

U.S. Department of Education



Performance Summary Report

Fiscal Year 2016

In Support of the

National Drug Control Strategy

March 13, 2017

U.S. Department of Education
Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Transmittal Letter	1
Performance Summary Information.....	2
Safe and Supportive Schools	2
School Climate Transformation LEA Grants.....	8
Assertions	15
Criteria for Assertions	16



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

March 13, 2017

Terry Zobeck
Executive Office of the President
Office of National Drug Control Policy
Washington, DC

Dear Terry:

As required by Office of National Drug Control Policy Circular *Accounting of Drug Control Funding and Performance Summary*, enclosed please find detailed information about performance-related measures for key drug control programs administered by the U.S. Department of Education, in accordance with the guidelines in the circular dated January 18, 2013. This information covers the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program, which is the Drug Control Budget Decision Unit under which the FY 2016 budgetary resources for the Department of Education are displayed in the *National Drug Control Budget and Performance Summary*.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about the enclosed information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Esquith".

David Esquith
Director, Office of Safe and Healthy Students

FY 2016 Performance Summary Information

Safe and Supportive Schools

In FY 2010 the Department awarded the first round of awards under the Safe and Supportive Schools (S3) grant program. No subsequent cohorts of grants were awarded under the program. Awards were made to 11 State educational agencies to support statewide measurement of, and targeted programmatic interventions to improve, conditions for learning in order to help schools improve safety and reduce substance use. Projects had to take a systematic approach to improving conditions for learning in eligible schools through improved measurement systems that assess conditions for learning, including school safety, and the implementation of programmatic interventions at the school level that address problems identified by data.

Measure 1: Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a decrease in the percentage of students who report current (30-day) alcohol use.

Table 1

Cohort	FY2012 Actual	FY2013 Actual	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual	FY2016 Target
2010	58.0	73.9	77.0	n/a	n/a	n/a

The Measure. ED established several GPRA performance measures for assessing the effectiveness of Safe and Supportive Schools grants. Four measures were related to addressing the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy. This measure was one of the four selected for that purpose.

FY 2016 Performance Results. FY 2014 was the final year of performance reporting. For the FY 2015 Performance report FY 2014 performance data were not available to report as most grantees were completing unfinished grant activities in a no-cost extension period that extended into FY 2015, and these grantees only provided that performance information as part of their final reports which were due January 1, 2016. That performance data has now been submitted and verified and corrected as needed, and is now being reported for the first time.

NOTE: The data from two grants in the FY 2010 cohort were excluded from both the FY 2012 and FY 2013 actual percentages, as those data were deemed invalid and not comparable to the data from the other grants in the cohort. Grantees were advised in the Safe and Supportive Schools GPRA guidance to include only schools that had fully implemented programmatic interventions with

fidelity. The data for the two grantees that were excluded included a significant number of schools that were at varying stages of program implementation and did not meet this criterion. The two grantees received additional technical assistance related to performance data collection, and 2014 data from them is included in the FY 2014 actual percentages in this report.

FY 2017 Performance Targets. A performance target was not set for FY 2016 as grantees have completed grant activities.

Methodology. These measures constituted the Department's indicators of success for the Safe and Supportive Schools grant program. Consequently, we advised applicants for a grant under this program to give careful consideration to these measures in conceptualizing the approach and evaluation for its proposed program. Each grantee was required to provide, in its annual performance and final reports, data about its progress in meeting these measures.

To receive funds after the initial year of a multiyear award, grantees were required to submit an annual continuation performance report that described the progress the project made toward meeting the predefined benchmarks and milestones. This performance report also provided program staff with data related to the GPRA measures established for the program.

Authorized representatives for the grant site signed the annual performance report and, in doing so, certified that to the best of the signer's knowledge and belief, all data in the performance report were true and correct and that the report fully disclosed all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relied on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and did not conduct further reviews.

The National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments, the technical assistance contractor for the S3 grant program, provided training on data collection. They reviewed data submitted, and worked with grantees to seek clarifying information and provide technical assistance if grantees were having difficulty in collecting or reporting data for this measure.

For measures related to 30-day alcohol use, States calculated the percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions that experienced either an increase or decrease in the percentage of students who reported each behavior or experience between year 1 and year 2, and this became the basis for the formulation of the baseline (FY 2012 actual) on which subsequent targets were set.

Measure 2: Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience an increase in the percentage of students who report current (30-day) alcohol use.

