

# **FY 2006 Program Performance Plan**

U.S. Department of Education  
February 7, 2005



# Contents

Introduction.....	1
Key To Legislation.....	1

## Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement

APEB: American Printing House for the Blind.....	4
CRA: Training and Advisory Services .....	8
ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers.....	10
ESEA: Advanced Credentialing.....	15
ESEA: Advanced Placement.....	16
ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity.....	18
ESEA: Charter Schools Grants .....	19
ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities.....	21
ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development .....	23
ESEA: Early Reading First .....	26
ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians.....	28
ESEA: English Language Acquisition.....	30
ESEA: Impact Aid Construction.....	37
ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants .....	38
ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries .....	41
ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships .....	43
ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program.....	46
ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program .....	53
ESEA: Reading is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution .....	55

## Goal 2 (Continued)

ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television .....	56
ESEA: Rural Education .....	58
ESEA: Special Programs for Indian Children .....	61
ESEA: State Assessments .....	64
ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs .....	68
ESEA: Teaching American History .....	69
ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies .....	70
ESEA: Transition To Teaching .....	72
ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers .....	74
ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice .....	76
ESRA: Comprehensive Centers .....	78
HEA: High School Equivalency Program .....	81
IDEA: Special Education Grants for Infants and Families .....	83
IDEA: Special Education Grants to States .....	87
IDEA: Special Education Parent Information Centers .....	96
IDEA: Special Education Personnel Preparation .....	99
IDEA: Special Education Preschool Grants .....	102
IDEA: Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination .....	105
IDEA: Special Education Technology and Media Services .....	108
MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths .....	111

## Goal 3: Develop Safe Schools and Strong Character

ESEA: Character Education .....	114
ESEA: Mentoring Program .....	116
ESEA: Physical Education Program .....	118
ESEA : Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Other National Programs .....	119

#### **Goal 4: Transform Education into an Evidence-Based Field**

ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination .....	124
ESRA: Statistics .....	132
IDEA: Research in Special Education .....	134
RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research .....	136

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

AEFLA: Adult Basic and Literacy State Grants .....	152
AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities.....	159
AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy .....	161
EDA: Gallaudet University .....	163
EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf.....	171
HEA: AID Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions.....	175
HEA: AID Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions .....	178
HEA: AID Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities.....	181
HEA: AID Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions .....	184
HEA: AID Strengthening Institutions .....	187
HEA: AID Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities .....	190
HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program .....	193
HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education .....	195
HEA: Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) .....	197
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Domestic Programs .....	201
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Institute for International Public Policy .....	204
HEA: Javits Fellowships .....	205
HEA: SFA Federal Pell Grants .....	207
DEOA/HEA: Student Aid Administration .....	209
HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers .....	212
HEA: TRIO McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement .....	213

**Goal 5 (Continued)**

HEA: TRIO Student Support Services ..... 215  
HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults ..... 217  
MECEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Overseas Programs ..... 221  
RA: Client Assistance State Grants ..... 223  
RA: Independent Living Centers ..... 225  
RA: Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals ..... 229  
RA: Independent Living State Grants ..... 231  
RA: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights ..... 234  
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs ..... 236  
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Grants for Indians ..... 238  
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants ..... 240  
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training ..... 243  
VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions ..... 248

**All Programs**

DEOA: Office for Civil Rights..... 250

**Programs with Ongoing Plans But without FY 2006 Measures**

ESEA: Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies ..... 254  
ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance..... 256  
ESEA: National Assessment..... 258  
HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents in School ..... 259  
HEA: SFA Federal Direct Student Loans ..... 262  
HEA: SFA Federal Family Education Loan Program & Liquidating..... 263  
HEA: SFA Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants..... 264

# INTRODUCTION

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

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

## Key to Legislation:

APEB = Act for the Promotion of Education for the Blind  
AEFLA = Adult Education and Family Literacy Act  
AID = Aid for Institutional Development  
CRA = Civil Rights Act  
DEOA = Department of Education Organization Act  
EDA = Education of the Deaf Act  
ESEA = Elementary and Secondary Education Act  
ESRA = Education Sciences Reform Act  
HEA = Higher Education Act

HKNCA = Helen Keller National Center Act  
IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act  
MECEA = Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act  
MVHAA = McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act  
RA = Rehabilitation Act  
SFA = Student Financial Assistance Programs  
VTEA = Vocational and Technical Education Act  
USC = United States Code





# Goal 2

## APEB: American Printing House for the Blind - 2006

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Appropriate, timely, high-quality educational materials are provided to pre-college-level blind students to allow them to benefit more fully from their educational programs.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Customer satisfaction: The American Printing House's customers/consumers will agree that the educational materials provided through the act are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																														
<p><i>The percentage of trustees who agree that the American Printing House's educational materials are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>95</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>96</td> <td>95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>96.50</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>97</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>99</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>98.75</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>99.50</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>98</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>98</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1998	95		1999	96	95	2000	96.50	96	2001	97	96	2002	99	96	2003	98.75	96	2004	99.50	96	2005		98	2006		98	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The survey instrument used by APH was constructed with the input of an external research firm and was designed to measure the levels of customer/consumer satisfaction with each of the factors. The survey was distributed to 147 ex officio trustees, as well as to various professional groups whose members work in the field of blindness. Additionally, the survey was available on the APH Web site. This made it easily available for response by individuals who were not on a specific mailing list, but who were encouraged to respond through invitations on listservs and in various newsletters and announcements. The Web-based format also provided accessibility to visually impaired individuals who require alternate media.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Surveys of Ex Officio Trustees; APH Advisory Committees; other consumers; and teachers of students who are visually impaired.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																
1998	95																																	
1999	96	95																																
2000	96.50	96																																
2001	97	96																																
2002	99	96																																
2003	98.75	96																																
2004	99.50	96																																
2005		98																																
2006		98																																

<p><i>The percentage of advisory committee members who agree that the American Printing House's educational materials are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.</i></p>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>1999</b>	100	
<b>2000</b>	100	100
<b>2001</b>	100	100
<b>2002</b>	100	100
<b>2003</b>	100	100
<b>2004</b>	100	100
<b>2005</b>		100
<b>2006</b>		100
<p><i>The percentage of consumers who agree that the American Printing House's educational materials are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.</i></p>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>1999</b>	90	
<b>2000</b>	100	95
<b>2001</b>	97	95
<b>2002</b>	96	95
<b>2003</b>	100	95
<b>2004</b>	99	95
<b>2005</b>		95
<b>2006</b>		96

<p><i>The percentage of teachers who agree that the American Printing House's educational materials are appropriate, timely, and high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>96</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>97</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>98</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>97</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	96		2003	97	96	2004	98	96	2005		96	2006		97								
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																										
2002	96																											
2003	97	96																										
2004	98	96																										
2005		96																										
2006		97																										
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Student performance and participation: The percentage of American Printing House ex officio trustees who report that the performance of students and their participation in their educational programs improves as a result of the availability of educational materials provided through the act will be maintained.</b></p>																												
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>			<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>																								
<p><i>The percentage of trustees who agree that the performance of students and their participation in educational programs improves as a result of the availability of educational materials provided by the American Printing House.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>98</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>98</td> <td>98</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>97</td> <td>99</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>97</td> <td>99</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>100</td> <td>99</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>99.50</td> <td>99</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>100</td> <td>99</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1998	98		1999	98	98	2000	97	99	2001	97	99	2002	100	99	2003	99.50	99	2004	100	99	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The American Printing House worked with an independent Research Corporation to develop a survey that would obtain more reliable information from its trustees and from teachers.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Survey of Ex Officio Trustees and Survey of Teachers.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																										
1998	98																											
1999	98	98																										
2000	97	99																										
2001	97	99																										
2002	100	99																										
2003	99.50	99																										
2004	100	99																										

2005		99						
2006		99						
<i>The percentage of teachers who agree that the performance of students and their participation in educational programs improves as a result of the availability of educational materials provided by the American Printing House.</i>								
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>					
2002	93							
2003	95		95					
2004	99		95					
2005			95					
2006			96					
<b>Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Student achievement: The percentage of students who attain identified concepts or skills during the field testing of products in four areas--low vision, early childhood, multiple disabilities, and tactile graphics.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality				
<i>The percentage of students who attain concepts or skills.</i>								
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>				<b>Performance Targets</b>			
	Low Vision	Early Childhood	Multiple Disabilities	Tactile Graphics	Low Vision	Early Childhood	Multiple Disabilities	Tactile Graphics
2005					999	999	999	999
2006					999	999	999	999
					<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.			
					<b>Additional Source Information:</b> American Printing House for the Blind records on testing of new products.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.			

## CRA: Training and Advisory Services - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.004D - Training and Advisory Services

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide high-quality technical assistance and training to public school districts in addressing equity in education.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices in eliminating, reducing, or preventing harassment, conflict, and school violence.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Equity Assistance Center Annual Performance Reports; Customer Satisfaction Survey</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<b>2006</b>		999		
<i>The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices ensuring that students of different races, national origins, and genders have equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<b>2006</b>		999		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Training and technical assistance services result in products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to education policy or practices.												
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>The percentage of customers that report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high usefulness to their policies and practices.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Equity Assistance Center Annual Performance Reports; Customer Satisfaction Survey</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets										
2005		999										
2006		999										

## ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers - 2006

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

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

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Achievement: The percentage of regular program participants whose mathematics/English grades improved from fall to spring.															
Targets and Performance Data										Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality			
<i>The percentage of regular program participants whose mathematics/English grades improved from fall to spring.</i>															
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets						<b>Additional Source Information:</b> 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Report/PPICS.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied		
	Elementary Math		Middle or High School English		Middle or High School Overall		Elementary Math		Middle or High School English		Middle or High School Overall				
<b>2000</b>	43	45	36	37	39	41									
<b>2001</b>	43	46	37	39	40	43	45	45	45	45	45	45			
<b>2002</b>	41.10	44.20	37.20	39.40	39.40	42.30	45	45	45	45	45	45			
<b>2003</b>	42.70	45.20	35.50	37.40	40	42.10	45	45	45	45	45	45			
<b>2004</b>							45	45	45	45	45	45			
<b>2005</b>							45	45	45	45	45	45			
<b>2006</b>							46	46	46	46	46	46			
<b>2007</b>							47	47	47	47	47	47			



<b>2008</b>		47.50	47.50	47.50	47.50	47.50	47.50		by grantees.
<b>2009</b>		48	48	48	48	48	48		
<b>2010</b>		48.50	48.50	48.50	48.50	48.50	48.50		
<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Achievement: The percentage of regular 21st Century Community Learning Centers program participants whose achievement test scores improve from not proficient to proficient or above in reading and mathematics on state assessments.</b>									
Targets and Performance Data								Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of fourth-grade 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in reading on state assessments.</i>								<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. These are new long-term measures for 2006.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Profile and Performance Information Collection System.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2007 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>					
<b>2006</b>				999					
<i>The percentage of eighth-grade 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in mathematics on state assessments.</i>									
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>					
<b>2006</b>				999					
<b>Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: The percentage of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.</b>									
Targets and Performance Data								Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality

<p><i>The percentage of regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.</i></p>							<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Report/PPICS.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees.</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets			
	Elementary	Middle or High School Math	Overall	Elementary	Middle or High School Math	Overall	
2000	76	64	69	75	75	75	
2001	74	71	73	75	75	75	
2002	76.30	73.60	75.50	75	75	75	
2003	77.70	73.40	76.60	75	75	75	
2004				75	75	75	
2005				75	75	75	
2006				75	75	75	
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Behavior: Students participating in the program will show improvement through measures such as attendance, classroom performance, and decreased disciplinary action or other adverse behaviors.</b></p>							
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>						<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>
<p><i>The percentage of students with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.</i></p>							<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> 21st Century Community Learning Centers Annual Performance Report/PPICS</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets			
	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall	
2000	62	57	59	70	70	70	
2001	73	75	74	75	75	75	

<b>2002</b>	76	76.90	76.30	75	75	75
<b>2003</b>	77.60	76.10	77.50	75	75	75
<b>2004</b>				75	75	75
<b>2005</b>				77	77	77
<b>2006</b>				77	77	77

**Frequency:** Annually.  
**Collection Period:** 2003 - 2004  
**Data Available:** January 2005  
**Validated By:** No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees.

**Objective 8.2 of 2: 21st Century Community Learning Centers will offer high-quality enrichment opportunities that positively affect student outcomes such as school attendance and academic performance, and result in decreased disciplinary actions or other adverse behaviors.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Core educational services: More than 85 percent of centers will offer high-quality services in at least one core academic area, such as reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.</b>																										
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																								
<p><i>The percentage of 21st Century Centers reporting emphasis in at least one core academic area.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2000</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">97</td> <td style="text-align: center;">85</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2001</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">96</td> <td style="text-align: center;">85</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2002</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">94.80</td> <td style="text-align: center;">85</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2003</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;">96.10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">85</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2004</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">85</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">100</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2006</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>2000</b>	97	85	<b>2001</b>	96	85	<b>2002</b>	94.80	85	<b>2003</b>	96.10	85	<b>2004</b>		85	<b>2005</b>		100	<b>2006</b>		100
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																								
<b>2000</b>	97	85																								
<b>2001</b>	96	85																								
<b>2002</b>	94.80	85																								
<b>2003</b>	96.10	85																								
<b>2004</b>		85																								
<b>2005</b>		100																								
<b>2006</b>		100																								
		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data collection for Web-based system will be upgraded periodically.</p>																								

<p><b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Other enrichment activities: More than 85 percent of centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and physical education.</b></p>																																
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality																									
<p><i>The percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in technology.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>70</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>79</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>80.60</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>81.30</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>85</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2000	70	85	2001	79	85	2002	80.60	85	2003	81.30	85	2004		85	2005		85	2006		85				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> 21st CCLC Annual Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data collection for Web-based system will be upgraded periodically.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																														
2000	70	85																														
2001	79	85																														
2002	80.60	85																														
2003	81.30	85																														
2004		85																														
2005		85																														
2006		85																														
<p><i>The percentage of 21st Century Centers offering enrichment and support activities in other areas.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>97</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>95</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>96</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>95.90</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2000	97	85	2001	95	85	2002	96	85	2003	95.90	85	2004		85	2005		100	2006		100					
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																														
2000	97	85																														
2001	95	85																														
2002	96	85																														
2003	95.90	85																														
2004		85																														
2005		100																														
2006		100																														

## ESEA: Advanced Credentialing - 2006

**CFDA Number:** 84.925 - Advanced Certification or Advanced Credentialing

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To increase the number of National Board-certified teachers.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The number of teachers awarded National Board certification will increase annually.</b>			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The cumulative number of teachers certified.</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p><b>Progress:</b> The target has been set at an increase of 5,000 board-certified teachers each year. Currently, 49 states and approximately 490 localities offer some kind of incentive for teachers to apply for National Board certification; these incentives have helped to increase the number of applicants for National Board certification. (These incentives include fee support, salary supplements, and license portability.) However, budget shortfalls in the states are having an impact on the incentives offered and thus the number of candidates.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Board reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2005</p>
<b>2002</b>	23,936		
<b>2003</b>	32,142		
<b>2004</b>		35,000	
<b>2005</b>		40,000	
<b>2006</b>		45,000	
<b>2007</b>		50,000	

## ESEA: Advanced Placement - 2006

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

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Encourage a greater number of low-income students to participate in the AP and IB programs and pass the exams.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Students served: The number of low-income students who are successful on AP and IB tests.</b>			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>(a) The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income students nationally.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for measures (b), (c), and (d). These data will be available annually in December. The FY 2006 target for (b) is the FY 2005 baseline plus 10 percent, and for (c) and (d) the FY 2006 target is the baseline plus 1 percent.	<b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> Advanced Placement Grantee Performance Report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>1999</b>	92,570	83,300		
<b>2000</b>	102,474	102,000		
<b>2001</b>	112,891	112,200		
<b>2002</b>	140,572	124,180		
<b>2003</b>	166,649	154,629		
<b>2004</b>	190,350	170,092		
<b>2005</b>		183,314		
<b>2006</b>		220,000		
<i>(b) The number of IB tests taken by low-income students nationally.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		

<b>2006</b>		999		
<i>(c) The percentage of low-income students served by the API program who receive a passing score on AP tests.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<b>2006</b>		999		
<i>(d) The percentage of low-income students served by the API Program who receive a passing score on IB tests.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<b>2006</b>		999		

## ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity – 2006

CFDA Number: 84.356A - Alaska Native Educational Programs

### Program Goal: Alaska Native Education Program Internal Goal.

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Support supplemental educational programs to benefit Alaska Natives.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The percentage of participants benefiting from the Alaska Native Education program will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of students participating in the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science or reading.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> For the first two measures, the FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 5 percent. The FY 2006 target is an increase of an additional 5 percent. Dropout rates is a new measure for FY 2005. FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 5 percent. The FY 2006 target is an increase of an additional 5 percent.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee performance report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2004		999		
2005		999		
2006		999		
<i>The percentage of Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs who improve on measures of school readiness.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2004		999		
2005		999		
2006		999		
<i>The dropout rate of Alaska Native and American Indian middle school students in the Anchorage School District.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2005		999		
2006		999		



## ESEA: Charter Schools Grants - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.282 - Charter Schools

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Encourage the development of a large number of high-quality charter schools that are free from state or local rules that inhibit flexible operation, are held accountable for enabling students to reach challenging state performance standards, and are open to all students.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: State legislation: The number of states that have charter school legislation.</b>			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of states with charter school legislation (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico).</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State educational agencies (SEA); state legislatures.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> There is variation in the definition of charter school and authorizing agency in state charter school legislation.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
<b>1996</b>	19		
<b>1997</b>	27		
<b>1998</b>	31		
<b>1999</b>	38		
<b>2000</b>	38	40	
<b>2001</b>	39	42	
<b>2002</b>	40	42	
<b>2003</b>	41	43	
<b>2004</b>		44	
<b>2005</b>		44	
<b>2006</b>		44	

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Charter operations: The number of charter schools in operation around the nation.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of charter schools in operation.</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Center for Education Reform Annual Survey: State education agencies.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. On-site monitoring by ED and data from the Center for Education Reform.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Differences in the definition of charter schools (i.e., some states count multiple sites as single charters, while others count them as multiple charters) cause variability in the counts among SEAs. There is sometimes disagreement about numbers of charter schools in operation among the agencies that do the counting.</p>
1996	255		
1997	428		
1998	790		
1999	1,100		
2000	1,700	2,060	
2001	2,110	2,667	
2002	2,431	3,000	
2003	2,700	3,000	
2004	2,996	3,000	
2005		3,300	
2006		3,600	

## ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.354A - Charter Schools Facilities Program

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

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Increase funds available for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Leveraged funds: The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, renovation, or construction of charter school facilities.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The amount of funding grantees leverage for the acquisition, construction, or renovation of charter school facilities (in millions).</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. We reported initially that the 2003 baseline was \$99 million; that has been revised to \$105 million. Definition of leverage: the number of dollars (in millions) leveraged consists of the dollar amount raised (versus the amount contributed to the financing from the grant) as a direct result of the guarantee. If the grantee received a non-Department of Education grant (including a New Markets Tax Credit allocation) and is using it to provide additional leveraging for a school served by the federal grant, funds leveraged from these other funds may also be counted as funds leveraged by the federal grant. A grantee may count senior debt toward the total amount of funds leveraged if it uses grant funds to guarantee or insure subordinate debt but not the senior debt to which it is tied. Likewise, grantees may</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Reports</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2006</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> These multi year grants received all the funding at the beginning of the first project period. As no reports are required for continuation funding, grantees were given a full year of performance before reporting data. First reports were due December 2003.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	105			
2004	70	100		
2005		100		
2006		100		

	count subordinate debt toward the total amount of funds leveraged if it only uses grant funds to credit-enhance senior debt.	
--	--	--

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the number of charter schools facilities acquired, constructed or renovated.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: The number of charter schools served.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of charter schools served through this program.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Performance Reports  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	20			
2004	33	20		
2005		20		
2006		25		

## ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.349A - Early Childhood Educator Professional Development

**Program Goal: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development (ECEPD).**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Early childhood educators will more frequently apply research-based approaches in early childhood instruction and child development and learning, including establishing literacy-rich classrooms.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Apply research-based approaches to early childhood pedagogy and child development and learning, including establishing literacy-rich classrooms: Average Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO) score will improve.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The ECEPD teachers' average scores on ELLCO.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1 percent. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 2 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Documentation of application of research-based approaches, as recorded by mentors or supervisors working with participating educators (i.e., logs or reports); pre and post evaluation of education lesson plans; results of the ELLCO.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> May 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Not all ECEPD grantees use the ELLCO literacy environment checklist. Data collected only represent the sample of grantees who use the checklist.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		999		
2006		999		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy and numeracy skills.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Demonstrated improved readiness for school: At the end of the last preschool year, children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy, and numeracy skills.																													
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality																									
<p><i>The percentage of children who demonstrate improved readiness for school in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy, and numeracy skills.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th colspan="2">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="2">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <th>Cognitive</th> <th>Social / Emotional</th> <th>Cognitive</th> <th>Social / Emotional</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			Cognitive	Social / Emotional	Cognitive	Social / Emotional	2004			999	999	2005			999	999	2006			999	999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Documented use of Get it Got it Go!, the Developmental Indicators for the Assessment of Learning (DIAL-3), and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-III). The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1 percent. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 2 percent.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Results of Get it Got it Go!; DIAL - 3; and PPVT-III</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> May 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the PPVT and the Individual Growth and Development Indicators available from Get it Got it Go! Not all ECEPD grantees use the PPVT or the Individual Growth and Development Indicators.</p>
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets																										
	Cognitive	Social / Emotional	Cognitive	Social / Emotional																									
2004			999	999																									
2005			999	999																									
2006			999	999																									

<p><b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Demonstrated skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction: One year following instruction from a teacher who participated in an Early Childhood Educator Professional Development program, children will demonstrate that they have the skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction at the end of the kindergarten year.</b></p>				
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>		<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>	
<p><i>The percentage of children who demonstrate that they have the skills needed to benefit from formal reading instruction at the end of the kindergarten year.</i></p>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 1 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Documented use of the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). Results of DIBELS.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> May 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
<p><b>Year</b></p>	<p><b>Actual Performance</b></p>			<p><b>Performance Targets</b></p>
<p><b>2005</b></p>				<p>999</p>
<p><b>2006</b></p>		<p>999</p>		

## ESEA: Early Reading First - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.359 - Early Reading First

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Preschool-aged children will attain the necessary early language, cognitive and prereading skills to enter kindergarten prepared for continued learning, including the age appropriate development of oral language and alphabet knowledge.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Language: The percentage of children who demonstrate age-appropriate development of receptive language.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of preschool-aged children participating in Early Reading First (ERF) programs who achieve age-appropriate benchmarks on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2003 is the baseline plus 1 percent. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 2 percent. The first full program year for Early Reading First grantees is FY 2003-2004. Early Reading First preschool children will take a Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III pretest and a posttest after the year of Early Reading First intervention. Posttest scores of ERF preschool children will be compared to the national norms provided by the test publisher.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Early Reading First Program Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition (PPVT) nationally normed tests which has been validated internally and correlated with other measures of cognitive development.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the PPVT. Not all Early Reading First grantees use the PPVT to measure cognitive development.</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
	Receptive			Receptive
<b>2004</b>				999
<b>2005</b>				999
<b>2006</b>		999		



Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Alphabet Knowledge: The average number of letters that preschool-aged children in ERF programs are able to identify as measured by the Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask on the PALS-Pre K assessment.															
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
<p><i>The number of letters ERF children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004		999	2005		999	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2005 target is the baseline plus 1 percent. The FY 2006 target is the baseline plus 2 percent. FY 2003-2004 is the first program year for Early Reading First grantees. The first Early Reading First Performance Report is due December 2004. The PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask is a measure of alphabet knowledge that will be administered to ERF preschool children with scores reported in the ERF Performance Report.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Early Reading First Program Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. The PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask is a measure that has been normed using a national sample from the Head Start population. It has been demonstrated to have a strong positive correlation with the Woodcock-Johnson Letter-Word Identification test.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Not all Early Reading First grantees use the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask to measure alphabet knowledge. Data collected represent the sample of grantees who use the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Early Reading First grantees will be encouraged to use the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask as the measure of alphabet knowledge.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets													
2004		999													
2005		999													
2006		999													

## ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians - 2006

- CFDA Numbers:** 84.209 - Native Hawaiian Family Based Education Centers  
 84.210 - Native Hawaiian Gifted and Talented  
 84.296 - Native Hawaiian Community-Based Education Learning Centers  
 84.297 - Native Hawaiian Curriculum Development, Teacher Training and Recruitment  
 84.316 - Native Hawaiian Higher Education Program  
 84.362A - Native Hawaiian Education

**Program Goal: Native Hawaiian Education Program.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To support innovative projects that provide supplemental services that address the educational needs of Native Hawaiian children and adults.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: The percentage of participants who will benefit from the Native Hawaiian Education program will increase.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of teachers involved with professional development activities who address the unique education needs of program participants.</i>		<b>Progress:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 5 percent. The target for FY 2006 is baseline plus 1 percent.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee performance report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> February 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2004				999
2005				999
2006		999		

