
Performance Details

Performance Details Overview

This is a transition year in performance reporting. The Department is moving to a new 5-year strategic plan that sets out the current Secretary's priorities.

The Department presents measures and results for each of four strategic goals as defined by the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan* and updated in the *FY 2009 Annual Performance Report*. For each strategic goal, the Department has selected program measures centered on the desired outcomes. The section for each goal provides specific details about the performance progress for each measure.

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. Some targets have been adjusted since publication of the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan* after review and approval by program, budget, and performance representatives.

Sources. 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 2010 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 2001, 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>.

Additional pertinent information can be found in the Department's Congressional Budget Justifications, which can be accessed on the Department's Web site at: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/focus/performance.html>

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 Writing¹	6	6	11	11	13	13	15	15
1.7.B. Mathematics or Science¹	3	4	7	8	10	11	12	15
1.7.C. Teacher Quality¹	3	3	5	5	7	7	10	10
1.7.D. Number of Visits to the WWC** Website²	*	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.

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

Overview

Far too many of the nation's children attend schools that year after year fail to provide students with a quality education. National attention and support focused on these persistently low-achieving schools in each state—the bottom 5 percent of all schools or approximately 5,000 schools nationwide—can help ensure students are getting the education they deserve. These schools, which are in urban, rural, and suburban communities, have extremely low achievement rates, have shown no improvement over multiple years, and have unacceptably low graduation rates.

Across the country almost half of students of color drop out of school. For example, there are as many as 2,000 high schools, about 12 percent nationally, where fewer than 60 percent of entering freshmen actually graduate.

Using the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan* data as collected and reported from FY 2007 through FY 2010, the data show that increasing numbers of students are participating in Advanced Placement classes, which is one measure of efforts to encourage students to reach higher levels of attainment and be ready for college. However, this represents just one slice of a big issue. Incremental reforms have failed to turn around the nation's lowest-achieving schools. Among schools that were in restructuring status in 2004–05, only 19 percent had moved out of restructuring status by 2006–07.

Disparities in school discipline are equally as stark. For example, African-American students with disabilities are more than twice as likely to be expelled or suspended as are their White counterparts. And these inequalities extend to higher education, with gaps in college participation by ethnic groups.

Emerging research on turnaround successes suggests that low-achieving schools that dramatically improve student results rely on common strategies, including building a positive culture of high expectations; ensuring strong leadership and staff have the commitment and skills to increase student achievement; supporting effective instructional teams through focused and intensive professional development; strengthening the instructional program, extending learning time, and engaging families and communities; and changing governance to provide flexibility for needed reforms.

The Department seeks to provide support to enhance education efforts that:

- In early education, improve the health, social-emotional, and cognitive outcomes for all children from birth through third grade;
- enhance the education system's ability to continually improve through better and more widespread use of data systems, research and evaluation, transparency, innovation, and technology;
- ensure effective educational opportunities for all students regardless of race, national origin, sex, disability, and socioeconomic status; and
- increase competence in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics for all to prepare the next generation of scientists, technicians, and engineers.

Goal 2: Details

NOTE: Goal 2 Measures were discontinued in FY 2010. Programs supporting this goal were either not funded or have shown consistent progress.

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

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2.1.A. Percentage of Low-Income Students Who Qualify for Academic Competitiveness Grants ¹	*	35	42	40	49	41	Discontinued	
2.1.B. Number of Advanced Placement Classes Available Nationwide	*	Not Collected	N/A	Not Collected	N/A	Not Collected	Discontinued	
Number of Advanced Placement Tests Taken by Public School Students ^{**2}								
2.1.C. Total	1,953,000	2,133,594	2,168,000	2,321,311	2,406,000	2,495,252	Discontinued	
2.1.D. Low-Income	230,352	286,028	328,932	308,072	378,272	387,986	Discontinued	
2.1.E. Minorities (Black, Hispanic, Native American) [†]	376,000	413,847	421,000	471,898	544,716	538,249	Discontinued	
2.1.F. Number of Teachers Trained Through Advanced Placement Incentive Grants to Teach Advanced Placement Classes	*	Not Collected	N/A	Not Collected	N/A	Not Collected	Discontinued	

N/A: No Data Available. PY = Prior Year.

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

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

† Advanced Placement measures use the definitional term Black.

Sources:

¹ Pell Grant End of Year Report; Academic Competitiveness Grant (ACG)/National SMART Grant Programs End of Year Report; Pell Grant Merged Applicant and Recipient File.

