



U.S. Department of Education FY 2010 Annual Performance Report

U.S. Department of Education

Arne Duncan

Secretary

Office of the Chief Financial Officer

Thomas Skelly

Delegated to perform the functions and duties of Chief Financial Officer

February 14, 2011

This report is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should be: U.S. Department of Education, *FY 2010 Annual Performance Report*, Washington, D.C., 2011.

This report is available on the Department's Web site at: <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/index.html>.

On request, this publication is available in alternative formats, such as Braille, large print, or computer diskette. For more information, please contact the Department's Alternate Format Center at (202) 260-0852 or (202) 260-0818.

The Department's *Strategic Plan* is available on the Web at: <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/strat/index.html>.

Department annual plans and annual reports are available on the Web at:
<http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/index.html>.

The Department welcomes all comments and suggestions on both the content and presentation of this report. Please forward them to: PARcomments@ed.gov.

Office of the Chief Financial Officer
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202-0600

The following companies were contracted to assist in the preparation of the
U.S. Department of Education *FY 2010 Annual Performance Report*:

For general layout and Web design:	ICF Macro
For database design:	Plexus Corporation
For accounting services:	IBM Business Consulting Services
	FMR Consulting, Inc.
	Cotton & Company, LLP

Foreword

As required by the *Government Performance and Results Act of 1993*, each federal agency must report annually on its progress in meeting the goals and objectives established by its *Strategic Plan*. The United States Department of Education's (the Department's) *Annual Performance Report* (APR) for fiscal year (FY) 2010 presents to Congress, the President, and the American people detailed information about progress in meeting the Department's strategic goals and objectives and key performance measures. The APR is released in support of the Department's Congressional Budget Justifications (CBJ). The complete CBJ can be accessed at <http://www.ed.gov/about/overview/focus/performance.html>.

The APR is one in a series of three reports required under the Office of Management and Budget's Program for Alternative Approaches to Performance and Accountability Reporting. In FY 2009 and FY 2010, the Department has participated in this voluntary program with the intent to strengthen annual reporting documents and to present more streamlined and timely information to clarify the relationship between performance, budgetary resources, and financial reporting.

The Department's FY 2010 annual reporting includes the following three documents:

Summary of Performance and Financial Information

[available February 2011]

This document provides an integrated overview of performance and financial information that consolidates the *Agency Financial Report* (AFR) and the *Annual Performance Report* (APR) into a user-friendly format.

Annual Performance Report (APR)

[available February 2011]

The APR is produced in conjunction with the FY 2012 President's Budget Request and provides more detailed performance information and analysis of performance results.

Agency Financial Report (AFR) [published November 15, 2010]

The AFR is organized into three major sections:

- The Management's Discussion and Analysis section provides executive-level information on the Department's history, mission, organization, key activities, analysis of financial statements, systems, controls and legal compliance, accomplishments for the fiscal year, and management and performance challenges facing the Department.
- The Financial Details section provides a Message From the Chief Financial Officer, consolidated and combined financial statements, the Department's notes to the financial statements, and the Report of the Independent Auditors.
- The Other Accompanying Information section provides *Improper Payments Information Act* reporting details and other statutory reporting requirements.

All three reports will be available on the Department's Web site at
<http://www.ed.gov/about/overview/focus/performance.html>.

Message From the Secretary



February 14, 2011

I am pleased to present the U.S. Department of Education's Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 *Annual Performance Report* (APR). This is one of three integrated reporting components that are included in the Office of Management and Budget's program for alternative approaches to the *Performance and Accountability Report* (PAR). The other two reports are the *FY 2010 Agency Financial Report*, released in November 2010, and the *FY 2010 Summary of Performance and Financial Information*, which will be released in February 2011.

FY 2010 was a transition year for the Department as we move to a new strategic plan. We are still firmly committed to our mission of promoting achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access. In FY 2010, we achieved major milestones in promoting our education goals.

We focused our efforts on the President's goal of the United States once again having the highest proportion of college graduates in the world—a goal that drives accountability for improvement from cradle to career. In order to achieve this goal, we need to continue to support students at all levels of the education continuum. We must begin with early learning, doing more to close the achievement gap before children enter kindergarten and to ensure success in school. We must provide our students with competent and effective teachers. We must work to reduce dropout rates in our high schools, promote college readiness, and make college more accessible and affordable.

We continue to work on the reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*. We need to ensure that states, districts, and schools are held accountable; provide greater flexibility to enable innovation and improvement; and place a greater emphasis on schools and students most at risk.

We have already focused on these objectives in administering our current programs. Race to the Top, authorized under the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009*, has prompted states and districts to remove obstacles to reform and encourage stakeholders to work together toward shared goals. I conducted a Courage in the Classroom tour to honor our nation's unsung heroes—our teachers. The major complaint I heard from teachers is that narrowly focused “bubble tests” pressure teachers to teach to the test. The Race to the Top Assessment program provides funding to coalitions of states to develop common assessments that measure real student knowledge and skills.

Our Investing in Innovation (i3) fund, authorized under the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009*, provides competitive grants to districts or consortia of schools to expand innovation and evidence-based practices. Additionally, states all across America are distributing School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds to districts to help their lowest-performing schools. And we are also distributing Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grants to districts to try new compensation programs that reward effective teachers or provide

incentives for teachers to teach in hard-to-staff schools and subjects. Also, I launched the TEACH Campaign to raise awareness of teaching as a valuable profession. For more information, please visit our Web site, www.TEACH.gov.

To help students struggling financially to enter college, the Department provides low-interest loans to students through the William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, and continues to provide Pell Grants, to make college more affordable and accessible. In the past year, we have significantly revised the student loan programs to provide additional options and benefits to borrowers. In addition, to save taxpayer dollars we now use private-sector companies generally chosen competitively based upon effective performance to service student loans.

Over the last two years, the Department has been able to support education jobs through stimulus funding provided by the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009*. Communities across America still face serious financial challenges. Our new Education Jobs Fund is saving and creating education jobs. It requires school districts to use the funds to pay the salaries and benefits of teachers, school administrators, and other essential employees.

The Department is in the final stages of completing a new strategic plan that reflects these new directions. Once complete, this plan will provide the basis for the performance measures that we will describe in future reports.

The current APR reports on measures that are tied to the existing strategic plan. Some of these measures focus on Departmental performance, such as the targeting of funding toward evidence-based programs. The vast majority of measures focus on student outcomes, such as achievement in reading and math. These student outcome measures are indicators of the health of our nation's education system as a whole.

Because it generally takes several months to collect, validate, aggregate meaningfully, and report student data, the most current student outcome-related data available for this report generally are from FY 2009. Of the student outcome-related measures with FY 2009 data in this report, our nation did not meet the target for the vast majority of measures. Targets missed include nearly all of the targets for improvement in K-12 state reading and math assessments, and all of the targets for improving teacher quality. This performance provides further evidence that broad reforms are needed across our education system. These reforms will be at the center of the Department's new strategic plan.

For the Departmental performance measures, the APR includes FY 2010 data. Of these measures, most show targets were met or showed improvement over the previous year. As part of our new strategic plan, the Department is undertaking a number of efforts to strengthen Departmental performance in support of all stakeholders involved in education reform and in support of improving student outcomes.

Education is the civil rights issue of our generation. To complement the Department's programmatic efforts to increase student academic achievement, we are reinvigorating our Office for Civil Rights to ensure access to equal educational opportunities for all students. We are also establishing the Equity and Excellence Commission to study the extent to which inequities and inefficiencies in K-12 education contribute to the achievement gap.

We will ensure that all public schools—traditional and charter—serve the children most in need.

I hope this information is useful to the many stakeholders and partners working together to achieve our education goals.

Sincerely,

/s/

Arne Duncan

Contents

Overview

About the Report.....	2
Linking Taxpayer Dollars to Performance Results.....	2
Accomplishments and Initiatives for FY 2010.....	2
Forward Looking Initiatives	3
Management Challenges	3
FY 2010 Financial Highlights and Detailed Financial Information	3
Data Analysis and the <i>Annual Performance Report</i>	4

Performance Summary

The Department's Priority Performance Goals	8
Challenges Linking Program Performance to Funding	8
Summary of Performance Results.....	9

Performance Details

Performance Details Overview	18
Goal 1: Improve Student Achievement, With a Focus on Bringing All Students to Grade Level in Reading and Mathematics by 2014	19
Goal 2: Increase the Academic Achievement of All High School Students	31
Goal 3: Ensure the Accessibility, Affordability, and Accountability of Higher Education and Better Prepare Students and Adults for Employment and Future Learning	37
Cross-Goal Strategy on Management	50

Appendices

Appendix A1: Summary of Inspector General Audits and Government Accountability Office Reports	58
Appendix A2: Summary of FY 2010 Performance Evaluations.....	63
Appendix B: Glossary of Acronyms and Abbreviations	71
Appendix C: Selected Department Web Links.....	75

Overview

About the Report

The United States Department of Education's *Annual Performance Report* (APR) for fiscal year (FY) 2010 provides detailed information on:

- the status of strategic goals, and
- the outcomes of the strategic performance measures identified in the Department's *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan* and updated previously in the *FY 2009 Annual Performance Report*. The Department is developing a new strategic plan for FY 2011–2015.

The *Agency Financial Report* (AFR), released in November 2010, provides detailed information on the Department's financial performance and stewardship over its financial resources. For a copy of the full report, go to:

<http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2010report/agency-financial-report.pdf>.

The Secretary has outlined accomplishments, forward looking initiatives, and management challenges for the Department in FY 2010 and certified that the Department's performance data are fundamentally complete and reliable in his letter published in the *AFR*. For more information, go to: <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2010report/1-message.pdf>.

This document is released with the Congressional Budget Justifications for FY 2012, as well as other budget and performance documents that support the budget process for the upcoming year. For more information, go to:

<http://www.ed.gov/about/overview/focus/performance.html>.

Linking Taxpayer Dollars to Performance Results

Given the current constraints on the current economy, the President has requested that federal agencies become more fiscally responsible. The Department strives to link taxpayer dollars to results and strives to ensure accountability for the expenditure of its grant and contract dollars. It has also undertaken significant measures to maximize administrative efficiency within the agency.

By including detailed performance information with the President's Budget, the Department will link its performance to its budget requests. For more information, please go to:

<http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2010report/2c-mda-performance-highlights.pdf>.

