

LRM ID: CJB96

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
Washington, D.C. 20503-0001

Thursday, August 21, 1997

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer - See Distribution below
FROM: *Constance J. Bowers*
Janet R. Forsgren (for) Assistant Director for Legislative Reference
OMB CONTACT: Constance J. Bowers
PHONE: (202)395-3803 FAX: (202)395-6148
SUBJECT: EDUCATION on GPRA Strategic Plan for the Department of EDUCATION
DEADLINE: Monday, September 8, 1997

In accordance with OMB Circular A-19, OMB requests the views of your agency on the above subject before advising on its relationship to the program of the President. **Please advise us if this item will affect direct spending or receipts for purposes of the "Pay-As-You-Go" provisions of Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.**

COMMENTS: Agencies: Please also provide a copy to your GPRA contact -- see attached list.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

AGENCIES:

32-ENERGY - Bob Rabben - (202) 586-6718
129-VETERANS AFFAIRS - Robert Coy - (202) 273-6666
118-TREASURY - Richard S. Carro - (202) 622-0650
59-INTERIOR - Jane Lyder - (202) 208-4371
62-LABOR - Robert A. Shapiro - (202) 219-8201
25-COMMERCE - Michael A. Levitt - (202) 482-3151
52-HHS - Sondra S. Wallace - (202) 690-7760
84-National Science Foundation - Lawrence Rudolph - (703) 306-1060
24-Corporation for Natl and Community Service - Gene Sofer - (202) 606-5000
31-Equal Employment Opportunity Comm. - Claire Gonzales - (202) 663-4900

EOP:

Robert M. Shireman
Michael Cohen
William R. Kincaid
Timothy A. Rosado
Kathryn B. Stack
Barry White
Walter S. Groszyk Jr.
James C. Murr
Janet R. Forsgren
Constance J. Bowers

copy

copy

SUBJECT: EDUCATION on GPRA Strategic Plan for the Department of

_____ Concur

_____ No Objection

_____ No Comment

_____ See proposed edits on pages _____

_____ Other: _____

FAX RETURN of _____ pages, attached to this reponse sheet

AGENCY CONTACT POINTS FOR GPRA STRATEGIC PLAN
(Alphabetical by Agency)

Tom Wilson
African Development Foundation (ADF)
Phone: 673-3948
Fax: 673-3810)

Barbara Bennett
Agency for International Development (AID)
Phone: 202-647-8441
Fax: 647-8321)

Ted David
Acting Chief Financial Officer
US Department of Agriculture
Room 143-W,
Whitten Building,

Ms. Barbara Starr
Ams Control and Disarmament Agency
320 21st. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20451

Mr. Steve Leeds
Department of Commerce
14th and Constitution Avenue
Room 5821
Washington D.C. 20230
phone number: (202) 482-5976
fax number: (202) 482-3361

Mr. James Cunningham
Acting Assistant Staff Director for Congressional Affairs
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
624 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20425
(202) 376-8589 phone
(202) 376-8315 fax

Bill Bentley
Corp. For National and Community Service
1201 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20525
Phone: 202) 606-5000 x 446

Sallyanne Harper
Acting Chief Financial Officer
1111 West Tower
Waterside Mall.
EPA
401 M St. SW
Washington, DC 20460

Ms. Maria Borrero
Executive Assistant to the Chairman
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
1801 L Street, N.W., Room 9024
Washington, D.C. 20507
(202) 663-4007 phone
(202) 663-4110 fax

Jim Cruse
Export Import Bank
phone: 565-3761
fax: 565-3770

Patti Hazard
Department of Health and Human Services
ASPE-Program Systems
Room 447D
200 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20201
Phone: 202-401-8279

Kathleen E. Monahan (Kathy)
Office of the Chief Financial Officer
**Department of Housing and
Urban Development**
Room 2200
451 Seventh Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20410
Telephone: (202) 619-8114 Ext. 3871
Facsimile : (202) 619-8025

James Barlage
Acting Director
Office of Government Liaison
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts
Phone: 416-8721
FAX: 416-8205

Adolfo Franco
Inter-American Foundation (IAF)
phone: 703-841-3894
fax: 703-841-3595

Jody Kusek, Director
Office of Planning and Program Management
Department of the Interior
Mail Stop 5258
1849 C Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20240

Edward L. Jackson
U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Room S4030
Washington, D.C. 20210
Office - 202/219-6888
Fax - 202/219-4676

Dr. Lewis Bellardo
Deputy Archivist
National Archives and Records
Administration
8601 Adlephi Road
Suite 4200
College Park, Maryland 20740-6001
(301) 713-6410

Alan Ladwig
Associate Administrator
Office of Policy and Plans
NASA
Phone: 358-2096

Ann Leven
Treasurer
National Gallery of Art
Phone: 842-6321
FAX: 789-2681

Harding Darden
National Labor Relations Board
1099 14th Street, N.W.
Room 7701
Washington, D.C. 20570
Office - 202/273-3970
Fax - 202/273-4273

Judy Sunley
Assistant to the Director
National Science Foundation
Phone: 703-306-1018

Ms. Ali Solis
Legislative Assistant
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
1325 G Street, N.W., Suite 810
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 376-2419 phone
(202) 376-2160 fax

Mary Strand
Director's Office
OPM
Theodore Roosevelt Building
1900 E Street NW Room 5 H 09
Washington, DC 20415-0001
Ph: 606-1000.

Beverly Hartline
Associate Director
Physical Sciences
Office of Science and Technology Policy
Phone: 456-6128

Ann Richard
Peace Corps
Phone: 606-3496
Fax: 606-3778

Dean Anderson
Dep. Dir. For Planning and Management
Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars
Phone: 357-2842
FAX: 357-4439

Contacts for selected agencies not listed above. (From bi-weekly conference call list.)

Defense

Alice Maroni
703 693-0582 (FAX)
David Hoen
703 614-9153; 703 614-2277 (FAX)
Nancy Nowak
703 697-1101; 703 693-7499 (FAX)

Education

Kay Rairdin
401-1028; 401-1438 (FAX)

Energy

Robert Alcock
586-5450; 586-4891 (FAX)
Lynwood Henderson
586-4600; 586-4504 (FAX)

FEMA

Maria Vogel
646-4500; 646-3600 (FAX)
Rick Shivar
646-3011; 646-3949 (FAX)

GSA

Bill Ratchford/Lisa McGovern
501-0563; 219-5742 (FAX)
Carole Hutchinson
501-0325; 501-3310 (FAX)

Justice

Karen Wilson
616-0658; 514-9149 (FAX)
Bob Diegelman
307-1853 (FAX)

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

John Evans

301 415-7324; 301 415-5386 (FAX)

SBA

Brad Douglas

205-6700; 205-7374 (FAX)

Antoniella Pianalto

205-6610; 358-6074 (FAX)

SSA

Dave Whalin

358-6084; 358-6074 (FAX)

Mary Ann Bennett

358-6025; 358-6074 (FAX)

Treasury

John Murphy

622-2400; 622-2549 (FAX)

USTR

John Hopkins

395-5799; 395-3911 (FAX)



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

AUG 20 1997

Mr. Franklin D. Raines
Director
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, DC 20503

Frank:
Dear ~~Mr. Raines~~:

Enclosed is the Department of Education's Strategic Plan, 1998-2002. This plan has been prepared to meet the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act. We consider it a meaningful document that will guide the Department in the coming years. Preparation of this plan involved all offices and many staff across the Department of Education. We have worked hard to ensure that this plan includes high-quality, rigorous performance indicators, because we believe the indicators will help us be accountable for results.

The draft plan was reviewed by several outside organizations, and we were pleased that they found our efforts to be on the right track. The General Accounting Office said the draft plan is "a useful document and includes almost all the elements required by the Results Act." Congressional reviewers rated the draft plan using a scorecard, and it received 60 points—the second highest rating among all plans reviewed. The Council for Excellence in Government described the plan as "a coherent, logical, well-articulated plan, with a clear focus on their targeted results."

These reviews by outside organizations provided constructive suggestions for changes, which we used to improve the plan. In addition, stakeholder comments were obtained through direct consultations, mailings, and our world wide web site; their views were also incorporated as we revised the draft plan.