² The College Board, Freeze File Report. Data are reported annually.

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

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was not met. The percentage of low income students qualifying for Academic Competitiveness Grants (ACGs) remained about the same in 2008–09 as in 2007–08.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The applicant data are from the student applications processed by the central processing system; recipient information is from the common origination and disbursement system.

Target Context: The target for 2009 was not met. Targets 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 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.

Report Explanation: The measure calculates the percentage of Pell Grant recipients determined to be eligible for ACGs who actually receive the grants in the current year. The measure for 2009 considered Pell Grant recipients as eligible for ACGs who were (1) United States citizens; (2) first- and second-year undergraduate students; (3) less than 21.5 years of age; (4) enrolled on a full-time basis; and (5) attending two- and four-year postsecondary institutions.

This number of ACG-eligible Pell Grant recipients was then compared to the number of actual ACG recipients in 2009. Specifically, 438,491 ACG recipients represented 41 percent of 1,068,245 estimated ACG-eligible Pell Grant recipients.

The program is scheduled to close in FY 2011. In addition, the data for FY 2008 was recalculated using this same methodology, resulting in a correction to previously reported data for 2008. This recalculation was performed because it was determined that the currently used data sources are more accurate data sources than the sources for last year's data.

Additional Information: The program's Web site can be found at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/ac-smart.html>.

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

Analysis of Progress: Data for this measure were not collected for FY 2007, FY 2008, or FY 2009. The measure indicates the number of AP 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: FY 2009 targets for 2.1.C and 2.1.D were exceeded. The target for 2.1.E was not met. 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. Baseline data were used to set 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							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Number of Advanced Placement Tests in Mathematics and Science Taken Nationwide by Public School Students: ¹								
2.2.A. Total	631,000	644,550	681,000	692,210	736,000	734,425	Discontinued	
2.2.B. Low-Income	65,000	66,337	70,000	73,710	76,000	91,927	Discontinued	
2.2.C. Minorities (Black, Hispanic, Native American)*	80,000	86,061	86,000	98,718	94,171	111,532	Discontinued	
2.2.D. Number of Teachers Trained Through Advanced Placement Incentive Grants to Teach Advanced Placement Classes in Mathematics and Science	Estab. BL	Not Collected	N/A	Not Collected	N/A	Not Collected	Discontinued	

BL = Baseline. PY = Prior Year. N/A = No Data Available.

*Advanced Placement measures use the definitional term Black.

Sources:

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

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: FY 2009 targets for 2.2.B and 2.2.C were exceeded. The FY 2009 target for 2.2.A was not met, but progress was shown. Targets are established by the program office and by the Department’s *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*. The Department exceeded its 2008 target for the total number of AP tests in mathematics and science taken by public school students. 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.

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: 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*.

Measure for Objective 2.3: Increase proficiency in critical foreign languages

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2.3.A. Combined Total of Advanced Placement ¹ and International Baccalaureate ² Tests in Critical Foreign Languages Passed by Public School Students	Estab. BL	3,557	4,091	4,033	4,638	4,642	Discontinued	

BL = Baseline.

Sources:

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

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

Measure 2.3.A.: Increase Proficiency in Critical Foreign Languages

Analysis of Progress: The target for FY 2008 was not met, but the target for FY 2009 was exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are for critical foreign language examinations administered by the College Board. Data from the International Baccalaureate Organization are not available in FY 2008 or FY 2009.

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

Overview

To meet the President's 2020 goal to have the highest proportion in the world of students graduating from college, millions of additional Americans will need to earn a baccalaureate or associate degree or certificate by 2020. Dramatically boosting community college and four-year college completion rates is essential if American youth are to compete successfully in the years ahead against their peers in a global economy.

Today, over 40 percent of students who enroll in four-year colleges fail to graduate within six years, and close to 70 percent who enroll in community college fail to complete a two-year program within three years. As a beginning, the President has challenged every American to commit to at least one year or more of higher education or career training—at a community college, four-year school, vocational-training school or program, or through an apprenticeship. It moves toward the 2020 goal, but it is not enough.

The *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan* data as collected and reported from FY 2007 through FY 2010 confirmed what other indicators have pointed to as well—institutions of higher education serve a remarkably diverse population of students, with a broad range of needs and challenges. Prospective students should have easily accessible information on the costs of a college education or training program, how to access federal student aid, placement and graduation rates, and other vital information.