Accomplishments and Initiatives for FY 2010

During FY 2010, the Department continued the enormous responsibility of allocating significant funds provided by the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (*Recovery Act*), as well as the Education Jobs Fund, Federal Student Aid initiatives, and Innovation. For more information, please go to:

<http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2010report/2d-mda-accomplishments.pdf>.

Forward Looking Initiatives

The *FY 2010 Agency Financial Report* identifies a series of future initiatives, including Implementation of Changes in Federal Student Aid, Data Quality and Reporting, Oversight and Monitoring, Information Technology Security, and Data Privacy Safeguards, are summarized at: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2010report/2e-mda-initiatives.pdf>.

Management Challenges

During FY 2010, the Department's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported management challenges in three areas: *Recovery Act*, student financial assistance (SFA) programs, with a focus on the *Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loans Act of 2008 (ECASLA)*; and information security and management. OIG has updated its analysis of each of these areas for FY 2011, and Data Quality and Reporting, previously a subarea, is presented as a separate challenge. The FY 2011 management challenges are: Implementation of New Programs/Statutory Changes, including the *Recovery Act* and changes to the SFA loan programs; Oversight and Monitoring, including SFA program participants, distance education, grantees, and contractors; Data Quality and Reporting; and Information Technology Security.

The Executive Summary of Management Challenges for FY 2011 is included in the Other Accompanying Information section of the *FY 2010 Agency Financial Report* and the full report is published by the Department's Office of Inspector General. To view the full report, go to: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/misc/mgmtchal2011.pdf>.

FY 2010 Financial Highlights and Detailed Financial Information

For the ninth consecutive year, the Department achieved an unqualified audit opinion on its annual financial statements. Since 2003, the independent auditors have identified no material weaknesses in the Department's internal control over financial reporting. To read the full report of the independent auditors, please go to:

<http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2010report/4-auditors.pdf>.

For an overview and analysis of the Department's sources of funds and financial position, please go to: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2010report/2g-mda-financial-highlights.pdf>.

To review the Department's financial summary and complete financial statements—including required supplementary stewardship information and notes to the principal financial statements for the fiscal years ended September 30, 2010, and September 30, 2009—please go to: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2010report/3-financial-details.pdf>.

For information on the *Improper Payments Information Act* reporting details, which includes a risk assessment of certain programs, please go to:

<http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2010report/5a-improper-payments.pdf>.

Data Analysis and the *Annual Performance Report*

The *Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA)* requires federal departments and agencies to describe the goals and objectives of their programs clearly, identify resources and actions needed to accomplish goals and objectives, develop a means of measuring progress made, and report regularly on achievement. The goals of the act include: improving program effectiveness by promoting a focus on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction; improving congressional decision-making by providing objective information on achieving statutory objectives; and focusing on the relative effectiveness and efficiency of federal programs and spending.

The Institute of Education Sciences Data Quality Initiative

The Data Quality Initiative (DQI) of the Department's Institute of Education Sciences, begun in 2006, is designed to improve the Department's program performance data and reporting in support of the goals of *GPRA*. Technical assistance is being provided to approximately 30 Department elementary and secondary grant programs.

The DQI has worked with the Department's program offices and with grantees to review grantee evaluation plans and reports, develop annual performance reporting forms, develop data collection and reporting guidance; review and analyze grantee annual performance data; and deliver grantee briefings and workshops focused on evaluation issues. The initiative includes programs covering a wide range of elementary and secondary education topics and populations. See http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/assistance_data.asp for more details.

Consolidating Data Collection Through *EDFacts*

Complete and accurate data are essential for effective decision-making. Given the requirements of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)*, as amended, accuracy of state and local educational agency performance data is crucial to funding decisions and management actions that are taken on the basis of this performance information. These requirements, and subsequent actions by the Department, are designed to improve the quality and validity of data across the states.

EDFacts is the U. S. Department of Education initiative to put performance data at the center of policy, management, and budget decisions for elementary and secondary educational programs. *EDFacts* centralizes performance data supplied by K-12 State educational agencies (SEAs) with other data assets, such as financial grant information, within the Department to enable better analysis and use in policy development, planning, and management. The ESEA requires states to electronically submit data to the Education Data Exchange Network Submission System (EDENS). SEAs submit data through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) submission system, an electronic data system capable of receiving data on over 100 data groups at the state, district, and school levels, a centralized, Internet-based system of elementary and secondary education data (K-12) from 52 state educational agencies. Data are available for state and local educational agencies. School data include data on demographics, program participation, implementation, and outcomes. See <http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/index.html> for insights into the program.

Starting in school year (SY) 2008–09, *EDFacts* became the mandatory system for states to report their K–12 education data to the Department electronically. The *EDFacts* system enabled the consolidation of historically separate data collection efforts, and it has allowed for even greater data collection efficiencies.

By using EDENS and the *EDFacts* Metadata and Process System together, *EDFacts* is able to reduce the reporting burden for states by eliminating redundant data requests from multiple data collections. This approach also provides program offices with the ability to retire paper-based collections and improve data quality by relying solely on electronic reporting methods. In the future, the *EDFacts* initiative will employ similar strategies to increase the efficiency of data acquisition methods across the Department.

Statewide Longitudinal Data System

The Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) grant program, as authorized by the *Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002*, Title II of the statute that created the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), is designed to aid state education agencies in developing and implementing longitudinal data systems. These systems are intended to enhance the ability of states to efficiently and accurately manage, analyze, and use education data, including individual student records. The data systems developed with funds from these grants should help states, districts, schools, and teachers make data-driven decisions to improve student learning, as well as facilitate research to increase student achievement and close achievement gaps. More information on the SLDS grant program is available at <http://nces.ed.gov/Programs/SLDS/>.

Performance Data Guidance

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-11, Part 6, section 230.5, Assessing the completeness and reliability of performance data, requires each agency to design a procedure for verifying and validating data that it makes public in its annual performance plans and reports. Finally, the *Reports Consolidation Act of 2000* requires that the transmittal letter included in annual performance reports contains an assessment by the agency head of the completeness and reliability of the performance data included in its plans and reports.

In response, the Department has developed a guidance document to assist principal offices responsible for reporting data on strategic and program performance measures. The guidance addresses issues of data integrity and provides a framework for validating and verifying performance data. Additionally, the Department has developed a worksheet for each program office to use to identify the validity of the data for their unique program performance measures.

Performance Summary

The Department's Priority Performance Goals

Evidence Based Policy. Implementation of a comprehensive approach to using evidence to inform the Department's policies and major initiatives, including:

- Increase by 2/3 the number of Department discretionary programs that use evaluation, performance measures, and other program data for continuous improvement.
- Implement rigorous evaluations for all of the Department's highest priority programs and initiatives.
- Ensure all newly authorized Department discretionary programs include a rigorous evaluation component.

Struggling Schools Reform. Identify as nationwide models 500 of the persistently lowest achieving schools initiating high-quality intensive reform efforts (e.g., turnarounds, restarts, transformations, or closures).

Effective Teaching. Improve the quality of teaching and learning by:

- increasing by 200,000 the number of teachers for low-income and minority students who are being recruited or retained to teach in hard-to-staff subjects and schools in systems with rigorous processes for determining teacher effectiveness;
- ensuring that all states have in place comprehensive teacher evaluation systems, based on multiple measures of effectiveness including student achievement, that may be used for professional development, retention, promotion, tenure, and compensation decisions.

Data Driven Decisions. All states implementing comprehensive statewide longitudinal data systems that link student achievement and teacher data and link K–12 with higher education data and, to the extent possible, with pre-K and workforce data.

College- and Career-Ready Standards. All states collaborating to develop and adopt internationally benchmarked college- and career-ready standards.

Simplified Student Aid. All participating higher education institutions and loan servicers operationally ready to originate and service Federal Direct Student Loans through an efficient and effective student aid delivery system with simplified applications and minimal disruption to students.

Link to the "Performance and Management" chapter of Analytical Perspectives, Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2011:

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2011/assets/management.pdf> and to the Department of Education: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/focus/goals.html>.

Challenges Linking Program Performance to Funding

Linking performance results to expenditures for Department programs is complicated. Most of the Department's funding is disbursed through grants and loans. As the majority of Federal education programs support state and local education programs, there is rarely a direct relationship between a grant or loan and the actual performance on a specific

outcome; results may be due to one or multiple Department of Education programs, the individual performance of grantees, or other factors. Additionally, results of some education programs may not be apparent for several years after funds are expended. For these reasons, program results cannot be attributed solely to the actions taken related to FY 2010 funds.

Due to this difficulty in linking program performance to funding, the Department invests significant funds into the evaluation of program impacts across multiple years. In addition to annual performance results, these evaluations, implemented by the Institute for Education Sciences, help to determine the most effective grants and programs.

Summary of Performance Results

During FY 2010, the Department drafted a new strategic plan and has subjected it to an extensive review process. As of this report, the Department continued to present data on measures related to the *2007–2012 Strategic Plan*.

Performance Results Summary	FY 2010	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
Strategic Goal 1—Improve student achievement, with a focus on bringing all students to grade level in reading and mathematics by 2014				
1.1. Improve student achievement in reading				
A. Percentage of all students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 80.2%; Actual: 72.6% for FY 2009]	Sept. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
B. Percentage of low-income students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 72.1%; Actual: 61.1% for FY 2009]	Sept. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
C. Percentage of American Indian/Alaska Native students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 75.1%; Actual: 59.8% for FY 2009]	Sept. 2011	Not met	Not met	Not met*
D. Percentage of African American students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 72.2%; Actual: 61.8% for FY 2009]	Sept. 2011	Not met*	Not met	Not met*
E. Percentage of Hispanic students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 70.0%; Actual: 58.8% for FY 2009]	Sept. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
F. Percentage of students with disabilities who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 61.7%; Actual: 43.6% for FY 2009]	Sept. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
G. Percentage of Limited English Proficient students who achieve proficiency on state reading assessments [Target: 62.4%; Actual: 40.1% for FY 2009]	Sept. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met
H. Percentage of career and technical education concentrators meeting reading/language arts standards [Target: 64%; Actual: 80% for FY 2009]	May 2011	Met	Met	NA
1.2. Improve student achievement in mathematics				
A. Percentage of all students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 78.1%; Actual: 71.5% for FY 2009]	Sept. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
B. Percentage of low-income students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 70.2%; Actual: 60.7% for FY 2009]	Sept. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
C. Percentage of American Indian/Alaska Native students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 70.8%; Actual: 56.3% for FY 2009]	Sept. 2011	Not met	Not met*	Not met*
D. Percentage of African American students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 68.0%; Actual: 59.1% for FY 2009]	Sept. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*

Notes:

Actuals and Targets updated as of January 10, 2011.