We will work closely with OMB in preparing the strategic plan for final transmittal to Congress and are currently developing our annual performance plan for submission to OMB. Completing these required plans will be just the beginning of our implementation of the Results Act. We look forward to collaborating with you and measuring our progress towards results.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "M. S.", is located below the word "Sincerely,".

Marshall S. Smith
Acting

Enclosures



U.S. Department of Education

Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

August 1997

The Department of Education's Mission
*To ensure equal access to education and to promote
educational excellence throughout the nation*

The U.S. Department of Education's Seven Priorities

February 1997

All students should be able to:

- 1. Read independently by the end of the 3rd grade.**
 - 2. Master challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry, by the end of the 8th grade.**
 - 3. By age 18, be prepared for and able to afford at least two years of college and to pursue lifelong learning.**
 - 4. Have a talented, dedicated, and well-prepared teacher in their classroom.**
 - 5. Have their classroom connected to the Internet by the year 2000 and be technologically literate.**
 - 6. Learn in strong, safe, and drug-free schools.**
 - 7. Learn according to challenging and clear standards of achievement and accountability.**
-
-

Preface

The American people consistently rank education among their top national priorities. In preparing for the 21st century, a sound education is essential to securing a good job and becoming a responsible and contributing citizen. Recognizing this, national goals for education were set in 1990 to focus the efforts of governments, educators, and parents and communities on education reforms needed to meet the mandate for education. Using our 1994 Strategic Plan as a guide, the Department of Education implemented programs and initiatives designed to produce education reform. After taking stock of progress towards the goals, President Clinton announced his "Call to Action for American Education" in February 1997, which identified critical areas where work was still needed. In response, the Department developed seven priorities to ensure that we focus our efforts on accomplishing the goals.

As required by the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, the Department has now prepared a strategic plan for 1998-2002. This plan reflects the Department's seven priorities and integrates them with our mission and program authorities. Our efforts to achieve the goals and objectives in this plan will help us to better meet the needs of the American people. The strategic plan will help to focus our resources, strengthen coordination within the Department and across federal agencies, eliminate duplication of programs and services, use technology to perform our work more efficiently and accurately, and communicate more effectively with our customers and stakeholders.

The strategic plan is not a static document—it will change in response to feedback from our stakeholders and customers, assessment of our performance, emerging national needs, and new legislation. It will be used to further transform the Department of Education into a high-performance, results-oriented organization.

Although not required under the Results Act, performance indicators are included in this plan. Using the indicators will hold us accountable for results, and we are fully committed to implementing a comprehensive performance measurement system throughout the Department. We will use the strategic plan as a basis for reporting to Congress and the public on our progress. In doing so, we hope to demonstrate to the taxpayers that our nation's resources are being invested and managed wisely in order to achieve educational excellence.

As we prepare for the 21st Century, the Department of Education has challenged states and schools to adopt new ways of teaching and learning. Likewise, the Department must adopt new ways of working in order to better meet the needs of families, students, communities, schools, and states. This strategic plan lays out our goals for improvement and how we will meet them.

Richard W. Riley
Secretary of Education

Marshall S. Smith
Under Secretary and
Acting Deputy Secretary of Education

Contents

Preface	1
Introduction	5
Framework of Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives	9
Goal 1. Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.	11
Objective 1.1: States develop and implement challenging standards and assessments for all students in the core academic subjects.	13
Objective 1.2: Every state has a school-to-work system that increases student achievement, improves technical skills, and broadens career opportunities.	14
Objective 1.3: Schools are strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free.	15
Objective 1.4: A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America.	16
Objective 1.5: Families and communities are fully involved with schools and school improvement efforts.	18
Objective 1.6: Public school students and parents have more choice of schools. ..	19
Objective 1.7: Schools use advanced technology for all students and teachers to improve education.	20
Goal 2. Build a solid foundation for learning for all children.	21
Objective 2.1: All children enter school ready to learn.	23
Objective 2.2: Every child reads independently by the end of the third grade.	24
Objective 2.3: Every eighth grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry.	25
Objective 2.4: Special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards.	26
Goal 3. Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning.	29
Objective 3.1: Secondary school students get the information and support they need to prepare successfully for postsecondary education.	31
Objective 3.2: Postsecondary students receive the financial aid and support services they need to enroll in and complete their educational program.	32
Objective 3.3: Postsecondary student aid delivery and program management is efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive.	33
Objective 3.4: Adults can strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime through lifelong learning.	35
Goal 4. Make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.	37
Objective 4.1: Our customers receive fast, seamless service and dissemination of high-quality information and products.	39
Objective 4.2: Our partners have the support and flexibility they need without diminishing accountability for results.	40

Contents, continued

Objective 4.3: An up-to-date knowledge base is available from education research to support education reform and equity.	42
Objective 4.4: Our information technology investments are sound and used to improve impact and efficiency.	44
Objective 4.5: The Department's employees are highly skilled and productive. ...	45
Objective 4.6: Management of our programs and services ensures financial integrity.	46
Objective 4.7: All levels of the agency are fully performance-driven.	47
Resources	48
Relationship of Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives to Annual Performance Goals	50
Key External Factors that Could Affect Achievement of ED's Goals and Objectives	55
Program Evaluations	57
Development and Implementation of the Plan	60
Appendix A: Department of Education's Customer Service Standards	63

Facts about the Department of Education

- *ED is the smallest federal department, with less than 5,000 staff. Our FTE ceiling (staffing) in FY 1997 is 4,613.*
 - *The number of programs administered in 1997 was 197.*
 - *We provided or oversaw \$66.5 billion in aid to education in FY 1997. (Includes program funding, new student loans, and federal administration)*
 - *Congressional appropriations for program activities: \$32.0 billion. Used for grants to state and local agencies, higher education institutions, and other entities; contracts; and subsidies for direct and guaranteed student loans.*
 - *New student loans: \$33.7 billion. Postsecondary education student loans made by ED or guaranteed by ED and issued by banks and other financial institutions.*
 - *Federal administration: \$808 million. Department of Education salaries and expenses totaled 1.2% of the FY 1997 dollars for aid to education.*
 - *We are responsible for a portfolio of outstanding student loans totaling \$132 billion in FY 1997.*
 - *Federal funds represent a small, but important proportion of K-12 education funding and postsecondary general institutional funding, but provide or guarantee a very large share of student financial aid. In 1994-95, Federal education funds were–*
 - *8.7% of all education funding (public and private).*
 - *6.3% of K-12 funding (public and private).*
 - *12.3% of funding for postsecondary institutions (excluding student financial aid).*
 - *74.7% of all student financial aid awarded to postsecondary students.*
-
-

Introduction

Mission and key functions

The Department of Education's mission is to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the nation. We promote educational excellence for all students by providing financial support to states and local agencies in areas of national priority, promoting challenging standards, involving families and communities in schools, providing information on the best educational practices, ensuring that postsecondary education is affordable, and providing high-quality statistics and evaluations of federal programs.

At the same time, we have a special obligation to ensure that all students have the opportunity to achieve to the challenging standards of educational excellence. This commitment often requires that we focus our resources and activities on students who risk educational failure due to the disadvantages they face. The Department of Education's mission for equal access enables students from all backgrounds to achieve excellence under the American educational system. Where this plan states that "all" students are a focus of a particular objective, it means just that.

To carry out our mission, the Department works in partnership with states, schools, communities, higher education institutions, and financial institutions—and through them with students, teachers and professors, families, administrators, and employers. Key functions of the agency include:

- Leadership to address critical issues in American education.
- Grants to education agencies and institutions to strengthen teaching and learning and prepare students for citizenship, employment in a changing economy, and lifelong learning.
- Student loans and grants to students and their families to help pay for the costs of postsecondary education.
- Grants for literacy, employment, and self-sufficiency training for adults.
- Monitoring and enforcement of civil rights to ensure nondiscrimination by recipients of federal education funds.
- Support for statistics, research, development, evaluation, and dissemination of information to improve educational quality and effectiveness.

Prior strategic plan

In December 1994, the U.S. Department of Education released its first-ever strategic plan, a working document that served as the forerunner to the current proposed plan. This first plan was widely distributed, both internally to every employee and externally to Congress, stakeholder groups, educators, and others interested in the Department's goals and operations. The Department has used the plan to guide performance improvements in its programs and operations and to help employees understand the Department's goals and the importance of their contributions to those goals. Accomplishments under this plan follow.