The Department supports college access and completion, in large part, by providing simple, reliable, and efficient federal student aid. In addition, the Department administers \$2 billion annually in higher education grants to strengthen institutions and promote college readiness and an additional \$2 billion in grant funds for career and technical education, adult education and literacy, correctional education, and agricultural science to build skills and prepare adults for work, citizenship, and lifelong learning.

The Department has already taken significant steps to increase college access, completion, and quality. Through the *Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010*, Congress has ended the creation of new subsidized student loans to banks, saving billions of dollars that will be used for financial aid in Pell Grants and reducing borrowers' repayments. The law also provides \$3 billion in grants over the next few years to states and institutions to strengthen institutions and promote access to college and work readiness. In addition, the Department is simplifying the application for federal student aid so it is easier and faster for students to apply for aid.

The nation must close the opportunity gap by improving affordability and increasing access to college and workforce training, especially for adult learners, low-income students, and underrepresented minorities. In addition, the Department is committed to increasing degree and certificate completion and job placement, with special attention to underrepresented and economically disadvantaged populations, as well as to foster institutional quality, accountability, and transparency and to build social and economic resilience and prosperity.

Goal 3: Details

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

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
	Postsecondary Enrollment							
3.1.A. Percentage of High School Graduates Aged 16–24 Enrolling Immediately in College ¹	68	66	68	67.2	68	68.6	69	Aug. 2011
3.1.B. Percentage of Upward Bound Participants Enrolling in College ²	65	77	70	80	75	Dec. 2011	75	Dec. 2012
3.1.C. Percentage of Career and Technical Education Concentrators Retained in Postsecondary Education or Transferring to a Baccalaureate Degree Program Who Have Transitioned to Postsecondary Education or Employment by December of the Year of Graduation ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	58	70	58	May 2011
	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	71	70	71	71.1	71	72.4	72	Aug. 2011
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	66	62	66	65	66	64	68-4yr 57-2yr	68-4yr 53-2yr
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	68	63.5	68	69	68	64.5	78-4yr 64-2yr	77-4yr 58-2yr
	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	57	57.3	57	57.2	57	April 2011	58	Jan. 2012
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 ⁶	27.5	25.1	27.5	27.8	28	March 2011	28	Dec. 2011
3.1.I. Percentage of First-Time, Full Time Degree Seeking Students Enrolled at Four-Year Historically Black Colleges and Universities Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment ⁵	39	35	39	35	40	34	40	Dec. 2011
3.1.J. Percentage of Students Enrolled at Four-Year Hispanic-Serving Institutions Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment ⁵	37	44	37	42	44	42	45	Dec. 2011
3.1.K. Percentage of Postsecondary Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Completed a Postsecondary Degree or an Industry-Recognized Credential, Certificate, or Degree ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	56	54	56	May 2011

Sources:

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

² U.S. Department of Education, Upward Bound Annual Performance Report.

³ U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Consolidated Annual Performance, Accountability, and Financial Status Report (CAR) (grantee performance report). Beginning in FY 2009.

⁴ U.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.

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

⁶ U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, Student Support Services Program Annual 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)*.

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 2008 to 2009.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The *Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2007–2012*, published in May 2007, included measures developed in FY 2006. Data for SY 2009–10 (column “2010” in the table) are expected for release in August 2011.

Target Context: The Department exceeded its 2009 target of 68 percent.

Report Explanation: While overall enrollment increased between 2008 and 2009, there was a shift in enrollment from four-year to two-year schools. Enrollment increased at two-year schools from 24.1 percent to 27.7 percent, while enrollment at four-year schools decreased from 43.1 percent to 40.9 percent.

Since 1990, the overall enrollment rate has fluctuated between 60.1 percent and the current 68.6 percent.

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

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2008 target was exceeded. Data for FY 2010 and 2009 are not currently available. The target for 2007 was exceeded.

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.

Report Explanation: With a greater proportion of Upward Bound participants being higher risk as a result of two recent funding initiatives encouraging Upward Bound projects to serve more higher risk students, continual program improvements will be required to maintain the college enrollment rate at current levels.

Additional Information: The Upward Bound Program Web site may be accessed at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/trioupbound/index.html>.

Measure 3.1.C.: Percentage of Career and Technical Education Concentrators Retained in Postsecondary Education or Transferring to a Baccalaureate Degree Program Who Have Transitioned to Postsecondary Education or Employment by December of the Year of Graduation

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. OVAE staff verifies the data through an on-site monitoring process.

Target Context: The target is the average of the performance levels that have been negotiated between the Department and the states.

Report Explanation: This is a new measure (3P1) established under the *Perkins IV Act*.