"Met" includes all measures met or exceeded.

Key:

* Not met but improved over prior years

** Data not collected

*** Discontinued

NA = Data not collected or reported for years, as noted

Performance Results Summary	FY 2010	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
E. Percentage of Hispanic students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 69.9%; Actual: 59.1% for FY 2009]	Sept. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
F. Percentage of students with disabilities who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 61.1%; Actual: 45.7% for FY 2009]	Sept. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
G. Percentage of Limited English Proficient students who achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments [Target: 64.6%; Actual: 48.6% for FY 2009]	Sept. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
H. Percentage of career and technical education concentrators meeting mathematics standards [Target: 57%; Actual: 77% for FY 2009]	May 2011	Met	Met	NA
1.3. Improve teacher quality				
A. Percentage of total core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100%; Actual: 95.9% for FY 2009]	Dec. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
B. Percentage of total core elementary classes taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100%; Actual: 97.0% for FY 2009]	Dec. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
C. Percentage of core elementary classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100%; Actual: 96.3% for FY 2009]	Dec. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
D. Percentage of core elementary classes in low-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100%; Actual: 97.6% for FY 2009]	Dec. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
E. Percentage of total core secondary classes taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100%; Actual: 94.9% for FY 2009]	Dec. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
F. Percentage of core secondary classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100%; Actual: 92.5% for FY 2009]	Dec. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
G. Percentage of core secondary classes in low-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers [Target: 100%; Actual: 96.5% for FY 2009]	Dec. 2011	Not met*	Not met*	Not met*
1.4. Promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free learning environments				
A. Percentage of students in grades 9 through 12 who carried a weapon (such as a knife, gun, or club) on school property one or more times during the past 30 days [Target: 4.0%; Actual: 5.6% for FY 2009]	NA	Not met*	NA	Not met*
B. Percentage of students in grades 9 through 12 who missed one or more days of school during the past 30 days because they felt unsafe at school, or on their way to and from school [Target: 5.0%; Actual: 5.0% for FY 2009]	NA	Met*	NA	Not met*

Notes:

Actuals and Targets updated as of January 10, 2011.

"Met" includes all measures met or exceeded.

Key:

* Not met but improved over prior years

** Data not collected

*** Discontinued

NA = Data not collected or reported for years, as noted

Performance Results Summary	FY 2010	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
C. Percentage of students in grades 9 through 12 who were offered, given, or sold an illegal drug by someone on school property in the past year [Target: 26.0%; Actual: 22.7% for FY 2009]	NA	Met	NA	Met
1.5. Increase information and options for parents				
A. Percentage of eligible students exercising choice	***	NA	Not met*	Met
B. Percentage of eligible students participating in supplemental educational services [Target: 18.2%; Actual: 15.6% for FY 2009]	***	Not met*	Not met	Not met*
C. Number of charter schools in operation [Target: 4,720; Actual: 4,705 for FY 2009]	Not met*	Not met*	Met	Met
1.6. Increase high school completion rate				
A. Percentage of total 18–24-year-olds who have completed high school [Target: 87.6% for FY 2009]	Jul. 2012	Jul. 2011	Met	Met
B. Percentage of African American 18–24-year-olds who have completed high school [Target: 85.8% for FY 2009]	Jul. 2012	Jul. 2011	Met	Met
C. Percentage of Hispanic 18–24-year-olds who have completed high school [Target: 70.6% for FY 2009]	Jul. 2012	Jul. 2011	Met	Met
D. Averaged freshman graduation rate [Target: 77.9% for FY 2009]	Jul. 2012	Jul. 2011	Not met*	Not met*
1.7. Transform education into an evidence-based field				
A. Number of Department-supported reading or writing programs and practices with evidence of efficacy using What Works Clearinghouse standards [Target: 13; Actual: 13 for FY 2009]	Met	Met	Met	Met
B. Number of Department-supported mathematics or science programs and practices with evidence of efficacy using What Works Clearinghouse standards [Target: 10; Actual: 11 for FY 2009]	Met	Met	Met	Met
C. Number of Department-supported teacher quality programs and practices with evidence of efficacy using What Works Clearinghouse standards [Target: 7; Actual: 7 for FY 2009]	Met	Met	Met	Met
D. Number of visits to the What Works Clearinghouse Web site [Target: 583,000; Actual: 772,154 for FY 2009]	Met	Met	Met	Met
Strategic Goal 2—Increase the academic achievement of all high school students				
2.1. Increase the proportion of high school students taking a rigorous curriculum				
A. Percentage of low-income students who qualify for Academic Competitiveness Grants [Target: 49%; Actual: 41% for FY 2009]	***	Not met*	Not met*	Met
B. Number of Advanced Placement classes available nationwide	***	**	**	**
C. Number of Advanced Placement tests taken by all public school students [Target: 2,406,000; Actual: 2,495,252 for FY 2009]	***	Met	Met	Met

Notes:

Actuals and Targets updated as of January 10, 2011.

"Met" includes all measures met or exceeded.

Key:

* Not met but improved over prior years

** Data not collected

*** Discontinued

NA = Data not collected or reported for years, as noted

Performance Results Summary	FY 2010	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
D. Number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income public school students [Target: 378,272; Actual: 387,986 for FY 2009]	***	Met	Not met*	Met
E. Number of Advanced Placement tests taken by minority (Black, Hispanic, Native American) public school students [Target: 544,716; Actual: 538,249 for FY 2009]	***	Not met*	Met	Met
F. Number of teachers trained through Advanced Placement Incentive grants to teach Advanced Placement classes	***	**	**	**
2.2. Promote advanced proficiency in mathematics and science for all students				
A. Number of Advanced Placement tests in mathematics and science taken nationwide by all public school students [Target: 736,000; Actual: 734,425 for FY 2009]	***	Not met*	Met	Met
B. Number of Advanced Placement tests in mathematics and science taken nationwide by low-income public school students [Target: 76,000; Actual: 91,927 for FY 2009]	***	Met	Met	Met
C. Number of Advanced Placement tests in mathematics and science taken nationwide by minority (Black, Hispanic, Native American) public school students [Target: 94,171; Actual: 111,532 for FY 2009]	***	Met	Met	Met
D. Number of teachers trained through Advanced Placement Incentive grants to teach Advanced Placement classes in mathematics and science	***	**	**	**
2.3. Increase proficiency in critical foreign languages				
A. Combined total number of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate tests in critical foreign languages passed by public school students [Target: 4,638; Actual: 4,642 for FY 2009]	***	Met	Not met*	Met
Strategic Goal 3—Ensure the accessibility, affordability, and accountability of higher education and better prepare students and adults for employment and future learning				
3.1. Increase success in and completion of quality postsecondary education				
A. Percentage of high school graduates aged 16–24 enrolling immediately in college [Target: 68%; Actual: 68.6% for FY 2009]	Aug. 2011	Met	Not met*	Not met
B. Percentage of Upward Bound participants enrolling in college [Target: 75% for FY 2009]	Dec. 2012	Dec. 2011	Met	Met
C. Percentage of Career and Technical Education concentrators retained in postsecondary education or transferring to a baccalaureate degree program who have transitioned to postsecondary education or employment by December of the year of graduation [Target: 58%; Actual: 70% for FY 2009]	May 2011	Met	NA	NA

Notes:

Actuals and Targets updated as of January 10, 2011.

"Met" includes all measures met or exceeded.

Key:

* Not met but improved over prior years

** Data not collected

*** Discontinued

NA = Data not collected or reported for years, as noted

Performance Results Summary	FY 2010	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
D. Percentage of full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students at Title IV institutions who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution [Target: 71%; Actual: 72.4% for FY 2009]	Aug. 2011	Met	Met	Not met
E. Percentage of full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution [Target: 66%; Actual: 64% for FY 2009]	Aug. 2011	Not met	Not met*	Not met
F. Percentage of full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students at Hispanic-Serving Institutions who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution [Target: 68%; Actual: 64.5% for FY 2009]	Dec. 2010	Not met	Met	Not met
G. Percentage of students enrolled at all Title IV institutions completing a four-year degree within six years of enrollment [Target: 57% for FY 2009]	Jan. 2012	April 2011	Met	Met
H. Percentage of freshmen participating in Student Support Services who complete an associate's degree at original institution or transfer to a four-year institution within three years [Target: 28% for FY 2009]	Dec. 2011	March 2011	Met	Not met
I. Percentage of first-time full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students enrolled at 4-year Historically Black Colleges and Universities graduating within six years of enrollment [Target: 40%; Actual 34% for FY 2009]	Dec. 2011	Not Met	Not met	Not met*
J. Percentage of first-time, full time degree seeking students enrolled at 4-year Hispanic-Serving Institutions graduating within six years of enrollment [Target: 44%; Actual 42% for FY 2009]	Dec. 2011	Not Met	Met	Met
K. Percentage of postsecondary career and technical education students who have completed a postsecondary degree or an industry-recognized credential, certificate, or degree. [Target: 56%; Actual: 54% for FY 2009]	May 2011	Not met*	NA	NA
3.2. Deliver student financial aid to students and parents effectively and efficiently				
A. Direct administrative unit costs for origination and disbursement of student aid (total cost per transaction) [Target: \$4.00; Actual: \$3.60 for FY 2009]	Met	Met	Met	Met
B. Customer service level on the American Customer Satisfaction Index for the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web [Target: 84 points; Actual: 84 for FY 2009]	Met	Met	Met	Not met
C. Pell Grant improper payments rate [Target: 3.41%; Actual: 3.50% for FY 2009]	Met	Not met*	Not met*	Not met
D. Direct Loan recovery rate [Target: 20%; Actual: 18% for FY 2009]	Not met	Not met	Met	Met

Notes:

Actuals and Targets updated as of January 10, 2011.

"Met" includes all measures met or exceeded.