Accomplishments: legislative reforms

In partnership with the Congress and the Administration, major legislation achievements provided the Department with a historic and more coherent set of laws.

- The *Balanced Budget Act of 1997* and the *Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997* provide the largest investment in higher education since the G.I. Bill. HOPE Scholarships should help make two years of

postsecondary education as universal as high school is today, and tax deductions will provide support for lifelong learning. In addition, new education savings accounts and expanded use of IRAs for education will help families save and pay for college.

- Elementary and secondary education reforms, including *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* and *Improving America's Schools Act* promote challenging education standards for all children, safe and disciplined schools, effective teaching practices, expanded technology, charter schools, and strengthened family involvement.
- *The School-to-Work Opportunities Act* helps communities and states put in place high-quality systems of academic and occupational education linking schools with postsecondary institutions and employers.
- *The Student Loan Reform Act* helps make the college student aid system more efficient through authorizing a new Direct Student Loan Program that promotes streamlined provision of aid and gives postsecondary institutions and students expanded choice among alternative aid providers.
- *The Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act* restructured the Department's research office and set new priorities for dissemination and improvement activities.
- The new *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997* improves basic academics, increases parental involvement, and moves federal dollars to the classroom. Students with disabilities will now be expected, to the maximum extent possible, to meet the same high educational expectations that have been set for all students by States and local schools.

Accomplishments: streamlining the agency

An increasingly streamlined Department of Education is more cost-efficient in providing education support and services.

- *Fewer separate programs.* Since 1994, the Department worked with Congress to eliminate 64 programs totaling more than \$700 million.
- *Fewer staff/higher productivity.* The Department's staffing level (FTE) in 1997 was 4,613, an 8% decrease below the 1993 FTE level of 5,023. During that same period, the Department's discretionary budget increased overall by \$2.8 billion (a 12% increase) as the Department started the \$11 billion-per-year direct student loan program.
- *Total reinvention of our regulations.* To date, the Department eliminated, reinvented, or simplified almost every regulation on the books in FY 1995—with 94% affected and 36% completely eliminated. More than 2,000 pages of regulations were affected.
- *Paperwork burden reduced.* During FY 1996, 10% of our paperwork burden was cut, translating into 5.4 million fewer hours for schools, students, parents, states and other customers to complete required forms. In FY 1997, we are using new technologies for collecting and exchanging information to further reduce paperwork burden on our customers.
- *One-stop shopping for information on student loans and grants.* Project EASI (Easy Access for Students and Institutions) is a collaborative initiative underway among education, business and government that will use cutting-edge technology and business practices to transform the administration of student financial aid and improve customer access to information and funding for education beyond high school.

Accomplishments: improved performance

A more effective Department of Education can better serve the public.

- *Efficient loan collections.* Default rates for student loans have been cut by more than half, from 22.4% for loans entering repayment in 1990 to 10.7% for 1994, the most recent year available.
- *Efficient loan collections.* Collections on defaulted student loans from all sources have increased from \$1.1 billion in FY 1992 to \$2.4 billion in FY 1996.
- *Serving student aid customers well.* Since the start of the program, over \$18 billion has been loaned through the Direct Loan Program—the new loan program that cuts out middlemen and makes loans directly to students. In this new program, 83% of participating institutions report they are satisfied or very satisfied.
- *Serving student aid customers well.* The customer satisfaction level for the Federal Family Education Loan program, which works through lenders such as banks, increased from 68% in 1994-95 to 79% in 1995-96. This may be due partially to the beneficial competition of the Direct Loan program.
- *Ensuring that taxpayers and students get their money's worth.* As a result of improved and tougher ED oversight, 875 postsecondary institutions have lost eligibility to participate in student financial aid programs, including 672 that cannot participate in any aid program and 203 that cannot participate in loan programs.
- *Well-focused research and statistics.* A strengthened research and statistical office is providing more timely and useful information on the condition of the American education system and on research-based improvements.
- *Performance indicators.* Performance measurement supported through program evaluations, national assessments, and grantee reporting systems is increasingly providing the Department with important information to gauge performance and guide improvement.
- *New employee-management partnership.* A strengthened Labor-Management Partnership is helping all employees to work together to achieve better results while enabling the Department to win the National Partnership Award in 1996 and the Office of Personnel Management's Family-Friendly Work-Place Award in 1997.
- *Improved communications with our customers.* The Department's world wide web page receives 5 million hits each month, and our toll-free 1-800-USA-LEARN number provides 5,000 callers a week with access to comprehensive information about Department publications and programs.

Accomplishments: partnerships

A Department increasingly built around partnerships is better able to work collectively to achieve national educational priorities.

- *Flexibility for states.* Over 200 waivers have been granted to communities to provide greater flexibility in exchange for increased accountability for results under the first time ever waiver authorities in Goals 2000, School-to-Work and the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

- *Flexibility for states.* Twelve states have been granted broad authority under Ed-Flex to waive a range of federal statutory or regulatory requirement in exchange for increased accountability for student progress.
- *Flexibility for states.* As of 1997, 49 states have submitted consolidated program plans covering several Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) programs and federal vocational education grants, instead of separate plans for each program.
- *Partnership for families.* The formation of the broad-based "Partnership for Family Involvement in Education" now consists of more than 3,000 organizations bringing together schools, families, communities, religious organizations and employers to work together to support learning.
- *Partnership for reading.* READ*WRITE*NOW, a grassroots community literacy initiative that links tutors with children learning to read who need help, has grown from serving 500,000 children in 1994 to 1.5 million in 1997.

Goals and indicators in new strategic plan

This strategic plan sets out four goals for the U.S. Department of Education:

1. *Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.*
2. *Build a solid foundation for learning.*
3. *Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning.*
4. *Make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.*

These are ambitious goals that reflect areas in which the Department can influence outcomes, even where we do not have direct control. Our plan identifies areas of national need as goals and objectives and sets strategies for the federal government to help meet those needs. At the same time, the plan ensures that in areas where we have direct control—management of our programs, data systems, and workforce—we are as efficient and effective as possible.

Under each goal, the plan identifies several objectives, supported by core strategies and performance indicators. The core strategies include key programs, special initiatives, and specific actions that the Department is pursuing to achieve each objective. The performance indicators ensure accountability for results and will provide feedback needed to adjust and improve our operations. The plan includes a mix of outcome and intermediate indicators, which we will use during the next five years to judge our progress and document results.

- Outcome indicators tell us whether progress is being made in areas of national need and in the specific goals for our programs. Are more children learning to read and complete challenging mathematics? Are school-to-work graduates able to move smoothly into employment or further education? Are more Americans able to enroll in and complete postsecondary education?
- Intermediate, or process, indicators tell us whether our strategies are working and our programs and processes are on-track. Are new programs reaching the anticipated number of students and states? Is the Department meeting major milestones and deadlines necessary to achieving the goals and objectives?

U.S. Department of Education

Framework of Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives

**Mission: To ensure equal access to education and
to promote educational excellence throughout the nation.**

Goal 1. Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.	Goal 2. Build a solid foundation for learning for all children.	Goal 3. Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning.	Goal 4. Make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.
Objectives	Objectives	Objectives	Objectives
1.1 States develop and implement challenging standards and assessments for all students in the core academic subjects. 1.2 Every state has a school-to-work system that increases student achievement, improves technical skills, and broadens career opportunities for all. 1.3 Schools are strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free. 1.4 A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America. 1.5 Families and communities are fully involved with schools and school improvement efforts. 1.6 Public school students and parents have more choice of schools. 1.7 Schools use advanced technology for all students and teachers to improve education.	2.1 All children enter school ready to learn. 2.2 Every child reads independently by the end of the third grade. 2.3 Every eighth grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry. 2.4 Special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards.	3.1 Secondary school students get the information and support they need to prepare successfully for postsecondary education. 3.2 Postsecondary students receive the financial aid and support services they need to enroll in and complete their educational program. 3.3 Postsecondary student aid delivery and program management is efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive. 3.4 Adults can strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime through lifelong learning.	4.1 Our customers receive fast, seamless service and dissemination of high-quality information and products. 4.2 Our partners have the support and flexibility they need without diminishing accountability for results. 4.3 An up-to-date knowledge base is available from education research to support education reform and equity. 4.4 Our information technology investments are sound and used to improve impact and efficiency. 4.5 The Department's employees are highly skilled and high-performing. 4.6 Management of our programs and services ensures financial integrity. 4.7 All levels of the agency are fully performance-driven

Goal 1. Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.