Table 2

Cohort	FY2012 Actual	FY2013 Actual	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY2017 Target
2010	37.0	22.6	18.0	n/a	n/a	n/a

The Measure. ED established several GPRA performance measures for assessing the effectiveness of Safe and Supportive Schools grants. Four measures were related to addressing the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy. This measure was one of the four selected for that purpose.

FY 2016 Performance Results. FY 2014 was the final year of performance reporting. For the FY 2015 Performance report FY 2014 performance data were not available to report as most grantees were completing unfinished grant activities in a no-cost extension period that extended into FY 2015, and these grantees only provided that performance information as part of their final reports which were due January 1, 2016. That performance data has now been submitted and verified and corrected as needed, and is now being reported for the first time.

NOTE: The data from two grants in the FY 2010 cohort were excluded from both the FY 2012 and FY 2013 actual percentages, as those data were deemed invalid and not comparable to the data from the other grants in the cohort. Grantees were advised in the Safe and Supportive Schools GPRA guidance to include only schools that had fully implemented programmatic interventions with fidelity. The data for the two grantees that were excluded included a significant number of schools that were at varying stages of program implementation and did not meet this criterion. The two grantees received additional technical assistance related to performance data collection, and 2014 data from them is included in the FY 2014 actual percentages in this report.

FY 2017 Performance Targets. A performance target was not set for FY 2016 as grantees have completed grant activities.

Methodology. These measures constituted the Department's indicators of success for the Safe and Supportive Schools grant program. Consequently, we advised applicants for a grant under this program to give careful consideration to these measures in conceptualizing the approach and evaluation for its proposed program. Each grantee was required to provide, in its annual performance and final reports, data about its progress in meeting these measures.

To receive funds after the initial year of a multiyear award, grantees were required to submit an annual continuation performance report that described the progress the project made toward meeting the predefined benchmarks and

milestones. This performance report also provided program staff with data related to the GPRA measures established for the program.

Authorized representatives for the grant site signed the annual performance report and, in doing so, certified that to the best of the signer’s knowledge and belief, all data in the performance report were true and correct and that the report fully disclosed all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relied on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and did not conduct further reviews.

The National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments, the technical assistance contractor for the S3 grant program, provided training on data collection. They reviewed data submitted, and worked with grantees to seek clarifying information and provide technical assistance if grantees were having difficulty in collecting or reporting data for this measure.

For measures related to 30-day alcohol use, States calculated the percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions that experienced either an increase or decrease in the percentage of students who reported each behavior or experience between year 1 and year 2, and this became the basis for the formulation of the baseline (FY 2012 actual) on which subsequent targets were set.

Measure 3: Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience an improvement in their school safety score.

Table 3

Cohort	FY2012 Actual	FY2013 Actual	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Target
2010	59.0	72.9	73.0	n/a	n/a	n/a

The Measure. ED established several GPRA performance measures for assessing the effectiveness of Safe and Supportive Schools grants. Four measures were related to addressing the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy. This measure was one of the four selected for that purpose.

NOTE: The school safety score is an index of school safety that may include the presence and use of illegal drugs (including alcohol and marijuana).

FY 2016 Performance Results. FY 2014 was the final year of performance reporting. For the FY 2015 Performance report FY 2014 performance data were

not available to report as most grantees were completing unfinished grant activities in a no-cost extension period that extended into fiscal year 2015, and these grantees only provided that performance information as part of their final reports which were due January 1, 2016. That performance data has now been submitted and verified and corrected as needed, and is now being reported for the first time.

NOTE: The data from two grants in the FY 2010 cohort were excluded from both the FY 2012 and FY 2013 actual percentages, as those data were deemed invalid and not comparable to the data from the other grants in the cohort. Grantees were advised in the Safe and Supportive Schools GPRA guidance to include only schools that had fully implemented programmatic interventions with fidelity. The data for the two grantees that were excluded included a significant number of schools that were at varying stages of program implementation and did not meet this criterion. The two grantees received additional technical assistance related to performance data collection, and 2014 data from them is included in the FY 2014 actual percentages in this report.

FY 2017 Performance Targets. A performance target was not set for FY 2016 as grantees have completed grant activities.

Methodology. These measures constituted the Department's indicators of success for the Safe and Supportive Schools grant program. Consequently, we advised applicants for a grant under this program to give careful consideration to these measures in conceptualizing the approach and evaluation for its proposed program. Each grantee was required to provide, in its annual performance and final reports, data about its progress in meeting these measures.