Key:

* Not met but improved over prior years

** Data not collected

*** Discontinued

NA = Data not collected or reported for years, as noted

Performance Results Summary	FY 2010	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
E. Federal Family Education Loan recovery rate [Target: 19.75%; Actual: 19.70% for FY 2009]	Met	Not met	Met	Met
3.3. Prepare adult learners and individuals with disabilities for higher education, employment, and productive lives				
A. Percentage of state vocational rehabilitation agencies that meet the employment outcome standard for the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants program	***	Not met	Met	Met
B. Percentage of adults served by the Adult Education State Grants program with a high school completion goal who earn a high school diploma or recognized equivalent [Target: 54%; Actual: 64% for FY 2009]	Feb. 2011	Met	Met	Met
C. Percentage of adults served by the Adult Education State Grants program with a goal to enter postsecondary education or training who enroll in a postsecondary education or training program [Target: 41%; Actual: 59% for FY 2009]	Feb. 2011	Met	Met	Met
D. Percentage of adults served by the Adult Education State Grants program with an employment goal who obtain a job by the end of the first quarter after their program exit quarter [Target: 42%; Actual: 55% for FY 2009]	Feb. 2011	Met	Met	Met
Strategic Goal 4—Cross-Goal Strategy on Management				
4.1. Maintain and strengthen financial integrity and management and internal controls				
A. Maintain an unqualified (clean) audit opinion [Target: Unqualified for FY 2009]	Met	Met	Met	Met
B. Achieve and maintain compliance with the <i>Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002</i> [Target: Compliant for FY 2009]	Not met	Not met	Not met	Met
C. Percentage of new discretionary grants awarded by June 30 [Target: 80%; Actual: 36% for FY 2009]	Not met	Not met	Not met	Met
4.2. Improve the strategic management of the Department's human capital				
A. Percentage of employees believing that leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment [Target: 40%; Actual: 37% for FY 2009]	Not met*	Not met*	Not met	Met
B. Percentage of employees believing that managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives [Target: 68%; Actual: 51% for FY 2009]	Not met*	Not met	Not met	Met
C. Percentage of employees believing that steps are taken to deal with a poor performer who cannot or will not improve [Target: 34%; Actual: 26% for FY 2009]	Not met*	Not met	Not met	Met
D. Percentage of employees believing that department policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace [Target: 56%; Actual: 48% for FY 2009]	Not met	Not met	Not met*	Not met*

Notes:

Actuals and Targets updated as of January 10, 2011.

"Met" includes all measures met or exceeded.

Key:

* Not met but improved over prior years

** Data not collected

*** Discontinued

NA = Data not collected or reported for years, as noted

Performance Results Summary	FY 2010	FY 2009	FY 2008	FY 2007
E. Percentage of employees believing that they are held accountable for achieving results [Target: 85%; Actual: 84% for FY 2009]	Not met	Not met	Met	Met
F. Percentage of employees believing that the workforce has the job-relevant knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish organizational goals [Target: 72%; Actual 68% for FY 2009]	Not met	Not met	Not met	Met
G. Average number of days to hire is at or below the OPM 45-day hiring model for non-SES	Met	Met	Met	Met
H. Percentage of employees with performance standards in place within 30 days of start of current rating cycle [Target: 95%; Actual: 95% for FY 2009]	Not met	Met	Met	Not met
I. Percentage of employees who have ratings of record in the system within 30 days of close of rating cycle [Target: 99%; Actual: 96% for FY 2009]	Not met	Not met	Met	Met
4.3. Achieve budget and performance integration to link funding decisions to results				
A. Percentage of Department program dollars in programs that demonstrate effectiveness in terms of outcomes, either on performance indicators or through rigorous evaluations [Target: 86%; Actual: 88% for FY 2009]	***	Met	Met	Met

Notes:

Actuals and Targets updated as of January 10, 2011.
 "Met" includes all measures met or exceeded.

Key:

* Not met but improved over prior years

** Data not collected

*** Discontinued

NA = Data not collected or reported for years, as noted

Performance Details

Performance Details Overview

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

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

How to Read This Report

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

Table. Provides trend data including the latest reported data. Years for Targets and Actual data are listed at the top of each table. Some targets have been adjusted since publication of the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan* after review and approval by program, budget, and performance representatives.

Sources. Provides bibliographic information.

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

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

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

Not all measures will include all data fields described above.

Methodology for Program Performance Summary

In keeping with the *Government Performance and Results Act of 1993*, the Department has established program-specific annual plans with measures and targets for the majority of the grant and loan programs and has provided the corresponding program performance reports in conjunction with the publication of the *FY 2010 Annual Performance Report*. Each program that has measures supports at least one of the Department's strategic goals. Web-based tables provide a summary of each program's performance results.

Since 2001, performance plans and reports have been published on the Department's Web site at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/index.html?src=pn>.

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

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

Overview

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

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

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

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

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

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

Goal 1: Details

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

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

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

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

Sources:

¹ Consolidated State Performance Reports

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

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

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

Analysis of Progress: For most measures in Objective 1.1, the targets were not met, but results improved over prior years for FY 2009. Measures 1.1.C declined slightly. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2009 reporting as updates to the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*.

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

Target Context: In accordance with the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, as amended, the goal is for 100 percent of all students to achieve proficiency on state reading assessments by 2014. Starting in 2007 and ending in 2014, there are eight years to close the gap between the 2006 baseline and the 2014 ultimate goal of 100 percent. Therefore, targets for 2007 and 2008 were calculated by (1) subtracting the baseline percentage from 100 percent to determine

the gap that must be closed, (2) dividing that gap by 8 to determine the annual improvement that would be needed if the gap were to be closed in a linear fashion, (3) adding that annual increment to the 2006 baseline to arrive at the 2007 target, and (4) increasing the 2007 target by another annual incremental improvement to arrive at the 2008 target.

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

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was exceeded.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sources:

¹ Consolidated State Performance Reports.

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

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

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

Analysis of Progress: For most measures in Objective 1.2, the targets were not met, but results improved over prior years for FY 2009. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2009 reporting to reflect trends since the development of the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*.

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

Target Context: In accordance with the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, as amended, the goal is for 100 percent of all students to achieve proficiency on state mathematics assessments by 2014. Starting in 2007 and ending in 2014, there are eight years to close the gap between the 2006 baseline and the 2014 ultimate goal of 100 percent. Therefore, targets for 2007 and 2008 were calculated by: (1) subtracting the baseline percentage from 100 percent to determine the gap that must be closed, (2) dividing that gap by 8 to determine the annual improvement that

would be needed if the gap were to be closed in a linear fashion, (3) adding that annual increment to the 2006 baseline to arrive at the 2007 target, and (4) increasing the 2007 target by another annual incremental improvement to arrive at the 2008 target.

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

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was exceeded.

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

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

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

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

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

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Analysis of Progress: For the measures in Objective 1.3, targets were not met, but results improved over prior years. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2009 reporting to reflect trends since development of the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*.

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

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

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

Percentage of Students in Grades 9 Through 12 Who:	Results*							
	FY 2003		FY 2005		FY 2007		FY 2009	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
1.4.A. Carried a Weapon (Such as a Knife, Gun, or Club) on School Property One or More Times During the Past 30 Days	N/A	6.1	5.0	6.5	5.0	5.9	4.0	5.6
1.4.B. Missed One or More Days of School During the Past 30 Days Because They Felt Unsafe at School, or on Their Way to and from School	N/A	5.4	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.5	5.0	5.0
1.4.C. Were Offered, Given, or Sold an Illegal Drug by Someone on School Property in the Past Year	N/A	28.7	28.0	25.4	27.0	22.3	26.0	22.7

N/A = Not Available.

*Data gathered only in odd-numbered years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Measure 1.4.B.: Percentage of Students in Grades 9 Through 12 Who Missed One or More Days of School During the Past 30 Days Because They Felt Unsafe at School, or on Their Way to and from School

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Measures for Objective 1.5: Increasing information and options for parents

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

N/A = Not Available.

Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports.

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

Analysis of Progress: This measure was discontinued in FY 2010. Progress was made in FY 2009. The target was not met in FY 2008. No target was set for FY 2009 in last year's report. Targets were adjusted prior to FY 2008 reporting to reflect trends since development of the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The target was not met in FY 2009 or FY 2010, but progress was made toward the target.

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

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

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

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

¹ Averaged freshman graduation rate is a Common Core of Data measure that provides an estimate of the percentage of high school students who graduate on time by dividing the number of graduates with regular diplomas by the size of the estimated incoming 9th grade class four years earlier.

Sources: For Measures 1.6.A., 1.6.B., and 1.6.C.—U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, October Current Population Survey. Data are collected annually. For Measure 1.6.D.—U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, State Non-fiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education. Data are collected annually.

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

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

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data for SY 2006–07 (column “FY 2007” in the table) were released in September 2009. Data for SY 2008–09 (column “FY 2009”) are not expected for release until July 2011.

Measure 1.6.D.: Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate

Analysis of Progress: Data for FY 2009 and FY 2010 are not yet available. Targets have not been met, but improvement has been shown.

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

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

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

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

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

**WWC = What Works Clearinghouse.

Sources:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2007 target of setting a baseline was met. The FY 2008, FY 2009, and FY 2010 targets were exceeded.

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

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

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

Overview

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Goal 2: Details

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

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

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

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

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

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

† Advanced Placement measures use the definitional term Black.

Sources:

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

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

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

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

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

Target Context: The target for 2009 was not met. Targets were developed as follows: the numerator was determined through a review of Financial Student Aid records and the denominator was developed from high school graduation records for the 2004–05 and 2005–06 school years, with the estimates narrowed for low-income students by use of the 2003–04 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study and state estimates of the proportion of students taking rigorous curricula. The target is a challenging goal for the program—a 20 percent increase annually in the proportion of qualified students given ACG grants, potentially leading to doubling the proportion of students by FY 2011.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Analysis of Progress: FY 2009 targets for 2.1.C and 2.1.D were exceeded. The target for 2.1.E was not met. Targets were originally established by the Department's program office and in the *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*. Data are supplied by the College Board. The Department exceeded its targets for FY 2008 and FY 2009 for the total number of AP tests taken by public school students. It did not meet its target for low-income students for FY 2008, but did exceed it for FY 2009. For minority students, the Department exceeded its target for FY 2008, but did not meet the target for FY 2009. The Department continues to see growth in the overall numbers of AP courses and tests taken by public school students, especially low-income and minority students. Low-income is defined as those students who meet the requirements for free or reduced-price lunches.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are reported annually. Data are analyzed by the College Board and by the Department. Baseline data were used to set future targets.