Key Outcome Indicators for Elementary and Secondary Education

(These indicators are cross-cutting and apply to several objectives in Goals 1 and 2).

1. *The number of students with access to high quality education increases each year.*
2. *Increasing percentages of all students will meet or exceed basic, proficient, and advanced performance levels in reading, math and other core subjects on such measures as the National Assessment of Educational Progress and state assessments aligned with challenging standards.*
3. *Students in high-poverty schools will show continuous improvement in reaching proficiency levels comparable to those for the nation.*
4. *High school attendance and graduation will continually improve—particularly in high-poverty schools and among students with disabilities and others at risk of school failure.*
5. *The percentage of high school graduates, including vocational concentrators, who complete at least three years of science and three years of math will increase 10% between 1996 and 2000.*
6. *Increasing numbers of high school students will complete advanced placement courses each year.*
7. *Students in high-poverty schools served by federal programs will show comparable increases in completion of challenging course work—including advanced placement courses—that will enable them to pursue higher education or other options.*
8. *High school graduates successfully transition into employment, further education, or the military.*

The federal government has an important but limited role to play in education reform. Federal support seeks to help states and local communities strengthen schools and improve educational performance for all children so that the nation can meet the economic and social challenges of the 21st century.

The key to improving student performance is comprehensive and sustained education reform that addresses all the areas that support learning. States and communities—not the federal government—are developing challenging academic standards for every child to meet, to ensure that all children know that their schools and communities have high expectations for their academic performance. To further support student academic success, state school-to-work systems place learning in the meaningful context of the world of work and encourage students to prepare for postsecondary education and high-skill employment.

Another key area is the learning environment. To learn, students must have schools that are safe and orderly and promote positive values. Also essential to high-quality learning are talented and dedicated teachers. In addition, teachers and students need access to advanced technology to assist instruction and provide students with skills they will need for work and further education.

A third area of support is family and community involvement. Schools, parents, and communities all have responsibilities to work together to support student learning. To achieve effective education reform that meets the needs of all students, everyone must be involved, including students; parents; educational leaders at the school, district, and state levels; community members, businesses and religious groups; and government at all levels.

Use of Evaluations and Assessments in Developing Goal 1

- Formulation of Goal 1 relied heavily on the findings from major evaluations of elementary and secondary programs and continues to be informed by ongoing studies. Studies of effective reforms documented the need to take a systemic approach to aligning all elements of schooling with challenging standards for student performance. Evaluations of programs prior to reauthorization helped identify areas that required major overhaul in Title I and Title II to support whole school improvement in teaching and learning. More recent studies on drug prevention programs have pointed to the need to strengthen the research base on effective strategies and their use in schools.
- Early findings from the evaluation of School-to-Work indicated that states have begun building School-to-Work systems but had not necessarily imbedded their efforts within general school reform. As of spring 1996, only two of the eight states in the study had made School-to-Work reforms a central part of their more general school reform agendas affecting all students.

Objectives, Indicators, and Strategies

Objective 1.1: States develop and implement challenging standards and assessments for all students in the core academic subjects.

Performance Indicators:

9. *By 1998, all states have challenging content and performance standards in place for two or more core subjects.*
10. *By 2001, all states have assessments aligned to challenging content and performance standards for two or more core subjects.*
11. *By 2002, most of the general public and parents are aware of the importance of challenging academic standards for all children, including at least the majority of parents from low-income families.*

Support for standards-based reform has deepened over the past six years and is currently part of almost all State education reform plans. The support for standards that came initially from subject matter and professional associations has deepened to include state policy makers, business leaders, and broader community coalitions. While understanding of the concept is broadening, considerable work needs to be done to move this support from understanding standards to implementing them in the classroom.

Changes in instruction and curriculum will require even greater effort over the next five years than the original challenges to support the concept of standards. Survey results and other sources indicate that developing assessments and related student performance standards, improving professional development programs, and linking accountability to school and student performance may be the most effective policy levers for the Department. The federal government can assist through support and guidance on challenging standards and assessments, and by offering highly focused, voluntary national tests that can provide benchmarks for parents and communities.

Core Strategies:

- **Support for standards and assessment development.** Provide financial support to states to develop and implement clear, challenging academic standards and aligned assessments in ways that promote excellence and equity through the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs such as Title I Aid for Disadvantaged Children, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education and Applied Technology Education Act, and other Federal programs designed to help all students achieve to high academic standards.
- **Technical assistance and information sharing.** Provide technical assistance and information sharing to states and school districts in implementing challenging academic standards and aligned assessments through the Department's comprehensive technical assistance centers, education laboratories, research and development centers, and the new integrated review teams.
- **Public awareness and community engagement.** Increase public understanding and support for having challenging academic standards and for the national assessments in reading and math through a national campaign of awareness and community engagement.
- **Federal programs incorporating standards.**
 - Implement federal program requirements calling for the adoption of state standards.
 - Provide technical assistance, guidance, and models of quality standards and their effective implementation to support the efforts of states to link Title I and other federally-supported programs to state standards.
 - Help guide the development of assessments that make appropriate accommodations for limited English proficient students and students with disabilities.

Objective 1.2: Every state has a school-to-work system that increases student achievement, improves technical skills, and broadens career opportunities.

Performance Indicators:

- 12. High school graduates from school-to-work systems or from vocational concentrations successfully transition into employment, further education, or the military.*
- 13. Employers are highly satisfied with the productivity and work-readiness skills of graduates from school-to-work systems or vocational concentrations.*
- 14. By fall 2000, the percentage of vocational concentrators passing industry-recognized tests on technical skills increases at least 10%.*
- 15. Two million youth will be engaged actively in school-to-work systems by 2000.*
- 16. An increasing percentage of secondary schools will provide opportunities for students to achieve industry-recognized skill standards.*
- 17. Thirty percent of high schools will have key school-to-work system components in place by 2000.*
- 18. All youths with disabilities age 14 and older will have IEPs with statements of transition service needs that focus on courses of study in an advanced placement or vocational education program.*

Researchers, educators, employers, and policy makers have sought ways to make education relevant to students' future careers, adapt instruction to the ways in which students learn best, and ensure that students learn the habits and skills that employers value. By adding meaningful context from the world of work, educators hoped to engage the interest and intellect of students and help them learn more effectively. Whether learning by doing and in context is accomplished at school or in a work setting, school-to-work (STW) seeks to improve career prospects and academic achievement in high school—and thereby boost enrollment in postsecondary education and increase the likelihood of obtaining high skill, high wage employment.

Core Strategies:

- **Financial support for STW system-building.** Help build comprehensive school-to-work systems in every state through grants under the School-to-Work Opportunities Act and by supporting high-quality technical training through vocational education and tech-prep education.
- **Interagency and interoffice collaboration.** Continue to work with the Department of Labor in administering the School-to-Work Opportunities Act; and align grant-making, monitoring and technical assistance, financial audit, performance reporting, and other key processes in the school-to-work initiative with those in related education programs in the Departments of Education and Labor.
- **Participation in school-to-work systems.** Assist implementation and improve the quality of school-to-work systems through technical assistance, identification of promising practices, and evaluation of states' progress.
- **Engaging schools and colleges and employers in building school-to-work systems and stronger vocational education programs.**
 - Engage high schools, postsecondary institutions, and adult high schools by sponsoring a national information center, creating networks that include educators, employers and other key stakeholder groups, and sponsoring efforts to align postsecondary admissions policies with new methods of assessing high school student performance.
 - Build strong employer participation in school-to-work by targeting outreach activities at employers and their organizations and through collaboration with the National Employer Leadership Council.
- **Professional development.**
 - Prepare teachers to fully participate in school-to-work by assisting colleges of education to incorporate school-to-work elements in their curriculum.
 - Support teacher training efforts aimed at increasing the skills of teachers in using contextual learning approaches to instruction of basic and technical skills.

