Average Number of Days to Hire Is at or Below the OPM 45-Day Hiring Model for Non-SES**	(2006)	Not Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved
4.2.H. Percentage of Employees With Performance Standards in Place Within 30 Days of Start of Current Rating Cycle³	(2005)	79	85	59	90	93	95	95	97	98

	Results								Plan	
	(Years ^{***})		FY 2007 ²		FY 2008 ¹		FY 2009 ²		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
4.2.I. Percentage of Employees Who Have Ratings of Record in the System Within 30 Days of Close of Rating Cycle ⁴	(2005)	85	90	97	95	98	99	96	100	100

*These metrics are based on the percentage of favorable response to questions on the Federal Human Capital Survey and the Department's Annual Employee Survey. The Department's 2006 responses (Departmentwide) are used as the baseline.

**The Office of Personnel Management 45-day hiring model for non-SES tracks the hiring process from the date of vacancy announcement closing to the date a job offer is extended. It is measured in workdays, not calendar days. The average is based on the total number of hires made within a specified period of time (quarterly).

***Years indicates the years that baseline target was established.

Sources:

¹Federal Human Capital Survey.

²Annual Department Employee Surveys.

³Data from the Education Department Performance Appraisal System.

⁴U.S. Department of the Interior's Federal Personnel Payroll System.

Measures 4.2.A.–4.2.F: Improve the Strategic Management of the Department's Human Capital

Analysis of Progress: Department employees indicated slightly lower agreement with four of the six measure statements in the 2009 Annual Employee Survey than they had in the 2008 Federal Human Capital Survey. Targets for two measures were met and progress for one measure was missed but the result remained the same as in 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The 84-item Federal Human Capital Survey is conducted in even-numbered years by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM); in 2008, the Department of Education had a 69 percent response rate. In odd-numbered years, the Department conducts the Annual Employee Survey with 56 items duplicated exactly from the biennial federal survey, plus additional agency-specific items can be added. The 2009 survey had 87 items including first-time questions related to two Department-level programs—the Equal Employment Opportunity Program and the Informal Dispute Resolution Center. In 2009, the response rate for the Annual Employee Survey was 61 percent, which indicates a high level of employee engagement according to the Hay Group and the Partnership for Public Service. The six survey items included among the measures are present on both surveys and were selected by the Department in consultation with OPM as major qualitative indicators of employee satisfaction. For more information on 2008 Federal Human Capital Survey or the 2009 Annual Employee Survey, go to <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/otherplanrpts.html>.

Target Context: The targets and data above reflect the percentage of favorable responses (either “strongly agree” or “agree”) to the selected items on the employee surveys. The Department used 2006 Federal Human Capital Survey data to establish baselines for the above measures.

Measure 4.2.G.: Average Number of Days to Hire Is at or Below the OPM 45-Day Hiring Model for Non-SES

Analysis of Progress: The Department met the goal of the OPM hiring model: in 2007, with an average hiring time of 27 business days; in 2008, with a revised average hiring time of 28 business days; and in 2009, with an average hiring time of 26 business days. In 2008, the Department restructured the Human Resources Services (HRS) office, which enabled additional resources to focus on improving the staffing process. Improved interaction over time between the Human Resources Specialists and principal office managers is also credited with enabling hiring process improvements. Furthermore, HRS tracks the hiring

cycles for each principal office and provides them with monthly reports on hiring progress. These actions provide continual incentives to shorten the hiring process.

Data Quality and Timeliness: For this measure, the Department tracks progress against the 45-day hiring model for positions other than the Senior Executive Service. The model tracks the hiring process from the closing date of the vacancy announcement to the date a job offer is extended. It is measured in business days rather than calendar days and is calculated quarterly based on an average process length of all hires completed within that quarter.

Target Context: When the Department's revised strategic plan was being developed, the median of the average hiring time for the four most recent quarters then known (July 2005 through June 2006) was 54 days. This data point was used to establish the 2006 baseline for this measure, which indicated that the Department had not achieved the standard.