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

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

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

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

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Number of Advanced Placement Tests in Mathematics and Science Taken Nationwide by Public School Students: ¹								
2.2.A. Total	631,000	644,550	681,000	692,210	736,000	734,425	Discontinued	
2.2.B. Low-Income	65,000	66,337	70,000	73,710	76,000	91,927	Discontinued	
2.2.C. Minorities (Black, Hispanic, Native American)*	80,000	86,061	86,000	98,718	94,171	111,532	Discontinued	
2.2.D. Number of Teachers Trained Through Advanced Placement Incentive Grants to Teach Advanced Placement Classes in Mathematics and Science	Estab. BL	Not Collected	N/A	Not Collected	N/A	Not Collected	Discontinued	

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

*Advanced Placement measures use the definitional term Black.

Sources:

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

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

Analysis of Progress: FY 2009 targets for 2.2.B and 2.2.C were exceeded. The FY 2009 target for 2.2.A was not met, but progress was shown. Targets are established by the program office and by the Department's *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan*. The Department exceeded its 2008 target for the total number of AP tests in mathematics and science taken by public school students. For low-income students, the Department exceeded its targets for FY 2008 and FY 2009. For minority students, it exceeded its FY 2008 and FY 2009 targets. The number of AP tests in mathematics and science taken nationwide continues to increase, especially for low-income students and minority students. Low-income students are defined as those students who qualify for free or reduced-price lunches.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are reported annually.

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

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

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data for this measure were not collected because there were no funds appropriated for the Advanced Placement Incentive program authorized under the *America COMPETES Act*.

Measure for Objective 2.3: Increase proficiency in critical foreign languages

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

BL = Baseline.

Sources:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Overview

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

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

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

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

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

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

Goal 3: Details

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

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

Sources:

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

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

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

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

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

⁶ U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, Student Support Services Program Annual Performance Report.

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The enrollment rate increased slightly from 2008 to 2009.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was exceeded.

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

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

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The national persistence increased from FY 2008 to FY 2009.

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

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

Report Explanation: Persistence measures the percentage of full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students at Title IV institutions who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution.

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The rates declined slightly between FY 2008 and FY 2009.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by NCES. Beginning with FY 2008, persistence was reported for the first time along with the numerator and denominator generating the percentage. Therefore, the rate established for any

program can be aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

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

Report Explanation: Until FY 2008, institutions reported only a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) program was calculated as a median. Beginning with FY 2008, institutions are required to report a denominator (an adjusted cohort of the students attending their first-year of school in the prior year) and a numerator (the number of students in the prior year's adjusted cohort, who remain in the same institution in the current year). Therefore, the Department is now calculating a mean persistence rate.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The Department exceeded its FY 2008 target of 57 percent. The percentage of bachelor's degree-seeking students completing a four-year degree within six years of enrollment remained at about the same level as the previous year (57.2 percent in FY 2008 compared with 57.3 percent in FY 2007).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The percentage of students enrolled at four-year HBCUs graduating within six years of enrollment declined to 34 percent in 2009.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was exceeded.

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

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

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

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

	Results*							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
3.2.A. Direct Administrative Unit Costs for Origination and Disbursement of Student Aid ¹ (<i>Total Cost per Transaction</i>)	\$4.25	\$4.03	\$4.15	\$3.65	\$4.00	\$3.60	\$3.76	\$3.35
3.2.B. Customer Service Level on the American Consumer Satisfaction Index for the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web ²	82	80	83	83	84	84	85	86
3.2.C. Pell Grant Improper Payments Rate	3.48%	4.11%	3.48%	3.69%	3.41%	3.50%	3.35%	3.12%
3.2.D. Direct Loan Recovery Rate ³	19.5%	20.8%	19.75%	21%	20.0%	18.0%	20.25%	17.4%
3.2.E. FFEL Recovery Rate	19.5%	19.6%	19.5%	23.6%	19.75%	19.7%	20.0%	21.9%

* Targets are based on the Department's *Strategic Plan* and may differ from the targets presented in the *FSA Annual Report*.
FFEL = Federal Family Education Loan.

Sources:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Data Quality. The "actual" data are the data reported as final in the current fiscal year. Because it takes some time after the close out of the fiscal year to receive completed data and to validate results, the data lag by one year. For example, in FY 2010, the unit costs were based on data from FY 2009. To calculate the unit cost of Origination and Disbursement of Student Aid, the total amount spent on originating and disbursing Direct Loans and Grants is divided by the number of Direct Loan and Grant disbursements.

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

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

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

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

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

Measure 3.2.C.: Pell Grant Improper Payments Rate

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

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

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

Measure 3.2.D.: Direct Loan Recovery Rate

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

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

Target Context. The recovery rate equals the sum of collections on defaulted loans divided by the outstanding default portfolio at the end of the previous year. The full extent of the economic downturn

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

Measure 3.2.E.: FFEL Recovery Rate

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

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

Target Context. The recovery rate equals the sum of collections on defaulted loans divided by the outstanding default portfolio at the end of the previous year. This measure will continue to be a key measure in monitoring collection performance, but will not be one of the primary performance measures tracked for external performance reporting. There is a significant lag time from the close of the fiscal year until final data are reported. The actual data reported through August 2010 show a recovery rate of 21.9 percent.

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

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
3.3.A. Percentage of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies That Meet the Employment Outcome Standard for the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants Program ¹	71	82	76	79	78	61	Discontinued	
3.3.B. Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With a High School Completion Goal Who Earn a High School Diploma or Recognized Equivalent ²	52	59	53	62	54	64	55	Feb. 2011
3.3.C. Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With a Goal to Enter Postsecondary Education or Training Who Enroll in a Postsecondary Education or Training Program ²	37	55	39	55	41	59	43	Feb. 2011
3.3.D. Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With an Employment Goal Who Obtain a Job by the End of the First Quarter After Their Program Exit Quarter ²	41	61	41	61	42	55	42	Feb. 2011

Sources:

1 OSERS/RSA/Quarterly Caseload Report

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was not met. In fiscal years 2007 and 2008, the percentage of general or combined state vocational rehabilitation agencies that met the performance criterion remained relatively constant at 82 percent and 79 percent, respectively. In FY 2009, the percentage of agencies fell to 61 percent because 10 fewer agencies passed the standard due to more challenging economic conditions, as well as a more difficult disability population being served.

Data Quality and Timeliness: State vocational rehabilitation agencies are required to submit their Rehabilitation Services Administration RSA-911 data by November 30 for the previous fiscal year. The data are considered very reliable because of the RSA editing process to which agency data are submitted. Data quality and timeliness have improved significantly in recent years.

Target Context: This measure has been discontinued. Employment outcomes increased from 2005 to 2007 with improving economic conditions. Performance targets for 2008 and future years were raised, but the targets may have to be revisited with the current economic crisis, especially in employment.

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

Analysis of Progress: The program exceeded its FY 2007, 2008, and 2009 targets. A part of the explanation of the increase in completions was improved data collection methods used by formula grantees to collect and report data for this measure.

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

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

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The program exceeded its FY 2007, 2008, and 2009 targets. Exceeding the performance target for this fiscal year was a result of the improved follow-up methodologies implemented by the formula grantees and the training and technical assistance provided by the OVAE on transitioning adult students into postsecondary education and training opportunities.

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

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

Report Explanation: The target has been met. Factors include (1) improved follow-up methodologies implemented by the states and (2) training and technical assistance by OVAE in

providing support to states regarding methodologies related to transitioning adult students into postsecondary education and training opportunities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cross-Goal Strategy on Management

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

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
4.1.A. Maintain an Unqualified (Clean) Audit Opinion ¹	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
4.1.B. Achieve and Maintain Compliance With the <i>Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002</i> ²	NC	NC	C	NC	C	NC	C	NC
4.1.C. Percentage of New Discretionary Grants Awarded by June 30 ³	60	66	70	61	80	36	90	20

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

Sources:

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

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

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The Department earned a ninth consecutive unqualified or "clean" audit opinion from independent auditors. The FY 2009 and FY 2010 targets were met for this measure.

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

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The Department's Office of Inspector General has determined the Department to be non-compliant in fulfilling the requirements of the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002* each year since the first evaluation in FY 2003, and this determination for FY 2010 means that the Department did not meet its target. However, the Department is making progress in addressing OIG's concerns.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. § 3545, the Department's Office of Inspector General annually evaluates the effectiveness of the Department's information security program and practices. The evaluation includes testing of the effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices of a representative subset of the agency's information systems, as well as

an assessment of compliance with requirements of the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002* and related information security policies based upon the testing performed.

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

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

Analysis of Progress: In FY 2010 and 2009, the targets were not met. In FY 2010, the total number of new discretionary grants awarded was 4,800, which was a significant increase over 3,110 grants awarded in FY 2009. Despite the percentage of grant awards at the June 30 mark, by August 31, 78 percent of discretionary grants were awarded in FY 2009 and 65 percent were awarded in FY 2010, compared with 82 percent in FY 2008.

Concerted efforts by Department program managers to award new discretionary grants earlier in the fiscal year resulted in 66 percent of new FY 2007 awards being issued by June 30 of that fiscal year (three-fourths of the year complete). This exceeded the 60 percent FY 2007 target for this measure. In the previous four fiscal years, no more than 49 percent of new discretionary grants had been awarded by June 30. In FY 2008, the ambitious 70 percent target was not achieved by June 30, but the 61 percent award rate far exceeded the rates prior to FY 2007.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sources:

¹ Federal Human Capital Survey.² 2010 Employee Viewpoint Survey.³ Data from the Education Department Performance Appraisal System, ED's in-house performance management software.⁴ U.S. Department of the Interior's Federal Personnel Payroll System.

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

An evaluation of the Department's 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey results (Narrative Report) determined that the Department's two lowest scoring survey dimensions, when compared to the rest of the government, are Talent Management and Performance Culture. The evaluation and results can be found on at:

<http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/otherplanrpts.html>, under the Office of Management.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Data Quality and Timeliness: For this measure, the Department tracks progress against the 45-day hiring model for positions other than the Senior Executive Service. The model tracks the hiring

process from the closing date of the vacancy announcement to the date a job offer is extended. It is measured in business days rather than calendar days and is calculated quarterly based on an average process length of all hires completed within that quarter.