Objective 1.3: Schools are strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free.

Performance Indicators:

- 19. Recent increasing rates of alcohol and drug use (alcohol, marijuana, tobacco) among school-aged children will slow and begin to fall by 2000.*
- 20. Rates of alcohol and drug use in schools will slow and begin to fall by 2000.*
- 21. The number of criminal and violent incidents in schools by students will show continuous decreases between now and 2002.*
- 22. The percentage of students reporting tolerant attitudes toward drug and alcohol use will decline significantly between now and 2002.*
- 23. By 1999, all local educational agencies participating in the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program will use prevention programs based on the Department's principles of effectiveness.*
- 24. By 1999, all states will conduct periodic statewide surveys or collect statewide data on alcohol and drug use of students and incidents of crime and violence in schools.*
- 25. The percentage of teachers who are trained to address discipline problems in the classroom will increase significantly by 2000.*

After more than a decade of declines, significant increases have occurred in illegal drug use by American youth. Rates of interpersonal violence are unacceptably high, and the seriousness of violent activity in and around schools appears to be escalating. Although significant federal support has been provided to schools to help them develop and implement drug prevention programs and activities, these efforts have not been universally successful. Definitive research findings about effective school-based prevention programs and strategies have been slow to emerge, and the data necessary to assess local problems and evaluate progress toward reducing youth drug use and violence are not readily available. Indeed, a recent longitudinal study of 19 school districts found that while some drug prevention programs in these districts improved student outcomes, effects were small. Moreover, the study found that few schools employed program approaches that have been found effective in previous research, and that program delivery was variable and inconsistent.

Clearly more needs to be done to improve the quality, quantity, and dissemination of information about research findings on effective drug and violence prevention. Also, additional support needs to be provided to states and local school districts to enhance their capacity to assess their problems and the effectiveness of their ongoing prevention activities.

Core Strategies:

- **Use of effective approaches.**
 - Implement principles of effectiveness for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to focus support on promising practices and use of sound information for program improvement.
 - Through research and evaluation, identify effective violence and drug prevention programming.
 - Disseminate effective programs and strategies through technical assistance and training, conferences, publications, and widespread dissemination of materials using technology.
 - Provide teacher training under such programs as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Professional Development program to improve teachers' skills in reducing conflict.
- **Financial support.** Continue to fund states and local school districts under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act program, while working to improve the quality of local activities.
- **Public attitudes.** Help change the attitudes of youth and parents on the harmful nature of drug use, working with other agencies, through media campaigns and dissemination of information.
- **Improved data systems.** Improve the capacity of states and school districts to collect and analyze information on alcohol and drug use and violent behavior.
- **Interagency coordination.** Work with other federal agencies, including the Departments of Justice, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation; the President's Crime Prevention Council, and the Office of National Drug Control Policy, to coordinate strategies to reduce drug and alcohol use and violence.

Objective 1.4: A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America.

Performance Indicators:

- 26. Throughout the nation the percentage of secondary school teachers who have at least a minor in the subject they teach increases annually.*
- 27. The number of nationally board certified teachers increases continually to 105,000 by 2006.*
- 28. The percentage of teachers and principals across the nation who rate other teachers as very effective increases annually.*
- 29. By 2002, 75% of states will align initial teacher certification standards with high content and student performance standards.*
- 30. The percentage of qualified new teachers who leave the profession within the first 3 years continuously decreases.*

A talented, dedicated, and well-prepared teaching force is one of the most important ingredients for education reform. Without outstanding teachers, there will be little chance of success for students to succeed in a changing workplace and society. Research indicates that teachers' knowledge and skill make a crucial difference in what students learn. Research also demonstrates the value of intensive and sustained high-quality professional development that is based on new models of teaching and learning. The current teaching force needs high quality professional development if all teachers are to be able to teach a diverse student population to challenging standards.

American schools will need to hire two million teachers in the next decade due to increased student enrollment and the retirement of an aging teaching force. However, 9.3% of new teachers who have taught less than one year leave the profession, and 6.4% who have taught for a full year also leave. This is due to a lack of support and a "sink or swim" approach to induction. About one-fourth of newly hired teachers lack the qualifications for their jobs. New teachers must be well prepared to help diverse learners master challenging content and performance standards.

Core Strategies:

- **Improving the quality of new teachers.**
 - Support programs to recruit talented Americans of all ages, particularly people of diverse backgrounds, to become teachers.
 - Support programs to improve teacher education so that future teachers teach all students to high standards and meet high certification and licensing standards.
 - Encourage and support special efforts to retain new teachers.
- **Financial support for professional development.** Provide funds to states and schools through the Eisenhower and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) professional development programs—as well as under other programs in which professional development is an allowable activity (for example, Title I Grants for Disadvantaged Children, Perkins Vocational Education State Grants, Bilingual Education, Technology Literacy Challenge Grants).
- **Licensing standards.** Through the Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching, support rigorous standards for teacher licensing, including states' efforts to align licensing and certification requirements with challenging content standards and performance-based assessments.
- **Teacher recognition and accountability.** Support the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and programs that recognize and reward good teachers and address the problems of incompetent ones.
- **Partnerships.** Promote public-private sector partnerships, such as industry-based internships that increase teachers' knowledge and skills to help students succeed in a changing workplace.
- **Research, development, evaluation, and dissemination.**
 - The National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Professional Development Program will assess the extent to which Eisenhower-supported professional development is aligned with high state content and student performance standards and is longer in duration and intensity.

- Provide educators and policy-makers with valid, research-based strategies for improving quality and developing sound policies related to teaching.
- Increase awareness and support for quality teaching and professional development among government, business, and community leaders, and the general public through outreach and dissemination of information.
- Establish the Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching to work with stakeholders and carry out applied research.
- Establish a Teacher Policy Center to conduct research on policies related to teaching.
- **Monitoring trends.** Issue a biennial national report card on teacher quality starting in 1998.

Objective 1.5: Families and communities are fully involved with schools and school improvement efforts.

Performance Indicators:

31. *The percentage of students who come to school prepared for learning and having completed their homework will increase substantially over the next five years, especially among children from low-income families.*
32. *The percentage of young children who read regularly at home with their parents and on their own (at least 15 minutes a day, five days a week) will increase to 90% by 2002.*
33. *The percentage of parents who meet with teachers about their children's learning will show continuous improvement, reaching 90% by 2002.*
34. *The percentage of parents who say that the school actively encourages and facilitates family involvement by respecting, welcoming, and responding to parents' concerns and interests and by involving them in decisions regarding their children will show continuous improvement.*
35. *By 2002 the number of children participating in after-school programs doubles, from 1.7 million to 3.4 million children. (Legislation needed.)*

Over thirty years of research clearly shows us that all families—whether they are rich or poor, whether the parents finished high school or not, or whether kids are in preschool or high school—can help their children learn. Greater family involvement in children's learning is a critical link to achieving a high-quality education and a safe, disciplined learning environment for every student.

Core Strategies:

- **Public understanding and outreach.** Convey the importance of and promote family and community involvement in the learning of children in school and after school through public awareness campaigns in major newspapers and educational organization publications; outreach efforts to provide information on programs, research and best practices; and by making materials in Spanish available to families.
- **Partnership for Family Involvement in Education.**
 - Sign on 1,000 new members annually by outreach efforts of current partners and membership drives at public forums.
 - Develop opportunities and capacity for schools, families, communities, and employers to work together through continuing nationwide activities of the Partnership (Read*Write*Now; America Goes Back to School, and a new initiative focused around middle schools).
- **Program assistance and support for family involvement.** Provide support for parent involvement by expanding Goals 2000 parent assistance centers to every state; providing technical assistance to support Title I compacts; continuing parental outreach and information in School-to-Work; supporting parents of children with disabilities through the IDEA Parent Training and Information Centers, and implementing the 21st Century Learning Centers.
- **Family involvement in civil rights to education.** Create partnerships between parents, community groups, and a broad range of stakeholders to provide civil rights information, technical expertise, and assistance in building linkages between parents and schools, and stakeholders engaged in collaborative efforts to ensure equal educational opportunity for all students.
- **Research, development, and evaluation.** Launch a systematic analytic agenda to identify and highlight programs and practices that successfully connect families, schools, and communities to school improvement efforts. Disseminate latest research findings that support teacher preparation for family involvement in education among institutions and organizations planning pre-service and in-service programs. Evaluate the activities of the Partnership and its members.
- **New after-school programs.** To support students and families after school and to extend learning time and promote safety, help create new after-school programs by expanding the role of the Community Partners and by providing federal program assistance (Title I, 21st Century Learning Centers, and dissemination of materials). *Legislation needed.*

Objective 1.6: Public school students and parents have more choice of schools.

