

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

Overview

There is a clear national consensus that the nation's K-12 education system should prepare every student for college and a career. However, there is also broad agreement that our education system fails to consistently deliver the excellent classroom instruction necessary to achieve that goal. Too many U.S. students are failing to reach their potential.

The Department's K-12 education reforms focus on the building blocks needed for schools, school districts, and states to more consistently deliver excellent classroom instruction for all students. The foundation of these reforms is a system for improving learning and teaching that aligns internationally benchmarked college- and career-ready standards. Because nothing is more important to student learning than a great teacher supported by a school principal who is a strong leader, the Department will work to ensure that every student has effective teachers, every school has effective leaders, and every teacher and leader has access to the preparation, on-going support, evaluation, recognition, and collaboration opportunities he or she needs to be effective.

School environments must be conducive to teaching and learning and must be safe places that provide necessary instructional time to help all students achieve. With reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, the Department has an opportunity to reinforce and extend the progress already being made through *Race to the Top* and other *Recovery Act* programs to strengthen the quality and delivery of education.

Using the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan* data as collected and reported from FY 2007 through FY 2010, we have confirmed what other indicators such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress have pointed to as well: student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics has been, for the most part, flat. State-reported data also show that, by at least one measure, the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers has remained steady, with almost all teachers meeting the highly qualified teacher requirement. But none of these measures gives us all the information we need to understand what is happening in our schools, nor where we should be going.

We must enhance the education system's ability to improve continually through better and more widespread use of data systems, research and evaluation, transparency, innovation, and technology. Facilitating development of interoperable data systems from early learning through the workforce will enable data-driven decisionmaking by increasing access to timely, reliable, and high-value data. We must present relevant and accessible information that protects privacy, increases demand for education attainment, and improves education performance.

The Department supports state-led efforts to develop and adopt college- and career-ready internationally benchmarked standards and aligned assessments. We are committed to improving preparation, recruitment, development, evaluation, and rewarding of effective teachers, principals, and administrators; increasing the success, safety, and health of students in high-need schools and communities; and supporting states and districts in turning around 5,000 of the nation's persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Goal 1: Details

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

NOTE: Measures 1.1.A—1.1.G below show data from students in grades 3–8; measure 1.1.H shows secondary and postsecondary data.

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
1.1.A. All Students ¹	72.3	70.2	76.2	70.5	80.2	72.6	84.2	Sept. 2011
1.1.B. Low-Income Students ¹	60.9	57.4	66.5	58.1	72.1	61.1	77.7	Sept. 2011
1.1.F. Students With Disabilities ¹	51.8	41.5	54.0	42.2	61.7	43.6	69.4	Sept. 2011
1.1.G. Limited English Proficient Students ¹	47.3	38.8	54.9	39.8	62.4	40.1	69.9	Sept. 2011
1.1.H. Career and Technical Education Concentrators ²	N/A	N/A	61	68	64	80	69	May 2011
Students From Major Racial and Ethnic Groups*:								
1.1.C. American Indian/Alaska Native ¹	65.1	62.4	70.1	62.2	75.1	59.8	80.1	Sept. 2011
1.1.D. African American ¹	61.1	58.4	66.6	57.7	72.2	61.8	77.8	Sept. 2011
1.1.E. Hispanic ¹	58.0	54.3	64.0	56.3	70.0	58.8	76.0	Sept. 2011

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

Sources:

¹ Consolidated State Performance Reports

² U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), Consolidated Annual Performance, Accountability, and Financial Status Report (CAR) (grantee performance report).

N/A: This measure replaced an earlier, similar measure in FY 2008 to conform with requirements of the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006 (Perkins IV)*.

Measures 1.1.A–1.1.G.: Percentage of Students Who Achieve Proficiency on State Reading Assessments

Analysis of Progress: For most measures in Objective 1.1, the targets were not met, but results improved over prior years for FY 2009. Measures 1.1.C declined slightly. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2009 reporting as updates to 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 integrate state, local, and federal programs in planning and service delivery.

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.