<p><i>The percentage of Native Hawaiian children participating in the early education program provided by Alu Like, Inc. who improve on measures of school readiness and literacy.</i></p>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>		999
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999
<p><i>The percentage of students participating in the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science, or reading.</i></p>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>		999
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999

## ESEA: English Language Acquisition - 2006

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

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

**Objective 8.1 of 3: English Language Acquisition State Grants.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>The percentage of states that have demonstrated the alignment of English language proficiency(ELP) standards with ELP assessments.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2007</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">40</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2009</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">70</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2011</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>2005</b>		10	<b>2007</b>		40	<b>2009</b>		70	<b>2011</b>		100	<p><b>Explanation:</b> States are providing information regarding aligned English languages proficiency assessments with English language proficiency standards for the first time under NCLB. Many states participated in consortia designed to develop aligned standards and assessments; however, the consortia encountered delays in progress due to the technical requirements for such an alignment. It is anticipated that the states will continue at their present rate and meet the time line indicated.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data Source: Consolidated Annual Performance Report. EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system). <b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2007 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
<b>2005</b>		10																	
<b>2007</b>		40																	
<b>2009</b>		70																	
<b>2011</b>		100																	

Indicator 8.1.2 of 7: The percentage of states that have demonstrated their English language proficiency standards are linked to academic content standards in English language arts or reading.																		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>The percentage of states that have demonstrated that their English language proficiency standards are linked to academic content standards in English language arts or reading.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011</td> <td></td> <td>50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		10	2007		20	2009		30	2011		50	<p><b>Explanation:</b> For the first time, states are to provide evidence of linking English language proficiency standards and academic content standards under NCLB to ensure meaningful experience in the content classroom for limited English proficient (LEP) students and preparing them to understand when taking the same content assessments as all students. Demonstrating linking requires a variety of resources in terms of time, funding and experts to guide the form that these demonstrations will take, over which states have varying degrees of control. This variance could result in delays for states trying to provide evidence. It is anticipated that the time line provided will be sufficient to achieve the targets.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data Source: Consolidated Annual Performance Report. EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system).  <b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2007 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																
2005		10																
2007		20																
2009		30																
2011		50																

Indicator 8.1.3 of 7: The percentage of states that have met state targets for Title III annual measurable achievement objectives.																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The percentage of states that have met state targets for Title III annual measurable achievement objectives.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	2007		999	2008		999	2009		999	2010		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Based on 9/03 submissions by states, the average annual measurable achievement objective (AMAO) for attainment and making progress is reflected in the performance target. The third AMAO for LEP students (in the state) served by Title III is to demonstrate those states meeting their AYP targets (submitted in 1/03). Average annual percentage increases vary depending on the LEP population in the state and available resources in serving these students. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is baseline plus 10 percent. The target for FY 2008 is baseline plus 20 percent. The target for FY 2009 is baseline plus 40 percent. The target for FY 2010 is baseline plus 70 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated Annual Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2007</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2006		999																			
2007		999																			
2008		999																			
2009		999																			
2010		999																			

Indicator 8.1.4 of 7: The percentage of states that have met state targets for making progress in English for LEP students who have received Title III services.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of states that have met state targets for making progress for LEP students who have received Title III services.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 10 percent. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 20 percent. The target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 40 percent. The target for FY 2010 is the baseline plus 70 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data Source: Consolidated Annual Performance Report and EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system). <b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2007 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2006		999		
2007		999		
2008		999		
2009		999		
2010		999		
Indicator 8.1.5 of 7: The percentage of states that have met state targets for attainment in learning English who have received Title services.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of states that have met state targets for attainment in learning English who have received Title III services.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 10 percent. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 20 percent. The target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 40 percent. The target for FY 2010 is the baseline plus 70 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data Source: Consolidated Annual Performance Report. EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system). <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2007 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2006		999		
2007		999		
2008		999		
2009		999		
2010		999		

Indicator 8.1.6 of 7: The percentage of states that have met state targets for making AYP for LEP students who have received Title III services.																						
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The percentage of states that have met state targets for making AYP for LEP students who have received Title III services.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	2007		999	2008		999	2009		999	2010		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 10 percent. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 20 percent. The target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 40 percent. The target for FY 2010 is the baseline plus 70 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data Source: Consolidated Annual Performance Report. EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system).  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2007 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																				
2006		999																				
2007		999																				
2008		999																				
2009		999																				
2010		999																				
Indicator 8.1.7 of 7: The states' LEP graduation rate targets for the Title III-served students.																						
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The percentage of states that have met state targets for LEP graduation rates for Title III-served students.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2007		999	2008		999	2009		999	2010		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> This measure is an added measure of result and will be reported based on information collected through EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system), thus not imposing a new reportable item through any other means of data collection but providing an effective measure of success through the programs provided in Title III. The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2008 is the baseline plus 10 percent. The target for FY 2009 is the baseline plus 15 percent. The target for FY 2010 is the baseline plus 20 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data Source: Consolidated Annual Performance Report. EDEN (in 2007 to ensure full implementation of the system).  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2006 - 2007 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2008 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																				
2007		999																				
2008		999																				
2009		999																				
2010		999																				



**Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the quality of teachers of LEP students.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Of programs serving preservice teachers, the rate of placement of graduates in an instructional setting serving LEP students, within one year of graduation, will be higher than the placement rate of preservice teachers nationally.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Of preservice teachers, the rate of placement of graduates in an instructional setting serving LEP students within one year of graduation.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is baseline plus 10 percent. The target for FY 2007 is baseline plus 20 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
2006		999		
2007		999		
Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Highly qualified teachers: The percentage of program completers who meet No Child Left Behind Highly Qualified Teacher requirements: The percentage of program completers who are highly qualified teachers.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of program completers who are highly qualified teachers.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is baseline plus 10 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
2006		999		

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Improve English proficiency and academic achievement of students served by the Native American and Alaska Native Children in School Program.**

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: English proficiency: Students in the program will annually demonstrate progress on English measures.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of projects in which three-quarters of students made gains in English proficiency.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 10 percent. The target for FY 2007 is the baseline plus 20 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p>Operational definitions of LEP students vary. Data is self-reported.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				999
2006				999
2007		999		

## ESEA: Impact Aid Construction - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.041C - Impact Aid Construction Grants

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: Improve the quality of public school facilities used to educate federally connected children.

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Construction: The percentage of schools in LEAs receiving Impact Aid Construction funds that report that the overall condition of their school buildings is adequate.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of LEAs reporting that the overall condition of their school buildings is adequate.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data collected from LEA application for Impact Aid Section 8003 payments.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported by Impact Aid applicants. Assessment of the condition of school facilities may differ depending on the judgment of the individual responding.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000		70		
2001	44	70		
2002	43	70		
2003	47	70		
2004	54	70		
2005		70		
2006		70		

## ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.367 - Improving Teacher Quality State Grants

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Show an annual increase in the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of core academic classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. FY 2003 actual performance was estimated from the State Consolidated Plans, submitted in September 2003. Data for FY 2004 were not collected.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI); 2004-2005 school survey  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2003</b>	75			
<b>2005</b>		90		
<b>2006</b>		95		
<b>2007</b>		100		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Highly qualified teachers in low-poverty schools: Percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in low-poverty schools.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of core academic classes in low-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. FY 2003 data were estimated from State Consolidated Plans submitted in September 2003. Data for FY2004 were not collected.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI)</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003	85			
2005				90
2006				95
2007		100		
Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Highly qualified teachers in elementary schools: Percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of core academic classes in elementary schools taught by highly qualified teachers .</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. FY 2003 data were estimated from State Consolidated Plans submitted in September 2003. Data for FY 2004 were not collected.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report, PBDMI</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003	80			
2005				90
2006				95
2007		100		

Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Highly qualified teachers in secondary schools: Percentage of core academic classes in secondary schools taught by highly qualified teachers.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of core academic classes in secondary schools taught by highly qualified teachers.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. FY 2003 data were estimated from State Consolidated plans submitted in September 2003. Data FY 2004 were not collected.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report, PBDMI</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2004</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003	75			
2005				85
2006				92
2007		100		

## ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.364 - Literacy through School Libraries

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

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the literacy skills of students served by the Improving Literacy Through School Libraries program.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
<p><i>The percentage of schools/districts served by Improving Literacy Through School Libraries that exceed state targets for reading achievement for all students.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2004</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2006</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>2004</b>		999	<b>2005</b>		999	<b>2006</b>		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The first program year for grantees receiving funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries is 2003-2004. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1 percent. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the target from the previous year.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Improving Literacy Through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; program evaluation by Department of Education.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets														
<b>2004</b>		999														
<b>2005</b>		999														
<b>2006</b>		999														

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Enhance the school library media collection at grantee schools/districts to align with curriculum.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: School library media collection: The comparison between the rate at which the school library media collection is increased at schools participating in the grant program and nonparticipating schools.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>The difference in rate of increase between participating schools and nonparticipating schools.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The first program year for grantees receiving funds from Improving Literacy through School Libraries is 2003-2004. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1 percent. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the target from the previous year.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Improving Literacy Through School Libraries Grantee Annual Performance Report; Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), NCES; program evaluation of 2005 by Department of Education.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		999		
2006		999		



## ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships - 2006

**CFDA Number:** 84.366A - Mathematics and Science Partnership program

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

**Objective 8.1 of 2: To increase the number of highly qualified mathematics and science teachers in schools participating in Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) programs.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of K-5 teachers who significantly increase their knowledge of mathematics and science.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 20 percent. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Project Annual Reports  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		999		
2006		999		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Highly qualified teachers in MSP schools: The percentage of mathematics and science middle and high school teachers who are not highly qualified upon beginning participation in the program who become highly qualified upon completion of the program.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of highly qualified middle school (grades six through eight) teachers.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 20 percent. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Evaluation. Individual annual reports from Partnership projects.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2004				999
2005				999
2006				999
<i>The percentage of highly qualified high school (grades nine through twelve) teachers.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2004		999		
2005		999		
2006		999		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: To increase the percentage of students in classrooms whose teachers are participating in Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) programs who score at the proficient or advanced level in mathematics and science on state assessments.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Student achievement in MSP classrooms: The percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced on state mathematics assessments.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced in mathematics.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 performance target is to maintain the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind Consolidated State Performance Report; PBDMI</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2004</b>				999
<b>2006</b>				999
<b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Student achievement in MSP schools: The percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced on state science assessments.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of students at proficient or advanced levels in science.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 data will establish a baseline. The FY 2006 performance target is to maintain the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Performance Report; PBDMI</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>				999

## ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.011 - Migrant Education\_State Grant Program

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Along with other federal programs and state and local reform efforts, the Migrant Education Program (MEP) will contribute to improved school performance of migrant children.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of states meeting performance targets in reading at the elementary level for migrant students.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 - 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The states reporting assessment data for migrant students fluctuate from one year to the next. States are also redesigning assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such, the indicator does not represent performance</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient		
<b>1996</b>	4	10	50		
<b>1997</b>	4	15	50		
<b>1998</b>	7	18	50		
<b>1999</b>	2	19	50		
<b>2000</b>	5	26	50		

<b>2001</b>	6	23	50	
<b>2002</b>				8 27 50
<b>2003</b>				10 32 50
<b>2004</b>				14 36 50
<b>2005</b>				16 38 50
<b>2006</b>				18 40 50

in the same states or on the same measures from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children were included in the assessment systems.

**Improvements:** It is expected that this measure will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the state assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.

**Indicator 8.1.2 of 6: Meeting or exceeding state performance standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the middle school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in reading.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The number of states meeting performance targets in reading for middle school migrant students.</i>						<b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report.	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>			<b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 - 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  <b>Limitations:</b> The states reporting assessment data for migrant students fluctuate from one year to the next. States are also
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	
<b>1996</b>	2	10	50				
<b>1997</b>	3	15	50				
<b>1998</b>	6	18	50				

<b>1999</b>	4	18	50						
<b>2000</b>	2	23	50						
<b>2001</b>	7	21	50						
<b>2002</b>				9	25	50			
<b>2003</b>				11	29	50			
<b>2004</b>				15	32	50			
<b>2005</b>				17	34	50			
<b>2006</b>				19	36	50			

redesigning assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such, the indicator does not represent performance in the same states or on the same measures from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children were included in the assessment systems.

**Improvements:** It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the state assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.

Indicator 8.1.3 of 6: Meeting or exceeding state performance standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the elementary school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in mathematics.						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of states meeting performance targets in math for elementary school migrant students.</i>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient
1996	4	10	50			
1997	5	15	50			
1998	9	18	50			
1999	6	19	50			
2000	7	25	50			
2001	10	23	50			
2002				12	27	50
2003				14	32	50
2004				18	36	50
2005				20	38	50
2006				22	40	50
<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 - 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The states reporting assessment data for migrant students fluctuate from one year to the next. States are also redesigning assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such, the indicator does not represent performance in the same states or on the same measures from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children were included in the assessment systems.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the state assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.</p>						

Indicator 8.1.4 of 6: Meeting or exceeding state performance standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students at the middle school level will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments in mathematics.						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of states meeting performance targets in math for middle school for migrant students.</i>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient	States meeting target	States that reported results	Percent of students at or above proficient
1996	3	10	50			
1997	3	15	50			
1998	7	18	50			
1999	4	18	50			
2000	2	22	50			
2001	4	20	50			
2002				6	24	50
2003				8	28	50
2004				12	32	50
2005				14	34	50
2006				16	36	50
						<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2001 - 2002 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The states reporting assessment data for migrant students fluctuate from one year to the next. States are also redesigning assessment systems and changing the definition of "proficient." As such, the indicator does not represent performance in the same states or on the same measures from one year to the next. In addition, until the passage of NCLB, limited numbers of migrant children were included in the assessment systems.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the state assessment systems become more stable and the systems include all migrant students.</p>



Indicator 8.1.5 of 6: Reducing dropout rate: More states have a decreasing percentage of migrant students who drop out from secondary school (grades 7 - 12).																												
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																								
<p><i>The number of states meeting performance targets for dropout rate for migrant students.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>States that meeting targets</td> <td>States that meeting targets</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>States that reported results</td> <td>Percent of students who dropped out of school</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>States that reported results</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Percent of students who dropped out of school</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2004</b></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2006</b></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		States that meeting targets	States that meeting targets		States that reported results	Percent of students who dropped out of school			States that reported results			Percent of students who dropped out of school	<b>2004</b>		999	<b>2005</b>		999	<b>2006</b>		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2005 target is the baseline plus 1 percent. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (proposed).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data on the number of high school migrant dropouts is not available currently.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The forthcoming Consolidated State Performance Report will collect information on the number and percentage of migrant students who drop out of school between the grades of 7 through 12 annually.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																										
	States that meeting targets	States that meeting targets																										
	States that reported results	Percent of students who dropped out of school																										
		States that reported results																										
		Percent of students who dropped out of school																										
<b>2004</b>		999																										
<b>2005</b>		999																										
<b>2006</b>		999																										

Indicator 8.1.6 of 6: Achieving high school graduation: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will graduate from high school.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The number of states meeting performance target for high school graduation of migrant students.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2005 target is the baseline plus 1 percent. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data on the number of migrant students who graduate from high school are currently not available.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The forthcoming Consolidated State Performance Report will collect information on the number and percentage of migrant students who graduate from high school annually.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets					
	States that meeting targets	Percent of States that reported results				Percent of students who graduated from high school	States that graduated from high school
<b>2004</b>						999	999
<b>2005</b>						999	999
<b>2006</b>			999	999			

## ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program - 2006

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

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Neglected or delinquent (N or D) students will improve academic and vocational skills needed to further their education or obtain employment.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Progress and achievement: The percentage of neglected or delinquent students obtaining a secondary school diploma, or its recognized equivalent, will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of neglected or delinquent students obtaining a diploma or diploma equivalent.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> This measure was new for FY 2003 and represents a new methodology to measure progress for determining program success. The FY 2003 data established the baseline from a sample of grantees. For FY 2005, the measure was slightly modified by deleting the phrase "obtain employment."</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Data collected for 2005 provided the baseline. New data are collected annually; targets are based on baseline data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	8	999		
2004		8.40		
2005		8.80		
2006		9.20		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: High school course credits: The percentage of high school course credits earned by neglected or delinquent students will increase.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of neglected or delinquent students earning high school course credits.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> OESE State Consolidated Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2007 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2006		999		
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Academic skills: Neglected or delinquent students shall have the same opportunities to learn as students served in regular classrooms. The academic skills of neglected or delinquent students served will increase, closing this gap.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of N or D students who improve academic skills as measured on approved and validated measures.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> This was a new measure for FY 2003. However, no data were collected for either 2003 or 2004. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is the baseline plus 5 percent.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data from state assessments will be disaggregated at the state agency level and reported for schools that receive Title I, Part D funds.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
2006		999		

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

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

Objective 8.1 of 1: To distribute books and to provide reading strategies to low-income children, their families, and service providers.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Reading is Fundamental (RIF) will provide books and scientifically based reading services to low-income children at risk of educational failure due to delays in reading.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of low-income children who receive books and reading services through the Reading is Fundamental Program.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee performance report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	3,713,541	999		
2004	3,769,000	3,899,218		
2005		4,089,895		
2006		4,270,572		

## ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.295 - Ready-To-Learn Television

**Program Goal: The Ready-To-Learn Television Program will enhance the learning strategies of preschool and early elementary children.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Develop, produce, and distribute high-quality televised educational programming for preschool and early elementary school children.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>(a) The percentage of children ages three to six years who viewed literacy-based Ready-to-Learn television shows that demonstrate expressive vocabulary skills at or above national norms.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2003</td> <td style="text-align: center;">28.40</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2004</td> <td style="text-align: center;">40</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2005</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">40</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2006</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">45</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	28.40		2004	40		2005		40	2006		45	<p><b>Explanation:</b> "Sesame Street" and "Between the Lions" are the literacy-based Ready-To-Learn programs that have been included for purposes of this measure. Twenty-five percent of Head Start children scored at or above national norms in expressive vocabulary skills and emergent literacy skills. Children participating in full-year Head Start programs who score at or above national norms for expressive vocabulary and emergent literacy skills can be expected to increase by approximately nine percent annually. Unlike Head Start, Ready-To-Learn services are not "full year." Further, at least some children in the Ready-To-Learn target populations achieve at lower baseline levels than comparable populations of children who did participate in the National Head Start study. Ready-To-</p>	<p><b>Source 1: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> National Evaluation.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Head Start Family &amp; Child Experience Survey: Longitudinal Findings on Program Performance 3rd Progress Report.  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 09/30/2003.</p> <p><b>Source 2: Non-NCES</b>  <b>Survey/Research</b>  <b>Collecting Agency:</b> Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.  <b>Survey/Research Report Title:</b> Ready to Learn National Evaluation.  <b>References:</b> Woodcock-Munoz Language Survey Normative Picture Vocab Test &amp; Woodcock-</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
2003	28.40																		
2004	40																		
2005		40																	
2006		45																	
<p><i>(b) The percentage of children ages three to six years who viewed literacy-based Ready-To-Learn television shows that demonstrate emergent literacy skills at or above national norms.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2003</td> <td style="text-align: center;">54.90</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2004</td> <td style="text-align: center;">75</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	54.90		2004	75									
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
2003	54.90																		
2004	75																		

2005		40	<p>Learn services included in this measure have four target populations: children with limited literacy, children with disabilities, children living in rural areas, and children whose primary language is not English.</p>	<p>Munoz Letter-Word Identification test.</p> <p><b>Source 3: Non-NCES Survey/Research</b>  <b>Collecting Agency:</b> WestEd.  <b>Survey/Research Report Title:</b> PBS Ready to Learn Performance Indicator Study of Viewing Effects.  <b>References:</b> Proportion of students age equivalent or higher on the Woodcock-Munoz Language Survey Normative Update Letter-Word Identification test.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005 Mathematica, WestEd, and reviewed by Department of Education staff.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are only being collected on preschool children because it is prohibitively expensive to include elementary school through third grade children. The parents/educators of all children included in this sample attended Ready-To-Learn workshops.</p>
2006		45		

## ESEA: Rural Education - 2006

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

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

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Local educational agencies (LEAs) participating in the Small Rural Schools Achievement (SRSA) Program, will make adequate yearly progress after the third year.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Adequate yearly progress: Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress after three years.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 5 percent.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report, State Report Card, Evaluation Survey, NCES & PBDMI.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
<b>2005</b>				999
<b>2006</b>		999		



**Objective 8.2 of 3: Local educational agencies (LEAs) participating in the Rural and Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program, will make adequate yearly progress after the third year.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Adequate yearly progress: Participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of participating LEAs making adequate yearly progress after three years.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is the baseline plus 5 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report, State Report Card, Evaluation Survey, NCES &amp; PBDMI</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				999
2006				999

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Eligible rural school districts will use the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.**

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Use of the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority will remain high, if not increase.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of eligible school districts utilizing the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2003 data established a baseline. Only districts eligible for the Small Rural Schools Achievement (SRSA) Program are eligible to utilize the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003	61			
2005				65
2006		65		

## ESEA: Special Programs for Indian Children - 2006

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

**Program Goal: Special Programs for Indian Children.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Discretionary programs will focus on improving educational opportunities and services for American Indian and Alaska Native children and adults.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of program participants who become principals/vice principals/school administrators of schools with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Projects for preservice training began in FY 2000 and were completed in FY 2003. Three-year projects for preservice administrative training were first funded in FY 2001 and completed in FY 2004.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Office of Indian Education Project Performance Reports: Schools and Staffing Survey 1999; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools (1998-99 and 2000-01).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> NCES.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Sample size is small and it is costly to add supplemental samples to data collection programs. National sample results in an under-representation in sample count.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Principals	Principals		
<b>2005</b>		20		
<b>2006</b>		20		
<i>The percentage of program participants who become teachers in schools with 25 percent or more American Indian and Alaska Native students.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Teachers	Teachers		
<b>2005</b>		23		
<b>2006</b>		23		

<i>The percentage of program participants who receive full state licensure.</i>			<b>Improvements:</b> Monitor the number of American Indian and Alaska Native students through LEAs' reporting on program effectiveness in their Annual Performance Report.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	
<b>2005</b>		75	
<b>2006</b>		75	

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Discretionary programs will focus on improving educational opportunities and services for Indian children and adults.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Increasing percentages of preschool American Indian and Alaska Native students will possess school readiness skills gained through a scientifically based research designed curriculum that prepares them for kindergarten.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of 3- to 4-year-old American Indian and Alaska Native children achieving educationally significant gains on a measure of language and communication development based on curriculum benchmarks.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> Data collection for this new program began in 2004.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Office of Indian Education Project Performance Reports.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Office of Indian Education performance report data supplied by grantees.  <b>Limitations:</b> Substantial variation will exist in curriculum benchmarks and assessments.	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>				46
<b>2006</b>				46
<i>The percentage of 3- to 4-year-old American Indian and Alaska Native children achieving educationally significant gains on prescribed measure of cognitive skills and conceptual knowledge, including mathematics, science and early reading based on curriculum benchmarks.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2005</b>		46		
<b>2006</b>		46		

<p><i>The percentage of 3- to 4-year-old American Indian and Alaska Native children achieving educationally significant gains on prescribed measure of social development that facilitates self-regulation of attention, behavior and emotion based on curriculum benchmarks.</i></p>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2005		46		
2006		46		
<p><b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Increasing percentages of American Indian and Alaska Native high school graduates will increase competency and skills in challenging subject matters, including mathematics and science, to enable successful transition to postsecondary education.</b></p>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<p><i>The percentage of high school American Indian and Alaska Native students successfully completing (as defined by a passing grade) challenging core courses. Core subjects include English, mathematics, science and social studies.</i></p>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data collection for this new program began in FY 2004. Core subjects include English, mathematics, science, and social studies.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Project Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Office of Indian Education performance report data are supplied by grantees.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Substantial variation may exist in methods used to assess student performance.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2005		46		
2006		46		
<p><i>The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students participating in the program that have college assessment scores (ACT, SAT, PSAT) as high or higher than the district average.</i></p>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2005		46		
2006		46		

## ESEA: State Assessments - 2006

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

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1:** By the 2005-2006 school year, all states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics in grades three through eight and high school and will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (three through five, six through eight and high school) in science, all on which are aligned with their content specific academic content standards.