Performance Indicators:

- 36. By 2002, 25% of all public school students in grades 3-12 will attend a school that they or their parents chose.*
- 37. By 2000, a minimum of 40 states will have charter school legislation.*
- 38. By 2002, there will be 3,000 charter schools in operation around the nation.*
- 39. By 2002, there will be 6,000 magnet schools in operation around the nation.*
- 40. School districts will increasingly make choice available to their students through magnet schools, charter schools, and open enrollment policies.*

Research on public schools that provide choice suggests that the sense of ownership by school staff, students, and parents helps to galvanize efforts towards common goals. Information on the educational effects of choice programs is limited; most charter schools are just getting started. Further work needs to be done on documenting the implementation and quality of public schools of choice and sharing the most promising strategies with the field.

The Department of Education is encouraging expansion of choice within the public school system with alternatives including magnet schools, charter schools, and systemwide strategies that make every public school a school of choice, thereby enabling all students and their parents to choose their school.

- Magnet schools have provided the most widespread opportunity for families to exercise choice for several decades. The Department's Magnet School program provides support for magnet schools that are intended to achieve desegregation goals, particularly in our largest urban centers.
- Charter schools are intended to give teachers, parents, and other members of local communities the flexibility to experiment with innovative methods of achieving educational excellence. At the same time, they should help all students receive access to quality schooling. Because they are new schools, charters require start-up funds and support that the Department helps to provide through its Charter School program.

Core Strategies:

- **Engage the public.** Expand support by the public and policymakers for the development of high-quality charter and magnet schools.
- **Financial support and technical assistance.**
 - Through the Charter Schools Grants program, help states and schools effectively plan and implement charter schools that have flexibility from state and district rules, are open to all students, and are held accountable for improving student achievement.
 - Continue to support implementation of magnet schools through grants to school districts under the Magnet Schools Program that provide opportunities and choice for students and promotes desegregation within high quality education settings.
- **Research and development.** Support research on public school choice, including evaluations of the effectiveness of charter schools and magnet schools, and promote the development of models and materials to assist parents, teachers, and communities to design effective school choice programs.
- **Outreach.**
 - Disseminate information on strategies for expanding quality school choice programs that improve student achievement and share lessons learned from research about school choice.
 - Increase awareness and support for effective public school choice programs among government, business leaders, and community leaders, and the general public through outreach and dissemination of information.

Objective 1.7: Schools use advanced technology for all students and teachers to improve education.

Performance Indicators:

- 41. The ratio of students per modern multimedia computer will improve to 5:1 by 2000.*
- 42. The percentage of public school instructional rooms connected to the Information Superhighway will increase from 14% in 1996 to 25% in 1998, and higher percentages thereafter.*
- 43. At least 50% of teachers will integrate high-quality educational technology, high-quality software, and the Information Superhighway into their school curriculum by 2001.*
- 44. At least 60 percent of teachers, school administrators and school librarians will receive professional development that enables them to effectively use modern multimedia computers and the Information Superhighway to help students learn by 2001.*
- 45. Students in high poverty schools and students with disabilities will have access to advanced technology (including assistive technology for students with disabilities) that is comparable to that in other schools by the year 2001.*

Hundreds of studies have found that, when properly used, technology improves many aspects of education, including student learning, teacher professional development, classroom management, and school administration. As an instructional tool, technology helps students master basic skills, solve complex real-life problems that require advanced skills, and prepare for the world of work.

Few schools have adequate numbers of modern computers, and relatively few teachers are prepared to use technology effectively. Only a small percentage of classrooms currently have access to the Internet. However, not only access to computers and other technologies, but also integration of technology into the curriculum, are needed. We must create an infrastructure that will enable all students to leave school with the technology skills needed for work and further education. Finally, we must encourage development of software and universal design interfaces that make advanced technology fully accessible to students with disabilities.

Core Strategies:

- **Technology connections, especially for high-poverty schools.**
 - Use the Federal Communications Commission's Universal Service Fund discounts and "NetDays" to wire schools for using educational technology and to connect them to the Internet.
 - Encourage use of technology connections, such as voice mail, faxes, and e-mail, to stimulate communication between families, communities, teachers, and schools.
- **Modern computers and other technology.** Encourage local, State, Federal and private sector partnerships to provide access to modern computers for all teachers and students, including those in high poverty schools. The Technology Innovation Challenge Fund will provide \$425 million to states and districts to plan, purchase, and use modern computers and other educational technology.
- **Effective software.** Using state and local standards as guides and building on research and development of effective practices, including those developed with support of the Technology Literacy Challenge Grants, work with the private sector to develop effective and engaging software and on-line learning resources as an integral part of school curriculum.
- **Professional development.** Building on new teaching standards, support teacher training through Federal programs such as Eisenhower Professional Development, Technological Literacy Challenge Fund, Star Schools, Bilingual Education, Vocational Education, and Title I programs, and by working with the National Science Foundation. In partnership with states, local districts, and the private sector, create new incentives and approaches and provide technical assistance that will help teachers use technology more effectively.
- **Access to technology.** Provide financial support and technical assistance for development, dissemination, and use of assistive technology that enables students with disabilities to participate fully in education programs. Key programs include research by the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research and support from the Assistive Technology program and IDEA.

Goal 2. Build a solid foundation for learning for all children.

In fostering the achievement of world-class student performance discussed in Goal 1, reform efforts need to focus on three main areas. First, reforms must promote family and community efforts to support children's early development and education, to ensure that all children have an appropriate preparation for school.

Second, reform efforts must identify what students will need to know and be able to do in core subject areas and effective strategies for improving instruction. Federal programs and national efforts across the nation must focus on enabling all students to master fundamental and advanced reading and math skills. Children need to be able to read independently and effectively by the end of third grade, to be able to apply reading to learning other subjects.

Similarly acquiring mathematics skills and knowledge that prepare students for algebra, geometry and more advanced work is critical to student success in high school and beyond. In mathematics, the latest results from the Third International Mathematics and Science Study affirm that poor U.S. performance in the 8th grade is linked to mediocre content, lack of instructional rigor, and inadequate training and support for quality teaching.

Third, reform strategies must meet the diverse needs of the student population, so that all students—including limited-English proficient students, students with disabilities, migrant students, students in high-poverty schools, and any students at risk of not achieving the knowledge and skills required to achieve high state standards—receive the support and encouragement they need to succeed.

To address these three areas, the Department:

- Provides financial support to states and local school districts to help underwrite improvement.
- Will be offering for the first time voluntary, national tests in reading and math so that parents and communities will know how well their children and schools are performing in these two critical areas compared to those in other communities.
- Is implementing priority initiatives in reading and math to bring together resources throughout the Department as well as involve key partners in education and the business community in support.
- Promotes educational practices conducive to learning for all students.
- Eliminates discriminatory practices within schools that contribute to deficiencies in achievement.

Use of Evaluations and Assessments in Developing Goal 2

Goal 2 relies on having timely and accurate information with which to track the preparation of young children for school and the progress of all students in reaching challenging standards. Sources for this information include special analyses of the National Assessment of Educational Progress for high-poverty and Title I schools, and state and local assessments. The proposed national tests in reading and math will become a highly valuable source of information once implemented in states and communities.

- Crosscutting evaluations of Goals 2000 and the reauthorized elementary and secondary programs are documenting how states and communities are implementing reforms to enable all students to achieve to challenging standards. Services provided to students who are the target populations for federal programs are a special focus. Studies have examined the supports that federal programs are providing to improve curriculum, technology, professional development, and parental engagement.

- In the early implementation of the Even Start program, evaluation documented how program results for families were associated with more intensive programs—especially parenting education programs. These findings helped to shape reauthorization that strengthened the program. Evaluations will continue to document how services relate to outcomes for children in their school readiness and for parents in supporting learning through the home.