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 national persistence increased from FY 2008 to FY 2009.

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 calculated for the nation or for any program for the first time was aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

Target Context: The Department exceeded its FY 2009 target of 71 percent.

Report Explanation: 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.

Related Information: The FY 2009 national persistence rate of 72.4 percent reflects a rate for 78.4 percent for four-year institutions and a rate of 60.1 percent for two-year institutions.

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 2008 and FY 2009.

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: The FY 2009 persistence rate of 64 percent did not meet the target.

Report Explanation: Until FY 2008, institutions reported only 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. Beginning with FY 2008, institutions are required to report a denominator (an adjusted cohort of the students attending their first-year of school in the prior year) and a numerator (the number of students in the prior year's adjusted cohort, who remain in the same institution in the current year). Therefore, the Department is now calculating a mean persistence rate.

Beginning with FY 2010 data, persistence rates for the HBCU and the other Institutional Development programs are presented separately for two- and four-year institutions. Overall persistence rates are presented for HBCUs and other Institutional Development programs in the years prior to 2010. Because persistence rates for two-year schools are generally lower than at four-year schools, the current proportion of two- and four-year schools influences the overall rate for any program. Since the proportion of grantee institutions that are two- or four-year schools is likely to change from one grant competition to another in several of the Institutional Development programs, the two- and four-year retention rates for the program will not be influenced by this variable mix of school types each year and will therefore better reflect program performance than the overall retention rate.

Related Information: The Persistence Measure for the HBCU and the other Institutional Development programs has been changed so to reflect separate persistence measures for two- and four-year schools. Targets through 2013 have been set for these new measures and future data will be reported separately against these separate targets. We have continued to show the former combined persistence measure rates prior to 2010.

Additional Information: The HBCU Program Web site may be accessed at:
<http://www.ed.gov/programs/iduestitle3b/index.html>.

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 FY 2010 targets of 78 percent for four-year HSIs and 64 percent for two-year HSIs were not met. The actual persistence rates were 77 percent for four-year HSIs and 58 percent for two-year HSIs. However, if the rates for both types of institutions were to be combined (the explanation directly below explains why the rates are calculated separately) the program-wide rate would be 66 percent. Performance declined in FY 2009 from the FY 2008 level. The FY 2009 target was not met.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by grantee institutions, which certify their accuracy.

Target Context: Beginning with 2010 data, persistence is now calculated separately for two- and four-year schools. Because persistence rates for two-year schools are generally lower than at four-year schools, the current proportion of two- and four-year schools at any given time influences the overall rate for any program. Since the proportion of grantee institutions that are two- or four-year schools is likely to change from one grant competition to another in several of the Institutional Development programs, the two- and four-year retention rates for the program will no longer be

influenced by this variable mix of school types each year and will therefore better reflect program performance than the overall retention rate.

However, for transition purposes, the overall persistence rate (above) is still being calculated for the FY 2010 Key Measure Report, in addition to the new two-year and four-year rates. Through FY 2007, only an overall persistence rate was calculated for Hispanic-Serving Institutions and other Institutional Development programs.

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 2008 target of 57 percent. The percentage of bachelor's degree-seeking students completing a four-year degree within six years of enrollment remained at about the same level as the previous year (57.2 percent in FY 2008 compared with 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.

Target Context: The target of 57 percent for FY 2008 was exceeded.

Report Explanation: Fifty-eight percent was previously reported incorrectly for FY 2008. The final rate for the year was 57.2 percent.

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: Data are not available for FY 2009. The FY 2008 target of 27.5 percent was exceeded.

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

Target Context: FY 2008 represents the first time that the program target has been met or exceeded.

Report Explanation: Program experience was used to estimate targets. An increase of 0.5 percentage points every other year was used to generate annual targets each year through 2013.

Additional Information: The student support services Web site may be accessed at: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/triostudsupp/index.html>.

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 HBCUs graduating within six years of enrollment declined to 34 percent in 2009.

The 2006 target for the four-year graduation rate was derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for a school year. Beginning with the FY 2007 target, values were established based on program experience.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by NCES.

Target Context: The FY 2009 graduation rate of 34 percent did not meet the target of 40 percent set for this year. The target of 40 percent, set for the years 2010–11, is ambitious given the recent data. Beginning with the FY 2007 target, values were established based on program experience.

Additional Information: The HCBU Program Web site may be accessed at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/iduestitle3b/index.html>.