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 5: Annual Assessments:** All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades three through eight and in high schools in reading/language arts that align with the state's academic content standards.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of states (including DC and PR) that have reading/language arts assessments in grades three through eight and high school.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> States are required to have reading/language arts assessments in grades three through eight and high school by SY 2005-2006. The SY 2006 performance target of 52 is set to reflect the compliance of 50 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. However, no 2004 data can be reported because the Department's review and approval of the state assessments under NCLB begins in February 2005. The approval process will continue through 2006, when state reading/language arts assessments must be implemented.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2004		999		
2005		18		
2006		52		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 5: Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in grades three through eight and in high schools in mathematics that align with the state's academic content standards.															
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
<p><i>The number of states (including DC and PR) that have mathematics assessments in grades three through eight and high school.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>52</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004		999	2005		18	2006		52	<p><b>Explanation:</b> States are required to have mathematics assessments in grades three through eight and high school by FY 2005-2006. The 2006 performance target of 52 is set to reflect the compliance of 50 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The Department's review and approval of the state assessments under NCLB begins in February 2005. The approval process will continue through 2006, when state mathematics assessments must be implemented.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets													
2004		999													
2005		18													
2006		52													

<p><b>Indicator 8.1.3 of 5: Annual Assessments: All states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (three through five, six through eight and high school) in science that align with the state's academic content standards.</b></p>																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The number of states (including DC and PR) that have science assessments in each grade span (grades three through five, six through eight and high school).</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>52</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004		999	2005		18	2006		21	2007		25	2008		52	<p><b>Explanation:</b> States are not required to have science assessments in grades three through eight and high school until FY 2007-08. This performance measure reflects a long-term goal based on requirements set up in NCLB. The FY 2004 target was to establish a baseline. However, no 2004 data can be reported because the Department's review and approval of the state assessments under NCLB begins in February 2005. The approval process will continue through 2008, when state science assessments must be implemented.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Standards and Assessment external peer review process; Title I review processes; staff recommendations; and approval decision by the Secretary.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2004		999																			
2005		18																			
2006		21																			
2007		25																			
2008		52																			



Indicator 8.1.4 of 5: Field testing reading: States' field testing assessments in reading/language arts.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of states that have completed field testing of the required assessments in reading/language arts.</i>			<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Reports and state Web sites  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2003	16		
2004	19		
2005		30	
2006		52	
Indicator 8.1.5 of 5: Field testing mathematics: States' field testing assessments in mathematics.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of states that have completed field testing of the required assessments in mathematics.</i>			<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Reports and state Web sites  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2003	16		
2004	19		
2005		30	
2006		52	

## ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.298 - Innovative Education Program Strategies

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To encourage states to use flexibility authorities in ways that will increase student achievement.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Improved student achievement: School districts that direct Title V funds to activities designated as strategic priorities by the U.S. Department of Education will be more likely to achieve adequate yearly progress (AYP) than those that use funds for all other activities. Strategic priorities include (1) those that support student achievement, enhance reading and math, (2) those that improve the quality of teachers, (3) those that ensure that schools are safe and drug free, (4) and those that promote access for all students.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of LEAs meeting AYP.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> School year 2002-2003 established the baseline. The target for FY 2004 is baseline plus 5 percent. The FY 2005 target is an increase of an additional 1 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State Report Cards; Title V Monitoring; Consolidated State Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> February 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Of districts targeting Title V funds, the percent achieving AYP	Of districts not targeting Title V funds, the percent achieving AYP	Of districts targeting Title V funds, the percent achieving AYP			Of districts not targeting Title V funds, the percent achieving AYP
<b>2003</b>	65	55	65			55
<b>2004</b>			68			58
<b>2005</b>			69			59
<b>2006</b>			70	60		

## ESEA: Teaching American History - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.215X - Teaching of Traditional American History

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Demonstrate the effectiveness of professional development activities for secondary level teachers of American history through the increased achievement of their students.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Students in experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational effectiveness in the Teaching of Traditional American History projects will demonstrate higher achievement on course content measures and/or statewide U.S. history assessments than students in control and comparison groups.**

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
<p><i>(a) The percentage of students in studies of educational effectiveness who demonstrate higher achievement than those in control or comparison groups.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2004</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2006</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>2004</b>		999	<b>2005</b>		999	<b>2006</b>		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> (a) The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1 percent; the FY 2006 target is to maintain the FY 2005 target. (b) The FY 2004 data will establish a baseline. The target for FY 2005 is the baseline plus 1 percent. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the FY 2005 target.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report</b>  <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b>                      Teaching American History Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> July 2005</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets												
<b>2004</b>		999												
<b>2005</b>		999												
<b>2006</b>		999												
<p><i>(b) The percentage of school districts that demonstrate higher educational achievement for students in TAH classrooms than those in control or comparison groups.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2006</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>2005</b>		999	<b>2006</b>		999					
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets												
<b>2005</b>		999												
<b>2006</b>		999												

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

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

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

**Objective 8.1 of 2: The performance of low-income students will increase substantially in reading and mathematics.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade low-income students meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in reading on state assessments.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">25</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>2006</b></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>2005</b>		25	<b>2006</b>		25	<p><b>Explanation:</b> School year 2002-2003 was the first year for which states were required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report. Actual performance data for FY 2005 will be obtained by comparing school year 2004-2005 data to school year 2003-2004 data. The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The 2006 target is to maintain the target from the previous year.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> No Child Left Behind; Consolidated State Report; Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
<b>2005</b>		25											
<b>2006</b>		25											

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Eighth-grade mathematics proficiency: The number of states administering eighth-grade mathematics assessments that report an increase in the percentage of low-income students who perform at either the proficient or advanced performance levels will increase annually.												
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade low-income students meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in mathematics on state assessments.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		25	2006		25	<p><b>Explanation:</b> School year 2002-2003 was the first year for which states were required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report. Actual performance data for FY 2005 will be obtained by comparing school year 2004-2005 data to school year 2003-2004 data.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report, Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI). <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets										
2005		25										
2006		25										

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) Status**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Making AYP: The number of states that report an increase in schools making AYP.												
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of schools making AYP.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		10	2006		20	<p><b>Explanation:</b> School year 2002-2003 was the first year for which states were required to report data through the NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report. Actual performance data for FY 2005 will be obtained by comparing school year 2004-2005 data to school year 2003-2004 data.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report; PBDMI <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets										
2005		10										
2006		20										

## ESEA: Transition To Teaching - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.350 - Transition to Teaching

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Recruit and retain highly qualified teachers in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>a) The percentage of all Transition to Teaching (TTT) participants who become highly qualified teachers and teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> For measures (a) and (b), FY 2003 data established the baselines. For measure (c), the FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline. The denominator for measure (c) is the total number of Transition to Teaching (TTT) participants who began teaching three years prior to the reporting year. Under the TTT program, all participants are required to serve in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for at least three years. (ED will use the statutory definitions of high-need schools and high-need LEAs). For measure (b), mathematics and science represent high-need subject areas. There was no target established for FY 2004.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report</b>  <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b> Transition to Teaching Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Each grantee uses its own method of recording and reporting data, and inconsistencies exist. ED expects to pilot a uniform reporting system in 2005. This system is expected to improve data quality over time but may require adjustments to the performance targets</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	2002 Grant	2004 Grant	2002 Grant			2004 Grant
<b>2003</b>	54					
<b>2005</b>			70			
<b>2006</b>			80			70
<i>(b) The percentage of participants who become highly qualified mathematics or science teachers.</i>						
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	2002 Grant	2004 Grant	2002 Grant	2004 Grant		
<b>2003</b>	19					
<b>2005</b>			25			

<b>2006</b>		25	25				
<i>(c) The percentage of highly qualified Transition to Teaching teachers who teach in high-need schools in high-need LEAs for at least three years.</i>							
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>				
	2002 Grant	2004 Grant	2002 Grant	2004 Grant			
<b>2006</b>			999				
<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: The percentage of Transition to Teaching teachers who receive full state certification or licensure will increase.</b>							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of teachers receiving full certification/licensure.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> This measure applies to the Transition to Teaching program under NCLB, which differs from the previous program and its measure. The FY 2004 data will establish the baseline. The target for 2005 is the baseline plus 1 percent. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the FY 2005 target.</p>		<p><b>Source: Performance Report</b>  <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b> Transition to Teaching Grantee Performance Report.   <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>					<b>Performance Targets</b>	
<b>2005</b>						999	
<b>2006</b>			999				

## ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.815 - Troops to Teachers

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To provide schools in high-need LEAs with highly qualified teachers who are former military or reserve component personnel.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Recruitment: Recruit and retain highly qualified teachers in high-need LEAs.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The denominator has changed from "recruits" to "participants." For measures (a) and (b), FY 2003 data established the baseline. Measure (a) is the total number of highly qualified Troops teachers since January 2002, when NCLB was passed, divided by the total number of Troops participants since January 2002. Measure (b) is the total number of highly qualified math or science Troops teachers since January 2002 divided by the total number of Troops participants since January 2002. FY 2003 data for measures (a) and (b) were recalculated using the above definitions and corrected from those reported in the FY 2005 Program Performance Plan. Data were previously reported for FY 2003 for measure (c) incorrectly as it only reflected an</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report</b> <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b> Troops to Teachers Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> DANTES annual performance reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> November 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
<i>(a) The percentage of participants who become highly qualified teachers.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	71			
2004	76			
2005		75		
2006		75		
<i>(b) The percentage of participants who become highly qualified math or science teachers.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	19			
2004	22			
2005		28		
2006		30		



<p><i>(c) The percentage of Troops-to-Teachers participants who remain in teaching for three or more years after placement in a teaching position in a high-need LEA.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Year</b></th> <th><b>Actual Performance</b></th> <th><b>Performance Targets</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>2005</b></td> <td></td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2006</b></td> <td></td> <td>80</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	<b>2005</b>		80	<b>2006</b>		80	<p>assessment after one, rather than three, years of teaching. Measure (c) is the total number of highly qualified Troops who teach for three or more years in high-need LEAs since January 2002 divided by the total number of highly qualified Troops teachers since January 2002. The first data point for this measure will be taken in June 2005, which will indicate the number of Troops who are still teaching in high-need LEAs after three years.</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>											
<b>2005</b>		80											
<b>2006</b>		80											

## ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.361 - Voluntary Public School Choice

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

**Objective 8.1 of 1: The Voluntary Public School Choice Program increases options for public school choice.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>(a) The number of students who have the option of attending participating VPSC schools selected by their parents.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2004</td> <td style="text-align: center;">755,148</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2005</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">849,864</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2006</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">846,523</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2007</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">843,384</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004	755,148		2005		849,864	2006		846,523	2007		843,384	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2004 data established the baselines for measures (a) and (b). The number of students who have the option of attending participating VPSC schools is the total of all students eligible to apply for the transfers. In some instances, grantees may not have slots available for all students applying for a transfer. For example, VPSC in Chicago includes 23 schools, but the transfer option is offered districtwide. Nine sites reported that 3,694 students transferred under VPSC. The percentage of students participating in VPSC (b) is the percentage who transfer among those eligible to participate across the 13 total grants. For measure (a), the performance target is estimated number of participating students when projects are fully implemented, excluding Florida for which no</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report</b>  <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b> Voluntary Public School Choice Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Evaluation of the Voluntary Public School Choice Program</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> November 2005</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
2004	755,148																		
2005		849,864																	
2006		846,523																	
2007		843,384																	
<p><i>(b) The percentage of students participating at each VPSC site who exercise school choice by changing schools.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2004</td> <td style="text-align: center;">11</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2005</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2006</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">16</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004	11		2005		13	2006		16					
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
2004	11																		
2005		13																	
2006		16																	

	estimate was possible. The targets for numbers reflect anticipated full implementation but decrease over time because of predicted declining enrollments in some grantee sites.	
--	---	--

## ESRA: Comprehensive Centers - 2006

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

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the quality of technical assistance.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: High quality: The percentage of products and services (such as professional development, problem solving, and networking) that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified stakeholders.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<i>The percentage of products and services that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified stakeholders.</i>								
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="width: 45%; text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 40%; text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2006</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Reviews by independent review panel.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Source information will be based upon report of independent review panel.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2006		999						

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: High relevance: The percentage of products and services (such as professional development, problem solving, and networking) that are deemed to be of high relevance by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational practice by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Reviews by independent review panel.  <b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Source information will be based upon report of independent review panel.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2006				999

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Technical assistance products and services will be used to improve results for children in the target areas.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Use: The percentage of all products and services (such as professional development, problem solving, and networking) that are deemed to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice by target audiences.</b>			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	
<i>The percentage of all products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice by target audiences.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY2007 target is to establish a baseline.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Source information will be based upon a survey of target audiences.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2006 - 2007  <b>Data Available:</b> February 2007  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2007</b>			999

## HEA: High School Equivalency Program - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.141A - High School Equivalency Program

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

**Objective 8.1 of 2: An increasing percentage of HEP participants will receive their General Educational Development (GED) diploma.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: GED completion: By 2010, 70 percent of High School Equivalency Program (HEP) participants will receive the GED.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>The percentage of HEP participants receiving a GED.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The long term goal for this program is that by 2010, 70 percent of participants will receive a GED. This measure differs from the FY 2005 performance measure in focusing on the percentage of participants who receive the GED, rather than complete the program and receive the GED, to more accurately reflect data collected from grantees.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> OME is working with grantees to provide detailed information within the annual performance reports.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996	70			
1997	70			
1998	66			
1999	72			
2000	73			
2001	58			
2002	53			
2003	63	60		
2004		60		
2005		65		
2006		66		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: An increasing percentage of HEP participants in the GED will enter postsecondary education programs, career positions, or the military.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Post-GED placement: The percentage of HEP participants who earn the GED and enter postsecondary education programs, career positions, or the military will continue to be high, if not increase.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress						
Sources and Data Quality								
<p><i>The percentage of HEP participants who earn the GED and enter postsecondary education programs, career positions, or the military.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2007  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2006		999						



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

**CFDA Number:** 84.181 - Special Education\_Grants for Infants and Families with Disabilities

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

**Objective 8.1 of 2: The functional development of infants and toddlers will be enhanced by early intervention services.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Functional abilities: The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in the Part C program who demonstrate positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and demonstrate appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</b>																				
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in Part C who demonstrate positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and demonstrate appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2006</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2007</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">70</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2008</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">75</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2009</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">80</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2010</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">85</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	2007		70	2008		75	2009		80	2010		85	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Part C Annual Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2007 OSEP is currently determining a data collection methodology for this indicator.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																		
2006		999																		
2007		70																		
2008		75																		
2009		80																		
2010		85																		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Family capacity: The percentage of families participating in Part C that report that early intervention services have increased their capacity to enhance their child's development.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have increased their capacity.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 1998 data established the baseline. Data for 1998 and 2001 were obtained from the IDEA National Early Intervention Study (NEILS). No data will be collected FY 2002-2006.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Part C Annual Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2006 - 2007</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2007</p> <p>OSEP is currently determining a data collection methodology for this indicator.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
1998	72			
2001	73			
2002				80
2003				80
2004				80
2005				80
2006				80
2007				80
2008				83
2009				87
2010		90		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: All infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families will receive early intervention services in natural environments that meet their individual needs.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: Infants served: The number of states that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under age one through Part C.																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The number of states that serve at least one percent of infants in the general population under age one through Part C.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>21</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>23</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>23</td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>27</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	21		2003	23		2004	23	37	2005		27	2006		27	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2002 data established the baseline. The 1 percent threshold in this indicator is based on the prevalence rates of 5 conditions: 0.4 percent, severe mental retardation; 0.2 percent, hearing impairment; 0.1 percent, visual impairment; 0.2 percent, physical conditions (spinal bifida, cerebral palsy, etc.); and 0.1 percent, autism. Actual performance data previously reported for FY 2001-2003 reflected performance in FY 2002-2004 and have been corrected here.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under Part C of IDEA and U.S. census data.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2002	21																				
2003	23																				
2004	23	37																			
2005		27																			
2006		27																			
<p><b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: Infants and toddlers served: The number of states that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, through Part C.</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>25</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>27</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>28</td> <td>40</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	25		2003	27	20	2004	28	40								
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2002	25																				
2003	27	20																			
2004	28	40																			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The number of states that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, through Part C.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>25</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>27</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>28</td> <td>40</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	25		2003	27	20	2004	28	40	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2002 data established the baseline. Actual performance data previously reported for FY 2001-2003 reflected performance in FY 2002-2004 and have been corrected here.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under IDEA Section 618 and U.S. census data.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring</p>						
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2002	25																				
2003	27	20																			
2004	28	40																			
<p><b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: Infants and toddlers served: The number of states that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, through Part C.</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>25</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>27</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>28</td> <td>40</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	25		2003	27	20	2004	28	40								
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2002	25																				
2003	27	20																			
2004	28	40																			

2005		31		By ED.
2006		31		
<b>Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: Service settings: The percentage of children receiving early intervention services in home or in programs designed for typically developing peers.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of children receiving early intervention services in home or in programs designed for typically developing peers.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> FY 1996 data established the baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> August 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
1996	56			
1997	58			
1998	63			
1999	67			
2000	73	67		
2001	76	69		
2002	82	71		
2003	83	78		
2004		79		
2005		83		
2006		84		
2007		85		
2008		86		
2009		87		
2010		88		

## IDEA: Special Education Grants to States - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.027 - Special Education\_Grants to States

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

**Objective 8.1 of 3: All children with disabilities will meet challenging standards as determined by national and state assessments with accommodations as appropriate.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic in reading on the NAEP.</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCES (NAEP).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> November 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> NCES.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Results of the NAEP scores for students with disabilities from this sample cannot be generalized to the total population of such students.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	23			
2002	29	33		
2003	29	35		
2005		35		
2007		35		
<i>The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic in mathematics on the NAEP.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2000	26			
2003	29	28		
2005		32		
2007		32		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Exclusion from NAEP: The percentage of students excluded from NAEP due to their disability.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			<p><b>Explanation:</b> For mathematics, the percentage excluded from NAEP includes public and private school students. For reading, it includes only public school students.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCES</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> November 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> NCES.</p>
<i>The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities who are excluded from the NAEP.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2000	4			
2002	5			
2003	5			
2005		5		
2007		4		
<i>The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities who are excluded from the NAEP.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2000	3			
2003	3			
2005		3		
2007		3		

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Performance on state assessments: The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above on state assessments.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in reading on state assessments.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		25	2006		25	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> OESE Consolidated State Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> January 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
2005		25											
2006		25											
<p><i>The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by achieving proficiency or above in mathematics on state assessments.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		25	2006		25		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets											
2005		25											
2006		25											

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Secondary school students will complete high school prepared for independent living and postsecondary education and/or competitive employment.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of students with disabilities who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Starting with 2004, we changed the method for calculating graduation rates. The graduation rate is now calculated by dividing the number of students with disabilities age 14 and older who graduated with a regular diploma by the total number of students with disabilities in the same age group who are known to have left school (i.e., graduated with a regular diploma, received a certificate of completion, reached the maximum age for services, died, dropped out, or moved (not known to have continued)). This includes calculations for 57 entities (50 states, DC, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, N. Marianas and BIA). The "Actual Performance" was revised accordingly back to 1996. No target was set for FY 2004.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under IDEA Section 618. The denominator includes graduation with diploma or certificate, dropout, maximum age, deceased, and not known to continue.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> August 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1996	42			
1997	43			
1998	45			
1999	47			
2000	46			
2001	48			
2002	51			
2003	52			
2005		54		
2006		55		
2007		56		
2008		57		
2009		58		
2010		59		



Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: Dropout rate: The percentage of students with disabilities who drop out of school.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of students with disabilities who drop out of school.</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Starting with 2004, the program changed the method for calculating graduation rates. The dropout rate is now calculated by dividing the number of students with disabilities age 14 and older who dropped out or moved (not known to have continued in education) by the total number of students with disabilities in the same age group who are known to have left school (i.e., graduated with a regular diploma, received a certificate of completion, reached the maximum age for services, died, dropped out, or moved (not known to have continued)). This includes calculations for 57 entities (50 states, DC, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, N. Marianas and BIA). The "Actual Performance" data were revised accordingly back to 1996. No target was set for FY 2004.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> August 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
1996	47		
1997	46		
1998	44		
1999	42		
2000	42		
2001	41		
2002	38		
2003	34		
2005		34	
2006		33	
2007		32	
2008		31	
2009		30	
2010		29	

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
<p><i>The percentage of children with disabilities who are either competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within two years of leaving high school.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>59</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>59.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004	59		2005		59.50	2006		60	<p><b>Explanation:</b> National Longitudinal Transition Study I (NLTS - I) was conducted from SY 1986-87 (N= 52 percent). NLTS II was conducted from SY 2003-04 (N = 59 percent). No target was set for FY 2004.</p>	<p><b>Source: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> National Evaluation.  <b>Sponsor:</b> OSEP.  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 09/30/2002.  <b>Additional Source Information:</b> Postsecondary Outcomes Center  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets														
2004	59															
2005		59.50														
2006		60														

**Objective 8.3 of 3: All children with disabilities will receive a free appropriate public education.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																																				
<p><i>The number of states with at least 90 percent of special education teachers fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>35</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>36</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>37</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>36</td> <td>41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>36</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>37</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>33</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>30</td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>40</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1996	35		1997	36		1998	37		1999	36	41	2000	36	42	2001	37	42	2002	33	42	2003	30	37	2004		37	2005		39	2006		40	<p><b>Explanation:</b> There is a clustering of states around the 90 percent threshold in this indicator, which may result in unpredictable changes from year to year.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under IDEA section 618.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> August 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data reflect grades 1-12, not teachers teaching children aged 6-21. State maintain data by grades taught, not ages of students. State requirements for teacher certification vary widely (i.e., teachers fully certified in one state might not be considered eligible for full certification in another state).</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> OSEP is planning to collect data on related services personnel, possibly through a follow-up to an existing study (SPeNSE).</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																						
1996	35																																							
1997	36																																							
1998	37																																							
1999	36	41																																						
2000	36	42																																						
2001	37	42																																						
2002	33	42																																						
2003	30	37																																						
2004		37																																						
2005		39																																						
2006		40																																						

Indicator 8.3.2 of 3: Highly qualified teachers under NCLB: The number of special education teachers who teach core academic subjects that are highly qualified, consistent with NCLB.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of special education teachers who teach core academic subjects who are highly qualified.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State reported data</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> NCES does not collect data on highly qualified teachers because there is no standard definition.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				999
2006				999

Indicator 8.3.3 of 3: Services outside the regular classroom: The percentage of children aged 6 to 21 served outside of the regular classroom 60 percent or more of the day because of their disability.																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The percentage of children served outside of the regular classroom 60 percent or more of the day due to their disability (as a percentage of the school population).</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>2.85</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>2.81</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>2.77</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>2.69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>2.65</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	2.85		2002	2.81		2003	2.77		2005		2.69	2006		2.65	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2001 data established the baseline. There was no target set for FY 2004.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b>                      Numerator: State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.                      Denominator: U.S. Census</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> August 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2001	2.85																				
2002	2.81																				
2003	2.77																				
2005		2.69																			
2006		2.65																			

## IDEA: Special Education Parent Information Centers - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.328 - Special Education\_Parent Information Centers

**Program Goal: To provide training and information to parents of children with disabilities.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the quality of parent training and information projects.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: High-quality products and services: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services will increase.</b>											
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<i>The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high quality.</i>											
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2005</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2006</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Expert panel.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets									
2005		999									
2006		999									

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Parent Training Information Centers' products and services will be used to improve results for children with disabilities in the target areas.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: Relevance: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the target audiences of the information will increase.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of products and services judged to be of high relevance.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Stakeholder panel review.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>				999
<b>2006</b>				999
<b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: Use: The percentage of all products and services used by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice will increase.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of all products and services used by target audiences.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Sample of recipients of products and services.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>				999

<b>Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: Cost per output: The cost per output defined as cost per unit of technical assistance, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating will decrease.</b>		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress
Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The cost per unit of technical assistance.</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>		999
		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>



## IDEA: Special Education Personnel Preparation - 2006

**CFDA Number:** 84.325 - Special Education\_Personnel Preparation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

**Program Goal: To prepare service providers and leadership personnel in areas of critical need who are highly qualified to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the curricula of IDEA training programs to ensure that personnel preparing to serve children with disabilities are knowledgeable and skilled in practices that reflect the current knowledge base.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Research-based curriculum: The percentage of projects incorporating evidence-based curriculum will increase.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of projects incorporating evidence-based curriculum.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Researcher/expert panel review of a sample of program curricula.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>				999
<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Knowledgeable and skilled scholars: The percentage of scholars who are knowledgeable and skilled in evidence-based practices will increase.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of scholars who are knowledgeable and skilled in evidence-based practices.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Sample of scholars.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>				999

	<p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
--	--

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the supply of teachers and service providers who are highly qualified for and serve in positions for which they are trained.**

<p><b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 4: Scholars exiting program: The percentage of scholars who exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance will decrease.</b></p>																	
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>															
<p><i>The percentage of scholars who exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	2006		999						
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets															
2005		999															
2006		999															
<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> IDEA - Part D- Personnel Preparation Annual Data Report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>																	
<p><b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 4: Scholars employed upon completion: The percentage of degree/certification program scholars who are employed upon program completion in the area(s) for which they were trained will increase.</b></p>																	
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>															
<p><i>The percentage of degree/certification program scholars who are employed upon program completion in the area(s) for which they were trained.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>79</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>85</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	79		2005		82	2006		83	2007		85
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets															
2003	79																
2005		82															
2006		83															
2007		85															
<p><b>Explanation:</b> No target was set for FY 2004.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> IDEA- Part D - Personnel Preparation Annual Data Report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> February 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>																	

2008		86		
2009		88		
2010		89		
<b>Indicator 8.2.3 of 4: Scholars employed and fully qualified: The percentage of degree/certification program completers who are employed upon program completion in the area(s) for which they were trained and are fully qualified under IDEA as appropriate will increase.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of degree/certification program completers who are employed upon program completion in the area(s) for which they were trained and are fully qualified under IDEA.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> IDEA- Part D - Personnel Preparation Annual Data Report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2005		999		
2006		999		
<b>Indicator 8.2.4 of 4: Scholars employed three or more years: The percentage of degree/ certification scholars who maintain employment beyond program completion for three or more years in the area(s) for which they were trained will increase.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of degree/certification scholars who maintain employment beyond program completion for three or more years in the area(s) for which they were trained.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> This is a new measure. The FY 2008 target is to establish a baseline. Baseline data will reflect scholars who have taught for a minimum of three years beyond program completion in the areas for which they were trained. Therefore these data will not be reported until FY 2008.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Sample of scholars in the field - post completion.  <b>Frequency:</b> Other. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2008 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2008 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2008		999		

## IDEA: Special Education Preschool Grants - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.173 - Special Education\_Preschool Grants

**Program Goal: To help preschool children with disabilities enter school ready to succeed by assisting states in providing special education and related services.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Preschool children with disabilities will receive special education and related services that result in increased skills that enable them to succeed in school.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Service setting: The percentage of children receiving special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of children with disabilities receiving special education and related services with typically developing peers (early childhood settings and home).</i>				<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> August 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> OSEP is planning to change the data collection by 2006-07 to reflect where the child spends most of his or her time, as opposed to where the child is receiving special education services.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999	41			
2000	40			
2001	39			
2002	40	39		
2003	38	40		
2004	37	40		
2005		41		
2006		42		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Certified preschool special education teachers under IDEA: The number of states with at least 90 percent of preschool special education teachers fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching.																																				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																																	
<p><i>The number of states with at least 90 percent of special education teachers of children aged three to five who are fully certified in the area in which they are teaching.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>34</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>35</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>37</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>34</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>36</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>35</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>34</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>32</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>38</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1996	34		1997	35		1998	37		1999	34		2000	36		2001	35		2002	34		2003	32		2005		37	2006		38	<p><b>Explanation:</b> There is a clustering of states around the 90 percent threshold in this indicator, which may result in unpredictable changes from year to year. No target was set for FY 2004.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State-reported data under IDEA Section 618.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> August 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> States maintain data by grades taught, not by ages of students taught. Therefore, these data are for teachers teaching prekindergarten and kindergarten.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Certification of related services personnel are not included because those requirements vary even more widely than requirements for teachers (e.g., some states certify sign language interpreters, but other states do not). OSEP will implement follow-up actions regarding increasing emphasis on related services personnel; possibly follow-up on SPeNSE study.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																		
1996	34																																			
1997	35																																			
1998	37																																			
1999	34																																			
2000	36																																			
2001	35																																			
2002	34																																			
2003	32																																			
2005		37																																		
2006		38																																		

<p><b>Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Functional abilities: The percentage of children with disabilities aged three through five participating in the Preschool Grants program who demonstrate positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and demonstrate appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</b></p>							
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>		<p>Assessment of Progress</p>					
<p><i>The percentage of children with disabilities aged three through five participating in the Preschool Grants program who demonstrate positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and demonstrate appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</i></p>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> This indicator focuses on early language/ communication, early literacy and social-emotional skills because these skills are the best indicators of success in later years. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>					
<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Initial data for 2005 from the IDEA Pre-elementary Education Longitudinal Study (PEELS). Subsequent years' data collection methodology will be determined through the Early Childhood Outcome Center and will use state-reported data under the Annual Performance Reports and IDEA section 618.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2007 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>							
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year		Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets					
2006		999					

## IDEA: Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.326 - Special Education\_Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

**Program Goal: To assist states and their partners in systems improvement through the integration of scientific-based practices.**

Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the quality of technical assistance and dissemination projects.