To receive funds after the initial year of a multiyear award, grantees were required to submit an annual continuation performance report that described the progress the project made toward meeting the predefined benchmarks and milestones. This performance report also provided program staff with data related to the GPRA measures established for the program.

Authorized representatives for the grant site signed the annual performance report and, in doing so, certified that to the best of the signer's knowledge and belief, all data in the performance report were true and correct and that the report fully disclosed all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relied on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and did not conduct further reviews.

The National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments, the technical assistance contractor for the S3 grant program, provided training on data collection. They reviewed data submitted, and worked with grantees to seek

clarifying information and provide technical assistance if grantees were having difficulty in collecting or reporting data for this measure.

For measures related to school safety scores, the improvement or worsening of scores were calculated between the year 1 and Year 2, and this became the basis for the formulation of the baseline (FY 2012 actual) on which subsequent targets were set.

Measure 4: Percentage of eligible schools implementing programmatic interventions funded by Safe and Supportive Schools that experience a worsening in their school safety score.

Table 4

Cohort	FY2012 Actual	FY2013 Actual	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Target
2010	30.0	20.8	20.0	n/a	n/a	n/a

The Measure. ED established several GPRA performance measures for assessing the effectiveness of Safe and Supportive Schools grants. Four measures were related to addressing the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy. This measure was one of the four selected for that purpose.

NOTE: The school safety score is an index of school safety that may include the presence and use of illegal drugs (including alcohol and marijuana).

FY 2016 Performance Results. FY 2014 was the final year of performance reporting. For the FY 2015 Performance report FY 2014 performance data were not available to report as most grantees were completing unfinished grant activities in a no-cost extension period that extended into fiscal year 2015, and these grantees only provided that performance information as part of their final reports which were due January 1, 2016. That performance data has now been submitted and verified and corrected as needed, and is now being reported for the first time.

NOTE: The data from two grants in the FY 2010 cohort were excluded from both the FY 2012 and FY 2013 actual percentages, as those data were deemed invalid and not comparable to the data from the other grants in the cohort. Grantees were advised in the Safe and Supportive Schools GPRA guidance to include only schools that had fully implemented programmatic interventions with fidelity. The data for the two grantees that were excluded included a significant number of schools that were at varying stages of program implementation and did not meet this criterion. The two grantees received additional technical

assistance related to performance data collection, and 2014 data from them is included in the FY 2014 actual percentages in this report.

FY 2017 Performance Targets. A performance target was not set for FY 2016 as grantees have completed grant activities.

Methodology. These measures constituted the Department's indicators of success for the Safe and Supportive Schools grant program. Consequently, we advised applicants for a grant under this program to give careful consideration to these measures in conceptualizing the approach and evaluation for its proposed program. Each grantee was required to provide, in its annual performance and final reports, data about its progress in meeting these measures.

To receive funds after the initial year of a multiyear award, grantees were required to submit an annual continuation performance report that described the progress the project made toward meeting the predefined benchmarks and milestones. This performance report also provided program staff with data related to the GPRA measures established for the program.

Authorized representatives for the grant site signed the annual performance report and, in doing so, certified that to the best of the signer's knowledge and belief, all data in the performance report were true and correct and that the report fully disclosed all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relied on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and did not conduct further reviews.

The National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments, the technical assistance contractor for the S3 grant program, provided training on data collection. They reviewed data submitted, and worked with grantees to seek clarifying information and provide technical assistance if grantees were having difficulty in collecting or reporting data for this measure.

For measures related to school safety scores, the improvement or worsening of scores were calculated between the year 1 and Year 2, and this became the basis for the formulation of the baseline (FY 2012 actual) on which subsequent targets were set.

School Climate Transformation Grant – Local Educational Agency Grants Program

In FY 2014 the Department awarded the first round of awards under the School Climate Transformation Grant – Local Educational Agency (LEA) Grants program to 71 school districts in 23 states, Washington, D.C., and the U.S. Virgin Islands. The funds are being used to develop, enhance, and expand systems of support for implementing evidence-based, multi-tiered behavioral frameworks for

improving behavioral outcomes and learning conditions for students. The goals of the program are to connect children, youths, and families to appropriate services and supports; improve conditions for learning and behavioral outcomes for school-aged youths; and increase awareness of and the ability to respond to mental-health issues among school-aged youths.

School districts also are using these funds to implement models for reform and evidence-based practices that address the school-to-prison pipeline—the unfortunate and often unintentional policies and practices that push our nation’s schoolchildren, especially those who are most at-risk, out of classrooms and into the juvenile and criminal justice systems. The grants provide funding for up to five years, for a total of nearly \$180 million. Year three continuation awards were made to these grantees in FY 2016.