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 did not meet its FY 2009 target of 44 percent. The percentage of students enrolled at four-year Hispanic-Serving Institutions graduating within six years of enrollment decreased from 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by NCES.

Target Context: Targets beginning with 2009 have been increased based on higher performance in 2007 and 2008. The outyear targets, which reflect a 0.5 percentage point growth each year from FY 2010 to FY 2013, will serve to gradually reduce the performance gap between the program and all public and private four-year schools nationally (58 percent).

Report Explanation: The 42 percent graduation rate for FY 2009 represents 9,347 students graduating with a bachelor's degree or equivalent by August 2009 out of 22,002 degree-seeking students having enrolled in the same institution in fall 2003. This rate was unchanged from FY 2008.

Additional Information: The developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program Web site may be accessed at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/idueshsi/index.html>.

Measure 3.1.K.: Percentage of Postsecondary Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Completed a Postsecondary Degree or an Industry-Recognized Credential, Certificate, or Degree

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. OVAE staff and a contractor then complete a check on the accuracy and completeness of the data and follow up with states as necessary. OVAE staff verifies data through an on-site monitoring process.

Target Context: The target is the average of the performance levels that have been negotiated between the Department and the states.

Report Explanation: This is a new measure (2P1) established under the *Perkins IV Act*.

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

	Results*							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
3.2.A. Direct Administrative Unit Costs for Origination and Disbursement of Student Aid ¹ (<i>Total Cost per Transaction</i>)	\$4.25	\$4.03	\$4.15	\$3.65	\$4.00	\$3.60	\$3.76	\$3.35
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	82	80	83	83	84	84	85	86
3.2.C. Pell Grant Improper Payments Rate	3.48%	4.11%	3.48%	3.69%	3.41%	3.50%	3.35%	3.12%
3.2.D. Direct Loan Recovery Rate ³	19.5%	20.8%	19.75%	21%	20.0%	18.0%	20.25%	17.4%
3.2.E. FFEL Recovery Rate	19.5%	19.6%	19.5%	23.6%	19.75%	19.7%	20.0%	21.9%

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

NOTE: Measures for Objective 3.2 were discontinued as key Departmental measures at the end of the FY2010 reporting cycle. Data have been provided. For additional information on FSA measures contained in its FY 2010 Annual Report, please see FSA's Annual Report at http://federalstudentaid.ed.gov/static/gw/docs/fsa_annual_report_2010.pdf.

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

Analysis of Progress. Federal Student Aid (FSA) continued to reduce its administrative costs, exceeding the target developed for FY 2010. The fixed costs associated with originations and disbursements were spread over a significantly higher volume, leading to a reduction in unit costs.

Data Quality. The "actual" data are the data reported as final in the current fiscal year. Because it takes some time after the close out of the fiscal year to receive completed data and to validate results, the data lag by one year. For example, in FY 2010, the unit costs were based on data from FY 2009. 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 number of Direct Loan and Grant disbursements.

Target Context. The measurement will be discontinued in 2011 and beyond, as FSA issued its new strategic plan in September 2010 to cover the FY 2011–15 period. In the new strategic plan, FSA will collapse this measurement with an application unit cost to reveal the total cost of delivering student aid.

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. In FY 2010, FAFSA on the Web exceeded its performance target with a score of 86 (on a 100-point scale).

Data Quality. CFI Group collects and analyzes data and reports the results. At each stage of the process, they conduct quality control checks to ensure that accurate and reliable data and information are delivered.

Target Context. Scores are based on the ACSI Index (100-point scale). Going forward, this measure will be combined with scores from servicing and the student's in-school experience to produce a measure that is more reflective of students as they progress through the entire aid lifecycle.

Measure 3.2.C.: Pell Grant Improper Payments Rate

Analysis of Progress. Federal Student Aid will continue to explore ways to facilitate the detection of error based on the results of the FAFSA/IRS Data Statistical Study. Additionally, Federal Student Aid continues to simplify the application process, which now includes real-time access for applicants and their parents to previously filed IRS tax information. These enhancements, coupled with improved error detection, should allow Federal Student Aid to further reduce improper payments.

Data Quality. A sampling of records is taken from the applicant file and compared to statistical averages from the IRS. The improper payment rate has two parts (over- and under-awards), which are added together to estimate the overall rate.

Target Context. Grant and loan improper payments will continue to be reported in the *Agency Financial Report*, but will not be a primary measure for FSA.