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: High-quality products and services: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products will increase.</b>		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress
<i>The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high quality.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Panel of Experts</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	
<b>2005</b>	999	
<b>2006</b>	999	

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Technical assistance and dissemination products and services will be used to improve results for children with disabilities in the target areas.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: Relevance: The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the target audiences for the technical assistance and disseminations will increase.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of products and services deemed to be of high relevance.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Stakeholder panel review of approved application material.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2005</b>				999
<b>2006</b>				999
<b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: Use: The percentage of all products and services used by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice will increase.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of all products and services used by target audiences.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Sample of recipients of products and services.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
<b>2006</b>				999



<b>Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: Cost per output: Cost per output (defined as cost per unit of technical assistance, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating) will decrease.</b>		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress
<i>The cost per unit of technical assistance.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	
<b>2006</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	
		999
		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Panel of experts.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>

## IDEA: Special Education Technology and Media Services - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.327 - Special Education\_Technology and Media Services for Individuals with Disabilities

**Program Goal: To promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology and media services to improve results for children with disabilities.**

Objective 8.1 of 3: Increase the relevance of research in technology to address the needs of children with disabilities.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of technology research projects judged to be of high relevance.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b>                      Primary source:                      Researcher/expert panel review of grant applications.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
2006		999		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the quality of technology research and technical assistance and dissemination projects.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: High quality: The percentage of technology research projects judged to be of high quality will increase.												
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>The percentage of newly funded technology research proposals judged to be of high quality.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Statistician panel of approved grant applications.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets										
2005		999										
2006		999										
Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: High quality: The percentage of technology technical assistance and dissemination projects judged to be of high quality will increase.												
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>The percentage of technology technical assistance and dissemination projects judged to be of high quality.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Statistician panel of approved grant applications.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets										
2006		999										

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Products and services will be used to improve results for children with disabilities.**

<b>Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Useful products: The percentage of technology technical assistance and dissemination products and services used by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention or practice will increase.</b>		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress
<i>The percentage of technology projects that produce findings, products, and/or services that contribute to improving results for children with disabilities.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	
<b>2006</b>	999	
		<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Final reports  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.

## MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.196 - Education for Homeless Children and Youth

**Program Goal: To ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education as is provided to other children and youth.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Homeless children and youth will have greater access to a free and appropriate public education.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: State assessment participation: Percentage of homeless students that participate annually in the state assessments in reading and mathematics will increase.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of homeless children and youth, grades three through eight, included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics as reported by LEA subgrantees.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2002 data established the baseline from a one-time data collection. However, the 2002 results could not be disaggregated by subject matter. Beginning with 2004, data were reported disaggregated by subject matter.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> The data to be collected from states are from LEAs that have subgrantees and are capable of reporting such data. However, approximately 10 percent of all school districts receive subgrant funds.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> November 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data collected by state assessments are validated by the individual state's data quality standards procedures. Data will reflect information principally from LEAs with McKinney-Vento</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets				
	Reading	Math	Reading				Math
<b>2004</b>	16	15					
<b>2005</b>			17				16
<b>2006</b>			18	17			

		<p>subgrants.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Prior to 2006, data were not a statutory requirement; beginning 2006, data on program improvement are required from states.</p>																													
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: State assessment achievement: The percentage of homeless students meeting or exceeding state's proficiency level or standard in reading and mathematics.</b></p>																															
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>	<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>																													
<p><i>The percentage of homeless students, grades three through eight, meeting or exceeding state proficiency standards in reading/language arts and mathematics.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Year</th> <th colspan="2">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="2">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Reading</th> <th>Math</th> <th>Reading</th> <th>Math</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>30</td> <td>24</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>36</td> <td>36</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>34</td> <td>26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>37</td> <td>37</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		Reading	Math	Reading	Math	2002	30	24			2004	36	36			2005			34	26	2006			37	37	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2002 data established the baseline from a one-time data collection. Data were not collected in 2003.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> November 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data collected by state assessments are validated by the individual state's data quality standards procedures. Data will reflect information principally from LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.</p>
Year		Actual Performance		Performance Targets																											
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math																											
2002	30	24																													
2004	36	36																													
2005			34	26																											
2006			37	37																											
		<p><b>Limitations:</b> There is no statutory requirement for annual data collections to determine year-to-year progress.</p>																													

# Goal 3

## ESEA: Character Education – 2006

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.215S - Partnerships in Character Education Program  
84.215V - Partnerships in Character Education

**Program Goal: To help promote the development of strong character among the nation's students.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Support the development and implementation of high-quality character education programs.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality			
<i>The proportion of Partnerships in Character Education projects demonstrating improved student outcomes through valid, rigorous evaluations.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> A subset of grantees evaluate their projects using either experimental or quasi-experimental designs. Evaluation reports will not be available annually. For each cohort, no target will be established for years in which evaluation reports are not due. Future year targets will be established as baseline data become available. The FY 2006 target is to set a baseline for the 2004 cohort, the FY 2007 target is to set a baseline for the 2005 cohort, and the FY 2008 target is to set the baseline for the 2006 cohort.</p>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Review of biennial evaluation reports included in program files. Because of different grant cohorts, information will be available each year for one or more cohorts, but data related to each cohort are collected biennially.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> While all grantees are required to conduct evaluations, only those responding to the competitive</p>			
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets							
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort					2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
<b>2006</b>								999		
<b>2007</b>								999		
<b>2008</b>				999						



		<p>preference for rigorous evaluations are actually conducting valid, rigorous evaluations. Thus, only a subset of Character Education grantees are actually reflected in the data collected under this measure. Evaluation results will be available after two years and at the completion of the each project.</p>
--	--	--

## ESEA: Mentoring Program - 2006

**CFDA Number:** 84.184B - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Mentoring Program

**Program Goal: To support mentoring programs and activities for children who are at risk of educational failure, dropping out of school, or involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide grants to community-based organizations and local school districts to support mentoring programs for high-risk youth.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Sustained mentoring matches: Proportion of student-mentor matches that are sustained for over one year.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of student-mentor matches that are sustained by the grantees for a period of 12 months.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort
<b>2006</b>			999	
<b>2007</b>			999	
		<p><b>Explanation:</b> No target is established for a cohort in the first year after award because grant sites will need to have operated for a minimum of 12 months in order to produce any student-mentor matches that meet the criteria established for this measure. The FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline for the 2004 cohort, and the FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline for the 2005 cohort.</p>		
		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Grantee Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Improved academic achievement: The proportion of mentored students demonstrating improved academic competencies.										
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality					
<i>The percentage of mentored students who demonstrate improvement in core academic subjects as measured by grade point average after 12 months.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort, and the FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.		<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Grantee Performance Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006					
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets			
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort					2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort		
2006							999			
2007			999							
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Unexcused absences: Proportion of mentored students with unexcused absences.										
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality					
<i>The percentage of mentored students who have unexcused absences from school.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort. The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline for the 2006 cohort.		<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Grantee Performance Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.					
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets			
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort					2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
2005								999		
2006				999						
2007				999						

## ESEA: Physical Education Program - 2006

**CFDA Number:** 84.215F - Carol M. White Physical Education Program

**Program Goal: To promote physical activity and healthy lifestyles for students.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Support the implementation of effective physical education programs and strategies.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Meeting state physical education standards: Program evaluations will demonstrate program activities are helping grantees meet state standards for physical education.</b>										
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality			
<i>The percentage of students served by the grant who make progress toward meeting state standards for physical education.</i>				<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish the baseline for the 2004 cohort, the FY 2006 target is to establish the baseline for the 2005 cohort, and the FY 2007 target is to establish the baseline for the 2006 cohort.			<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Grantee Performance Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.			
Year	Actual Performance							Performance Targets		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort					2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
<b>2005</b>								999		
<b>2006</b>								999		
<b>2007</b>				999						
<i>The percentage of students served by the grant actively participating in physical education activities.</i>										
Year	Actual Performance							Performance Targets		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort					2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
<b>2005</b>								999		
<b>2006</b>								999		
<b>2007</b>				999						

## ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Other National Programs - 2006

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.184D - Student Drug Testing  
 84.184L - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Safe Schools/Healthy Students Program

**Program Goal: To help ensure that schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug- and violence-prevention strategies.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grantees will demonstrate substantial progress in improving student behaviors and school environments.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Safe Schools/Healthy Students: Extent to which grantees demonstrate substantial progress in improving student behaviors and school environments.</b>						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that experience a decrease in the number of violent incidents at schools during the three-year grant period.</i>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
<b>2005</b>				999		
<b>2006</b>				999		
<b>2007</b>				999		
				<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2004 cohort. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort. The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline for the 2006 cohort.		<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Grantee Performance Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.

<i>The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that experience a decrease in substance abuse during the three-year grant period.</i>						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
<b>2005</b>				999		
<b>2006</b>					999	
<b>2007</b>						999
<i>The percentage of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant sites that improve school attendance during the three-year grant period.</i>						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort	2004 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2006 Cohort
<b>2005</b>				999		
<b>2006</b>					999	
<b>2007</b>						999

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Student drug testing grantees will make substantial progress in reducing substance abuse incidence among target students.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Student drug testing: Proportion of grantees that experience an annual reduction in the incidence of drug use by students in the target population.				Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a five percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-month drug use by students in the target population.</i>						<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for the 2003 cohort; FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for the 2005 cohort.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Grantee Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets						
	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort					
<b>2005</b>			999						
<b>2006</b>			999						
<i>The percentage of Student Drug Testing grantees that experience a five percent annual reduction in the incidence of past-year drug use by students in the target population.</i>									
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets						
	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort	2003 Cohort	2005 Cohort					
<b>2005</b>			999						
<b>2006</b>			999						





# Goal 4

## ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination – 2006

CFDA Number: 84.305 - Education Research

**Program Goal: Transform education into an evidence-based field.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Raise the quality of research funded or conducted by the Department.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: The percentage of new research proposals funded by Institute of Education Sciences that receive an average score of excellent or higher from an independent review panel of qualified scientists.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>The percentage of new research proposals funded by the Department's National Center for Education Research that receive an average score of excellent or higher from an independent review panel of qualified scientists.</i>				<b>Additional Source Information:</b> The average panel review score for each newly funded IES research proposal will be calculated.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		<b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the peer review panel. Inclusion of only senior scientists leading researchers in their fields ensures the quality of the data.
<b>2003</b>	88			
<b>2004</b>	97			
<b>2005</b>		100		
<b>2006</b>		100		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Whether or not the modal rating (most common judgment) of an independent review panel of qualified scientists is that new research and evaluation publications by IES are of high quality.																		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>Whether or not the modal rating (most common judgment) of an independent review panel of qualified scientists is that new research and evaluation publications by IES are of high quality. (Data tables will indicate "2" for "Yes," "1" for "No," and "0" for "No New Publications/evaluations issued.")</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	0		2004	0		2005		2	2006		2	<p><b>Explanation:</b> This measure was changed from focusing on percentages of publications deemed to be of high quality to focusing on whether or not the modal response (most common judgment) of the review panel is that new IES publications are of high quality. This alteration is because the number of IES research and evaluation publications is currently quite small. With very small numbers, percentages are not very meaningful, because changes in one or two reports can translate into large changes in percentages. In this case, focusing on whether the most common rating is that publications are of high quality is a more meaningful indication of the overall judgment of the review panel. No new research/evaluation publications were issued in 2003 or 2004.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> IES selects a random sample of new research and evaluation publications from IES. Publications are distributed to senior scientists in the field for review. Data will be collected annually.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p>Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel. Inclusion of only eminent senior scientists who are distinguished professors in their institutions, editors of premier research journals, and leading researchers in education and special education assures the quality of the data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																
2003	0																	
2004	0																	
2005		2																
2006		2																

Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the IES that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.																								
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>Of new research and evaluation projects funded by the Department's National Center of Education Research that address causal questions, the percentage of projects that employ randomized experimental designs.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>32</td> <td>32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>100</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>97</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>90</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	32	32	2002	100	75	2003	97	75	2004	90	75	2005		75	2006		75		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b>                      IES researchers evaluate all newly funded research and evaluation proposals by IES to identify projects that address causal questions and of those projects, those that use randomized experimental designs to answer those questions. Data will be collected annually. The 75 percent target for 2002-2006 recognizes that some high-quality research addressing causal questions will not be able to employ randomized experimental designs.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the proposal reviewers. Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as having two IES researchers independently evaluate a subset of proposals (with minimum inter-rater</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																						
2001	32	32																						
2002	100	75																						
2003	97	75																						
2004	90	75																						
2005		75																						
2006		75																						

		<p>agreement of 90 percent), minimizes threats to the validity and reliability of data. Presence of a causal question is defined as instances in which the investigation is designed to examine the effects of one variable on a second variable. A causal relation might be expressed as one variable influencing, affecting, or changing another variable. A randomized experimental design is defined as instances in which there are (a) an experimental (treatment) group and one or more comparison groups, and (b) random assignment of participants to treatment and comparison groups, or random assignment of groups (e.g., classrooms or schools) to treatment and comparison conditions. If a proposal includes a design in which two or more groups of participants are compared, but the PI does not explicitly indicate that random assignment procedures will be used, the proposal is recorded as not using a randomized experimental design.</p>
--	--	--

Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: Of new research and evaluation publications funded by IES that address causal questions, the percentage of publications that employ randomized experimental designs.																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>Of new research and evaluation publications funded by the Department's National Center of Education Research that address causal questions, the percentage of publications that employ randomized experimental designs.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>100</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>0</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>0</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	100	75	2003	0	75	2004	0	75	2005		75	2006		75	<p><b>Explanation:</b> No new research/evaluation publications were issued in 2003 or 2004. The 75 percent target for 2002 through 2006 recognizes that some high-quality studies will not be able to employ randomized experimental designs.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> IES researchers evaluate all newly funded research and evaluation publications by IES to identify projects that address causal questions and of those projects, those that use randomized experimental designs to answer those questions.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the proposal reviewers. Having qualified researchers conduct the reviews, as well as a check of inter-rater agreement where two IES researchers independently evaluate a subset of publications (with minimum inter-rater agreement of 90 percent), minimizes threats to the validity and reliability of data. Presence of a causal question is defined as instances in which the investigation is designed to</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2002	100	75																			
2003	0	75																			
2004	0	75																			
2005		75																			
2006		75																			

		<p>examine the effects of one variable on a second variable. A causal relation might be expressed as one variable influencing, affecting, or changing another variable. A randomized experimental design is defined as instances in which there are (a) an experimental (treatment) group and one or more comparison groups, and (b) random assignment of participants to treatment and comparison groups, or random assignment of groups (e.g., classrooms or schools) to treatment and comparison conditions. If a publication includes a design in which two or more groups of participants are compared, but does not explicitly indicate that random assignment procedures will be used, the publication is recorded as not using a randomized experimental design.</p>
--	--	--

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the relevance of our research in order to meet the needs of our customers.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 3: The percentage of new research projects funded by IES that are deemed to be of high relevance to education practice as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>The percentage of new research projects funded by the Department's National Center of Education Research that are deemed to be of high relevance as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>21</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>25</td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>60</td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	21		2002	25	25	2003	60	37	2004		50	2005		65	2006		75	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The target of 75 percent for 2006 recognizes that some important research may not seem immediately relevant but will make important contributions over the long term.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> External panel of qualified practitioners will evaluate the relevance of a random sample of newly funded research proposals. Data will be collected annually.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Evaluations are only as good as the qualifications of the external review panel. Inclusion of only experienced practitioners and administrators in education and special education assures the quality of the data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2001	21																								
2002	25	25																							
2003	60	37																							
2004		50																							
2005		65																							
2006		75																							



Indicator 8.2.2 of 3: The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse Web site.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of annual hits on the What Works Clearinghouse Web site.</i>			<b>Additional Source Information:</b> What Works Clearinghouse.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. A Web-based program automatically counts the hits on this Web site.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2003	1,522,922	1,000,000	
2004	4,249,668	2,000,000	
2005		4,500,000	
2006		5,000,000	
Indicator 8.2.3 of 3: The percentage of WWC Web site users surveyed randomly who responded to the statement, "Evidence provided on the WWC Web site is useful in making decisions about education programs and practices" by checking "agree" or "strongly agree."			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of WWC Web site users surveyed randomly who responded to the statement, "Evidence provided on the WWC Web site is useful in making decisions about education programs and practices" by checking "agree" or "strongly agree."</i>			<b>Additional Source Information:</b> There were no available data in 2003 or 2004.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2005		30	
2006		31	

## ESRA: Statistics - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.830 - Statistics

**Program Goal: To collect, analyze, and disseminate information on the condition of education in the United States and to provide comparative international statistics.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide timely, useful, and comprehensive data that are relevant to policy and educational improvement.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Customer satisfaction: The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data are timely, relevant, and comprehensive.						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES publications.</i>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Utility
<b>1997</b>	88	72	86			
<b>1999</b>	91	77	89	85	85	85
<b>2001</b>	90	74	90	90	90	90
<b>2004</b>	90	78	90	90	90	90
<b>2006</b>				90	90	90
				<p><b>Explanation:</b> NCES expects that each year, all user manuals for NCES public-use data files will be available on the Web, at least 50 percent of its public-use data files will be available on the Web, and 75 percent of nonassessment surveys will be administered either through the use of computerized interviews or directly over the Web. The efficiency steps will facilitate easier, quicker, and wider access to NCES products.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NCES Customer Satisfaction Survey.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> NCES. Data will be validated by using NCES review procedures and by applying NCES statistical standards.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The NCES Monitoring System will yield annual updates on the use and applications of NCES data. NCES views Web release of its reports as a source of increased efficiency and is committed to releasing at least 90 percent of its reports on the Web</p>

<i>The percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES data files.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness
1997	82	52		
1999	87	67	85	85
2001	88	66	90	90
2004	88	78	90	90
2006			90	90

  

<i>The percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied with NCES services.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness	Comprehensiveness	Timeliness
1997		89		
1999	93	93	85	85
2001	83	88	90	90
2004	92	84	90	90
2006			90	90

## IDEA: Research in Special Education - 2006

**CFDA Number:** 84.324 - Special Education\_Research and Innovation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

**Program Goal: To produce and advance the use of knowledge to improve services provided under IDEA and results for children with disabilities**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Improve the quality of research**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: High-quality projects: The percentage of research deemed to be of high-quality will increase.									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>The percentage of new research proposals funded by the Department's National Center for Special Education Research that receive an average score of excellent or higher from an independent review panel of qualified scientists.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">2006</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Statistician panel review of approved grant applications.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
2006		999							

<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Randomized designs: The percentage of research addressing causal questions that employ randomized experimental designs will increase.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress						
<p><i>The percentage of projects addressing causal questions that employ randomized experimental designs.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Statistician panel review of approved grant applications.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2006		999						

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the relevance of research that addresses the needs of children with disabilities.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Relevance: The percentage of research projects judged by scientists to be of high relevance to the needs of children with disabilities will increase.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress						
<p><i>The percentage of new research projects funded by the Department's National Center for Special Education that are deemed to be of high relevance by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Primary source: Practitioner panel review of approved grant applications.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2006		999						

## RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.133 - National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research

**Program Goal: To conduct high-quality research and related activities that lead to high-quality products.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Advance knowledge through capacity building: Increase capacity to conduct and use high-quality and relevant disability and rehabilitation research and related activities designed to guide decision-making, change practice and improve the lives of individuals with disabilities.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of projects conducting multisite, collaborative controlled trials.</i>				<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, Model Systems, and DRRPs).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> NIDRR administrative data and reports.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> November 2005</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2005		999		
2006		999		

<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: By 2015, as a result of pre- and postdoctoral research training supported by NIDRR, at least 100 individuals from diverse disciplines and backgrounds will be actively engaged in conducting high-quality disability and rehabilitation research and demonstration projects.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress						
<p><i>The number of former pre- and postdoctoral students and fellows who received research training supported by NIDRR that are actively engaged in conducting high-quality research and demonstration projects.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. This is a new outcome-oriented, long-term measure. The baseline will be established in 2006 based on self-report data from the revised annual Web-based project performance reporting system (APPR), external surveys, and judgments of expert panelists.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2006		999						
		<p><b>Sources and Data Quality</b></p> <p><b>Source:</b> Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, Model Systems, DRRPs, and ARRTs).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Contracted survey/evaluation Frequency: Reported every 3 years.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> November 2006</p>						

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Percentage of NIDRR-supported fellows, postdoctoral trainees, and doctoral students who publish results of NIDRR-sponsored research in refereed journals.																													
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality																							
<p><i>The percentage of NIDRR-supported fellows, postdoctoral trainees, and doctoral students who meet the criteria specified in indicator 8.1.3.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Year</th> <th colspan="2">Actual Performance</th> <th colspan="3">Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Post-Doc Fellows</th> <th>Doctoral Trainees</th> <th>Post-Doc Fellows</th> <th>Doctoral Trainees</th> <th>Doctoral Students</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> <td>999</td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>999</td> <td>999</td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			Post-Doc Fellows	Doctoral Trainees	Post-Doc Fellows	Doctoral Trainees	Doctoral Students	2005			999	999	999	2006			999	999	999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The target for 2006 is to maintain the baseline. This is an output-oriented annual performance measure. The baseline will be established using 2005 data from the revised Web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system containing information on all three target groups (i.e., fellows, postdoctoral trainees, and doctoral students).</p>			<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTCs, Model Systems, DRRPs, and ARRTs).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2005 NIDRR is planning to work with other ED staff to conduct an audit of publications entered into the Web-based reporting system to verify grantees' self-reports of peer-reviewed journal articles.</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets																									
	Post-Doc Fellows	Doctoral Trainees	Post-Doc Fellows	Doctoral Trainees	Doctoral Students																								
2005			999	999	999																								
2006			999	999	999																								



**Objective 8.2 of 3: Advance knowledge through research and related activities: Generate scientific-based knowledge, technologies, and applications to inform policy, change practice, and improve outcomes.**