Drug prevention is an allowable activity. Indeed, grantees are encouraged, as part of their local needs assessment, to measure student drug use along with other relevant issues and problems. This local needs assessment is also being used by grantees to help identify and select the most appropriate evidence-based programs and practices. If the needs assessment indicates that drug abuse is an issue for students, drug abuse prevention should be addressed through implementation of a multi-tiered behavioral framework.

The Department has developed a variety of measures to assess the performance of the School Climate Transformation Grants, including (1) measures related to increasing the capacity of LEAs to implement a multi-tiered decision-making framework to improve behavioral and learning outcomes and (2) measures to demonstrate the progress of LEAs in achieving those outcomes as evidence by decreasing student disciplinary actions and increased student attendance. Among those measures, the two discussed below are the most directly related to the drug prevention function of this program.

In addition, in FY 2016 ED released the new, high-quality, adaptable ED School Climate Surveys (EDSCLS) and associated web-based platform. The EDSCLS allows States, local school districts, and schools to collect and act on valid and reliable school climate data in real-time.

- The EDSCLS web-based administration platform, including a suite of school climate surveys for middle and high school students, instructional staff, non-instructional staff, and parents/guardians, can now be downloaded free of charge.
- The platform processes data and provides user-friendly reports in real-time.
- Local education agencies administering the survey can store the data locally on their own data systems. ED will *not* have access to the data.
- In FY 2017, ED will survey a nationally-representative sample of schools to create school climate benchmark scores. These benchmark scores will be added to the platform’s reporting functionality to enable comparisons between local and national scores.

Measure 1: Number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions, including those related to possession or use of drugs or alcohol.

Table 5

Cohort	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Target
2014	n/a	n/a	524 51%	540 53%

The Measure. ED established several GPRA performance measures for assessing the effectiveness of the School Climate Transformation Grant – Local Educational Agency Grants program. Two measures were related to addressing the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy. This measure was one of the two selected for that purpose.

It is expected that grantees may show progress in meeting this measure due to improvement in school climate that results in a decrease in actual student use of drugs or alcohol, and as a result these students do not face disciplinary action for such use. Alternatively, grantees may show progress because they change their disciplinary approach to student drug or alcohol use, and take a more supportive disciplinary approach to addressing the behavior, rather than relying on suspensions and expulsions.

FY 2016 Performance Results. There was no FY 2015 actual performance data to report, because two years of performance data (2015 and 2016) were needed to calculate the decrease(s) in the metrics of this measure. Those results are now available and comprise the FY 2016 actual, as well as baseline, performance data for Measure 1.

FY 2017 Performance Target. A performance target has been set for FY 2017 as prior year (FY 2016) baseline data are now available against which to set this and subsequent targets. The targets for FY 2017 are set as an increase of 3 percent in both the number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions, including those related to possession or use of drugs or alcohol.

Methodology. These measures constitute the Department's indicators of success for the School Climate Transformation Grant – Local Educational Agency Grants program. Consequently, we advised applicants for a grant under this program to give careful consideration to these measures in conceptualizing the approach and evaluation for its proposed program. Each grantee is required to provide, in its annual performance and final reports, data about progress in meeting these measures.

To receive funds after the initial year of a multiyear award, grantees must submit an annual continuation performance report that describes the progress the project has made toward meeting the predefined benchmarks and milestones. This performance report also provides program staff with data related to the GPRA measures established for the program.

Grantees are not required to collect and report to the Department disaggregated data corresponding to such suspensions and expulsions that are related to possession or use of alcohol or drugs only, but many of grantees already do so and the Department encourages the remaining grantees to do so. Accordingly, beginning with the 2016 baseline data available for this performance measure, the Department is reporting in the tables below on the number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions related to possession or use of alcohol (only) and on the number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions related to possession or use of other drugs (only), for the grantees that provide that more detailed data.

NOTE: As grantees are not required to collect this data, nor do all grantees collect it, no targets are set.

Table 6: Number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions related to possession or use of alcohol only (31 out of a total of 70 grantees reported on this)

Cohort	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual
2014	n/a	n/a	184 40%

Table 7: Number and percentage of schools that report an annual decrease in suspensions and expulsions related to possession or use of other drugs only (32 out of a total of 70 grantees reported on this)

Cohort	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Actual	FY2016 Actual
2014	n/a	n/a	204 41%

Authorized representatives for the grant site sign the annual performance report and, in doing so, certify that to the best of the signer's knowledge and belief, all data in the performance report were true and correct and that the report fully

disclosed all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relies on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and will not conduct further reviews, unless data quality concerns arise.