Measure 3.2.D.: Direct Loan Recovery Rate

Analysis of Progress. Through the end of the fiscal year, the default portfolio recovery rate was 17.4 percent for Direct Loans and 21.89 percent (August 2010) for FFEL. To identify possible reasons for this difference, FSA is comparing collection activity for the Direct Loan portfolio and FFEL portfolio held by guaranty agencies to analyze contract pricing, incentives, and structure and identify possible changes that could increase Direct Loan recovery rates. As part of this analysis, the Direct Loan portfolio will be adjusted to control for guaranty agencies' ability to assign their worst-performing loans to the Department and thus reduce the size and improve the relative quality of their collection portfolio.

Data Quality. Processes and procedures are in place to verify and validate the results. The A-123 process for debt management collection systems reviews payment and reconciliation processes.

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 targets were originally established. This measure will continue to be a key measure in monitoring collection performance, but will not be one of the primary performance measures tracked for external performance reporting.

Measure 3.2.E.: FFEL Recovery Rate

Analysis of Progress. The FY 2010 target of 20 percent has been met with data reported through August 2010.

Data Quality. Processes and procedures are in place to verify and validate the results. The A-123 process for debt management collection systems reviews payment and reconciliation processes.

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. This measure will continue to be a key measure in monitoring collection performance, but will not be one of the primary performance measures tracked for external performance reporting. There is a significant lag time from the close of the fiscal year until final data are reported. The actual data reported through August 2010 show a recovery rate of 21.9 percent.

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

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
3.3.A. Percentage of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies That Meet the Employment Outcome Standard for the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants Program ¹	71	82	76	79	78	61	Discontinued	
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 ²	52	59	53	62	54	64	55	Feb. 2011
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 ²	37	55	39	55	41	59	43	Feb. 2011
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 ²	41	61	41	61	42	55	42	Feb. 2011

Sources:

1 OSERS/RSA/Quarterly Caseload Report

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

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: The FY 2009 target was not met. 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. In FY 2009, the percentage of agencies fell to 61 percent because 10 fewer agencies passed the standard due to more challenging economic conditions, as well as a more difficult disability population being served.

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.

Target Context: This measure has been discontinued. Employment outcomes increased from 2005 to 2007 with improving economic conditions. Performance targets for 2008 and future years were raised, but the targets 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 FY 2007, 2008, and 2009 targets. A part of the explanation of the increase in completions was improved data collection methods used by formula grantees to collect and report data for this measure.

Data Quality and Timeliness: As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the grantees (states and outlying areas) to collect from sub-recipients and report data within published guidelines. OVAE has developed and refined a data quality review process for grantees based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. All grantees are expected to provide these data in their annual performance report and all grantees have reported. Grantees are required to certify an annual Data Quality checklist which is completed online and reviewed by OVAE staff. A Data Quality Improvement Plan may be required if OVAE's review indicates it is needed. High school diplomas issued are certified by local educational agencies or the state educational agency and GED high school equivalency diplomas are confirmed through data match with the state GED administrative database.

Target Context: Targets are set in line with the goal of continuous improvement in program performance. Trend data on actual performance (from 2000 to present) are considered when annual targets are established. Targets have been authorized by OMB through 2015.

Report Explanation: The data represent the number of enrolled adults who earned a high school diploma or GED (equivalency) diploma upon exit from the program divided by the total number of enrolled students with a goal to earn a high school or GED (equivalency) diploma who exited the program. Data were reported from all grantees (50 states, District of Columbia, and six outlying areas including American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands).

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 program exceeded its FY 2007, 2008, and 2009 targets. Exceeding the performance target for this fiscal year was a result of the improved follow-up methodologies implemented by the formula grantees and the training and technical assistance provided by the OVAE on 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 grantees and sub-recipients to collect and report data within published guidelines. All grantees are expected to provide these data in their annual performance report. All grantees have reported. OVAE has developed and refined a data quality review process for grantees based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. Grantees are required to certify an annual Data Quality checklist that completed online and reviewed by OVAE staff. A Data Quality Improvement Plan may be required if OVAE's review indicates it is needed.

Target Context: Targets are set in line with the goal of continuous improvement in program performance. Trend data on actual performance (from 2000 to present) are considered when annual targets are established. Targets have been authorized by OMB through 2015.

Report Explanation: The target has been met. Factors include (1) improved follow-up methodologies implemented by 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.