<p><b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 8: By 2015, the number of discoveries, analyses, and standards developed and/or tested with NIDRR funding that have been judged by expert panels to advance understanding of key concepts, issues, and emerging trends and strengthen the evidence base for disability and rehabilitation policy, practice, and research will increase by at least 20 percent.</b></p>		
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>		<p>Assessment of Progress</p>
<p><i>The number of discoveries, analyses, and standards developed and/or tested with NIDRR funding that meet the criteria specified in indicator 8.1.2.</i></p>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. This is a new outcome-oriented, long-term measure. The baseline will be established in 2006 based on the number of discoveries, analyses, and standards published between 2004 and 2006 that are judged by an expert review panel to advance understanding and strengthen the evidence-base for disability and rehabilitation policy, practice, and research.</p>
<p><b>Year</b></p>	<p><b>Actual Performance</b></p>	
<p><b>2006</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Targets</b></p> <p>999</p>	
		<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, Model Systems, and DRPs).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Review by expert panel. Frequency: Every three years.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> - 2006</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> April 2007</p>

<p><b>Indicator 8.2.2 of 8: By 2015, the number of new or improved tools and methods developed and/or tested with NIDRR funding that have been judged by expert panels to improve measurement and data collection procedures and enhance the design and evaluation of disability and rehabilitation interventions, products and devices will increase by at least 20 percent.</b></p>			
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>		<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>
<p><i>The number of new or improved tools and methods developed and/or tested with NIDRR funding that meet the criteria specified in indicator 8.2.2.</i></p>			<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC, Model Systems, DRRPs, FIPs, and SBIRs).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Review by expert panel. Frequency: Reported every three years.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2007</p>
<p><b>Year</b></p>	<p><b>Actual Performance</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Targets</b></p>	
<p><b>2006</b></p>		<p>999</p>	

Indicator 8.2.3 of 8: By 2015, the number of new and improved interventions, programs, and devices developed and/or tested with NIDRR funding that have been judged by expert panels to be successful in improving individual outcomes and increasing access will increase by at least 20 percent.									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>The number of new and improved interventions, programs, and devices developed and/or tested with NIDRR funding that meet the criteria specified in indicator 8.2.3.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. This is a new outcome-oriented, long-term measure. The baseline will be established in 2006 based on the number of new and/or improved interventions, programs, and devices published between 2004 and 2006 that are judged by an expert review panel to be successful in improving outcomes.</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, Model Systems, DRRPs, FIPs, and SBIRs).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Review by expert panel. Frequency: Every three years.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2007</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
2006		999							

Indicator 8.2.4 of 8: The percentage of grantee research and development that has appropriate study design, meets rigorous standards of scientific and/or engineering methods, and builds on and contributes to knowledge in the field.																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The percentage of grantee research and development that has appropriate study design, meets rigorous standards of scientific and/or engineering methods, and builds on and contributes to knowledge in the field.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>54</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>67</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	54	65	2003	67	70	2004		70	2005		999	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> No data were collected in 2004. The percentages reported are based on the number of projects in each year that scored 4 or 5 on the following NIDRR center of excellence indicators for R&amp;D: appropriateness of study designs, rigor with which standards of scientific and/or engineering methods are applied, and the degree to which the research builds on and contributes to the improvements. NIDRR plans to correct this limitation, beginning in 2005 with the initial implementation of the new performance assessment system, which will include other types of R&amp;D projects. Therefore the target for FY 2005 is to establish a baseline under this new methodology. The target for FY 2006 is to maintain the 2005 baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Qualitative data from formative and/or summative program review meetings with expert panels.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> To date, the data for this indicator have been limited to the three largest program funding mechanisms within the NIDRR portfolio -- i.e., RERCs, RRTC's and Model Systems.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> NIDRR plans to correct this limitation with the new, revised version of the APPR, which will be complete by the end of FY 2004.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2002	54	65																			
2003	67	70																			
2004		70																			
2005		999																			
2006		999																			

Indicator 8.2.5 of 8: The average number of publications per award based on NIDRR-funded research and development activities in refereed journals.																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>The number of publications per award meeting the criteria specified in indicator 8.2.5.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>2.74</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>2.84</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	2.74		2003	2.84	8	2004		5	2005		5	2006		2	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2002 data established the baseline. NIDRR worked out significant data management and verification problems associated with this measure. These problems were resolved in July 2004, allowing NIDRR to report nonduplicative and verifiable averages for both 2002 and 2003 using rigorous criteria established by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) to determine peer-review status. The actual values include the combined NIDRR-funded RERCs, RRTC's, and Model Systems programs. To capture all the refereed journal articles published in a given calendar year, data collection for this measure must span two years of performance reports. Accordingly, data on 2004 refereed publications will not be available until September 2005.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, Model Systems).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> NIDRR is planning to work with other ED staff to conduct an audit of publication entered into the Web-based project performance reporting systems to verify grantees' self-reports of publications.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> NIDRR plans to correct these limitations with the new version of the APPR, which will include publication data from four additional program funding mechanisms: DBTACs, DRRPs, FIPs, and KDU (Dissemination &amp; Utilization) projects.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2002	2.74																				
2003	2.84	8																			
2004		5																			
2005		5																			
2006		2																			

Indicator 8.2.6 of 8: Number of new or improved tools and methods developed, evaluated and/or tested, and published by NIDRR grantees that are judged by an expert panel to meet the accepted standards of scientific and/or engineering rigor.									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>The number of new or improved tools and methods that meet the criteria specified in indicator 8.2.6.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. This is a revised output-oriented annual measure.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, DBTACs, Model Systems, DRRPs, FIP, and SBIRs).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina..</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Preliminary analyses are currently underway by the contractor -- National Rehabilitation Information Center (NARIC) -- responsible for collecting products from NIDRR grantees. Triangulation of data from three sources: (1) National Rehabilitation Information Center (NARIC), the contractor responsible for collecting products from NIDRR grantees, (2) the Web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system, and (3) program-review-type meetings with expert panels.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> - 2006</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
2006		999							

		<p><b>Data Available:</b> September 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Review by expert panels</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> To reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of collecting qualitative judgments from experts panels, in 2005 NIDRR will experiment with using Internet-based alternatives to face-to-face program-review-type meetings.</p>
--	--	--

Indicator 8.2.7 of 8: Percentage of new studies funded by NIDRR that assess the effectiveness of interventions, programs, and devices using rigorous and appropriate methods.												
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>The percentage of new studies that assess the effectiveness of interventions, programs, and devices and meet the criteria specified in indicator 8.2.7.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target maintains the baseline. This is an activity-oriented annual measure.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, Model Systems, DBTACs, DRRPs, and FIPs.).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Triangulation of data from the APPR and program-review-type meetings with expert panels.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Review of expert panel</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> To reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of collecting qualitative judgments from experts panels, in 2005 NIDRR will experiment with using Internet-based alternatives to face-to-face program-review-type meetings.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets										
2005		999										
2006		999										



Indicator 8.2.8 of 8: Number of discoveries, analyses, and standards developed and/or tested and published by NIDRR grantees that are judged by expert panels to meet accepted standards of scientific and/or engineering rigor.									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>The number of discoveries, analyses, and standards developed and/or tested and published by NIDRR grantees that meet the criteria specified in indicator 8.2.8.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. This is a new outcomes-oriented annual measure that was added based on recommendations from NIDRR's PART review.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Program Performance Report Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, DBTACs, DRRPs, FIPs, and SBIRs).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Review by expert panels.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> November 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Review by expert panels</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
2006		999							

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Advance knowledge through translation and dissemination: Promote the effective use of scientific-based knowledge, technologies, and applications to inform policy, improve practice, and enhance the lives of individuals with disabilities.**

<p><b>Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: By 2015, the number of tools, methods, interventions, programs, and devices, developed and/or validated with NIDRR funding that meet the standards for review by independent scientific collaborations and registries will increase by at least 20 percent .</b></p>		
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>		<p>Assessment of Progress</p>
<p><i>The number of NIDRR-funded tools, methods, interventions, programs, and devices that meet the criteria specified in indicator 8.3.1.</i></p>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline based on the findings of the independent Comprehensive Strategic Planning and Management Study of NIDRR's KDU portfolio. This is a new outcome-oriented, long-term measure.</p>
<p><b>Year</b></p>	<p><b>Actual Performance</b></p>	
<p><b>2006</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Targets</b></p> <p>999</p>	
		<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, Model Systems, DBTACs, DRRPs, and FIPs.).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Contracted survey/evaluation of NIDRR's Knowledge, Dissemination and Utilization projects. Frequency: Assessed every three years.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> - 2006</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> April 2007</p> <p>Independent examiner</p>

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Number of new or improved assistive and universally designed technologies, products, and devices developed by grantees that are judged by an expert panel to be effective in improving outcomes and have potential to be transferred to industry for commercialization.												
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<p><i>The number of new or improved assistive and universally designed technologies, products, and devices.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> This is an output-oriented annual performance measure. The FY 2005 target is to establish a preliminary baseline based on the 2005 pilot version of the redesigned Web-based annual project performance reporting (APPR) system and judgments of expert panels. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</p> <p><b>Program:</b> Annual Performance Reporting Forms for NIDRR Grantees (RERCs, RRTC's, Model Systems, DBTACs, DRRPs, and FIPs.).</p> <p><b>Contractor:</b> Research Triangle Institute, north Carolina.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Expert panel review.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> April 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> To reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of collecting qualitative judgments from expert panels, in 2005 NIDRR will experiment with using Internet-based alternatives to face-to-face program-review-type meetings.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets										
2005		999										
2006		999										



# Goal 5

## AEFLA: Adult Basic and Literacy State Grants - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.002 - Adult Education\_State Grant Program

**Program Goal: To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Provide adult learners with opportunities to acquire basic foundation skills (including English language acquisition), complete secondary education, and transition to further education and training and to work.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 5: Basic skill acquisition: The percentage of adults in adult basic education programs who acquire the level of basic skills needed (validated by standardized assessments) to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																											
<p><i>The percentage of adults in adult basic education programs who acquire the level of basic skills needed to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Percentage of adults</td> <td>Percentage of adults</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>40</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>31</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>44</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>26</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>36</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>37</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>38</td> <td>41</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Percentage of adults	Percentage of adults	1997	40		1998	31		1999	44		2000	26	40	2001	36	40	2002	37	40	2003	38	41	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 1997 data established the baseline. This measure has been changed to require validation of basic skills acquisition through standardized assessment. Because of change to the indicators, new performance target/baseline has been established. Data reflect percent of adult education learners (adults with limited basic skills) who demonstrated a level of basic skill proficiency needed to advance to the next educational functioning level. Educational functioning levels range from beginning literacy through high school. Revised measures require validation of basic skill proficiency through standardized assessment. New targets reflect a new standard.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third-tier recipient of these data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																													
	Percentage of adults	Percentage of adults																													
1997	40																														
1998	31																														
1999	44																														
2000	26	40																													
2001	36	40																													
2002	37	40																													
2003	38	41																													

<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>42</td> </tr> </table>	2004		42	2005		42	2006		42			<p>1, 2000, reporting period, OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>															
2004		42																									
2005		42																									
2006		42																									
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 5: Basic English language acquisition: Percentage of adults enrolled in English literacy programs will acquire (validated by standardized assessment) the level of English language skills needed to complete the levels of instruction in which they enrolled.</b></p>																											
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>		<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>																								
<p><i>The percentage of adults enrolled in English literacy programs who acquire the level of English language skills needed to complete the levels of instruction in which they enrolled.</i></p>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 1996 data established the baseline. This measure has been changed to require validation of basic skill acquisition through standardized assessment. Because of change to the measure, new performance target/baseline has been established. Data reflect the percentage of English literacy learners (adults with minimal English language skills) who demonstrated a level of English language proficiency needed to advance to the next educational functioning level. Educational functioning levels range from beginning-</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report</b>  <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b>                      1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      The 2003 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>																								
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>49</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>20</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>31</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>34</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year			Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1996	30		1997	28		1998	28		1999	49		2000	20	40	2001	31	40	2002	34	42	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets																							
1996	30																										
1997	28																										
1998	28																										
1999	49																										
2000	20			40																							
2001	31	40																									
2002	34	42																									
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>49</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>20</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>31</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>34</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	1996	30		1997	28		1998	28		1999	49		2000	20	40	2001	31	40	2002	34	42						
1996	30																										
1997	28																										
1998	28																										
1999	49																										
2000	20	40																									
2001	31	40																									
2002	34	42																									
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>49</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>20</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>31</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>34</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	1996	30		1997	28		1998	28		1999	49		2000	20	40	2001	31	40	2002	34	42						
1996	30																										
1997	28																										
1998	28																										
1999	49																										
2000	20	40																									
2001	31	40																									
2002	34	42																									
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>49</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>20</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>31</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>34</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	1996	30		1997	28		1998	28		1999	49		2000	20	40	2001	31	40	2002	34	42						
1996	30																										
1997	28																										
1998	28																										
1999	49																										
2000	20	40																									
2001	31	40																									
2002	34	42																									
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>49</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>20</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>31</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>34</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	1996	30		1997	28		1998	28		1999	49		2000	20	40	2001	31	40	2002	34	42						
1996	30																										
1997	28																										
1998	28																										
1999	49																										
2000	20	40																									
2001	31	40																									
2002	34	42																									
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>49</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>20</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>31</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>34</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	1996	30		1997	28		1998	28		1999	49		2000	20	40	2001	31	40	2002	34	42						
1996	30																										
1997	28																										
1998	28																										
1999	49																										
2000	20	40																									
2001	31	40																									
2002	34	42																									
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>49</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>20</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>31</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>34</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	1996	30		1997	28		1998	28		1999	49		2000	20	40	2001	31	40	2002	34	42						
1996	30																										
1997	28																										
1998	28																										
1999	49																										
2000	20	40																									
2001	31	40																									
2002	34	42																									
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>49</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>20</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>31</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>34</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	1996	30		1997	28		1998	28		1999	49		2000	20	40	2001	31	40	2002	34	42						
1996	30																										
1997	28																										
1998	28																										
1999	49																										
2000	20	40																									
2001	31	40																									
2002	34	42																									

<b>2003</b>	36	44	<p>level English literacy through advanced-level English literacy. Revised indicators require validation of English proficiency through standardized assessment. New targets reflect a new standard.</p>	<p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and data quality review.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>
<b>2004</b>		45		
<b>2005</b>		45		
<b>2006</b>		45		



Indicator 8.1.3 of 5: Secondary completion: The percentage of adults with a high school completion goal and who exit during the program year that earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.																																										
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																																							
<p><i>The percentage of adults with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Percent of adults</td> <td>Percent of adults</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>36</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>37</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>33</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>34</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>34</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>33</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>42</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>44</td> <td>41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>46</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>47</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Percent of adults	Percent of adults	1996	36		1997	37		1998	33		1999	34		2000	34	40	2001	33	40	2002	42	40	2003	44	41	2004		42	2005		46	2006		47	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Because of a change to the indicator, new performance benchmark targets have been established. FY 2001 data established the baseline. The performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners with a goal to complete high school in secondary level programs of instruction who, upon exit, had earned their high school diploma or GED credential within the reporting period.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      The 2003 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third-tier recipient of this data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> OVAE has</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																								
	Percent of adults	Percent of adults																																								
1996	36																																									
1997	37																																									
1998	33																																									
1999	34																																									
2000	34	40																																								
2001	33	40																																								
2002	42	40																																								
2003	44	41																																								
2004		42																																								
2005		46																																								
2006		47																																								

				developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.			
<b>Indicator 8.1.4 of 5: Transition to postsecondary education or training: The percentage of enrolled adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who exit during the program year that enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.</b>							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of adults with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Because of the change to the indicator, new targets have been established. FY 2001 data established the baseline. The new performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners with a goal of further education or training who, upon exit from adult education, enrolled in a postsecondary education or training program.</p>		<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      The 2003 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, OVAE</p>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>					<b>Performance Targets</b>	
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults				Number of adults	Percentage of adults
<b>1996</b>	175,255						
<b>1997</b>	178,520						
<b>1998</b>	158,167						
<b>1999</b>	148,803						
<b>2000</b>	161,650					300,000	
<b>2001</b>		25					
<b>2002</b>		30					25
<b>2003</b>		30					26
<b>2004</b>							27
<b>2005</b>				30			
<b>2006</b>				34			

		<p>implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and a data quality review.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>
--	--	---

**Indicator 8.1.5 of 5: Transition to work: The percentage of unemployed adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<p><i>The percentage of adults with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter.</i></p>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> Because of the change to the indicator, new performance benchmark targets have been established. FY 2001 data established the baseline. The 2001 performance data reflect the percentage of adult learners with an employment goal who, upon exit from an adult education program, obtain a job.</p>		<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1830-0027 Adult Education Annual Performance and Financial Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      The 2003 data were verified by the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
	Number of adults	Percentage of adults	Number of adults					Percentage of adults
1996	306,982							
1997	340,206							
1998	294,755							
1999	409,062							
2000	454,318		425,000					
2001	36							

<b>2002</b>	39	36	<p><b>Limitations:</b> As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. Starting with the July 1, 2000, reporting period, OVAE implemented new data collection protocols, including standardized data collection methodologies and standards for automated data reporting and a data quality review.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p>
<b>2003</b>	37	37	
<b>2004</b>		38	
<b>2005</b>		40	
<b>2006</b>		43	

## AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.191 - Adult Education\_National Leadership Activities

**Program Goal: National Programs (Adult Education and Literacy Act).**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of states yielding high-quality learner assessment data.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2002 data established the baseline. Performance reporting is largely on learner assessment data. The NRS requires greater validity and reliability of this data. OVAE policies are requiring continuous improvement of state- level assessment data. States are at various levels of expertise and capacity to collect high-quality assessment data.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State Annual Performance Reports - data and narrative.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Program monitoring and data review and analysis by ED and Data Quality Certification Process. Data will be verified by electronic checks and expert staff analysis, and by requiring confirmation and attestation of data by state directors. State data are also checked independently by ED/OVAE during onsite monitoring and state audit reviews.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>2002</b>	50			
<b>2003</b>	65	75		
<b>2004</b>		95		
<b>2005</b>		96		
<b>2006</b>		100		

		<p><b>Limitations:</b> Total data quality and full systems development are dependent on investments of staff and resources by states to adopt and adapt the models developed and promoted by ED/OVAE; they are supported by the technical assistance and expertise provided by ED.</p>
--	--	--

## AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.257 - National Institute for Literacy

**Program Goal: To provide knowledge and resources to improve literacy instruction across the lifespan.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Recipients state that information based on scientific research (or the most rigorous research available) provided by NIFL prepares them to improve instruction.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Technical assistance: The percentage of persons who receive NIFL technical assistance.</b>								
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>(a) The percentage of recipients who receive information through NIFL technical assistance who report they are likely to implement instructional practices grounded in scientifically based research (or the most rigorous research available).</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="width: 40%; text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 45%; text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2006</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. These are new measures for FY 2006.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Evaluations of technical assistance</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Not everyone who receives technical assistance will complete an evaluation.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2006		999						
<p><i>(b) The percentage of individuals who receive NIFL technical assistance who can demonstrate that they implemented instructional practices grounded in scientifically based research within six months of receiving the technical assistance.</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="width: 40%; text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 45%; text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2006</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2006		999						

**Objective 8.2 of 2: NIFL effectively disseminates high-quality information to improve instructional practice and/or service delivery.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Dissemination: The percentage of projects that are deemed to be of high quality.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of products that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent panel of qualified scientists.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Panel of experts to review a sample of products available on the NIFL Web site.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2006				999



## EDA: Gallaudet University - 2006

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.910A - Gallaudet University Programs and Elementary and Secondary Education Programs  
 84.910B - Gallaudet University Endowment Grant  
 84.910D - Gallaudet University Construction Program

**Program Goal: To challenge students who are deaf, graduate students who are deaf, and graduate students who are hearing to achieve their academic goals and obtain productive employment, provide leadership in setting the national standard for best practices in education of the deaf and hard of hearing, and establish a sustainable resource base.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: The University Programs and the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School will optimize the number of students completing programs of study.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Enrollment at Gallaudet University: Maintain minimum enrollment numbers in Gallaudet's undergraduate, graduate, and professional studies programs, as well as the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School as established by Gallaudet University.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress			Sources and Data Quality
<i>University enrollment in Gallaudet's programs and schools.</i>							<p><b>Explanation:</b> Gallaudet has established minimum enrollment targets based on long-standing enrollment targets and historical trends, recognizing that actual figures vary from year to year.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Collegiate Office of Enrollment Services, and Clerc Center student database, FY 2005 enrollment as of October 2004, summarized in Gallaudet's FY 2004 annual report, submitted in 2005.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by Gallaudet</p>
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets			
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional Studies	Undergraduate	Graduate	Professional Studies	
<b>1998</b>	1,339	714	92				
<b>1999</b>	1,300	628	70	1,250	700	70	
<b>2000</b>	1,318	541	86	1,250	700	70	
<b>2001</b>	1,321	625	93	1,250	700	70	
<b>2002</b>	1,243	517	92	1,250	700	70	
<b>2003</b>	1,243	617	154	1,250	700	70	

<b>2004</b>	1,236	506	70	1,250	700	70
<b>2005</b>	1,207	451	176	1,250	650	70
<b>2006</b>				1,250	650	175
<i>Enrollment in Gallaudet's Clerc Center .</i>						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>			
	Model Sec. School	Kendall Elem. School	Model Sec. School	Kendall Elem. School		
<b>1998</b>	224	137				
<b>1999</b>	209	117	225	140		
<b>2000</b>	219	135	225	140		
<b>2001</b>	205	148	225	140		
<b>2002</b>	188	148	225	140		
<b>2003</b>	190	152	225	140		
<b>2004</b>	186	145	225	140		
<b>2005</b>	182	142	225	140		
<b>2006</b>			225	140		

University and the Clerc Center. No formal verification procedure applied.

**Improvements:** Gallaudet has implemented a new method for calculating its graduate and professional studies enrollment numbers in order to present a more accurate enrollment picture.

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Student persistence rate: Increase the undergraduate persistence rate and increase or maintain the graduate student persistence rate.					
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>Persistence rates of university students served by Gallaudet.</i>					
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets		
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Graduate	
1998	72				
1999	73		75		
2000	72	78	76	80	
2001	71	82	76	82	
2002	73	98	76		
2003	71	86	79		
2004	73	89	79	86	
2005			79	86	
2006			79	86	

**Explanation:** Prior to FY 2006, this measure was retention rates. Gallaudet is committed to an increased focus on student persistence at all levels, with particular attention to the success of first year students.

**Additional Source Information:** Collegiate Office of the Register records, summarized in the FY 2004 annual report, submitted in 2005.