Target Context: The Department met the goal of the OPM hiring model repeatedly: in 2007, with an average hiring time of 27 business days; in 2008, with a revised average hiring time of 28 business days; and in 2009, with an average hiring time of 26 business days. In 2008, the Department restructured the Human Resources Services office, which enabled additional resources to focus on improving the staffing process. Improved interaction over time between the Human Resources Specialists and principal office managers is also credited with enabling hiring process improvements. Furthermore, Human Resources Services tracks the hiring cycles for each principal office and provides them with monthly reports on hiring progress. These actions provide continual incentives to shorten the hiring process.

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

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

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

Data Quality and Timeliness: To be considered successful on this measure, a Department employee or his or her supervisor must establish performance standards that align with the *Strategic Plan* and are approved by the supervisor. These standards must be entered no more than 30 days into the fiscal year covered by the measure. SES employees are not included in this measure.

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2010 and FY 2009 targets were not met. The FY 2008 target was exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: To be considered successful on this measure, an employee rating of the level of success achieved on established performance standards must be entered no more than 30 days after the fiscal year covered by the measure. SES employees are not included in this measure.

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

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

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

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was met.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Calculation was based on dollars in Department programs with at least an *Adequate* PART rating in the given year divided by dollars in all Department programs rated through that year. The PART assessment cycle occurred during the spring and summer and OMB makes scores public via <http://www.expectmore.gov>. OMB suspended the PART process during FY 2009 and the measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

Target Context: As of October 2008, 91 funded Department programs had undergone a Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review, representing 98 percent of the Department's FY 2008 budget authority for programs subject to the PART. The FY 2009 results were static and the PART program was discontinued in FY 2010, as is this measure.

Appendices

Appendix A1: Summary of Inspector General Audits and Government Accountability Office Reports

For all Department of Education Inspector General reports for FY 2010, please visit the Inspector General's Web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/reports.html>.

For Government Accountability Office reports on education for FY 2010, please visit GAO's Web site at <http://www.gao.gov/docsearch/agency.php>.

Relevant Inspector General Reports

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

To view the Department's Office of Inspector General reports about the *Recovery Act* as posted on Recovery.gov, go to:
http://www.recovery.gov/Accountability/inspectors/Pages/findings.aspx?agency_code=91.

To view the Department's Office of Inspector General Web page about the *Recovery Act* reports, go to: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/recoveryact.html>.

Selected Reports From the IG Site

- State Educational Agencies' Implementation of Federal Cash Management Requirements
<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/AlertMemorandums/I09j0007.pdf>
- Corrections Needed to Information about Federal Education Programs Included in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance
<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/AlertMemorandums/I16j0075.pdf>
- The Department's Process to Ensure Data Quality Under the Reporting Requirements of the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009*
<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/a19j0004.pdf>

Student Financial Assistance Programs and Operations

- Department's Oversight of the Direct Loan Program
<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/x19i0006.pdf>
- Great Lakes Educational Loan Services Compliance with Selected Requirements of the *Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loans Act of 2008*
<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/a05j0013.pdf>
- Reporting Requirements for the *Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loans Act of 2008* Loan Purchase Programs Have Not Been Met
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/I03k0004.pdf>
- Review of the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools' Standards for Program Length
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/aireports/x13j0003.pdf>

Higher Education

- Weaknesses in the Regulations and Guidelines for Department of Education-Approved Publishers of the Ability-to-Benefit Test
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/alternativeproducts/x11j0002.pdf>
- Definition of a High School Diploma as a Condition for Receiving Federal Student Aid
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/alternativeproducts/x11k0001.pdf>
- Carnegie Student Loans' Compliance With Lender Inducement Provisions
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/a05i0026.pdf>
- Alert Memorandum—The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools' Decision to Accredite American Intercontinental University
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/AlertMemorandums/l13j0006.pdf>
- Review of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education's Standards for Program Length
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/aireports/i13j0005.pdf>
- Review of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools—Commission on Colleges' Standards for Program Length
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/aireports/i13j0004.pdf>

Elementary and Secondary Education

- Center for Civic Education's Administration of Selected Programs
<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/a09i0010.pdf>
- Office of Indian Education's Management of the Professional Development Grant Program
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/a19i0002.pdf>
- Charter School Vulnerabilities
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/invtreports/x42k0002.pdf>

Other Reports

- Security Over Certification and Accreditation for Information Systems
<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/a11j0001.pdf>
- Financial Statement Audits for the Department—FY 2010 and FY 2009
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2010report/3-financial-details.pdf>
- Financial Statement Audits for Federal Student Aid—FY 2010 and FY 2009
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2010report/fsa-report.pdf>
- Financial Statement Audits—Special Purposes—FY 2009 and FY 2008
<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/a17j0003.pdf>
- Untimely Resolution of Issues Impacting Performance Validation and Payment Calculations Under the EDUCATE Contract
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/l19k0001.pdf>

- OIG's Independent Report on the Department's Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2009 in Support of the National Drug Control Strategy
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/b19k0003a.pdf>
- OIG's Independent Report on the Department's Detailed Accounting of Fiscal Year 2009 Drug Control Funds
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/b19k0003.pdf>
- Desktop Services Pricing Under the EDUCATE Contract
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/l19k0004.pdf>
- Controls Over the Department's Transit Benefits Program
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2010/a19i0001.pdf>
- OIG Semiannual Report to Congress, No. 60, October 1, 2009–March 31, 2010
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/semiann/sar60.pdf>
- OIG Semiannual Report to Congress, No. 61, April 1, 2010–September 30, 2010
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/semiann/sar61.pdf>

Relevant Government Accountability Office Reports

Federal Student Aid: Highlights of a Study Group on Simplifying the Free Application for Federal Student Aid

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-10-29>.

Recovery Act: Planned Efforts and Challenges in Evaluating Compliance with Maintenance of Effort and Similar Provisions

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-10-247>.

Grant Monitoring: Department of Education Could Improve Its Processes with Greater Focus on Assessing Risks, Acquiring Financial Skills, and Sharing Information

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-10-57>.

Student Achievement: Schools Use Multiple Strategies to Help Students Meet Academic Standards, Especially Schools with Higher Proportions of Low-Income and Minority Students

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-10-18>.

Recovery Act: Recipient Reported Jobs Data Provide Insight into Use of *Recovery Act* Funding, but Data Quality and Reporting Issues Need Attention

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-10-223>.

School Facilities: Physical Conditions in School Districts Receiving Impact Aid for Students Residing on Indian Lands

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-10-32>.

Proprietary Schools: Improved Department of Education Oversight Needed to Help Ensure Only Eligible Students Receive Federal Student Aid

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-10-127T>.

Recovery Act: One Year Later, States' and Localities' Uses of Funds and Opportunities to Strengthen Accountability

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-10-437>.

Recovery Act: States' and Localities' Uses of Funds and Actions Needed to Address Implementation Challenges and Bolster Accountability

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-10-604>.

Federal Education Funding: Overview of K–12 and Early Childhood Education Programs

<http://www.gao.gov/docdblite/details.php?rptno=GAO-10-51>.

Foreign Medical Schools: Education Should Improve Monitoring of Schools That Participate in the Federal Student Loan Program

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d10412.pdf>.

State and Local Governments' Fiscal Outlook: March 2010 Update

<http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-10-358>.

Recovery Act: States Could Provide More Information on Education Programs to Enhance the Public's Understanding of Fund Use

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d10807.pdf>.

Higher Education: Institutions' Reported Data Collection Burden Is Higher Than Estimated but Can Be Reduced Through Increased Coordination

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d10871.pdf>.

For-Profit Colleges: Undercover Testing Finds Colleges Encouraged Fraud and Engaged in Deceptive and Questionable Marketing Practices

<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-10-948T>.

Department of Education: Improved Dissemination and Timely Product Release Would Enhance the Usefulness of the What Works Clearinghouse

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d10644.pdf>.

Federal Student Loan Programs: Opportunities Exist to Improve Audit Requirements and Oversight Procedures

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d10668.pdf>.

Recovery Act: Increasing the Public's Understanding of What Funds Are Being Spent on and What Outcomes Are Expected

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d10581.pdf>.

Postsecondary Education: Many States Collect Graduates' Employment Information, but Clearer Guidance on Student Privacy Requirements Is Needed

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d10927.pdf>.

Student Loans: Federal Web-based Tool on Private Loans Would Pose Implementation Challenges and May Be Unnecessary

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d10990.pdf>.

Appendix A2: Summary of FY 2010 Performance Evaluations

For a complete list of program evaluations and studies from the Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, please visit <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oepdp/ppss/reports.html>. For a complete list of evaluation studies of the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/index.asp>.

Selected Evaluation Reports

Policy and Program Studies Service (PPSS)

Interim Report on the Evaluation of the Growth Model Pilot Project

The Department initiated the Growth Model Pilot Project (GMPP) in 2005 with the goal of approving up to ten states to incorporate growth models in school adequate yearly progress (AYP) determinations under the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)*. After extensive reviews, eight states were fully approved for the pilot project in SY 2006–07: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Iowa, North Carolina, and Tennessee. Based on analyses of data provided by the Department and by pilot grantee states, the report describes the progress states made in implementing the GMPP in SY 2006–07.

The results of this analysis showed that schools serving economically disadvantaged student populations in all pilot states except for Delaware were more likely than more-advantaged schools to make AYP by growth. Across all eight states, the percentage increase in the number of high-poverty schools making AYP as a result of the growth model being available was 8 percent, compared to 3 percent among low-poverty schools. The percentage increases among high-poverty schools in Arkansas, Florida, and Iowa were five to six times greater than those among low-poverty schools.

<http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/growth-model-pilot/gmpp.pdf>

Evaluation of the Comprehensive School Reform Program Implementation and Outcomes Fifth-Year Report

This Fifth-Year Report from the Evaluation of the Comprehensive School Reform Program Implementation and Outcomes is the final report on the outcomes of the federally funded Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) program. It presents findings about the relationship between participation in the Department's CSR program in 2002 and subsequent student achievement five years later. It is one approach to help low performing K–12 public schools meet state performance standards. The report presents the fifth-year findings of this study, including the value of a robust database to identify potential low performing schools and measure turnarounds, as well as share information when improvements in achievement were observed. After tracking these matched pairs of successful turnaround and comparison schools for several years, further analysis may provide observed trends in practice.