Measure 1.1.H.: Percentage of Students Who Achieve Proficiency on State Reading Assessments—Career and Technical Education Concentrators

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: States submit their Consolidated Annual Performance, Accountability, and Financial Status Reports (CARs) to the Department each year through an electronic system. At that time, each grant recipient must attest to the accuracy and completeness of their CAR submission by signing their data submissions. State directors who submitted their data electronically to the Department attested to the accuracy and completeness of their data using an electronic personal identification number (PIN) that is supplied to them by the Department. The Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) staff and a contractor then complete a check on the accuracy and completeness of the data and follow up with states as necessary. Staff verifies the data through an on-site monitoring process.

Target Context: This measure replaced an earlier, similar measure in FY 2008 to conform to requirements of the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006* (*Perkins IV Act*). The target is the average of the performance levels that have been negotiated between the Department and the states.

Report Explanation: The *Perkins IV Act* prescribes the measures that a state must use to measure career and technical education students' attainment of challenging academic content standards and student achievement standards. *Perkins IV* requires a state to use its state's academic assessments (i.e., the state's reading/language tests) implemented under section 1111(b)(3) of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended, to measure career and technical education students' attainment of the state standards. Moreover, a state must report the number or percent of career and technical education students who score at the proficient level or above on the state's assessments in reading administered under the *ESEA* to measure the academic proficiency of secondary career and technical education students against the *ESEA* standards.

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

NOTE: Measures 1.2.A—1.2.G below show data from students in grades 3–8; measure 1.2.H shows secondary and postsecondary data.

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
1.2.A. All Students ¹	69.4	68.0	73.8	69.6	78.1	71.5	82.5	Sept. 2011
1.2.B. Low-Income Students ¹	58.3	55.9	64.2	57.8	70.2	60.7	76.2	Sept. 2011
1.2.F. Students With Disabilities ¹	52.2	41.9	53.3	42.5	61.1	45.7	68.9	Sept. 2011
1.2.G. Limited English Proficient Students ¹	50.4	44.7	57.5	46.7	64.6	48.6	71.7	Sept. 2011
1.2.H. Career and Technical Education Concentrators ²	N/A	N/A	54	62	57	77	63	May 2011
Students From Major Racial and Ethnic Groups*:								
1.2.C. American Indian/Alaska Native ¹	59.1	56.8	64.9	58.6	70.8	56.3	76.6	Sept. 2011
1.2.D. African American ¹	55.2	52.9	61.6	54.1	68.0	59.1	74.4	Sept. 2011
1.2.E. Hispanic ¹	57.8	54.8	63.9	57.7	69.9	59.1	75.9	Sept. 2011

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

Sources:

¹ Consolidated State Performance Reports.

² U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), Consolidated Annual Performance, Accountability, and Financial Status Report (CAR) (grantee performance report).

N/A: This measure replaced an earlier, similar measure in FY 2008 to conform with requirements of the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006 (Perkins IV)*.

Measures 1.2.A–1.2.G.: Percentage of Students Who Achieve Proficiency on State Mathematics Assessments

Analysis of Progress: For most measures in Objective 1.2, the targets were not met, but results improved over prior years for FY 2009. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2009 reporting to reflect trends since the 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 integrate state, local, and federal programs in planning and service delivery.

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 mathematics 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.

Measure 1.2.H.: Percentage of Students Who Achieve Proficiency on State Mathematics Assessments—Career and Technical Education Concentrators

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: States submit their CARs to the Department each year through an electronic system. At that time, each grant recipient must attest to the accuracy and completeness of their CAR submission by signing their data submissions. State directors who submitted their data electronically to the Department attested to the accuracy and completeness of their data using an electronic personal identification number (PIN) that is supplied to them by the Department. OVAE staff and a contractor then complete a check on the accuracy and completeness of the data and follow up with states as necessary. Staff verifies the data through an on-site monitoring process.

Target Context: This measure replaced an earlier, similar measure in FY 2008 to conform to requirements of the *Perkins IV Act*. The target is the average of the performance levels that have been negotiated between the Department and the states.

Report Explanation: The *Perkins IV Act* prescribes the measures that a state must use to measure career and technical education students' attainment of challenging academic content standards and student achievement standards. *Perkins IV* requires a state to use its state's academic assessments (i.e., the state's mathematics tests) implemented under section 1111(b)(3) of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended, to measure career and technical education students' attainment of the state standards. Moreover, a state must report the number or percent of career and technical education students who score at the proficient level or above on the state's assessments in mathematics administered under the *ESEA* to measure the academic proficiency of secondary career and technical education students against the *ESEA* standards.