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Collection Period:** 2004 - 2005

**Data Available:** October 2005

**Validated By:** No Formal Verification.  
Data supplied by Gallaudet University.

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Student graduation rates: By 2008, the undergraduate graduation rate will reach 48 percent; the graduate student and Model Secondary School student graduation rates will be increased or maintained.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Graduation rates of university students served by Gallaudet.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Undergraduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Graduate
1998	41			
1999	42		41	
2000	41	82	42	80
2001	41	82	43	80
2002	42	82	44	
2003	42	82	45	
2004	42	84	45	82
2005			46	83
2006			47	83
2007			47	
2008			48	
<i>Model Secondary School graduation rate of Clerc Center students.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
1998	93			
1999	88		94	
2000	98		94	
			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The undergraduate graduation rates are calculated as the number of graduates in one year over the number of entering students six years previously. Consistent with other universities, Gallaudet students are taking longer to complete baccalaureate studies.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Collegiate Office of the Registrar and the Clerc Center Office of Exemplary Programs and Research records, summarized in FY 2004 annual report, submitted in 2005.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> With regard to the graduate student graduation rate, Gallaudet is unable to accurately calculate graduation rates for FY 2000-2005 for a number of reasons: 1) the relative recency of accessible data through PeopleSoft, i.e., many students graduating during this period matriculated before PeopleSoft was implemented; 2) the widely varying "time to degree" for graduate students, particularly Ph.D. students; and 3) the mix of</p>

<b>2001</b>	90	94	<p>full- and part-time graduate students in Gallaudet's graduate programs. As a proxy, Gallaudet has estimated the graduation rate for the FY 2000-2005 by dividing the total number of degrees awarded during the period (615) by the number of new students matriculated during this period (730). This yields an estimated graduation rate of 84 percent. This number is consistent with the reported retention rates for the period. As part of this work, new baselines and performance targets will be established.</p>
<b>2002</b>	80	94	
<b>2003</b>	71	94	
<b>2004</b>	89	94	
<b>2005</b>		94	
<b>2006</b>		94	

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Gallaudet works in partnership with others to develop and disseminate educational programs and materials for deaf and hard-of-hearing students.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of programs adopting Model/Kendall innovative strategies/curricula.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The number of new programs adopting innovations from year to year will vary and depends in part on the number and type of strategies and curricula being disseminated by the Clerc Center and the financial and personnel resources available within other programs for training and implementation activities.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Records of the Clerc Center Office of Training and Professional Development, summarized in the FY 2004 Annual Report, submitted in January 2005.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University and the Clerc Center.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	41			
1999	52	41		
2000	62	41		
2001	39	41		
2002	56	41		
2003	54	41		
2004	91	50		
2005		55		
2006		55		

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Curriculum and extracurricular activities prepare students to meet the skill requirements of the workplace or to continue their studies.**

Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the university: Gallaudet's bachelor's graduates will either find employment commensurate with their training and education or attend advanced education or training programs during their first year after graduation.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of graduates who are employed or in advanced education or training during the first year after graduation.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> In FY 2003, Gallaudet disaggregated this indicator to provide the percentages in each category of students, those actually employed and those students who were in advanced education or training programs. In the past, these two categories were combined. The percents total more than 100 percent because some respondents were employed and undertook a program of advanced education or training in the same year. Employed includes both full and part-time employment. Advanced education or training includes students enrolled in a master's or Ph.D. program, a vocational or technical program, or another type of program, e.g., law school or medical school.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> University study on the status of graduates' employment and advanced studies, February, 2003.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data supplied by Gallaudet University.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	Students Employed	Students in Advanced Education or Training				Students Employed	Students in Advanced Education or Training
2001	90	38				77	38
2002	89	49					
2003	79	40					
2004	73	38				80	40
2005						81	41
2006			82	41			

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the Model Secondary School: A high percentage of the Model Secondary School graduates will either find jobs commensurate with their training or will attend postsecondary programs.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of Model Secondary School graduates who are in jobs or postsecondary programs during first year after graduation.</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> The follow-up survey is conducted by the Cerc Center Office of Exemplary Programs and Research, approximately three months following June graduation.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by Gallaudet University.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2000	74		
2001	72	80	
2002	90	80	
2003	82	80	
2004	83	80	
2005		81	
2006		81	



## EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf - 2006

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.908A - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Operations  
 84.908B - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Endowment Program  
 84.908C - National Technical Institute for the Deaf Construction Program

**Program Goal: To provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate programs and professional studies with state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, undertake a program of applied research, share NTID expertise, and expand outside sources of revenue.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate and professional studies with outstanding state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, complemented by a strong arts and sciences curriculum and supplemented with appropriate student support services.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Enrollment: Maintain a minimum student body of undergraduates, graduates, and educational interpreters as established by NTID.								
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The number of students enrolled.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> This goal focuses on the total enrollment as year-to-year shifts in specific programs may result in the individual targets either being exceeded or not met. There are also human and physical resource limitations to the number of students NTID can serve. NTID's sub-baccalaureate programs are experiencing increased competition from the growth of services for deaf and hard-of-hearing students at community colleges. More aggressive recruitment efforts have been successful in the educational interpreter program, and NTID expects the same results next year with undergraduate programs.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Technical Institute for the Deaf Registrar Office records, FY 2005 as of October 2004.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>			
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
	Undergraduate	Grad/Masters Educational in Special Interpreter Ed.	Undergraduate			Grad/Masters Educational in Special Interpreter Ed.		
1996	1,038	59 27						
1997	1,069	72 32						
1998	1,085	84 36						
1999	1,135	93 50	1,080			100	50	
2000	1,084	77 59	1,080			100	50	
2001	1,089	75 55	1,080			100	50	
2002	1,125	53 60	1,080			100	75	
2003	1,093	65 73	1,080	100	75			

<b>2004</b>	1,064	92	114	1,080	100	75
<b>2005</b>	1,055	100	126	1,080	100	90
<b>2006</b>				1,080	100	120

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Maximize the number of students successfully completing a program of study.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Graduation rate: By 2008, the overall student graduation rate will be 60 percent.</b>						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The graduation rates of NTID students, in percent.</i>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Sub-Overall	Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Sub-Overall	Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate
<b>1997</b>	50	50	51			
<b>1998</b>	51	50	57			
<b>1999</b>	53	50	61			
<b>2000</b>	53	50	63	53	51	61
<b>2001</b>	54	50	64	53	51	61
<b>2002</b>	57	54	66	53	52	61
<b>2003</b>	56	52	68	53	52	61
<b>2004</b>	56	51	68	57	52	69
<b>2005</b>				57	52	69
<b>2006</b>				58	53	70
<b>2007</b>				59	53	71
<b>2008</b>				60	54	72

**Explanation:** The institute's goal is to maintain or increase the rate for students in sub-baccalaureate programs and increase the rate for students in baccalaureate programs.

**Additional Source Information:** NTID Registrar Office records  
**Frequency:** Annually.  
**Collection Period:** 2004 - 2005  
**Data Available:** October 2005  
**Validated By:** No Formal Verification.  
 Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Student retention rate: The first-year student overall retention rate for students in sub-baccalaureate and baccalaureate programs will meet or exceed established targets.						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The student retention rates of NTID students, in percent.</i>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Sub-Overall	Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate	Sub-Overall	Baccalaureate	Baccalaureate
1997	76	85	84			
1998	74	73	81			
1999	74	69	84			
2000	74	69	85	74	73	84
2001	74	68	86	74	74	84
2002	77	72	87	74	74	84
2003	76	70	86	74	74	84
2004	75	70	86	74	74	84
2005				75	74	86
2006				75	74	86

**Additional Source Information:**  
 NTID registrar office records.

**Frequency:** Annually.  
**Collection Period:** 2004 - 2005  
**Data Available:** October 2005  
**Validated By:** No Formal Verification.

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Prepare graduates to find satisfying jobs in fields commensurate with the level of their academic training.**

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Placement rate: Maintain a high percentage of graduates placed in the workforce.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																																				
<p><i>The placement rate of graduates in the workforce.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>96</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997</td> <td>97</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>95</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>94</td> <td>95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>90</td> <td>95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>92</td> <td>95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>89</td> <td>95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>93</td> <td>95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>95</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1996	96		1997	97		1998	95		1999	94	95	2000	90	95	2001	92	95	2002	89	95	2003	93	95	2004		95	2005		95	2006		95	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Placement rate data are reported the year after graduation. The institute believes that a 95 percent placement rate represents an appropriate ongoing target, but economic conditions have deteriorated to a point where it is affecting students' ability to find permanent placement. The placement rates are calculated as the percentage of graduates who are employed among those who want to be employed. Those individuals who continue their education or who are not seeking employment, for whatever reasons, in the respective years are not included. The Bureau of Labor Statistics uses this same methodology.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Technical Institute for the Deaf placement records for FY 2003.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 Data supplied by the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. No formal verification procedure applied.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																						
1996	96																																							
1997	97																																							
1998	95																																							
1999	94	95																																						
2000	90	95																																						
2001	92	95																																						
2002	89	95																																						
2003	93	95																																						
2004		95																																						
2005		95																																						
2006		95																																						

## HEA: AID Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions - 2006

**CFDA Number:** 84.031S - Title V Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program

**Program Goal: To improve the capacity of minority-serving institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Improve the academic quality of participating Institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that have been met or exceeded.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with 2003 data and 2006 targets, we are disaggregating AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. No targets were established for FY 2004 and 2005. The long term target for this measure is 86 percent in 2010. AID= Aid for Institutional Development.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	79			
2006		83		
2007		84		
2008		85		
2009		86		
2010		86		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the institutional management and fiscal stability of the participating Institutions.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Institutional management and fiscal stability: Title V project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management and fiscal stability that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.																								
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>The percentage of project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management and fiscal stability that have been met or exceeded.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>73</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>83</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	73		2006		79	2007		80	2008		81	2009		82	2010		83	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with 2003 data and 2006 targets, we are disaggregating AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. No targets were established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term goal for this measure is 83 percent in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																						
2003	73																							
2006		79																						
2007		80																						
2008		81																						
2009		82																						
2010		83																						

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Improve the student services and student outcomes of the participating institutions.**

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Student services and student outcomes: The percentage of Title V project goals relating to the improvement of student services and student outcomes that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
Targets and Performance Data																									
<p><i>The percentage of project goals relating to the improvement of student services and student outcomes that have been met or exceeded.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>80</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>86</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	80		2006		83	2007		84	2008		85	2009		86	2010		86	<p><b>Explanation:</b> In order to better measure the success of these programs, new GPRA measures were developed in 2002 based on the new Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR was designed with extensive consultation with the grant community. These measures provide program success information across the diverse type of institutions. However, beginning with 2003 data and 2006 targets, we are disaggregating the data and targets to report specifically on each program. The long-term target for this measure is 86 in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data. Limitations: Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2003	80																								
2006		83																							
2007		84																							
2008		85																							
2009		86																							
2010		86																							

## HEA: AID Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions - 2006

**CFDA Number:** 84.031N - Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions

**Program Goal: To improve the capacity of minority-serving institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Improve the academic quality of participating institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of ANNH project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that have been met or exceeded.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FY 2003 data and the 2006 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and the targets to report specifically on each program. No targets were established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term goal for this measure is 89 percent in 2010. AID= Aid for Institutional Development.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.  <b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	86			
2006		87		
2007		88		
2008		88		
2009		89		
2010		89		



**Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the institutional management and fiscal stability of the participating institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>The percentage of ANNH project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management and fiscal stability that have been met or exceeded.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>64</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>78</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	64		2006		70	2007		72	2008		74	2009		76	2010		78	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FY 2003 data and FY 2004 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and the targets to report specifically on each program. No targets were established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term target for this measure is 78 percent in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2003	64																								
2006		70																							
2007		72																							
2008		74																							
2009		76																							
2010		78																							

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Improve the student services and student outcomes of the participating institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>The percentage of ANNH project goals relating to the improvement of student services and student outcomes that have been met or exceeded.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>84</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>87</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>87</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>88</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	84		2006		86	2007		87	2008		87	2009		88	2010		88	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FY 2003 data and FY 2004 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. No targets were established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term target for this measure is 88 percent in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2003	84																								
2006		86																							
2007		87																							
2008		87																							
2009		88																							
2010		88																							

# HEA: AID Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.031B - Strengthening HBCUs and Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions

**Program Goal: To improve the capacity of minority-serving institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.**

Objective 8.1 of 3: Improve the academic quality of participating institutions.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of HBCU project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that have been met or exceeded.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FY 2003 data and FY 2006 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. Targets were not established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term target for this measure is 82 percent in 2010. AID= Aid for Institutional Development.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	70			
2006		76		
2007		78		
2008		80		
2009		81		
2010		82		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the institutional management and fiscal stability of the participating institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>The percentage of HBCU project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management and fiscal stability that have been met or exceeded.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>65</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>81</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	65		2006		71	2007		73	2008		75	2009		79	2010		81	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FY 2003 data and FY 2006 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. Targets were not established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term target for this measure is 81 percent in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2003	65																								
2006		71																							
2007		73																							
2008		75																							
2009		79																							
2010		81																							

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Improve the student services and student outcomes of the participating institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>The percentage of HBCU project goals relating to the improvement of student services and student outcomes that have been met or exceeded.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>75</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>85</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	75		2006		81	2007		82	2008		83	2009		84	2010		85	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FY 2003 data and FY 2006 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. Targets were not established for FY 2004 and 2005. The long-term target for this measure is 85 percent in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2003	75																								
2006		81																							
2007		82																							
2008		83																							
2009		84																							
2010		85																							

## HEA: AID Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions - 2006

**Program Goal: To improve the capacity of minority-serving institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Improve the academic quality of participating institutions.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Academic quality: The percentage of HBGI project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of HBGI project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that have been met or exceeded.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FY 2003 data and FY 2006 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. Targets were not established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term target for this measure is 94 percent in 2010. AID= Aid for Institutional Development.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	92			
2006		93		
2007		93		
2008		93		
2009		94		
2010		94		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the institutional management and fiscal stability of the participating institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>The percentage of HBGI project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management and fiscal stability that have been met or exceeded.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>63</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>79</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	63		2006		69	2007		71	2008		73	2009		75	2010		79	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FY 2003 data and FY 2006 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. Targets were not established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term goal for this measure is 79 percent in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2003	63																								
2006		69																							
2007		71																							
2008		73																							
2009		75																							
2010		79																							

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Improve the student services and student outcomes of the participating institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>The percentage of HBGI project goals relating to the improvement of student services and student outcomes that have been met or exceeded.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>67</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>82</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	67		2006		73	2007		75	2008		79	2009		81	2010		82	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FT 2003 data and FY 2006 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. The long-term target for this measure is 87 percent in 2011.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2004                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2003	67																								
2006		73																							
2007		75																							
2008		79																							
2009		81																							
2010		82																							



## HEA: AID Strengthening Institutions - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.031A - Strengthening Institutions Program--Development Grants, Planning Grants

**Program Goal: To improve the capacity of minority-serving institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.**

Objective 8.1 of 3: Improve the academic quality of participating Institutions.

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Academic quality: The percentage of SI project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of SI project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that have been met or exceeded.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FY 2003 data and FY 2006 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. No targets were established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term target for this measure is 94 percent in 2010. AID= Aid for Institutional Development.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	92			
2006		93		
2007		93		
2008		93		
2009		94		
2010		94		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the institutional management and fiscal stability of the participating Institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>The percentage of SI project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management and fiscal stability that have been met or exceeded.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>91</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>93</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	91		2006		92	2007		92	2008		93	2009		93	2010		93	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FY 2003 data and FY 2006 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. No targets were established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term target for this measure is 93 percent in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2003	91																								
2006		92																							
2007		92																							
2008		93																							
2009		93																							
2010		93																							

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Improve the student services and student outcomes of the participating institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>The percentage of SI project goals relating to the improvement of student services and student outcomes that have been met or exceeded.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>88</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>91</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	88		2006		89	2007		90	2008		90	2009		90	2010		91	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FY 2003 data and FY 2006 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. No targets were established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term target for this measure is 91 percent in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected from the Annual Performance Reports submitted by grantees.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2003	88																								
2006		89																							
2007		90																							
2008		90																							
2009		90																							
2010		91																							

## HEA: AID Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.031T - Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities

**Program Goal: To improve the capacity of minority-serving institutions, which traditionally have limited resources and serve large numbers of low-income and minority students, to improve student success and to provide high-quality educational opportunities for their students.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Improve the academic quality of participating institutions.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Academic quality: The percentage of TCCU project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that are met or exceeded will increase or be maintained over time.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FY 2003 data and FY 2006 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. No targets were established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term target for this measure is 84 percent in 2010. AID= Aid for Institutional Development.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.   <b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
<i>The percentage of TCCU project goals relating to the improvement of academic quality that have been met or exceeded.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>2003</b>	74			
<b>2006</b>		80		
<b>2007</b>		81		
<b>2008</b>		82		
<b>2009</b>		83		
<b>2010</b>		84		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Improve the institutional management and fiscal stability of the participating institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of TCCU project goals relating to the improvement of institutional management and fiscal stability that have been met or exceeded.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FY 2003 data and FY 2006 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. No targets were established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term target for this measure is 86 percent in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.   <b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	80			
2006		83		
2007		84		
2008		85		
2009		85		
2010		86		

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Improve the student services and student outcomes of the participating institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																					
<p><i>The percentage of TCCU project goals relating to the improvement of student services and student outcomes that have been met or exceeded.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>100</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	100		2006		100	2007		100	2008		100	2009		100	2010		100	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Beginning with FY 2003 data and FY 2006 targets, we are disaggregating the AID data and targets to report specifically on each program. No targets were established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term target for this measure is 86 percent in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Data supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data.   <b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																							
2003	100																								
2006		100																							
2007		100																							
2008		100																							
2009		100																							
2010		100																							

## HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.149A - College Assistance Migrant Program

**Program Goal: Assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students to successfully complete their first academic year of college and to continue at a postsecondary education.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: All CAMP students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of CAMP participants completing the first year of their academic or postsecondary program.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Although no target was established for FY 2003, data will be collected.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	82			
2002	80			
2004		83		
2005		85		
2006		86		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: A majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first year of college will continue in postsecondary education.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: CAMP students continue in Postsecondary: By 2010, 85 percent of CAMP participants who successfully complete their first year of college will continue in postsecondary education.</b>																				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress																		
<p><i>The percentage of CAMP students who, after completing first year, continue their postsecondary education.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>78</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>75</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>81</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	78		2002	75		2004		79	2005		80	2006		81	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Although no target was established for FY 2003, data will be collected.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																		
2001	78																			
2002	75																			
2004		79																		
2005		80																		
2006		81																		
		<p><b>Sources and Data Quality</b></p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> HEP/CAMP grantee performance reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> April 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>																		



## HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.116 - Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

**Program Goal: To improve postsecondary education by making grants to institutions in support of reform and innovation.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Promote reforms that improve the quality of teaching and learning and postsecondary institutions.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Replication of projects: The percentage of projects that are adapted in full or in part, or whose materials are used by other institutions.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of FIPSE grantees reporting project dissemination to others.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FIPSE has shifted to a new online data collection instrument that allows for more accurate calculation of the measure. After undertaking an external evaluation of this measure through PPSS, FIPSE has revised the target for this measure for years 2006-2010 to reflect results of the evaluation and the changes in data collection.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Final Report Scorecard</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Similar results from annual report and site visit scorecards.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data supplied by project directors in response to survey instruments. They have revised the form to match indicators more closely through an external evaluation funded by PPSS.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	92			
1999	100			
2000	83	100		
2001	96	85		
2002	94.50	95		
2003	88	95		
2004	88	95		
2005		95		
2006		90		
2007		90		
2008		91		
2009		91		

2010		92		
------	--	----	--	--

**Objective 8.2 of 2: The institutionalization of FIPSE programs.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Projects sustained: The percentage of projects sustained beyond federal funding.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of projects reporting institutionalization on their home campuses.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FIPSE's emphasis on institutional contributions to projects and development of long-term continuation plans are designed to embed projects within campus structures. Based on the results of an external evaluation by PPSS, FIPSE has reset its expected rates of institutionalization to be in the 90-93 percent range. FIPSE has also changed the way that it collects data through a new on-line data collection and scoring system.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Final Report Scorecard. Assessment of projects based on review of final reports sent within 90 days after the completion of projects.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Similar data from annual reports and site visit score cards. Assessment of project drawn from on site visitation and evaluation of projects.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data supplied as a result of the assessment of project final reports submitted by project directors.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	93			
1999	96			
2000	94	100		
2001	100	95		
2002	96	95		
2003	96	95		
2004	90	95		
2005		95		
2006		91		
2007		92		
2008		92		
2009		93		
2010		93		

## HEA: Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.200 - Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need

**Program Goal: To increase the number of persons trained at the highest academic level.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To increase the number of students of superior academic ability completing a terminal degree in designated areas of national need in order to alleviate that need.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 4: Graduate school completion: The percentage of GAANN fellows who obtain a terminal degree in an area of national need will be greater than the national average.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																														
<p><i>The percentage of GAANN fellows completing a terminal degree in the designated areas of national need.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>12</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>28</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>47</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>31</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	12	12	2002	28	12	2003	47		2005		28	2006		29	2007		29	2008		30	2009		30	2010		31	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 and FY 2004 data will be available in December 2005. The program office developed a database to collect this information. The data provided by the National Research Council's Survey of Earned Doctorates gives the national average for doctoral recipients in the sciences at 28 percent. The 2002 year information contains data from the 1997 cohort. 2003 year information contains data from the 1998 cohort, as well as the final performance reports from those in the 2000 cohort that finished in 2003. The 1998 cohort had a large number of Ph.D.s and successful students, and the 2000 cohort had a large number of successful students as well. We believe that this is the reason for the substantial increase in the completion rate. However, at this stage there is not a sufficient basis for assuming that this unusually high rate will continue. For this reason, we are not increasing the targets at this time. However, we will reevaluate our targets if future data indicate that it would be appropriate. The long- term target for this measure is 31 percent in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report</b>  <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b>            1840-0748 GAANN Final Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																
2001	12	12																																
2002	28	12																																
2003	47																																	
2005		28																																
2006		29																																
2007		29																																
2008		30																																
2009		30																																
2010		31																																

Indicator 8.1.2 of 4: Enrollment of underrepresented populations: The percentage of GAANN fellows from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds completing the terminal degree in the designated area of national need will be greater than the national average.										
Targets and Performance Data						Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of GAANN fellows from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds completing the terminal degree in the designated areas of national need.</i>										
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets				
	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Women	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Women
1999	1	10	7	4	37					
2001	0	7	7	7	39					
2002	1	11	10	5	38					
2003	0	6	7	2	35	999	999	999	999	999
2004	1	6	10	4	36	0	6	7	2	35
2005						1	8	7	6	39
2006						1	11	10	5	39
2007						1	11	10	5	39.50
2008						1	11	10	5	40
2009						1	11	10	5	40.50
2010						1	11	10	5	41
						<p><b>Explanation:</b> The program office has developed a database to collect this information. Data in 2002 are from the 1997 cohort. Data in 2003 are from the 1998 cohort and from those in the 2000 cohort that completed their degrees. FY 2003 data established the baseline. Data in 2004 include those in the 2000 cohort that finish, as well as those in the 2001 cohort that completed their degrees.</p>				
						<p><b>Source: Performance Report</b>  <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1840-0748 GAANN Final Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The performance of the GAANN program is limited in that the authorizing legislation recommends, but does not mandate that grantees seek individuals from traditionally underrepresented groups when awarding fellowships. However, in responding to the selection criteria, grantees must address plans to include students from underrepresented groups.</p>				

Indicator 8.1.3 of 4: Time for program completion: The median duration of time from entering graduate school until degree completion will be less than that of comparable doctoral students as identified annually in the Survey of Earned Doctorates.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Time to degree completion</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The baseline data are from the 1997 cohort. Actual performance is compared to the National Research Council's Survey of Earned Doctorates in which the current average time to degree for comparable degrees is 7.5 years. The long-term target for this measure is 7 years in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> Non-NCES Survey/Research  <b>Collecting Agency:</b> NSF.  <b>Survey/Research Report Title:</b> Survey of Earned Doctorate.  <b>References:</b> .  <b>Web Site:</b>  <a href="http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/ssed/start.htm">http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/ssed/start.htm</a>.  <b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Administrative Records; 1840-0748 GAANN Final Performance Reports  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> Federal Statistical Agencies. Program data have no formal evaluation.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	6.50			
2003	7.10			
2005		6.45		
2006		7.25		
2007		7		
2008		7		
2009		7		
2010		7		

<b>Indicator 8.1.4 of 4: The cost per successful GAANN fellow. This efficiency measure is derived by taking the total funding for years one, two, and three divided by the number of GAANN Ph.D.s and those that pass preliminary exams.</b>														
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress												
Sources and Data Quality														
<p><i>The cost per successful GAANN fellow-the total funding for years one, two, and three divided by the number of GAANN Ph.D.s and those who pass preliminary exam fellows will be the formula for determining outcome.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>92,557</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>127,514</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>127,500</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	92,557		2003	127,514		2006		127,500	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2002 data established the baseline. No target was established for this measure until FY 2006. The program office has developed a database to collect this information for the efficiency measure. The 2002 information is based on the 1997 cohort. The 2003 information is based on the 1998 cohort and those in the 2000 cohort that finished. Data received in December 2004 will be available in spring 2005.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets												
2002	92,557													
2003	127,514													
2006		127,500												
		<p><b>Source: Performance Report</b>  <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1840-0748 GAANN Final Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grants Administration &amp; Payments System (GAPS)</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>												

## HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Domestic Programs - 2006

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.015 - National Resource Centers and Fellowships Program for Language and Area or Language and International Studies  
 84.016 - Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs  
 84.017 - International Research and Studies  
 84.153A - Business and International Education Program  
 84.220 - Centers for International Business Education  
 84.229A - Language Resource Centers  
 84.274A - American Overseas Research Centers  
 84.337 - Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access

**Program Goal: To meet the nation's security and economic needs through the development of a national capacity in foreign languages, and area and international studies.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Maintain a U.S. higher education system able to produce experts in less commonly taught languages and area studies who are capable of contributing to the needs of the U.S. Government, academic and business institutions.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Employment in field of study: Percentage of National Resource Center Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government, and national security.</b>																	
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<i>The percentage of National Resource Center Ph.D. graduates who find employment in higher education, government, and national security.</i>																	
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">Year</th> <th style="width: 40%; text-align: center;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 45%; text-align: center;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2001</td> <td style="text-align: center;">48.50</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2002</td> <td style="text-align: center;">53.70</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2003</td> <td style="text-align: center;">46.10</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2005</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">47.50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2001	48.50		2002	53.70		2003	46.10		2005		47.50	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Government employment reflects employment in federal government. Employment in national security is represented by military employment. No targets were established for FY 2004 and FY 2005. The long-term goal for this measure is 50 percent in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research</b>  <b>Survey/Research Report Title:</b> EELIAS.  <b>References:</b> National Resource Center Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system.  <b>Web Site:</b>  <a href="http://www.eeliasonline.net">http://www.eeliasonline.net</a></p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets															
2001	48.50																
2002	53.70																
2003	46.10																
2005		47.50															

<table border="1"> <tr><td>2006</td><td></td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2007</td><td></td><td>48.50</td></tr> <tr><td>2008</td><td></td><td>49</td></tr> <tr><td>2009</td><td></td><td>49.50</td></tr> <tr><td>2010</td><td></td><td>50</td></tr> </table>	2006		48	2007		48.50	2008		49	2009		49.50	2010		50			<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>									
2006		48																									
2007		48.50																									
2008		49																									
2009		49.50																									
2010		50																									
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Expansion of critical languages: Percentage of critical languages taught, as reflected by the list of critical languages referenced in the Title VI program statute (National Resource Centers, International Research and Studies, and Language Resource Centers).</b></p>																											
<p>Targets and Performance Data</p>		<p>Assessment of Progress</p>	<p>Sources and Data Quality</p>																								
<p><i>The percentage of critical languages taught, as reflected by the list of critical languages referenced in the Title VI program statute (National Resource Centers).</i></p>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The list of critical languages included in the Title VI program statute comprises 169 languages. The FY 2004 data established the baseline and reflects the 120 languages that are currently being taught in Title VI institutions. It is the goal of the program to have all of these languages taught by 2015. The long-term goal for this measure is 89 percent in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research</b>  <b>Survey/Research Report Title:</b> EELIAS.  <b>References:</b> National Resource Center Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system.  <b>Web Site:</b> <a href="http://www.eeliasonline.net">http://www.eeliasonline.net</a>.  <b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Information  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>																								
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>71</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>89</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year			Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2004	71		2005		74	2006		77	2007		80	2008		83	2009		86	2010		89	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets																							
2004	71																										
2005				74																							
2006				77																							
2007				80																							
2008				83																							
2009				86																							
2010		89																									
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>71</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2004	71																									
2004	71																										
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>74</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2005		74																								
2005		74																									
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>77</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2006		77																								
2006		77																									
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>80</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2007		80																								
2007		80																									
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>83</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2008		83																								
2008		83																									
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>86</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2009		86																								
2009		86																									
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>89</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2010		89																								
2010		89																									



Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Improved language competency: Average competency score of Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship recipients at the end of one full year of instruction (posttest) minus the average competency score at the beginning of the year (pretest).																											
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																								
<p><i>The average competency score of Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship Recipients at the end of one full year of instruction (posttest) minus the average competency score at the beginning of the year (pretest).</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>1.20</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>1.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>1.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>1.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>1.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td></td> <td>1.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td></td> <td>1.20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2003	1.20		2005		1.20	2006		1.20	2007		1.20	2008		1.20	2009		1.20	2010		1.20	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. Regarding the performance data, an increase of "1" reflects normal progress of one full year of instruction. Therefore, the performance level (and targets) of 1.2 indicate that the students receiving FLAS fellowships are acquiring more language skill than their coursework actually offers. The long term goal for this measure is 1.2 in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Source: Non-NCES Survey/Research</b>  <b>Survey/Research Report Title:</b> EELIAS.  <b>References:</b> National Resource Center Annual and Final Reports from the EELIAS performance reporting system.  <b>Web Site:</b> <a href="http://www.eeliasonline.net">http://www.eeliasonline.net</a>.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																									
2003	1.20																										
2005		1.20																									
2006		1.20																									
2007		1.20																									
2008		1.20																									
2009		1.20																									
2010		1.20																									

## HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Institute for International Public Policy - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.269 - Institute for International Public Policy

**Program Goal: To meet the nation's security and economic needs through the development of a national capacity in foreign languages, and area and international studies.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Maintain a U.S. higher education system able to produce experts in less commonly taught languages and area studies who are capable of contributing to the needs of the U.S. Government, and national security.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Employment: The percentage of Institute for International Public Policy (IIPP) Ph.D. graduates who find employment in government service and national security.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of IIPP Ph.D. graduates who find employment in government and national security.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline. The program is currently in the process of working with the program grantee to assess how they can best perform the necessary longitudinal tracking to obtain this employment in field data. This measure differs from a previous measure that included NRC and IIPP graduates.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report Contractor Performance Report</b></p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Information</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2007</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2006		999		

## HEA: Javits Fellowships - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.170 - Javits Fellowships

**Program Goal: To provide financial assistance to graduate students who have demonstrated superior academic ability, achievement, and exceptional promise.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: To enable students of superior ability in the arts, humanities, and social sciences to complete their terminal degree.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 3: Graduate school completion: The percentage of Javits fellows who complete a terminal degree within seven years.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of Javits fellows who complete a doctorate degree within seven years.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data included in the Survey of Earned Doctorates indicate that the percentage of doctorates awarded nationally during the 2001 to 2002 academic year for doctoral students in comparable subject areas in the humanities and social sciences was 29 percent. The long-term target for this program is 33 in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Performance Report and Survey of Earned Doctorates 2002.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	30			
1999	26			
2003	31	29		
2004	31	30		
2005		31		
2006		31		
2007		32		
2008		32		
2009		33		
2010		33		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Time to degree completion: Average time to degree completion for Javits fellows will be less than the national average.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The average time to degree completion for Javits fellows.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> According to the most recent data provided by the Survey of Earned Doctorates, the median time to degree completion rate for all comparable graduate programs in the United States was 7.5 years in 2002. The long-term goal for this measure is 6.10 in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003	6.30			
2004	6.30			
2005				6.30
2006				6.30
2007				6.20
2008				6.20
2009				6.10
2010				6.10
Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Efficiency Measure: Cost per terminal degree (MFA/PhD) awarded.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The cost per terminal degree (PhD/MFA) for the Javits Fellowship Program.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2003 data established the baseline. This efficiency data are determined by calculating the total dollars allocated to the cohorts divided by the total number of Javits Fellows receiving a terminal degree during this same time frame. The baseline was calculated using appropriation amounts for fiscal years 1998 through 2001, and school year data for 1998-99 through 2001-02. Over time, the uses for this efficiency measure may include examining the relative efficiency of the Javits Program as compared with other comparable programs.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> GAPS and Annual Performance Report</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> December 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Program and Budget Service staff</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2003	109,873			
2004	110,000			
2006		110,000		

## HEA: SFA Federal Pell Grants - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.063 - Federal Pell Grant Program

**Program Goal: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants in an efficient, financially sound and customer-responsive manner.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that low- and middle-income students will have the same access to postsecondary education that high-income students do.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Targeting of Pell Grants: Pell Grant funds will continue to be targeted to those students with the greatest financial need. At least 75 percent of Pell Grant funds will go to students below 150 percent of the poverty line.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of Pell Grant funds going to students below 150 percent of the poverty line.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Increases in the maximum award without other changes in the formulas used to award Pell grants will tend to lower the percentage of funds going to the neediest students. The long-term target for this measure is 80 percent in 2010.</p>	<p><b>Source: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Record/File.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Pell Grant Applicant/Recipient File...  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 03/30/2004.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	82			
1998	80			
1999	78	75		
2000	78	75		
2001	79	75		
2002	78	75		
2003	76	75		
2004		75		
2005		75		
2006		74		

HEA: SFA Federal Pell Grants - 2006

Goal 5

<b>2007</b>		78		
<b>2008</b>		79		
<b>2009</b>		79		
<b>2010</b>		80		

## DEOA/HEA: Student Aid Administration - 2006

**Program Goal: Student Financial Assistance Programs**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Student aid administration**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Reduce or maintain FSA business process unit cost</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The unit cost of application processing.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2004 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2005 and FY 2006 targets are to maintain the baseline. FSA has completed defining and validating the ABC methodology that it will use. In addition, reporting has been redesigned to address GAO concerns as well as the current needs of FSA. However, additional work is required from the FSA subject matter specialist to allocate baseline resource data prior to using the ABC information. This effort will continue in FY 2005 and will be accomplished by the end of that calendar year. We will develop baseline unit cost measures for the business processes referenced.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> FSA Activity-Based Cost Model will be used to collect data. The model is currently under construction with a target date of September 2004.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost		
<b>2004</b>		999		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<b>2006</b>		999		
<i>The unit cost of origination and disbursement.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost		
<b>2004</b>		999		
<b>2005</b>		999		
<b>2006</b>		999		

<i>The unit cost of direct loan repayment.</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost
<b>2004</b>		999
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999
<i>The unit cost of direct loan consolidation.</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost
<b>2004</b>		999
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999
<i>The unit cost of default collections.</i>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>
	\$ Unit Cost	\$ Unit Cost
<b>2004</b>		999
<b>2005</b>		999
<b>2006</b>		999



Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Pell Grant overpayments: The percentage of Pell Grant overpayments.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of Pell Grant overpayments.</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
2001	3.40		
2002	3.30	3.40	
2003	3.10	3.10	
2004	2.80	3.10	
2005		3.10	
2006		3.10	
			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b>                      Analysis of sampled Internal Revenue Service income data compared to data reported on the Department of Education's Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) reported by the Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) and the Common Origination and Disbursement (COD) system.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>

## HEA: TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.066 - TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers

**Program Goal: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase postsecondary enrollment rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary enrollment: Percentage of EOC participants enrolling in college.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of TRIO Educational Opportunity Centers participants enrolling in college.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> FY 2000 data established the baseline.	<b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
<b>2000</b>	57			
<b>2003</b>	57			
<b>2004</b>				57
<b>2005</b>				57.50
<b>2006</b>				58

## HEA: TRIO McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.217A - TRIO - McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement

**Program Goal: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase postsecondary persistence and completion rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Graduate school enrollment and persistence: Percentages of McNair participants enrolling and persisting in graduate school.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentages of TRIO McNair participants enrolling and persisting in graduate school.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The 1998-99 annual performance reports provided the baseline data for the McNair program. These annual performance reports have been used to determine if the performance targets for graduate school enrollment and persistence have been met. Enrollment refers to immediate enrollment in graduate school for B.A. recipients. The long-term targets for this program for enrollment and persistence are 38 and 72, respectively, for 2010. The 78 percent persistence rate for McNair in 2003 is not comparable to previous years' persistence rates. The rate for 2003 is one-year rate that assesses the percentage of McNair recipients who were enrolled at the end of their first year in graduate school in school year 2001-2002 (1,407), who were still enrolled at the end of school year 2002-</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> The redesigned McNair annual performance report that all grantees are required to submit annually. Additional data will be forthcoming from a national study of the McNair Program.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> September 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. The annual performance report is self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The primary data</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	Enrollment	Persistence				Enrollment	Persistence
<b>1999</b>	35	48					
<b>2000</b>	35	75				35	48
<b>2001</b>	40	66				35	48
<b>2002</b>	39	65				35	48
<b>2003</b>	36	78				36	75
<b>2004</b>						36	75
<b>2005</b>						36	70
<b>2006</b>						37	71
<b>2007</b>			37	71			
<b>2008</b>			38	72			

<b>2009</b>		38	72	2003 (1,102). The previous years persistence rates were cumulative persistence rates. This change from a cumulative persistence rate to an one-year rate was made to bring the persistence calculation for McNair more in line with the persistence calculations of other OPE programs.	source is the annual performance report that comprises self-reported data.
<b>2010</b>		38	72		

## HEA: TRIO Student Support Services - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.042A - TRIO Student Support Services

**Program Goal: Increase the percentage of low-income, first-generation college students who successfully pursue postsecondary education opportunities.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase postsecondary persistence and completion rates of low-income, first-generation individuals in the academic pipeline.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Postsecondary persistence and completion: Percentages of Student Support Services participants persisting and completing a degree at the same institution.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of TRIO Student Support Services participants persisting and completing a degree at the same institution.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data from the national study of the Student Support Services Program provide the baseline data (1999 actual performance). The redesigned Student Support Services' annual performance report has been used to determine if the performance targets for college persistence from freshman to sophomore year have been met. The six-year college completion baseline of 29 percent includes only SSS students who remain at the same school through graduation. It has been set at this level because the annual performance reports will only report the academic progress of SSS participants that remain at the grantee institution. The first year for which completion data will be available will be FY 2003-3004.</p>		<p><b>Source:</b> ED Evaluation  <b>Evaluation:</b> Higher Education.  <b>Section:</b> <u>A Study of the Talent Search Program (1995) Analysis and Highlights.</u></p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b>                      The redesigned Student Support Services performance report that all grantees are required to submit annually.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      The baseline data from the National Study of the Student Support Services Program met</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	College Persistence	College Completion				College Persistence	College Completion
<b>1999</b>	67	29					
<b>2000</b>	67					67	29
<b>2001</b>	70					67	29
<b>2002</b>	72					67	29
<b>2003</b>						68	29.50
<b>2004</b>						68.50	30
<b>2005</b>						69	30.50
<b>2006</b>			73	30.50			

		<p>the data collection standards of the Department of Education. 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.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The national study was a longitudinal evaluation of program participants and a comparison group. Data from this study have provided the baseline on persistence and graduation rates. Since this longitudinal evaluation cannot be used to measure program improvements annually, the annual performance reports have been used to assess attainment of persistence targets and will be used to determine four-year graduation rates beginning with the FY 2001-2002 data and six-year graduation dates beginning with the 2003-2004 data that should be available in late 2005.</p>
--	--	---

# HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.904A - Helen Keller National Center

**Program Goal: Individuals who are deaf-blind will become independent and function as full and productive members of their local community.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Individuals who are deaf-blind received the specialized services and training they need to become as independent and self-sufficient as possible.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Services to consumers at headquarters: By 2008, the training program at Helen Keller National Center (HKNC) headquarters will increase the number of adult consumers who have achieved successful employment to 45 percent, less restrictive setting outcomes to 75 percent, and identified training goals to 85 percent.**

Targets and Performance Data					Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality				
<i>The percentage of adult consumers who successfully achieve/maintain employment and independent living outcomes.</i>					<b>Explanation:</b> For FY 2006, this measure was reworded to more accurately reflect the elements being measured. In addition, the data from FY 2005 indicator 8.1.2. has been incorporated into this measure.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Final transition plans for each client will include the employment and living				
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets			
	%						%			
	Training %	in Less %	Placed in %	Adult consumers			Training %	in Less %	Placed in %	Adult consumers
	goals met	Restrictive Settings	Employment Settings	goals met			goals met	Restrictive Settings	Employment Settings	goals met
<b>1999</b>	75		45				85		38	
<b>2000</b>	82		52				90		45	
<b>2001</b>	87	92	71	38	90	86	59	45		
<b>2002</b>	85	90	80	27			59	45		
<b>2003</b>	100	88	70	42.50						

<b>2004</b>	98	90	69	46	95	88	70	45		<p>situations each client will be entering upon completion of training.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are based upon self-reported data from the grantee and are not independently verified. A follow-up survey was developed, but budgetary limitations prevented its implementation. HKNC will conduct a limited survey using selected RSA regions.</p>
<b>2005</b>					95	88	70	45		
<b>2006</b>					95	88	72	45		
<b>2007</b>					95	90	75	45		
<b>2008</b>					95	90	75	45		



**Objective 8.2 of 2: Increase the capacity of deaf-blind consumers to function more independently in the home community.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: Impact of professional training: State and local service providers will demonstrate improved knowledge and skills to meet the needs of HKNC consumers.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>The percentage of service providers who demonstrate knowledge/skill acquisition six months after HKNC training.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> HKNC Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      HKNC regional representatives maintain client case summary files that indicate activity with individual consumers, family members, professionals and organizations/agencies.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Client case summary reports do not measure the level of service provided or impact of the services on the lives of the consumers and family members. There are no improvements planned at this time.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2006		999		

Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: Consumer outcomes: Improved vocational and independent living outcomes									
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality			
<i>The percentage of consumers who successfully achieve/maintain employment or independent living outcomes.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> This is a new measure under development. The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> HKNC Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> October 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>			
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets		
	Secure Employment	Retain Employment	Independent Living				Secure Employment	Retain Employment	Independent Living
2006							999	999	999

## MECEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies Overseas Programs - 2006

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.018 - International: Overseas Seminars Abroad\_Bilateral Projects  
 84.019 - International: Overseas\_Faculty Research Abroad  
 84.021 - International: Overseas\_Group Projects Abroad

**Program Goal: To meet the nation's security and economic needs through the development of a national capacity in foreign languages, and area and international studies.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Maintain a U.S. higher education system able to produce experts in less commonly taught languages and area studies who are capable of contributing to the needs of U.S. Government and academic institutions.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Improved language competency: Average competency score of Fulbright Hays Training Grants--Faculty Research Abroad recipients--at the end of one full year of instruction (posttest) minus the average competency score at the beginning of the year (pretest).</b>								
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>The average competency score of Fulbright Hays Training Grants--Faculty Research Abroad recipients at the end of one full year of instruction (posttest) minus the average competency score at the beginning of the year (pretest).</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; padding: 5px;">Year</th> <th style="width: 45%; padding: 5px;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 40%; padding: 5px;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">2006</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets						
2006		999						
<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Information</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2007</p>						

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Improved Language Competency: Average competency score of Fulbright Hays Training Grants--Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad recipients--at the end of one full year of instruction (posttest) minus the average competency score at the beginning of the year (pretest).									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>The average competency score of Fulbright Hays Training Grants--Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad recipients at the end of one full year of instruction (posttest) minus the average competency score at the beginning of the year (pretest).</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Information</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2007</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
2006		999							

## RA: Client Assistance State Grants - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.161 - Rehabilitation Services\_Client Assistance Program

**Program Goal: To provide assistance and information to help individuals with disabilities secure the benefits available under the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants program and other programs funded under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended.**

Objective 8.1 of 2: Resolve cases at lowest possible level.

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Alternative dispute resolution (ADR): Through FY 2008, the percentage of cases resolved through the use of alternate dispute resolution (ADR) will be maintained at a rate of 84 percent.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of cases resolved through alternative dispute resolution (ADR).</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2001 data established the baseline. Performance targets have been established based on FY 2001 through 2003 data.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> CAP performance report, RSA-227.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> April 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialists. Onsite compliance reviews are conducted, and random sampling of onsite files is cross-checked with reported data for verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The collection instrument does not contain known data limitations.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	84			
2002	85			
2003	82			
2004		84		
2005		84		
2006		84		
2007		84		
2008		84		

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Accurately identify problem areas requiring systemic change and engage in systemic activity to improve services under the Rehabilitation Act.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Effects of systemic change: By FY 2008, the percentage of Client Assist Programs (CAPs) that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will increase to a rate of 55 percent.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																																	
<p style="text-align: center;">Targets and Performance Data</p> <p><i>The percentage of Client Assist Programs (CAPs) that reported that their systematic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>43</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>44</td> <td>44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>45</td> <td>45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>54</td> <td>46</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>48</td> <td>47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>49</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>55</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1999	43		2000	44	44	2001	45	45	2002	54	46	2003	48	47	2004		49	2005		50	2006		52	2007		54	2008		55	<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 1999 data established the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> CAP performance report, RSA-227, narrative section.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2004  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data will be limited because they are self-reported and in a narrative format. The data submitted are reviewed by program specialists, but data validity will be unattainable.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																			
1999	43																																				
2000	44	44																																			
2001	45	45																																			
2002	54	46																																			
2003	48	47																																			
2004		49																																			
2005		50																																			
2006		52																																			
2007		54																																			
2008		55																																			

## RA: Independent Living Centers - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.132 - Centers for Independent Living

**Program Goal: To promote and support a philosophy of independent living, including a philosophy of consumer control, peer support, self-help, self-determination, equal access, and individual and system advocacy, in order to maximize the leadership, empowerment, independence, and productivity of individuals with disabilities, and the integration and full inclusion of individuals with disabilities into the mainstream of American society.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: Through the provision of IL services (including the four IL core services), increase the percentage of CIL consumers who report having access to services needed to improve their ability to live more independently and participate fully in their communities.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Increase the percentage of CIL consumers who report having access to previously unavailable transportation, health care, and assistive technology.						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<p><i>As a result of direct services provided by a CIL (including referral to another service provider), the percentage of CIL consumers who report having access to previously unavailable transportation, appropriate accommodations to receive health care services, and/or assistive technology resulting in increased independence in at least one significant life area.</i></p>						
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets		
	Appropriate Accommodations for Health Care Transportation	Assistive Services Technology	Assistive Technology	Appropriate Accommodations for Health Care Transportation	Assistive Services Technology	Assistive Technology
<b>2006</b>				999	999	999
				<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA Annual Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2007</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Increase the percentage of CIL consumers moving out of institutions.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Through the provision of IL services (including the four IL core services) the percentage of CIL consumers who move out of institutions into a community-based setting.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 data will establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is the baseline plus one percent.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA Annual (704 Part 1).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> May 2006</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data is self-reported by CILs.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
	Percentage of CIL consumer moving out of institutions	Percentage of CIL consumer moving out of institutions	
2006		999	



**Objective 8.2 of 3: Increase the percentage of community services available to persons with disabilities.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Increase the percentage of community services available to persons with disabilities.						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<p><i>The percentage of CILs with CIL staff, board members and/or consumers creating/participating on community committees, in advocacy initiatives, in public information campaigns, and/or other community events, designed to increase the accessibility to transportation, develop relationships with health care providers, increase the availability /access to assistive technology and/or increase the compliance with applicable laws/regulations governing the number of affordable accessible housing units within the community.</i></p>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA Annual Performance Report (704 Report).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2007</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	Appropriate Health Care	Assistive Technology Housing	Appropriate Transportation Accommodations			Assistive Technology Housing
<b>2006</b>			999			999

**Objective 8.3 of 3: Improve the efficiency and transparency of the Centers for Independent Living Program.**

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Improve the efficiency and transparency of the Centers for Independent Living Program.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The number of months from due date to the release of CIL data to the public.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> This is a new measure for 2005. FY 2005 data will establish the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Office records and files.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> May 2006</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2006				3

## RA: Independent Living Services for Older Blind Individuals - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.177 - Rehabilitation Services\_Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who are Blind

**Program Goal: Support individuals with significant disabilities, including older blind individuals, served by Independent Living programs, in the achievement of their independent living goals.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Through the provision of services (either directly or through contracts), increase the percentage of consumers receiving services funded through OB Title VII, Chapter 2 funds who report having access to services needed to improve their ability to live more independently and participate fully in their communities.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of Title VII, Chapter 2, consumers who report having access to previously unavailable assistive technology aids and devices; and the percentage of Title VII, Chapter 2, consumers who report improved ADL skills.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is the baseline plus 1 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual 7-OB reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> July 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets			
	AT	ADL	AT			ADL
2005			999			999
2006			999			999

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Improve the efficiency and transparency of the IL Title VII, Chapter 2 Older Blind Program**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Make Title VII, Chapter 2 data available to the public.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The number of months from data due to the release of the data to the public.</i>		<b>Explanation:</b> This was a new measure for 2005.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual 7-OB Report  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> July 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				7
2006				5

## RA: Independent Living State Grants - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.169 - Independent Living\_State Grants

**Program Goal: To promote and support a philosophy of independent living, including a philosophy of consumer control, peer support, self-help, self-determination, equal access, and individual and system advocacy, in order to maximize the leadership, empowerment, independence, and productivity of individuals with disabilities, and the integration and full inclusion of individuals with disabilities into the mainstream of American society.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Through the provision of services (either directly or through grants and/or contracts), increase the percentage of consumers receiving services funded through IL Title VII, Part B funds who report having access to services needed to improve their ability to live more independently and participate fully in their communities.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: The percentage of Part B consumers who report having access to previously unavailable transportation, health care, and assistive technology provided by the DSU will increase.</b>						
Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of Part B consumers who report having access to (previously unavailable) transportation, appropriate accommodations to receive health care services, and/or assistive technology resulting in increased independence in at least one significant life area.</i>						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	Appropriate Accommodations for Health Care Transportation	Assistive Services Technology		Appropriate Accommodations for Health Care Transportation	Assistive Services Technology	
<b>2006</b>			999	999	999	
				<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Source: RSA Annual 704 Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2007 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Increase the percentage of consumers reporting satisfaction with IL services.									
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p><i>The percentage of consumers receiving/who have received IL services reporting satisfaction with IL services received.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State's consumer satisfaction survey (required by 34 CFR 364.38) collected every three years as an attachment to the State Plan for Independent Living.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> March 2007  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets							
2006		999							

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Improve the efficiency and transparency of the IL Title VII, Part B Independent Living Program.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Make Title VII, Part B data available to the public.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The number of months from data due date to the release of data to the public.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> This was a new measure in FY 2005.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Part 1 704 Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> May 2006</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self-reported.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2005				5
2006				3

## RA: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.240 - Program of Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights

### Program Goal: Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR).

Objective 8.1 of 1: Identify problem areas requiring systemic change and engage in systemic activities to address those problems.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Policy changes: By FY 2008, the percentage of PAIRs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will increase to a rate of 82 percent.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																														
<p><i>The percentage of PAIRs that reported that their systemic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>54</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>68</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>81</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>75</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td></td> <td>77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>82</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2000	54		2001	68		2002	81		2003	75		2004		77	2005		79	2006		80	2007		81	2008		82	<p><b>Explanation:</b> Actual performance percentage based on 43 out of 57 PAIRs reporting successful systemic change activities in FY 2003. Performance trends are based on actual data reported for FY 2000-2003. These data demonstrate significant annual increases in the percentage of PAIRs achieving changes in policies and practices, making it difficult to accurately assess trends and performance.</p>	<p><b>Source: Performance Report</b>  <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b>                      1820-0627 Annual Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR) Program Performance Report.  <b>Program:</b> RSA Form 509.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.                      Data will be supplied through uniform data reporting. Once data are submitted, appropriate review will be conducted by program specialists.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data will be limited because they are self-reported</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																																
2000	54																																	
2001	68																																	
2002	81																																	
2003	75																																	
2004		77																																
2005		79																																
2006		80																																
2007		81																																
2008		82																																



		and in a narrative format. The data submitted will be reviewed by program specialists, but data validity will be unattainable.
--	--	--

## RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.235 - Rehabilitation Services Demonstration and Training\_Special Demonstration Programs