The ED-funded Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (www.pbis.org) is providing training and technical assistance on data collection.

Measure 2: Number and percentage of schools annually that are implementing the multi-tiered behavioral framework with fidelity.

Table 8

Cohort	FY2014 Actual	FY2015 Target	FY 2015 Actual	FY2016 Target	FY2016 Actual	FY2017 Target
2014	n/a	n/a	512 45%	589 52%	584 55%	677 60%

The Measure. ED established several GPRA performance measures for assessing the effectiveness of the School Climate Transformation Grant – Local Educational Agency Grants program. Two measures were related to addressing the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy. This measure was one of the two selected for that purpose.

Although schools have long attempted to address issues of student disruptive and problem behavior (including substance use, violence, and bullying), the vast majority of our Nation's schools have not implemented comprehensive, effective supports that address the full range of students' social, emotional, and behavioral needs. Research demonstrates that the implementation of an evidence-based, multi-tiered behavioral framework, such as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), can help improve overall school climate and safety. A key aspect of this multi-tiered approach is providing differing levels of support and interventions to students based on their needs. Certain supports involve the whole school (e.g., consistent rules, consequences, and reinforcement of appropriate behavior), with more intensive supports for groups of students exhibiting at-risk behavior and individualized services for students who continue to exhibit troubling behavior.

This second measure supports the drug prevention function of this program because a school that is implementing a multi-tiered behavioral framework with fidelity can be expected to be a school where any prevention program(s) – including drug prevention program(s) – selected for implementation is (1) an evidence-based program and (2) has an improved chance of being implemented

more effectively. This measure is designed to inform whether the LEA School Climate Transformation Grants result in such increased capacity.

FY 2016 Performance Results. FY 2016 performance data have been received and aggregated. The number and percentage of schools annually that are implementing the multi-tiered behavioral framework with fidelity are reported as 584 and 55 percent respectively. The number of schools target was not quite met, while the percentage target was exceeded slightly. A likely explanation for slightly missing the number of schools target (by 5 schools – 584 compared to 589) and slightly exceeding the percentage of schools target (by approximately 3 percentage points) is that the number of schools served by the grants changed across years.

More specifically, in 2015, 512 schools out of 1,132 served by these grants (45 percent) were found to be implementing the multi-tiered behavioral framework with fidelity, with those 512 and 45 percent of schools constituting the baseline data for this measure. The 2016 target was to increase these by 15 percent, to 589 schools representing 52 percent of the schools served by these grants. But when we established the 2016 target, we did not anticipate that the overall number of schools served by these grants would change from one year to the next. It turns out some of the grantees chose to add more schools to their projects, while other grantees chose to focus their project on a smaller number of schools.

The net result is that the overall number of schools served decreased to 1,069 in 2016. The lower number of schools served likely explains why the number of schools target was not quite met; and at the same time the overall lower number of schools (i.e., denominator) makes for a higher percentage of schools meeting this measure than would be the case had the overall number of schools been higher. Respecting the shift in the total number of schools served across years, however, seemed like a more accurate way to report the 2016 data for this measure than did denying the shift and basing 2016 performance entirely on the 2015 implementation of the program.

Not knowing at this time what the shift will be (if any) in the number of schools overall served by these grants in future years, and given how closely 2016 performance still aligned with the 2016 targets as we implemented the measure, we think it is reasonable at this time to maintain the future targets as they were originally set (aspiring for an annual improvement of 15 percent in both the number, and percentage, of schools that are implementing the multi-tiered behavioral framework with fidelity) rather than to revise them.

FY 2017 Performance Target. The FY 2017 performance targets for the number and percentage of schools annually that are implementing the multi-tiered behavioral framework with fidelity are set at 677 and 60 percent respectively. These and the FY 2016 targets represent an annual increase of 15 percent.

Methodology. These measures constitute the Department's indicators of success for the School Climate Transformation Grant – Local Educational Agency Grants program. Consequently, we advised applicants for a grant under this program to

give careful consideration to these measures in conceptualizing the approach and evaluation for its proposed program. Each grantee will be required to provide, in its annual performance and final reports, data about its progress in meeting these measures.