Objectives, Indicators, and Strategies

Objective 2.1: All children enter school ready to learn.

Performance Indicators:

1. *Kindergarten and first grade teachers increasingly report that their students enter school with readiness skills for reading and math.*
2. *The disparity in preschool participation rates between children from high-income families and children from low-income families declines continuously year by year.*
3. *The percentage of 0- to 5-year-olds whose parents read to them or tell them stories regularly increases.*

Recent research has highlighted the importance of the earliest years of life for children's later success. Children's early learning experiences, or lack of them, have consequences that extend into the long-term. Early brain development research reveals that if some learning experiences are not introduced to children at an early age, learning will be more difficult later. Furthermore, children who enter school ready to learn are more likely to achieve to high standards than children who are inadequately prepared. High-quality preschool and child care are integral in providing children with adequate preparation for school.

Core Strategies:

- **Interagency coordination and services integration.** Support children at risk of early school failure by coordinating with the Department of Health and Human Service's (HHS) Head Start program, HHS' and Department of Agriculture's nutrition support programs, and other federal programs and services for young children to ensure full coverage of their needs and reduction of burden on families and schools to work with multiple providers.
- **Financial support for children who are educationally disadvantaged or with disabilities.** Provide resources to states and local school districts under Title I for preschool programs and Even Start, and to states and local providers under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) for programs aimed at infants and toddlers and preschool children with disabilities or at risk of developing disabling conditions.
- **Research, development, and technical assistance.**
 - Identify, evaluate, and encourage the use of programs for young children that make use of the latest research on early brain development, early intervention, and quality nurturing.
 - Develop, field test, and evaluate models of effective practice through such programs as Even Start that can be shared with projects funded under the Head Start, Title I preschool, and IDEA preschool program, and State and local programs.
 - Work with experts to develop an agreed-upon definition of school readiness and to establish a core set of standards that Even Start, Title I preschool, and IDEA programs will help children attain before entering school.
- **Development and dissemination of easy-to-use kits for learning at home.** Support family practices that encourage early learning by developing and disseminating educational materials for parents and their young children, such as the Ready*Set*Read Early Childhood Kit.
- **Development of readiness indicators.** Develop indicators of young children's knowledge and school readiness by working with HHS, other agencies, and organizations, incorporating measures from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study and other developmentally-appropriate studies of children's school readiness.

Objective 2.2: Every child reads independently by the end of the third grade.

Performance Indicators:

4. *All students achieve to the basic level in reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) by 2002.*
5. *Increasing percentages of fourth graders will meet proficient and advanced levels in reading on NAEP.*
6. *At least 20 states implement the national reading test by 1999; all states implement the national reading test by 2002.*
7. *By 2001, the America Reads Challenge corps prepares tutors for 3 million children, including at least 100,000 college work-study tutors annually. (Needs legislation.)*
8. *Increasing percentages of teachers of kindergarten through third grade complete intensive professional development to enable them to skillfully teach reading.*

In 1994, 40% of fourth grade students failed to attain the basic level of reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress and 70% did not attain the proficient level. Although reading problems are particularly severe for disadvantaged students, students with reading difficulties represent a cross-section of American children. More and more jobs require a high level of reading skill, indicating that all students will have to improve their reading skills.

The Department's existing programs already play a critical role in supporting the reading success of young children. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides reading services to millions of children each year. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and bilingual education funds under Title VII also support reading services for children. While teachers and schools have the critical responsibility for literacy, studies find that sustained individualized attention and tutoring after school and over the summer can raise reading levels when combined with parental involvement and quality school instruction.

Core Strategies:

- **Legislation.** Work with Congress to pass the America Reads Challenge legislation.
- **Voluntary national test.** Support the development and effective use of a national, voluntary test in reading so that parents, teachers, and communities have a benchmark for children's progress.
- **Public information.** Build on the national test to provide information via the world wide web and other means to bring about an understanding of what it means to read independently and share strategies that teachers, parents, and others can use to help students achieve this goal.
- **Program support for children with special needs.** Provide accommodations for students with disabilities and limited English proficiency in taking the test. Provide reports for parents in English and several other languages.
- **Financial support for children with special needs.** Provide in-class reading instruction with upgraded standards and curriculum—especially for children in kindergarten through third grade. Key programs that support reading instruction include Title I Grants for Disadvantaged Children, Bilingual Education, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and Even Start.
- **Community partnerships.** Encourage community partnerships that sponsor reading tutors (the America Reads Challenge, Read*Write*Now, Parents as First Teachers and college work-study).
- **Research and development.** Support state-of-the-art research—including a reading center—to test, validate, disseminate, and encourage the use of effective approaches to reading instruction and tutoring, especially for students experiencing difficulty with reading. Coordinate with reading research conducted for children with learning disabilities by the National Institute for Child Health and Development (NICHD).
- **Evaluation and performance measurement.** Through evaluation studies and support to improve state and local performance data systems, provide useful information on how states and communities are doing in improving children's reading.

Objective 2.3: Every eighth grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry.

Performance Indicators:

9. *More eighth graders reach the basic level or higher levels of proficiency in math on the National Assessment of Educational Progress: at least 60% will score at the international median by 2002; at least 15% will be in the top 10% internationally by 2002.*
10. *At least 20 states implement the national math test by 1999; all states by 2002.*
11. *Each year, more new teachers enter the workforce with adequate preparation to teach challenging mathematics to students in kindergarten through eighth grade.*
12. *Each year, more teachers in grades 5-8 complete intensive professional development to enable them to teach challenging mathematics.*
13. *By 1998, schools have access to and use information on best practices for math instruction.*

Mathematics is a basic skill—the gateway to learning many more advanced skills, the language of technology and science, a tool for analysis and problem solving, and a prerequisite for success in a wide variety of careers. Leading employers emphasize the need for U.S. students to excel in quantitative and problem-solving skills in order to succeed in the workplace. Math, like reading, has a key academic turning point. For math this occurs around eighth grade. In eighth grade, students are often put on different tracks that follow them through high school and even beyond, and often it is math that determines what that track will be.

Notwithstanding math's importance, U.S. students fail to achieve to the high standards needed for math success. The recent Third International Math and Science Study (TIMSS) showed that, while US. 4th grade students perform above the international average in math, by 8th grade our students scored below the international average. The study also showed that we do not expect students to master material as challenging as students in high-performing nations do by that grade.

Core Strategies:

- **Voluntary national test.** Support the development of a national, voluntary test in math so that parents and communities have a benchmark for their children's progress. Use the test as a means of encouraging schools, districts, states, business, and communities to move toward improving math curriculum, instruction, instructional materials, teacher training, and professional development.
- **Program support for children with special needs.** Provide accommodations for students with disabilities and limited English proficiency in taking the test. Provide reports and information on how to use test results for parents in English and several other languages.
- **Professional development programs.** Strengthen the Department's existing programs that support teacher preparation and upgrading teacher skills for math instruction—especially for teachers of fourth through eighth grade—such as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Eisenhower Professional Development program, the Individuals with Disabilities Act Professional Development program, and others.
- **Challenging standards.** Promote upgraded standards and curriculum for math instruction through Goals 2000, the Eisenhower Professional Development program, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and by working with the National Science Foundation.
- **Public information.** Increase public understanding and support of mastering challenging mathematics by the end of eighth grade through partnerships with key education, mathematics, and professional organizations; further collaborative activity with the National Science Foundation; and providing concrete information about what students should be able to do in mathematics.
- **Research, development, and dissemination.** Based on state-of-the-art research, develop high quality materials on effective practices and tools for improving math curriculum, professional development, software, instruction, and family and community support; widely disseminate these materials; and promote the use of these materials by states, schools, teachers, and families.

Objective 2.4: Special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards.