**Program Goal: To expand, improve or further the purposes of activities authorized under the Act.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Expand and improve the provision of rehabilitation services that lead to employment outcomes.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of individuals who were provided employment services through projects and who were placed into employment.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2001 data established the baseline. No FY 2004 target was set.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Web-based Annual Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The Web-based system that grantees use for reporting provides raw data but does not aggregate all the numbers needed, which has resulted in hand counting to obtain the information required.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The Department of Education internal programmer is being assisted by an outside contractor to correct this problem.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Percent of individuals placed into employment	Percent of individuals placed into employment		
<b>2001</b>	23			
<b>2002</b>	20			
<b>2003</b>	27			
<b>2005</b>		24		
<b>2006</b>		25		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Improvement: The percentage of individuals referred to or from VR agencies will be maintained or increased as a result of interactions with, presentations to, and information provided to VR agencies.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of referrals to and from state VR agencies and projects.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Referrals to VR from Projects	Referrals from VR to Projects	Referrals to VR from Projects	Referrals from VR to Projects
2001	8	37		
2002	8	29	10	58
2003	20	22	10	60
2004			10	62
2005			13	33
2006			14	34
			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2001 data established the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Web-based Annual Performance Reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> January 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data will be supplied by grantees through uniform reporting.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The Web-based system that grantees use for reporting provides raw data but does not aggregate all the numbers needed, which has resulted in hand counting to obtain the information required.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> The Department of Education internal programmer is being assisted by an outside contractor to remedy this situation.</p>

## RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Grants for Indians - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.250 - Rehabilitation Services\_American Indians with Disabilities

**Program Goal: To improve employment outcomes of American Indians with disabilities who live on or near reservations by providing effective tribal vocational rehabilitation services.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that eligible American Indians with disabilities receive vocational rehabilitation services and achieve employment outcomes consistent with their particular strengths, resources, abilities, capabilities, and interests.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: The percentage of individuals who leave the program with employment outcomes: By the end of FY 2008, at least 65 percent of all eligible individuals who exit the program after receiving services under an individualized plan for employment will achieve an employment outcome.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of individuals who leave the program with employment outcomes.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> FY 2004 data are preliminary, based on reports by 68 of the 69 projects operating in FY 2004.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.            RSA staff must contact grantees regarding missing or apparently inconsistent data.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Continued technical assistance will ensure that grantees are providing uniform data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	58			
1999	61			
2000	62	61		
2001	65	62		
2002	64	62		
2003	66	64.10		
2004	61.60	64.50		
2005		65		
2006		65		
2007		65		
2008		65		

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: The cost per employment outcome.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
<i>The cost (in dollars) per employment outcome.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline for this new measure, based on PART recommendations. The measure is calculated by dividing the total federal grant funds by the number of individuals with employment outcomes.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2006		999		

## RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.126A - Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants

**Program Goal: Individuals with disabilities served by the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) State Grant program will achieve high-quality employment.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that individuals with disabilities who are served by the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) State Grant program achieve employment consistent with their particular strengths, resources, abilities, capabilities, and interests.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<p><i>(a) The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies that assist at least 55.8 percent of individuals who receive services to achieve employment outcomes, and (b) state VR agencies for the blind that assist at least 68.9 percent of individuals who receive services to achieve employment outcomes will increase.</i></p>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> This indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on Indicator 1.2 in Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve employment of all individuals whose cases were closed after receiving services. In order to pass this measure, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 55.8 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 68.9 percent.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED. Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from</p>
<p><i>(a) The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies that assist at least 55.8 percent of individual receiving services to achieve employment.</i></p>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	75			
2003	66			
2004		83		
2005		75		
2006		78		
<p><i>(b) The percentage obtaining employment for VR agencies for the blind.</i></p>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2002	75			
2003	58			

<table border="1"> <tr><td>2004</td><td></td><td>83</td></tr> <tr><td>2005</td><td></td><td>75</td></tr> <tr><td>2006</td><td></td><td>78</td></tr> </table>	2004		83	2005		75	2006		78			80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.			
2004		83													
2005		75													
2006		78													
<p><b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 3: Competitive employment for individuals with significant disabilities: The percentage of (a) general and combined state VR agencies for which at least 80 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities, and (b) state VR agencies for the blind for which at least 90 percent of the individuals achieving competitive employment have significant disabilities will increase.</b></p>															
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality												
<p><i>(a) The percentage with significant disabilities (for general and combined VR agencies).</i></p>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> This indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on indicator 1.4, in Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals achieving competitive employment who have significant disabilities. To pass the Section 106 indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 62.4 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 89 percent. For purposes of this measure, it was decided that the criteria were too low, so they have been increased to 80 percent for general and combined agencies and 90 percent for agencies for the blind to reflect more ambitious targets. FY 2002 and 2003 data were recalculated to reflect the criteria that were developed in 2006. No targets were established for FY 2004 or FY 2005.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.</p>												
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> </table>	Year			Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr><td>2002</td><td>75</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2003</td><td>82</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2006</td><td></td><td>88</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	2002	75		2003	82		2006		88
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets											
2002	75														
2003	82														
2006		88													
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr><td>2002</td><td>75</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2003</td><td>82</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2006</td><td></td><td>88</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	2002	75		2003	82		2006		88						
2002	75														
2003	82														
2006		88													
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr><td>2002</td><td>82</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2006</td><td></td><td>88</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	2002	82		2006		88									
2002	82														
2006		88													
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr><td>2006</td><td></td><td>88</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	2006		88												
2006		88													
<p><i>(b) The percentage with significant disabilities (for VR agencies for the blind).</i></p>															
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr><td>2002</td><td>88</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2003</td><td>88</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2006</td><td></td><td>96</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	2002	88		2003	88		2006		96		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets													
2002	88														
2003	88														
2006		96													
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr><td>2002</td><td>88</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2003</td><td>88</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2006</td><td></td><td>96</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	2002	88		2003	88		2006		96						
2002	88														
2003	88														
2006		96													
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr><td>2002</td><td>88</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2003</td><td>88</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2006</td><td></td><td>96</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	2002	88		2003	88		2006		96						
2002	88														
2003	88														
2006		96													
<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr><td>2006</td><td></td><td>96</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	2006		96												
2006		96													

Indicator 8.1.3 of 3: Competitive employment: By 2008 (a) 98 percent of general and combined state VR agencies will assist at least 85 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment, and (b) 60 percent of state VR agencies for the blind will assist at least 65 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment.																					
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality																		
<p><i>(a) The percentage of general and combined state VR agencies assisting at least 85 percent of individuals to achieve competitive employment.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>88</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>93</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>98</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>98</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	88		2003	93		2006		96	2007		98	2008		98	<p><b>Explanation:</b> This long-term indicator is derived from state VR agency performance on indicator 1.3 in Section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act. For each VR agency, RSA examines the percentage of individuals who achieve competitive employment of all individuals who achieve employment. To pass the Section 106 indicator, a general/combined agency must achieve a rate of 72.6 percent, while an agency for the blind must achieve a rate of 35.4 percent. For purposes of this measure, it was decided that the criteria were too low so they were increased to 85 percent for general and combined VR agencies and 65 percent for agencies for the blind. For measure (a), the FY 2002 and 2003 data were incorrectly calculated and have been corrected. No targets were set for FY 2004 or FY 2005.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> RSA state agency data from the RSA-911.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2003 - 2004  <b>Data Available:</b> April 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.                      Verified by ED attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluation Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Accuracy/ consistency of reporting is contingent upon counselors' interpretations of definitions. Timeliness is dependent upon submittal of clean data from 80 grantees. Limited staff resources affect ability to check data for reasonableness and publish data quickly.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2002	88																				
2003	93																				
2006		96																			
2007		98																			
2008		98																			
<p><i>(b) The percentage of state VR agencies for the blind assisting at least 65 percent of individuals to achieve competitive employment.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>50</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>54</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>56</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>58</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td></td> <td>60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	50		2003	54		2006		56	2007		58	2008		60		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																			
2002	50																				
2003	54																				
2006		56																			
2007		58																			
2008		60																			



## RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training - 2006

**CFDA Numbers:** 84.129 - Rehabilitation Long-Term Training  
 84.246 - Rehabilitation Short-Term Training  
 84.264 - Rehabilitation Training\_Continuing Education  
 84.275 - Rehabilitation Training\_General Training

**Program Goal: To provide the public vocational rehabilitation (VR) sector with well-trained staff and to maintain and upgrade the skills of current staff through continuing education.**

**Objective 8.1 of 3: To provide graduates who work within the vocational rehabilitation (VR) system to help individuals with disabilities achieve their goals.**

**Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Numbers trained: The number of students supported by RSA scholarships and the number of RSA scholars graduating will remain stable.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of scholars supported by RSA scholarships.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> After peaking in 2001, target performance decreased as college tuitions are rapidly increasing, while program funds are either level or decreasing.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual grantee reporting.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> March 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees. No formal verification procedure applied.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1997	1,600			
1998	1,550			
1999	1,665	1,473		
2000	2,390	2,000		
2001	2,540	2,000		
2002	2,232	2,000		
2003		2,050		
2004		2,050		

2005		2,100		
2006		2,100		
<i>The number of scholars graduating.</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
1997	800			
1998	817			
1999	832	729		
2000	764	688		
2001	841	700		
2002	817	700		
2003		725		
2004		725		
2005		725		
2006		725		
<b>Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Percentage working: The percentage of graduates fulfilling their payback requirements through acceptable employment will increase annually.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of graduates fulfilling their payback requirements through acceptable employment.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Targets were reduced in 2005 since more accurate data are being collected and indicate a lower performance level. There are two ways to increase the number of new graduates: by increasing (1) the total number of graduates, or (2) the ratio of new to returning students. At	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual grantee reporting form.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data supplied by grantees
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2000	72	70		
2001	71	71		
2002	85	72		

2003		72	present there are not enough graduates entering state VR agencies to replace the departed staff.	<b>Limitations:</b> We are using a new reporting system, which is being refined. Same as indicator 1.1.
2004		74		
2005		73		
2006		73		

**Objective 8.2 of 3: Maintain and upgrade the knowledge and skills of personnel currently employed in the public VR system.**

<b>Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Qualified personnel: The percentage of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their state's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standard will increase annually.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of currently employed VR state agency counselors who meet their state's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) standards.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> Anticipate a leveling off in performance as staff turnover is at an all-time high due to retirements, and there is an insufficient pool of qualified candidates to replenish the staff positions.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual Evaluation. Ongoing collection could be through the in-service training program's annual performance report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Other. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2003 <b>Data Available:</b> March 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification. Data would be supplied through an external RSA contractor. No formal verification procedure applied.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
2000	69			
2001	71	70		
2002	65	75		
2003	67	77		
2004		79		
2005		70		
2006		70		

**Objective 8.3 of 3: To provide existing staff of the public vocational rehabilitation sector with continuing education to maintain and upgrade skills and knowledge.**

Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Knowledge and skills development: Percentage of staff of the public vocational rehabilitation sector who report improvement of skills and knowledge necessary for high quality performance.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
<p style="text-align: center;">Targets and Performance Data</p> <p><i>The percentage of participants who report an improvement in their knowledge and skills acquisition.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Source: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Record/File.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Project annual report Evaluation Instrument.  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 06/30/2006.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b>                      Performance reports submitted by trimester; annual reports.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2007  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Evaluation instruments vary across projects.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Plan to develop common data collection instrument during FY 2005-2006 for use in all future years.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets								
2006		999								

Indicator 8.3.2 of 2: Project activities consistent with needs assessment: The percentage of continuing education activities that are consistent with regional needs assessment.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>The percentage of project activities consistent with annual needs assessment.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2006 target is to establish a baseline.</p>	<p><b>Source: Other</b>  <b>Other:</b> Record/File.  <b>Sponsor:</b> Trimester reports.  <b>Date Sponsored:</b> 06/30/2005.</p> <p><b>Additional Source Information:</b>                      Performance reports including evaluation data are submitted by trimester and annually.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2005 - 2006  <b>Data Available:</b> January 2007  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Assessment comprehensiveness varies across projects.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> Plan to develop consistent reporting for needs assessment data during FY 2005-FY2006 for use in future years.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2006				999

## VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary - 2006 Vocational and Technical Institutions

**CFDA Number:** 84.245 - Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institutions

**Program Goal: To increase access to and improve vocational education that will strengthen workforce preparation, employment opportunities, and lifelong learning in the Indian community.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that vocational students served in tribally controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institutions make successful transitions to work or continuing education.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of vocational students in the TCPVIP who earn an A.A. degree or certificate.</i>			<b>Explanation:</b> FY 1999 data established the baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the target from the previous year.	<b>Additional Source Information:</b> Program Performance Report.  <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.  <b>Limitations:</b> Calculations of completions are based on the number of students receiving degrees relative to all students available to graduate (i.e., students in their final semester). Data are self-reported by the grantees using lists of graduates and enrollees.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Percentage of students	Percentage of students		
1999	23			
2000	57	25		
2001	82	59		
2002	46	65		
2003	48	47		
2004	44	49		
2005		52		
2006		52		

A horizontal rectangular area with a marbled, stone-like texture in shades of grey and white. The texture consists of irregular, vein-like patterns. Centered within this area is the text "All Goals" in a large, bold, black sans-serif font.

**All Goals**

## DEOA: Office for Civil Rights - 2006

**Program Goal: To ensure equal access to education and promote educational excellence throughout the nation through the vigorous enforcement of civil rights.**

**Objective 8.1 of 2: To provide high-quality customer service throughout the case-resolution process.**

<b>Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Customer response: Based on an OCR customer service evaluation, respondents will indicate a satisfaction rate above the FY 2004 baseline.</b>											
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<i>The percentage of respondents satisfied with OCR's customer service.</i>											
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Actual Performance</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2005</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2006</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">999</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2005		999	2006		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline. The FY 2006 target is to maintain the baseline.</p>	<p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets									
2005		999									
2006		999									



**Objective 8.2 of 2: To obtain results by the efficient management of civil rights compliance activities.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Resolution of complaints: The percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days of receipt.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days.</i>			<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Data are collected in OCR's Case Management System throughout the fiscal year (October 1-September 30).</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
1997	80		
1998	81		
1999	80	80	
2000	78	80	
2001	84	80	
2002	89	80	
2003	91	80	
2004	92	80	
2005		80	
2006		80	



# Ongoing Plans Without FY 2006 Measures

## ESEA: Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.060 - Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies

**Program Goal: To help American Indian and Alaska Native children achieve to the same challenging standards expected of all students by supporting access to programs that meet their unique educational and culturally related academic need.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: American Indian and Alaska Native students served by LEAs' receiving Indian Education Formula Grants will progress at rates similar to those for all students in achievement to standards, promotion, and graduation.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<p><i>The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade four who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>63</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>51</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>47</td> <td>62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>53</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2000	63		2002	51	60	2003	47	62	2005		53	<p><b>Explanation:</b> NAEP assessments for reading and math are not administered annually; therefore, no target have been set for FY 2006. National trends indicate performance in reading and math are declining.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2000, 2002; Schools and Staffing Survey, 1997.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> NCES.                      Data validated by National Center for Education Statistics review procedures and statistical standards.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> The small sample (for the subpopulation of American Indian and Alaska Native students) means there is a</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
2000	63																		
2002	51	60																	
2003	47	62																	
2005		53																	
<p><i>The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade eight who were at or above basic level in reading on NAEP.</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>61</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>57</td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td></td> <td>63</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2002	61		2003	57	66	2005		63					
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets																	
2002	61																		
2003	57	66																	
2005		63																	

<p><i>The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade four who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP.</i></p>			<p>high degree of standard error surrounding the estimates and limits data collection and possibilities for comparison to other populations. These estimates will vary greatly until a larger population is surveyed.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	
1996	57		
2000	40		
2002		64	
2003	64	66	
2005		66	
<p><i>The percentage of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grade eight who scored at or above basic level in math on NAEP.</i></p>			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	
1996	51		
2000	47		
2002		62	
2003	52	64	
2005		54	

## ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.165A - Magnet Schools Assistance

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

**Objective 8.1 of 2: Federally funded magnet schools will eliminate, reduce, or prevent minority group isolation in targeted elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group students.**

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of magnet schools whose student applicant pool reduces, prevents, or eliminates minority group isolation.</i>				<p><b>Explanation:</b> The Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) grants are three-year grants. New cohorts of grantees are established in SY 2004-05 (cohort 1) and in SY 2007-08 (cohort 2). The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 1, and the FY 2008 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 2.</p>		<p><b>Source: Performance Report</b>  <b>Grantee Performance Report:</b> Magnet Schools Grantee Performance Report.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006  <b>Validated By:</b> On-Site Monitoring By ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are self reported.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets					
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1					Cohort 2
<b>2005</b>			999					
<b>2008</b>			999					

**Objective 8.2 of 2: Magnet school students meet their state's academic achievement standards.**

Indicator 8.2.1 of 2: The percentage of magnet schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed the state's adequate progress standard.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of schools whose students from major racial and ethnic groups meet or exceed the state's adequate yearly progress standard.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> New cohorts of grantees are established in SY 2004-05 (cohort 1) and in SY 2007-08 (cohort 2). The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 1. The target for FY 2008 is to establish a baseline for cohort 2.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Annual state test results required by NCLB</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 State educational agencies</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are frequently late in being released.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2				Cohort 1	Cohort 2
2005						999	
2008						999	
Indicator 8.2.2 of 2: The percentage of magnet schools that meet or exceed the state's adequate yearly progress standard.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The percentage of magnet schools that meet or exceed the state's adequate yearly progress standard.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> New cohorts of grantees are established in SY 2004-05 (cohort 1) and in SY 2007-08 (cohort 2). The FY 2005 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 1. The FY 2008 target is to establish a baseline for cohort 2.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> State test results required by NCLB</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005 <b>Data Available:</b> October 2006 State educational agencies.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are frequently late in being released.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2				Cohort 1	Cohort 2
2005						999	
2008						999	

## ESRA: National Assessment - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.902 - Assessments

**Program Goal: To collect, analyze, and disseminate information on the condition of education in the United States and to provide comparative international statistics.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Timeliness of NAEP data for reading and mathematics assessment in support of the President's No Child Left Behind Initiative.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of months from the end of data collection to the initial public release of results.</i>				<p><b>Frequency:</b> Biennially.  <b>Collection Period:</b> 2004 - 2005  <b>Data Available:</b> December 2005  <b>Validated By:</b> NCES.                      Data will be validated by determining number of months between actual end of data collection and the release date.</p> <p><b>Improvements:</b> NCES has added an additional goal in GPRA, i.e., "Timeliness of NAEP data for Reading and Mathematics Assessment in support of the President's No Child Left Behind Initiative." In addition, NCES is developing a monitoring system to measure external uses of NCES products. Both volume and actual use for specific user groups will be documented in the monitoring system. The monitoring system will establish baseline measures of usage and application of NCES products from which long-term outcomes can be established.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2003	8	6		
2005		6		
2007		6		



## HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents in School - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.335 - Child Care Access Means Parents in School

**Program Goal: To support the participation of low-income parents in the postsecondary education system through the provisions of campus-based child care services.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Increase access for low-income parents to postsecondary institutions.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 2: Persistence rate.: The percentage of program participants who persist in postsecondary education.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The persistence rate of program participants in postsecondary education receiving child care services.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> These measures have been reformatted since 2005. Data are collected, as per program statute, from 18-month and 36-month performance reports. Although data from the 36-month reports are more meaningful for reporting on persistence, data are also presented and projected from 18-month reports. This enables regular annual reporting on program activity. The 79 percent persistence rate from the most recent 36-month report (2002) compares to a 67 percent persistence rate for Pell recipients with dependents --- a comparable group. The next update on persistence from a 36-month report covering 2002-2004 will be available in June 2005. The calendar for data collection with reports at 18 and 36 months means that data are not collected in FY 2006.</p>		<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> Grantee Performance Report: 1840-0737. 18 and 36 months Performance Reports for the Child Care Access Parents in Schools Program. The Grantee Performance Report attest to the accuracy of the data they provide by signing a form.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2004 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2005 <b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are supplied by grantees with no formal verification procedure provided. Grantees attest to accuracy of data.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	18 month report	36 month report				18 month report	36 month report
2002	79						
2003	64						
2004	66					64.50	79.50
2005							80
2007						65	
2008						65.50	81
2009							81.50
2010						66	
2011				82			

Indicator 8.1.2 of 2: Graduation rate: The percentage of program participants, not including those at four-year institutions, who complete their program of study.							
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress		Sources and Data Quality		
<i>The graduation rate of program participants in postsecondary education other than four-year schools.</i>			<p><b>Explanation:</b> Data are collected, per program statute, from 18-month and 36-month performance reports. Although data from the 36-month reports are more meaningful for reporting on graduation, data are also presented and projected from 18-month reports. The 18 percent graduation rate from the 18-month performance reports, reported for 2004 for the 2002-2004 reporting period for the program's 2002 cohort, compares favorably to the comparable group of Pell recipients with dependents (14 percent). Updated graduation rate data from the 36-month performance report covering data through 2004 for the 2001 cohort, will be available in June 2005. Data are not collected in FY 2006.</p>		<p><b>Source: Performance Report Grantee Performance Report:</b> 1840-0763 18 and 36 months Performance Reports for the Child Care Access Parents in Schools Program.</p> <p><b>Frequency:</b> Other.</p> <p><b>Collection Period:</b> 2002 - 2004</p> <p><b>Data Available:</b> June 2005</p> <p><b>Validated By:</b> No Formal Verification.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> Data are supplied by child care centers with no formal verification procedure provided.</p>		
Year	Actual Performance					Performance Targets	
	18 month report	36 month report				18 month report	36 month report
2002	22						
2003	17						
2004	18					17.50	22.50
2005							23
2007						18	
2008						18.50	23.50
2009							24
2010						19	
2011							25

<i>The graduation rate of program participants in postsecondary education including four-year schools.</i>				
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	18 month report	36 month report	18 month report	36 month report
2001	25		25	
2002		24		
2003	17			
2004			17	25
2005				25
2007			18	
2008			18.50	25.50
2009				26
2010			19	
2011				27

## HEA: SFA Federal Direct Student Loans - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.268 - Federal Direct Student Loans

**Program Goal: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of work-study in an efficient, financially sound and customer-responsive manner.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that persistence rates will increase for low- and middle-income students.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Student persistence.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Student Persistence</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2008 target is to establish a baseline. Providing program-specific data for this program will become feasible when individual student enrollment information is collected. The collection of student data at the individual unit record level will provide the information needed to calculate retention and completion rates for the individual FSA programs. OPE management has been actively involved in the technical review panel for the IPEDS Student Unit Record Feasibility Study. The study is being conducted to review the feasibility of redesigning the IPEDS collection of student-related data to incorporate individual student unit records. Although it is premature to anticipate when, and if, unit record data will become available, FY 2008 would likely be the earliest possible date since field testing is anticipated in FY 2006 and implementation would probably not occur until FY 2007. Given that the unit record project study outcome is not yet known, OPE also is exploring the feasibility of obtaining program data on persistence and completion by drawing an alternative sample from the merged applicant/recipient file and conducting a survey of this group.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> IPEDS <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2007 - 2008 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2008</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2008				999

# HEA: SFA Federal Family Education Loan Program & Liquidating - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.032 - Federal Family Education Loans

**Program Goal: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of loans in an efficient, financially sound and customer-responsive manner.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that persistence rates will increase for low- and middle-income students.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Student persistence.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Student persistence rates.</i>		<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. Providing program-specific data for this program will become feasible when individual student enrollment information is collected. The collection of student data at the individual unit record level will provide the information needed to calculate retention and completion rates for the individual FSA programs. OPE management has been actively involved in the technical review panel for the IPEDS Student Unit Record Feasibility Study. The study is being conducted to review the feasibility of redesigning the IPEDS collection of student-related data to incorporate individual student unit records. Although it is premature to anticipate when, and if, unit record data will become available, FY 2008 would likely be the earliest possible date since field testing is anticipated in FY 2006 and implementation would probably not occur until FY 2007. Given that the unit record project study outcome is not yet known, OPE also is exploring the feasibility of obtaining program data on persistence and completion by drawing an alternative sample from the merged applicant/recipient file and conducting a survey of this group.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> IPEDS <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2006 - 2007 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2008</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
2007				999

## HEA: SFA Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants - 2006

CFDA Number: 84.007 - Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants

**Program Goal: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants in an efficient, financially sound and customer-responsive manner.**

**Objective 8.1 of 1: Ensure that persistence rates will increase for low- and middle-income students.**

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Student Persistence.												
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality									
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="3"><i>Student persistence rates</i></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td></td> <td>999</td> </tr> </table>		<i>Student persistence rates</i>			Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	2007		999	<p><b>Explanation:</b> The FY 2007 target is to establish a baseline. Providing program-specific data for this program will become feasible when individual student enrollment information is collected. The collection of student data at the individual unit record level will provide the information needed to calculate retention and completion rates for the individual FSA programs. OPE management has been actively involved in the technical review panel for the IPEDS Student Unit Record Feasibility Study. The study is being conducted to review the feasibility of redesigning the IPEDS collection of student-related data to incorporate individual student unit records. Although it is premature to anticipate when, and if, unit record data will become available, FY 2008 would likely be the earliest possible date since field testing is anticipated in FY 2006 and implementation would probably not occur until FY 2007. Given that the unit record project study outcome is not yet known, OPE also is exploring the feasibility of obtaining program data on persistence and completion by drawing an alternative sample from the merged applicant/recipient file and conducting a survey of this group.</p>	<p><b>Additional Source Information:</b> IPEDS <b>Frequency:</b> Annually. <b>Collection Period:</b> 2006 - 2007 <b>Data Available:</b> June 2008</p>
<i>Student persistence rates</i>												
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets										
2007		999										