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 program exceeded its FY 2007, 2008, and 2009 targets. The formula grantees and their local program providers continue to work to identify follow-up methodologies that will prove to be both reliable and valid. Early in this period, approximately one-half of the formula grantees collected employment status through the use of follow-up surveys which provide sporadic response rates impacting both the quantity and quality of data collected. The trend toward increased use of data-matching has contributed to an overall increase in the quality of the data used for this measure.

Data Quality and Timeliness: As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the grantees and sub-recipients to collect and report data within published guidelines. All grantees are expected to provide these data in their annual performance report. All grantees have reported. OVAE has developed and refined a data quality review process for grantees based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. Grantees are required to certify an annual Data Quality checklist that is completed online and reviewed by OVAE staff. A Data Quality Improvement Plan may be required if OVAE's review indicates it is needed.

Target Context: Targets are set in line with the goal of continuous improvement in program performance. Trend data on actual performance (from 2000 to present) are considered when annual targets are established. Targets have been authorized by OMB through 2015.

Report Explanation: The target has been met. The actual data for 2008 exceeded the target and remained consistent with the actual data for 2007. 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.

Cross-Goal Strategy on Management

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

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
4.1.A. Maintain an Unqualified (Clean) Audit Opinion ¹	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	C	NC	C	NC	C	NC
4.1.C. Percentage of New Discretionary Grants Awarded by June 30 ³	60	66	70	61	80	36	90	20

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

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 a ninth consecutive unqualified or "clean" audit opinion from independent auditors. The FY 2009 and FY 2010 targets were met 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 non-compliant 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 for FY 2010 means that the Department did not meet its target. However, the Department is making progress in addressing OIG's concerns.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. § 3545, the Department's Office of Inspector General 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 continued 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: In FY 2010 and 2009, the targets were not met. In FY 2010, the total number of new discretionary grants awarded was 4,800, which was a significant increase over 3,110 grants awarded in FY 2009. Despite the percentage of grant awards at the June 30 mark, by August 31, 78 percent of discretionary grants were awarded in FY 2009 and 65 percent were awarded in FY 2010, compared with 82 percent in FY 2008.

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.

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							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Percentage of Employees Believing That:								
4.2.A. Leaders Generate High Levels of Motivation and Commitment^{1*}	31	37	34	33	40	37	43	41
4.2.B. Managers Review and Evaluate the Organization's Progress Towards Meeting Its Goals and Objectives^{1*}	56	58	59	56	68	51	71	60
4.2.C. Steps Are Taken to Deal With a Poor Performer Who Cannot or Will Not Improve¹	28	29	31	28	34	26	37	29
4.2.D. Department Policies and Programs Promote Diversity in the Workplace^{1*}	49	48	52	51	56	48	59	49
4.2.E. They Are Held Accountable for Achieving Results^{1*}	82	82	83	84	85	84	86	82
4.2.F. The Workforce Has the Job-Relevant Knowledge and Skills Necessary to Accomplish Organizational Goals^{1*}	69	70	71	70	72	68	74	68
4.2.G. Average Number of Days to Hire Is at or Below the OPM 45-Day Hiring Model for Non-SES^{2**}	45	27	45	28	45	26	45	22
4.2.H. Percentage of Employees With Performance Standards in Place Within 30 Days of Start of Current Rating Cycle³	85	59	90	93	95	95	97	91
4.2.I. Percentage of Employees Who Have Ratings of Record in the System Within 30 Days of Close of Rating Cycle⁴	90	97	95	98	99	96	100	96

*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).

Sources:

¹ Federal Human Capital Survey.

² 2010 Employee Viewpoint Survey.

³ Data from the Education Department Performance Appraisal System, ED's in-house performance management software.

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

NOTES: The Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) Regulation 5 CFR 250—"Personnel Management in Agencies: Employee Surveys" (specifically 250.303 (1)) requires agencies to annually evaluate and post their results on their public domains and send to OPM. The Regulation can be found at: <http://www.opm.gov/fedregis/2006/71-082406-49983-a.pdf>.

An evaluation of the Department's 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey results (Narrative Report) determined that the Department's two lowest scoring survey dimensions, when compared to the rest of the government, are Talent Management and Performance Culture. The evaluation and results can be found on at: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/otherplanrpts.html>, under the Office of Management.

Measure 4.2.A.: Percentage of Employees Believing That Leaders Generate High Levels of Motivation and Commitment

Analysis of Progress: The Department of Education saw progress on this measure for the third consecutive year. In 2010, the Department closed the gap between the target score and actual score to within 2 percent.

Data Quality and Timeliness: These data were collected and reviewed by the United States Office of Personnel Management (OPM) in the 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. There was a second review done by the Human Capital Planning, Policy, and Accountability Staff.