To receive funds after the initial year of a multiyear award, grantees must submit an annual continuation performance report that describes the progress the project has made toward meeting the predefined benchmarks and milestones. This performance report also provides program staff with data related to the GPRA measures established for the program.

Authorized representatives for the grant site sign the annual performance report and, in doing so, certify that to the best of the signer's knowledge and belief, all data in the performance report were true and correct and that the report fully disclosed all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data included. Generally, the Department relies on the certification concerning data supplied by grantees and will not conduct further reviews, unless data quality concerns arise. The ED-funded Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (www.pbis.org) is providing training and technical assistance on data collection.

The ED-funded Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (www.pbis.org) is providing training on data collection.

Assertions

Performance Reporting System

The Department of Education has a system in place to capture performance information accurately and that system was properly applied to generate the performance data in this report. In instances in which data are supplied by grantees as part of required periodic performance reports, the data that are supplied are accurately reflected in this report.

Data related to the drug control programs included in this Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2016 are recorded in the Department of Education's software for recording performance data and are an integral part of our budget and management processes.

Explanations for Not Meeting Performance Targets

The explanations provided in the Performance Summary report for Fiscal Year 2016 for not meeting performance targets and for recommendations for plans to maintain rather than revise performance targets are reasonable given past experience, available information, and available resources.

Methodology for Establishing Performance Targets

The methodology described in the Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2016 to establish performance targets for the current year is reasonable given past performance and available resources.

Performance Measures for Significant Drug Control Activities

The Department of Education has established at least one acceptable performance measure for each Drug Control Decision Unit identified in its Detailed Accounting of Fiscal Year 2016 Drug Control Funds.

Criteria for Assertions

Data

No workload or participant data support the assertions provided in this report. Sources of quantitative data used in the report are well documented. These data are the most recently available and are identified by the year in which the data was collected.

Other Estimation Methods

No estimation methods other than professional judgment were used to make the required assertions. When professional judgment was used, the objectivity and strength of those judgments were explained and documented. Professional judgment was used to establish targets for programs until data from at least one grant cohort were available to provide additional information needed to set more accurate targets. We routinely re-evaluate targets set using professional judgment as additional information about actual performance on measures becomes available.

Reporting Systems

Reporting systems that support the above assertions are current, reliable, and an integral part of the Department of Education's budget and management processes. Data collected and reported for the measures discussed in this report are stored, or will be stored, in the Department of Education's Visual Performance System (VPS). Data from the VPS are used in developing annual budget requests and justifications, and in preparing reports required under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, as amended by the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010.




UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

AUDIT SERVICES

March 13, 2017

TO: David Esquith
Director, Office of Safe and Healthy Students
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

FROM: Patrick J. Howard 
Assistant Inspector General for Audit

SUBJECT: Office of Inspector General's Independent Report on the U.S. Department of
Education's *Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2016*, dated
March 13, 2017

Attached is our authentication of management's assertions contained in the U.S. Department of Education's *Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2016*, dated March 13, 2017, as required by section 705(d) of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. § 1704(d)).

Our authentication was conducted in accordance with the guidelines stated in the Office of National Drug Control Policy Circular: *Accounting of Drug Control Funding and Performance Summary*, dated January 18, 2013.

If you have any questions or wish to discuss the contents of this authentication, please contact Michele Weaver-Dugan, Director, Operations Internal Audit Team, at (202) 245-6941.

Attachment



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

AUDIT SERVICES

Office of Inspector General's Independent Report on the U.S. Department of Education's
Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2016, dated March 13, 2017

We have reviewed management's assertions contained in the accompanying *Performance Summary Report for Fiscal Year 2016*, dated March 13, 2017 (Performance Summary Report). The U.S. Department of Education's management is responsible for the Performance Summary Report and the assertions contained therein.

Our review was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards for attestation review engagements. A review is substantially less in scope than an examination, the objective of which is the expression of an opinion on management's assertions. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion.

We performed review procedures on the "Performance Summary Information," "Assertions," and "Criteria for Assertions" contained in the accompanying Performance Summary Report. In general, our review procedures were limited to inquiries and analytical procedures appropriate for our review engagement. We did not perform procedures related to controls over the reporting system noted in the attached report.

Based on our review, nothing came to our attention that caused us to believe that management's assertions, contained in the accompanying Performance Summary Report, are not fairly stated in all material respects, based upon the Office of National Drug Control Policy Circular: *Accounting of Drug Control Funding and Performance Summary*, dated January 18, 2013.

Patrick J. Howard
Assistant Inspector General for Audit