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

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
1.3.A. Total Core Academic Classes	100	94.0	100	95.0	100	95.9	100	Dec. 2011
1.3.B. Total Core Elementary Classes	100	95.9	100	96.5	100	97.1	100	Dec. 2011
1.3.C. Core Elementary Classes in High-Poverty Schools	100	93.5	100	94.9	100	96.3	100	Dec. 2011
1.3.D. Core Elementary Classes in Low-Poverty Schools	100	96.6	100	97.5	100	97.6	100	Dec. 2011
1.3.E. Total Core Secondary Classes	100	93.0	100	93.9	100	94.9	100	Dec. 2011
1.3.F. Core Secondary Classes in High-Poverty Schools	100	88.7	100	89.6	100	92.5	100	Dec. 2011
1.3.G. Core Secondary Classes in Low-Poverty Schools	100	95.4	100	96.0	100	96.5	100	Dec. 2011

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. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2009 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*							
	FY 2003		FY 2005		FY 2007		FY 2009	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
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	5.6
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	5.0
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	22.7

N/A = Not Available.

*Data gathered only in odd-numbered years.

Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance – United States, 2009. Surveillance Summaries. MMWR 2010;59(No. SS-5).

Measure 1.4.A.: Percentage of Students in Grades 9 Through 12 Who Carried a Weapon (Such as a Knife, Gun, or Club) on School Property One or More Times During the Past 30 Days

Analysis of Progress: While the prevalence of school-based weapons carrying seems lower in 2009 than in 2007, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion reports no statistically significant change between 2007 and 2009 or between 2003 and 2009.

Data Quality and Timeliness: CDC did not report any significant alteration in data collection methodology that would impair year-to-year comparability or would otherwise represent a change in data quality.

Target Context: Targets are consistent with the goal of continuous improvement in performance for programs related to school-based violence reduction. Given the potential for floor effects, as past 30-day prevalence has never been very high, the 2009 target was very ambitious. In addition, because measures for objective 1.4 were set and based on Department investments in the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants program, and funding for this program ended in FY 2009.

Report Explanation: The national Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS) monitors priority health risk behaviors that contribute to the leading causes of death, disability, and social problems among youth and adults in the United States. The national YRBSS is conducted every two years during the spring semester and provides data representative of 9th through 12th grade students in public and private schools throughout the United States.

Measure 1.4.B.: Percentage of Students in Grades 9 Through 12 Who 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

Analysis of Progress: While fewer students reported skipping school in 2009 than in 2007, the CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion reports no statistically significant change between 2007 and 2009. However, they do report a statistically significant decrease between 2001 (when prevalence was 6.6 percent) and 2009.

Data Quality and Timeliness: CDC did not report any significant alteration in data collection methodology that would impair year-to-year comparability or would otherwise represent a change in data quality.

Target Context: Targets are consistent with the goal of continuous improvement in performance for programs related to school-based violence reduction. Given the potential for floor effects, as past 30-day prevalence has never been very high, the 2009 target was very ambitious. In addition, measures for objective 1.4 were set and based on ED investments in the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants program, and funding for this program ended in FY 2009.

Report Explanation: The national YRBSS monitors priority health risk behaviors that contribute to the leading causes of death, disability, and social problems among youth and adults in the United States. The national YRBSS is conducted every two years during the spring semester and provides data representative of 9th through 12th grade students in public and private schools throughout the United States.

Measure 1.4.C.: Percentage of Students in Grades 9 Through 12 Who Were Offered, Given, or Sold an Illegal Drug by Someone on School Property in the Past Year

Analysis of Progress: A greater percentage of students reported substance use-related events in 2009 than in 2007. At the same time, the CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion reports no statistically significant change between 2007 and 2009. However, they do report a statistically significant decrease between 1995 (when prevalence was 32.1 percent) and 2009.

Data Quality and Timeliness: CDC did not report any significant alteration in data collection methodology that would impair year-to-year comparability or would otherwise represent a change in data quality.