<http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/other/csrd-outcomes/year5-report.pdf>

ESEA Evaluation Brief: The English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Series)

The *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)*, as reauthorized in 2002, includes provisions to ensure that English Learners (ELs) have access to core academic content and gain the English language skills needed to meet state standards and be successful in school. Title I of *ESEA* requires that states test ELs in academic subjects of reading, mathematics, and science; that districts and schools be held accountable for meeting AYP targets for this subgroup; and that states assess the English language proficiency of all EL students. Title III then specifies requirements regarding the English language proficiency standards, assessments, and accountability measures for districts receiving Title III funds. These briefs focus on state implementation of Title III, describing the title's main provisions, summarizing state actions to date to implement those provisions, and outlining key benefits and challenges that have emerged. The evaluation is ongoing.

Title III Policy: State of the States

<http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/title-iii/state-of-states.pdf>

Title III Accountability: Behind the Numbers

<http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/title-iii/behind-numbers.pdf>

Title III Accountability and District Improvement Efforts: A Closer Look

<http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/title-iii/district-efforts.pdf>

Use of Education Data at the Local Level, From Accountability to Instructional Improvement

The use of student data systems to improve education and help students succeed is a national priority. The *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, as reauthorized in 2002, calls for the collection, analysis, and use of student achievement data to improve school outcomes. Data systems are expected to play an integral role in improving educational decision making at all levels—including that of the classroom teacher. The Department has supported improvements in data quality of state systems to enable longitudinal analysis of student data and linkage between student outcomes and other education system variables. Since 2006, the national Study of Education Data Systems and Decision Making, sponsored by the Department's Policy and Program Studies Service, has been examining both the implementation of student data systems and the broader set of practices involving the use of data to improve instruction, regardless of whether or not the data are stored in, and accessed through, an electronic system.

This final report builds on the picture of local practices in implementing data-driven decision making provided in the earlier reports by presenting data from the national district survey as well as from site visits conducted during SY 2007–08 at 36 schools in 12 districts. The majority of districts lack data systems adequate to support routine evaluation of district practices and decisions. An area in which districts are making less rapid progress than they are with interim assessments is in obtaining the capability to combine data from different types of systems in order to link assessment results with instructional resources.

Just 42 percent of districts have systems that can generate reports showing student performance linked to participation in specific instructional programs. Only 27 percent of districts have systems that will support queries linking student performance to school finance data.

<http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/use-of-education-data/use-of-education-data.pdf>

Achieving Dramatic School Improvement: An Exploratory Study

The study examined 11 CSR schools that were initially low-performing and substantially improved student performance at some point between 1999–2000 and 2004–05. Some schools made quick, dramatic improvement, while others progressed at a slow-and-steady pace. The purpose of the study was: to conduct in-depth retrospective case studies of schools nationwide that received CSR grants and that demonstrated significant improvement in student achievement, and to understand the processes and practices in which they engaged to accomplish this improvement. All 11 schools exhibited several common experiences with regard to school leadership, instructional improvement strategies, school climate, and external support. Ten of the 11 schools implemented new reading curricula, used data for school improvement, and focused on student behavior. All but three of the schools had new principals at the start of the improvement period. All 11 schools reported obtaining and using additional resources beyond their CSR grants.

<http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/other/dramatic-school-improvement/exploratory-study.pdf>

National Evaluation of Student Support Services: Examination of Student Outcomes After Six Years Final Report

Student Support Services (SSS) is one of eight federally funded grant programs that are administered as part of the TRIO programs. The SSS program provides the most services to first-year college students, though it also provides services in later years. The purpose of the study was to estimate the effects of SSS on the outcomes of the student participants. The full report discusses five academic outcomes, including retention in college, transfers from two-year to four-year institutions, and degree completion.

The single most consistent finding is that the receipt of supplemental services was correlated with improved student academic outcomes. Participation in SSS was also associated with receiving a higher level of supplemental services, including both those services specifically designed for SSS students and supplemental services in general. A second finding is that supplemental services continued to be important after the freshman year. In fact, the later-year services appear to show a stronger relationship to long-term outcomes than first-year services.

<http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/highered/student-support/final-report.pdf>

National Center for Education Evaluation (NCEE)

The Enhanced Reading Opportunities Study Final Report: The Impact of Supplemental Literacy Courses for Struggling Ninth Graders

The Enhanced Reading Opportunities (ERO) demonstration evaluated two supplemental literacy programs—Reading Apprenticeship Academic Literacy (RAAL) and Xtreme

Reading (XR)—targeted to ninth-grade students whose reading skills were at least two years below grade level. Over two years, about 6,000 eligible students in 34 high schools from 10 districts were randomly assigned to enroll in the year-long ERO class or remain in a regularly scheduled elective class (non-ERO group). At the end of 9th grade, both groups were assessed using a standardized, nationally normed reading test, and participated in surveys about their reading activities and behaviors. School records were used to examine the effect of the literacy programs on academic performance during the program year (9th grade) and a year afterwards.

The study found that ERO supplemental literacy programs improved students' reading comprehension skills during the 9th grade. The ERO programs also had a positive impact on students' academic performance in core subject areas, including their grades and credit accumulation. Students in the ERO group scored higher on their states' English/Language Arts and mathematics assessment than did those in the non-ERO group. The ERO program effects did not continue beyond the program year. While there were statistically significant and positive impacts on students' GPA, credit accumulation, and state test scores in 9th grade, the impacts were not significant the following school year. Analyzed separately, the RAAL program significantly improved students' reading comprehension during the 9th grade year while the XR program did not have a statistically significant impact on reading comprehension. Impacts on other outcomes were similar for the two programs.

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104021/pdf/20104021.pdf>

National Evaluation of the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers: Interim Report

In an evaluation of the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers, a sample of Center projects were rated by their clients to be on average 3.94 for relevance and 3.70 for usefulness on a scale of 1 to 5. A panel of experts rated their technical quality to be 3.34, on average. NCEE released an interim report on the congressionally mandated evaluation of the Centers, a federally funded program that provides technical assistance to states to implement provisions of NCLB through 16 Regional Comprehensive Centers (RCCs) and 5 Content Centers (CCs).

The interim report addresses the first of the evaluation's three rounds of data collection pertaining to the Comprehensive Centers' work from July 2006 through June 2007. All Comprehensive Centers reported planning their work in coordination and consultation with their clients, making adjustments in their work plan during the year. More than one third of state administrators reported that the Centers "served the state's purposes completely," with another 52 percent reporting that "it was a good start."

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104033/pdf/20104033.pdf>

The Evaluation of Charter School Impacts: Final Report

Adding to the growing debate and evidence based on the effects of charter schools, this evaluation was conducted in 36 charter middle schools in 15 states. It compares the outcomes of 2,330 students who applied to these schools and were randomly assigned by lotteries to be admitted (lottery winners) or not admitted (lottery losers) to the schools. Both sets of students were tracked over two years, and data on student achievement, academic progress, behavior, and attitudes were collected. The study is the first large-scale

randomized trial of the effectiveness of charter schools in varied types of communities and states.

Key findings include:

- On average, charter middle schools that held lotteries were neither more nor less successful than traditional public schools in improving math or reading test scores, attendance, grade promotion, or student conduct within or outside of school. Being admitted to a study charter school did significantly improve both students' and parents' satisfaction with school.
- Charter middle schools' impact on student achievement varied significantly across schools.
- Charter middle schools in urban areas—as well as those serving higher proportions of low-income and low achieving students—were more effective (relative to their nearby traditional public schools) than were other charter schools in improving math test scores. Some operational features of charter middle schools were associated with less negative impacts on achievement. These features include smaller enrollments and the use of ability grouping in math or English classes.

Because the study could only include charter middle schools that held lotteries, the results do not necessarily apply to the full set of charter middle schools in the United States.

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104029/index.asp>

Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Final Results from a Randomized Controlled Study

The final report on an impact evaluation of comprehensive induction on beginning teachers compares retention, achievement, and classroom practices of teachers who were offered comprehensive induction services to teachers who were offered the support normally offered by the school. Teachers assigned to receive comprehensive induction for either one or two years were supported by a full-time mentor who received ongoing training and materials to support the teachers' development. The teachers also were offered monthly professional development sessions and opportunities to observe veteran teachers. The teachers were followed for three years.

Key findings include:

- There were no impacts on teacher retention rates after each of the three years of follow-up.
- There were no impacts on teachers' classroom practices, which were measured during teachers' first year in the classroom.
- For teachers offered one year of comprehensive induction, there were no impacts on student achievement in any of the teachers' first three years in the classroom.
- For teachers offered two years of comprehensive induction, there were no impacts on student achievement in either of the first two years. However, in the third year, there were positive impacts on student achievement, based on the sample of teachers whose students had both pre-test and post-test scores. These impacts were equivalent to

moving the average student from the 50th percentile to the 54th percentile in reading and the 58th percentile in math.

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104027/index.asp>

Accommodations for English Language Learner Students: The Effect of Linguistic Modification of Math Test Item Sets

The study on middle school math assessment accommodations found that simplifying the language—or linguistic modification—on standardized math test items made it easier for English language learners to focus on and grasp math concepts, and thus was a more accurate assessment of their math skills. The study randomly assigned students to be assigned using two sets of math items—either the originally worded items or those that had been modified. Researchers analyzed results from three subgroups of students—English learners (EL), non-English language arts proficient (NEP), and English language arts proficient (EP) students.

Key results include:

- Linguistically modifying the language of mathematics test items did not change the math knowledge being assessed.
- The effect of linguistic modification on students' math performance varied between the three student subgroups. The results also varied depending on how scores were calculated for each student.
- For each of the four scoring approaches analyzed, the effect of linguistic modification was greatest for EL students, followed by NEP and EP students.

http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/west/pdf/REL_20094079.pdf

Evaluation of the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program: Final Report

The DC Opportunity Scholarship Program (OSP) is the first federally funded voucher program in the United States, providing scholarships of up to \$7,500 for low-income residents of the District of Columbia to send their children to local participating private schools. The congressionally mandated evaluation of the program compared the outcomes of about 2,300 eligible applicants randomly assigned to receive or not receive an OSP scholarship through a series of lotteries in 2004 and 2005.