Measure 4.2.H.: Percentage of Employees With Performance Standards in Place Within 30 Days of Start of Current Rating Cycle

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was met. After an unexpected decline in 2007 that fell well short of the target percentage, the Department rebounded to exceed an even higher target in 2008 and held steady in FY 2009. The inclusion of this measure as a component in the Organizational Assessment rating for each principal office beginning in 2007, which first affected this measure for 2008, likely provided an incentive toward timely completion of performance standards.

Data Quality and Timeliness: To be considered successful on this measure, a Department employee or his or her supervisor must establish performance standards that align with the *Strategic Plan* and are approved by the supervisor. These standards must be entered no more than 30 days into the fiscal year covered by the measure. SES employees are not included in this measure. Effective October 1, 2007, the 12-month period on which employee performance is assessed aligns with the federal fiscal year.

Target Context: This measure was a component of measure 6.2.A. from the Department's previous *Strategic Plan*, which comprised an index of Department human capital activities and was measured in FY 2005 through FY 2007. The 2005 actual data served as the baseline for this measure.

Measure 4.2.I.: Percentage of Employees Who Have Ratings of Record in the System Within 30 Days of Close of Rating Cycle

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was not met. The FY 2008 target was exceeded. After an unexpected decline to 54 percent in 2006 that fell well short of expectations (see Target Context), the Department rebounded to exceed the measure's target in 2007. The inclusion of this measure as a component in the Organizational Assessment rating for each principal office beginning in 2007 likely provided an incentive toward timely completion of ratings.

Data Quality and Timeliness: To be considered successful on this measure, an employee rating of the level of success achieved on established performance standards must be entered no more than 30 days after the fiscal year covered by the measure. SES employees are not included in this measure. Effective October 1, 2007, the 12-month period on which employee performance is assessed aligns with the federal fiscal year.

Target Context: This measure was a component of measure 6.2.A. from the Department's previous *Strategic Plan*, which comprised an index of Department human capital activities and was measured in FY 2005 through FY 2007. The 2005 actual data served as the baseline for this measure.

Measures for Cross-Goal Strategy, Objective 3: Achieve budget and performance integration to link funding decisions to results

	Results								Plan	
	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
4.3.A. Percentage of Department Program Dollars in Programs That Demonstrate Effectiveness in Terms of Outcomes, Either on Performance Indicators or through Rigorous Evaluations	79	86	79	86	86	88	86	88	87*	88*

*Pending Office of Management and Budget action on program performance ratings.
 Source: U.S. Department of Education, analysis of Program Assessment Rating Tool findings.

Analysis of Progress: As of October 2008, 91 funded Department programs had undergone a Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review, representing 98 percent of the Department’s FY 2008 budget authority for programs subject to the PART. Although 45 currently funded programs (constituting 88 percent of this budget authority) were rated *Adequate* or higher in their PART reviews, enabling the Department to exceed its target for FY 2008, four programs were rated *Ineffective* and 42 programs were rated *Results Not Demonstrated*.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Calculation is based on dollars in Department programs with at least an *Adequate* PART rating in the given year divided by dollars in all Department programs rated through that year. The PART assessment cycle occurs during the spring and summer and OMB makes scores public via <http://www.expectmore.gov>. OMB allows the Department to report aggregated results from a year’s assessments in time for publication in that year’s *Performance and Accountability Report*.

Target Context: The Department determines the measure of effectiveness from the proportion of FY 2009 PART-eligible program budget authority that supports programs with an *Adequate* or higher rating from the PART analysis. This standard is used because such programs produce evidence of effectiveness with data from performance measures and rigorous program evaluations, unlike programs that have insufficient performance or evaluation data or for which data indicate ineffectiveness. The rationale for the target remaining steady for FY 2009 compared with the two previous years is that nearly all program dollars subject to PART have been rated and subsequent changes will likely be incremental based upon selected program reassessments. The PART process is currently under governmentwide review and subject to possible revisions during FY 2010.