Target Context: The original intent of the 2009 target was continuous decrease in the prevalence of illegal substance distribution on school campuses as a means of reducing student substance use. However, the 2009 target was actually reached in 2005. While the current figures demonstrate that we met our 2009 target, no progress was made between 2007 and 2009. In addition, because measures for objective 1.4 were set and based on Department investments in the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants program, and funding for this program ended in FY 2009.

Report Explanation: The national YRBSS monitors priority health risk behaviors that contribute to the leading causes of death, disability, and social problems among youth and adults in the United States. The national YRBSS is conducted every two years during the spring semester and provides data representative of 9th through 12th grade students in public and private schools throughout the United States.

Measures for Objective 1.5: Increasing information and options for parents

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
1.5.A. Percentage of Eligible Students Exercising Choice	N/A	2.2	2.4	2.3	N/A	2.7	Discontinued	
1.5.B. Percentage of Eligible Students Participating in Supplemental Educational Services	15.4	14.5	16.8	13.8	18.2	15.6	Discontinued	
1.5.C. Number of Charter Schools in Operation	3,900	4,155	4,290	4,376	4,720	4,705	5,190	4,958

N/A = Not Available.

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

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

Analysis of Progress: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010. Progress was made in FY 2009. The target was not met in FY 2008. No target was set for FY 2009 in last year's report. 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 by states to the Department 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).

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

Analysis of Progress: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010. The target was not met in FY 2009.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report is submitted annually by states to the Department 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: The target was not met in FY 2009 or FY 2010, but progress was made toward the target.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The Consolidated State Performance Report is submitted annually by states to the Department 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*). 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 School

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
1.6.A. Total	87.3	89.0	87.4	89.9	87.6	Jul. 2011	87.8	Jul. 2012
1.6.B. African American	85.3	88.8	85.5	86.9	85.8	Jul. 2011	86	Jul. 2012
1.6.C. Hispanic	70.1	72.7	70.3	75.5	70.6	Jul. 2011	71.0	Jul. 2012
1.6.D. Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate¹	75.2	73.9	76.6	74.9	77.9	Jul. 2011	79.3	Jul. 2012

¹ 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 estimated incoming 9th grade class four years earlier.

Sources: For Measures 1.6.A., 1.6.B., and 1.6.C.—U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, October Current Population Survey. Data are collected annually. For Measure 1.6.D.—U.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.

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

Analysis of Progress: Targets were exceeded in FY 2008. Data for FY 2009 and FY 2010 are not yet available and thus unable to be assessed.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data for SY 2006–07 (column “FY 2007” in the table) were released in September 2009. Data for SY 2008–09 (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 2009 and FY 2010 are not yet available. Targets have not been met, but improvement has been shown.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data for SY 2008–09 (column “FY 2009”) are not expected for release until July 2011.

Target Context: States are required to start reporting four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates for SY 2010–11 in annual AYP reports. These rates are based on data that track individual children over time. Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate is based on aggregate average data that do not include information on the progress of individual children. Evaluation of the consistency and comparability of state reports of four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates will need to be undertaken.

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

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Number of Department-Supported Programs and Practices with Evidence of Efficacy Using WWC Standards:								
1.7.A. Reading or Writing ¹	6	6	11	11	13	13	15	15
1.7.B. Mathematics or Science ¹	3	4	7	8	10	11	12	15
1.7.C. Teacher Quality ¹	3	3	5	5	7	7	10	10
1.7.D. Number of Visits to the WWC** Website ²	*	482,000	530,000	531,162	583,000	772,154	641,000	919,883

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

**WWC = What Works Clearinghouse.

Sources:

¹ Grantees send journal articles or fully prepared manuscripts describing evaluations of specific interventions to the U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

² U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

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

Analysis of Progress: In FY 2006, FY 2007, FY 2008, FY 2009, and FY 2010, targets for reading, writing, and teacher quality were met and targets for mathematics or science were met or exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Grantees' journal articles or manuscripts describing evaluations are submitted to the What Works Clearinghouse (the clearinghouse) for review to determine if the evaluation meets clearinghouse standards with or without reservations, and if the evaluation found the intervention to produce a statistically significant or substantively important positive effect for at least one outcome. The reported data are the numbers of interventions with positive effects based on evidence of efficacy meeting clearinghouse standards as determined by the clearinghouse.

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, FY 2009, and FY 2010 targets were exceeded.

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

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.