This final report finds that the program had mixed longer-term effects on participating students and their parents, including:

- No conclusive evidence that the OSP affected student achievement overall, or for the high-priority group of students who applied from “schools in need of improvement.”
- The program significantly improved students' chances of graduating from high school, according to parent reports. Overall, 82 percent of students offered scholarships received a high school diploma, compared to 70 percent of those who applied but were not offered scholarships. This graduation rate improvement also held for the subgroup of OSP students who came from “schools in need of improvement.”

- Although parents had higher satisfaction and rated schools as safer if their child was offered or used an OSP scholarship, students reported similar ratings for satisfaction and safety regardless of whether they were offered or used a scholarship.

The evaluation also found that the cumulative loss of students between 2004 and 2009 from DC Public Schools (DCPS) to the program was about 3 percent. In contrast, an estimated 20 percent of students annually change schools or leave DCPS.

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104018/pdf/20104018.pdf>

Compendium of Student, Teacher, and Classroom Measures Used in NCEE Evaluations of Educational Interventions

This NCEE Reference Report is a resource to help evaluators and researchers select outcome measures for their future studies and also to assist policymakers in understanding the measures used in existing IES studies. The two-volume “Compendium of Student, Teacher, and Classroom Measures Used in NCEE Evaluations of Educational Interventions” provides comparative information about the domain, technical quality, and history of use of outcome measures used in IES-funded evaluations between 2005 and 2008. The Compendium is intended to facilitate the comparisons of results across studies, thus expanding an understanding of these measures within the educational research community.

Focusing exclusively on studies that employed randomized controlled trials or regression discontinuity designs, the Compendium also used outcome measures that were (1) available to other researchers and (2) had information available about psychometric properties. Volume I describes typical or common considerations when selecting measures and the approach used to collect and summarize information on the 94 measures reviewed. Volume II provides detailed descriptions of these measures including source information and references.

<http://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=NCEE20104012>

Middle School Mathematics Professional Development Impact Study: Findings After the First Year of Implementation

Results after one year of providing teachers math professional development (PD) indicate no improvement on their students’ math achievement when compared to teachers who did not receive the study-provided PD. The Middle School Mathematics Professional Development Impact Study: Findings After the First Year of Implementation included 77 schools in 12 districts in SY 2007–08. The PD, although purposely designed to be relevant to the curricula that teachers were using in their classrooms, focused primarily on developing teachers’ capability to teach positive rational number topics effectively. America’s Choice and Pearson Achievement Solutions were the two professional development providers, each operating in half the districts. Schools participating in the study were randomly assigned to the treatment group or the control group within each of 12 study districts. Teachers who taught the core 7th grade mathematics class in the study schools received the professional development or not according to their school’s assigned status. Teachers in all of the study schools continued to be eligible for district-provided PD.

Other key findings include:

- The training did have a statistically significant impact on one of three measures of teacher practice—"frequency with which teachers engaged in activities that elicited student thinking."
- The training did not have a statistically significant impact on measured teacher knowledge.
- The study's program was implemented as intended and on average resulted in an additional 55 hours of math professional development during SY 2007–08.

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104009/pdf/20104009.pdf>

Patterns in the Identification of and Outcomes for Children and Youth With Disabilities

Reported here are the results of analyses to describe the patterns of identification and academic and developmental outcomes for children with disabilities, conducted as part of the 2004 National Assessment of the implementation of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. This report provides background context for National Assessment studies on program implementation and effectiveness. It provides a national description of the outcomes of children identified for services under *IDEA* and, as appropriate, in comparison with the outcomes of samples including their nondisabled peers.

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104005/index.asp>

Reading First Impact Study Final Report

The results indicate that Reading First produced statistically significant positive impacts on multiple reading practices promoted by the program, such as the amount of instructional time spent on the five essential components of reading instruction and professional development in scientifically based reading instruction. Reading First did not produce a statistically significant impact on student reading comprehension test scores in grades one, two, or three. However, there was a positive and statistically significant impact on first grade students' decoding skills in spring 2007.

<http://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=NCEE20094038>

Other Evaluation Reports

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/>

Publications by REL or Search for a Specific Publication

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/projects/index.asp>

Appendix B: Glossary of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ABCP	Asset-Backed Commercial Paper
ACG	Academic Competitiveness Grant
ACSI	American Customer Satisfaction Index
AFR	<i>Agency Financial Report</i>
AGI	Adjusted Gross Income
APR	<i>Annual Performance Report</i>
ARRA	<i>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act)</i>
ATA	<i>Assistive Technology Act of 2004</i>
CAR	Consolidated Annual Performance, Accountability, and Financial Status Report
CAROI	Cooperative Audit Resolution and Oversight Initiative
CBJ	Congressional Budget Justifications
CDC	Centers for Disease Control
CCRAA	<i>College Cost Reduction and Access Act</i>
CFAAA	<i>Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003</i>
CFDA	<i>Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance</i>
CRA	<i>Civil Rights Act of 1964</i>
CSPR	<i>Consolidated State Performance Report</i>
CSR	Comprehensive School Reform
CSRS	Civil Service Retirement System
CTEA	<i>Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006</i>
ECASLA	<i>Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loans Act of 2008</i>
EDA	<i>Education of the Deaf Act of 1986</i>
EDEN	Education Data Exchange Network
EFC	Expected Family Contribution
EMAPS	EDFacts Metadata and Process System
ESEA	<i>Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965</i>
ESRA	<i>Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002</i>

ESS	EDEN Submission System
FAFSA	Free Application for Federal Student Aid
FASAB	Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
FECA	<i>Federal Employees' Compensation Act</i>
FERS	Federal Employees Retirement System
FFB	Federal Financing Bank
FFEL	Federal Family Education Loan
FFMIA	<i>Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996</i>
FISMA	<i>Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002</i>
FMFIA	<i>Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982</i>
FOTW	FAFSA on the Web
FSA	Federal Student Aid
FY	Fiscal Year
GA	Guaranty Agency
GAPS	Grant Administration and Payment System
GPRA	<i>Government Performance and Results Act of 1993</i>
GSA	General Services Administration
HBCUs	Historically Black Colleges and Universities
HC	Human Capital
HCERA	<i>Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010</i>
HCMS	Human Capital Management Staff
HEA	<i>Higher Education Act of 1965</i>
HPPG	High Priority Performance Goals (Priority Goals)
HR	Human Resources
IDEA	<i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>
IES	Institute of Education Sciences
IP	Improper Payments
IPERA	<i>Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act</i>

IPIA	<i>Improper Payments Information Act of 2002</i>
IRS	Internal Revenue Service
i3	Investing in Innovation Fund
IT	Information Technology
IUS	Internal Use Software
IV&V	Independent Verification and Validation
LEA	Local Educational Agency
LLR	Lender of Last Resort
MD&A	Management's Discussion and Analysis
MECEA	<i>Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961</i>
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress
NCLB	<i>No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</i>
NLA	<i>National Literacy Act of 1991</i>
OA	Organizational Assessment
OCR	Office for Civil Rights
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OELA	Office of English Language Acquisition
OESE	Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
OIG	Office of Inspector General
OII	Office of Innovation and Improvement
OM	Office of Management
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OPE	Office of Postsecondary Education
OPM	Office of Personnel Management
OSDFS	Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools
OSERS	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
OVAE	Office of Vocational and Adult Education
PAR	<i>Performance and Accountability Report</i>

PBO	Performance-Based Organization
Perkins IV	<i>Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006</i>
PIC	Performance Improvement Council
PII	Personally Identifiable Information
PIO	Performance Improvement Officer
PIRLS	Progress in International Reading Literacy Study
PLUS	Parent Loans for Undergraduate Students
RA/JF	<i>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act)/Education Jobs Fund</i>
RMS	Risk Management Service
SAFRA	<i>Student Aid Fiscal Responsibility Act (SAFRA Act)</i>
SAP	Special Allowance Payment
SEA	State Educational Agency
SFSF	State Fiscal Stabilization Fund
SIG	School Improvement Grant
SLDS	Statewide Longitudinal Data System
SOF	Statement of Financing
SY	School Year
TASSIE	Title I Accountability Systems and School Improvement Efforts
TIF	Teacher Incentive Funds
TIMSS	Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study
USC	United States Code
VPS	Visual Performance Suite
VR	Vocational Rehabilitation
WWC	What Works Clearinghouse
YRBSS	Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System

Appendix C: Selected Department Web Links

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

Important *Recovery Act* Reference Sites

- Recovery.Gov
- [Department Weekly and Communication Reports](#)
- [American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009: Frequently Asked Questions](#)

Department Evaluation Studies

The Department designs evaluation studies to produce rigorous scientific evidence on the effectiveness of education programs and practices.

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/index.asp>

<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oepdp/ppss/reports.html>

Performance Data

EDFacts is a Department initiative to put performance data at the center of policy, management, and budget decisions for all K-12 educational programs.

<http://www.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/index.html>

Projections of Education Statistics to 2018

For the 50 states and the District of Columbia, the tables, figures, and text contain data on projections of public elementary and secondary enrollment and public high school graduates to the year 2018. The report includes a methodology section describing models and assumptions used to develop national and state-level projections.

<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2009062>

Discretionary Grant Programs for FY 2009–2010

This site lists Department grant competitions previously announced, as well as those planned for later announcement, for new awards organized according to the Department's principal program offices.

<http://www.ed.gov/fund/grant/find/edlite-forecast.html>

Open Government Initiative

The Department's Open Government Initiative is designed to improve the way the Department shares information, learns from others, and collaborates to develop the best solutions for America's students.

<http://www2.ed.gov/about/open.html>

Research and Statistics

The *Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002* established the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) within the Department to provide research, evaluation, and statistics to our nation's education system.

<http://ies.ed.gov/>

National Assessment of Educational Progress

The National Assessment of Educational Progress assesses samples of students in grades 4, 8, and 12 in various academic subjects. Results of the assessments are reported for the nation and states in terms of achievement levels—basic, proficient, and advanced.

<http://nationsreportcard.gov/>

Office of Inspector General

The OIG has four primary business functions: audit, investigation, cyber security, and evaluation and inspection.

<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/index.html>

For a list of recent reports, go to:

<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/reports.html>



**OUR MISSION IS TO PROMOTE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND PREPARATION FOR
GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS BY FOSTERING EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE AND
ENSURING EQUAL ACCESS.**

[WWW.ED.GOV](http://www.ed.gov)