Target Context: The target represents the percentage of employees who gave a positive response to this item on the Employee Viewpoint Survey.

Measure 4.2.B.: Percentage of Employees Believing That Managers Review and Evaluate the Organization's Progress Towards Meeting Its Goals and Objectives

Analysis of Progress: After two years of decreasing scores, the Department saw a 9 percent improvement on this survey item in 2010. If the Department can duplicate this improvement over the next two surveys, scores will exceed targets in 2012.

Data Quality and Timeliness: These data were collected and reviewed by the OPM in the 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. There was a second review done by the Human Capital Planning, Policy, and Accountability Staff.

Target Context: The target represents the percentage of employees who gave a positive response to this item on the Employee Viewpoint Survey.

Measure 4.2.C.: Percentage of Employees Believing That Steps Are Taken to Deal With a Poor Performer Who Cannot or Will Not Improve

Analysis of Progress: After two years of decreasing scores, the Department saw a 3 percent improvement on this survey item in 2010. The Department will need to make significant progress on this measure in order to reach its target in 2011.

Data Quality and Timeliness: These data were collected and reviewed by the OPM in the 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. There was a second review done by the Human Capital Planning, Policy, and Accountability Staff.

Target Context: The percentage of employees who gave a positive response to this survey item.

Measure 4.2.D.: Percentage of Employees Believing That Department Policies and Programs Promote Diversity in the Workplace

Analysis of Progress: The Department saw a slight increase on this item in 2010 but still remains 10 percent below the target. Significant progress will be required to reach the target goal in 2011 or 2012.

Data Quality and Timeliness: These data were collected and reviewed by the OPM in the 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. There was a second review done by the Human Capital Planning, Policy, and Accountability Staff.

Target Context: The target represents the percentage of employees who gave a positive response to this item on the Employee Viewpoint Survey.

Measure 4.2.E.: Percentage of Employees Believing That They Are Held Accountable for Achieving Results

Analysis of Progress: The Department saw a slight decrease on this survey item in 2010 and fell 4 percent below the target. The Department will need a 5 percent increase in positive responses to this survey item in 2011 to meet its target.

Data Quality and Timeliness: These data were collected and reviewed by the OPM in the 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. There was a second review done by the Human Capital Planning, Policy, and Accountability Staff.

Target Context: The target represents the percentage of employees who gave a positive response to this item on the Employee Viewpoint Survey.

Measure 4.2.F.: Percentage of Employees Believing That the Workforce Has the Job-Relevant Knowledge and Skills Necessary to Accomplish Organizational Goals

Analysis of Progress: The Department saw no increase or decrease in 2010 on this survey item. The Department fell 6 percent short of the target and will need an 8 percent improvement in 2011 to meet the target goal.

Data Quality and Timeliness: These data were collected and reviewed by the OPM in the 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. There was a second review done by the Human Capital Planning, Policy, and Accountability Staff.

Target Context: The target represents the percentage of employees who gave a positive response to this item on the Employee Viewpoint Survey.

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: For FY 2010, the Department averaged 22 days to hire, which is below the 45-day average hiring model. Target is exceeded.

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: The Department met the goal of the OPM hiring model repeatedly: 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 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, Human Resources Services 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.

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 2010 target was not met. The 2009 target was met. The percentage of performance plans in place within 30 days of the start of the rating cycle has significantly increased since 2008. During 2008, 2009, and 2010, the percentages have been fluctuating around the 90 percent range. In 2010 the Department experienced a slight drop in percentage points; the Department will continue to monitor and enforce the need for plans within 30 days of the start of the rating cycle.

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.

Target Context: The Department fell slightly below the target, specifically having timely performance plans in place for FY 2010. The 2010 performance cycle was a year of presidential transition, which resulted in new supervisors and managers becoming acclimated to ED's performance appraisal system.

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 2010 and FY 2009 targets were not met. The FY 2008 target was exceeded.

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.

Measures for Cross-Goal Strategy, Objective 4.3: Achieve budget and performance integration to link funding decisions to results

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
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	86	88	86	88	Discontinued	

Source: U.S. Department of Education, analysis of Program Assessment Rating Tool findings.

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was met.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Calculation was 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 occurred during the spring and summer and OMB makes scores public via <http://www.expectmore.gov>. OMB suspended the PART process during FY 2009 and the measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

Target Context: 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. The FY 2009 results were static and the PART program was discontinued in FY 2010, as is this measure.