Performance Indicators:

14. *States will implement appropriate procedures for assessing and reporting progress towards achieving to high standards by students who have disabilities, are limited English proficient, or are children of migrant workers, by 2001.*
15. *The number of schools using comprehensive, research-based approaches to improve curriculum and instruction and support services for at-risk students annually increases.*
16. *Administrators and educators working with at-risk children have access to and use high-quality information and technical assistance on effective practices provided by Department-sponsored technical assistance and research centers as well as through professional associations and publications.*
17. *Bilingual education and special education resources focus on improving the skills of school staff working with special populations.*
18. *Federal technical assistance and other support to states will result in annual increases in the number of states and local school districts with the capacity to disaggregate and report out assessment data aligned with standards for at-risk students.*

At-risk children need the same high quality schooling that is our goal for all students and additional supports to help them succeed. These children may include limited-English proficient students, students with disabilities, migrant students, students in high-poverty schools, and others who are the focus of federal programs. Federal support is critical to ensuring that these students are not left behind in the drive for higher standards. Serving the needs of at-risk children to enable them to reach the high standards expected of all students must figure prominently in reform efforts. Whole-school approaches or targeted interventions must be based on the best research and promising practices from the field. Assessment of our nation's progress must be measured in terms of not only how well states, districts, and schools perform overall, but also in terms of how students at-risk fare.

Outcomes for students in special populations are included in the objectives throughout this plan and especially in the Goals 1 and 2 key outcome indicators on page 11.

Core Strategies:

- **Challenging standards in federal programs.** Work with states and districts to ensure that the standards set for students served by federal programs are the same challenging standards set for all children through providing technical assistance, guidance, and models of effective implementation of challenging standards.
- **Assessment with accommodations.** Promote the development of assessments aligned with high standards that make appropriate accommodations for children with disabilities and limited English proficiency.
- **Financial support.** Provide significant resources to states, local school districts, and other education providers to improve student achievement for children with special needs or assist states in providing education that meets civil rights requirements for free and appropriate education. The Department funds major programs aimed at disadvantaged children or children with disabilities, including:
 - Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (education for disadvantaged children)
 - Migrant education programs
 - Title I program for neglected and delinquent children
 - Programs for homeless children and youth
 - Indian education
 - Bilingual education
 - Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) program
- **Research, development, dissemination and technical assistance on promising practices.** Support and share research on the most promising practices through the research and development centers of

the Department's Office of Education Research and Improvement (OERI), Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA), and the Department of Health and Human Services' National Institute on Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) to focus on strategies for teaching and assessing children with special needs. In particular, provide technical assistance and disseminate information on including children with disabilities in the general curriculum in the least restrictive environment.

- **Professional development.** Support professional development that equips teachers with strategies to enable limited English proficient students and students with disabilities to meet challenging standards. Key programs include professional development programs sponsored under the Individual with Disabilities Act and Bilingual Education Act, as well as that provided under Title I.
 - **Evaluation and continuous improvement.**
 - Conduct evaluations of federally supported programs to determine the extent to which new program provisions support standards-based reforms and continuous improvement to help students meet challenging academic standards.
 - Use evaluations to inform continuous improvement of programs.
-

New Help for Families to Pay for College

The balanced budget signed into law August 1997 provides the largest investment in higher education since the G.I. Bill in 1945. The tax cuts and education spending provisions contained in this bill will help make the first two years of college universally available and they will give many more working Americans the financial means to go back to school if they want to choose a new career or upgrade their skills. When fully phased in, 12.9 million students are expected to benefit from these tax cuts—5.8 million under the Hope Scholarship tax credit, and 7.1 million claiming the Lifetime Learning tax credit.

- **Up to a \$1,500 tax credit for students starting college:** The HOPE Scholarship tax credit helps make the first two years of college universally available. Students (or the parents of dependent students) will receive a tax credit of 100% on the first \$1,000 of tuition and required fees (less grants, scholarships, and other tax-free educational assistance) and 50% on the second \$1,000. The Hope Scholarship credit can be claimed in two taxable years for students who are in their first two years of postsecondary education and who are enrolled on at least a half-time basis for any portion of the year. This credit will be available for payments after December 31, 1997 for college enrollment after that date. The credit is phased out for joint filers with adjusted gross income (AGI) of between \$80,000 and \$100,000 and singles filers with AGI of between \$40,000 and \$50,000.
 - **The Lifetime Learning tax credit:** This tax credit is designed to assist a broad cross section of Americans—adults who want to go back to school to upgrade their skills; juniors, seniors, and graduate and professional students; people requiring new educational training to change careers; and people who want to make a course or two to improve themselves. A family will receive a 20% tax credit for the first \$5,000 of tuition and required fees (less grants, scholarships, and other tax-free educational assistance) paid each year through 2002, and for the first \$10,000 thereafter. The Lifetime Learning tax credit is available on a per-taxpayer (family) basis and is phased out at the same income levels as the Hope scholarship. Families will be able to claim a Lifetime Learning tax credit for some members of their family and the Hope Scholarship credit for others who qualify.
 - **Expanded Savings Opportunities:** There are several provisions of the balanced budget which make it easier for families to save for their children's college expenses.
 - Beginning January 1, 1998 taxpayers may withdraw funds from an IRA, without penalty, for the postsecondary education expenses of the taxpayer, a spouse, a child, or even a grandchild.
 - For each child under 18, families may deposit \$500 per year into an Educational IRA in the child's name. Earnings will accumulate tax free and no taxes will be due upon withdrawal if used to pay expenses at a postsecondary institution before the child turns 30.
 - Qualified state-sponsored tuition plans may now include savings for certain room and board expenses for students who attend at least half-time. Withdrawals are eligible for the Hope Scholarship and Lifetime Learning tax credits.
 - **Easier Student Loan Repayment:** Students or their families can, beginning in 1998, take a tax deduction for interest paid in the first 60 months of repayment on their student loans. In addition, student loan amounts forgiven by non-profit, tax exempt charitable or educational institutions for borrowers who take community-service jobs that address unmet needs will be excluded from income.
 - **Expanded Pell Grants for Needy and Deserving Students:** The balanced budget agreement also provides for a substantial \$300 increase in the Pell Grant maximum award to \$3,000. This builds upon last year's substantial increase in the maximum award (\$230) to begin to restore the lost buying power of Pell Grants for students at the lowest income level.
-
-

Goal 3. Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning.

Postsecondary Education

Postsecondary education has been America's traditional gateway to the professions, more challenging jobs, and higher wages. American postsecondary education has become world-class and foreign nations have sent thousands of their future leaders here for training. Graduates have been eagerly sought by business, government, and education itself to resolve present problems and envision future opportunities. At least two years of postsecondary education will be increasingly necessary in the 21st century to gain higher earnings and improved job opportunities.

Although American higher education is the envy of the world, almost 40% of our own high school graduates do not immediately attend postsecondary education. Worse, postsecondary enrollment and completion rates are significantly lower for blacks and Hispanics and for students from lower- and middle-income families than for whites and those from higher income families, respectively. Although enrollment rates have been rising in recent years, postsecondary education remains an elusive option for too many American high school graduates.

To help ensure access to postsecondary education, we need to continue to make progress in three key areas:

- Ensuring that all students leave high school with the academic background and preparation to pursue postsecondary education. Movement towards achievement of Goals 1 and 2 will go a long way toward making this a reality. We also need to help motivate students to continue their education beyond high school by providing them with earlier and better information about the benefits of postsecondary education, what admission requirements are, how much college costs, and how they can get financial aid to help pay postsecondary costs.
- Ensuring that all students motivated and academically ready to attend postsecondary education, have the financial resources and support services needed to do so.
- Ensuring that the student aid delivery system is efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive.

Lifelong Learning

While overcoming barriers to postsecondary enrollment and completion for young people is critical to our nation, it is just as important to do more to encourage lifelong learning, whether it be graduate school or adult basic education, advanced technical training or job entry skills. This includes many for whom lifelong learning opportunities are of special importance, such as persons with disabilities, adults lacking basic skills, and those whose job skills need upgrading or who require retraining because of labor market changes.

Persons with disabilities are at least twice as likely as people without disabilities to be unemployed. Their low employment rate is estimated to cost society in excess of \$2 billion annually. At the end of 1994, 19.5 percent of the working-age population, or 30.7 million people, had a disability, with 14.5 million considered to have a severe limitation.

Adults who haven't graduated from high school or postsecondary programs are also at a serious disadvantage when competing for jobs and maintaining their independence from government support.

The National Adult Literacy Survey of 1992 showed that at least 21% of adults age 16 and older lacked basic reading and math skills needed for well-paying jobs or entry into higher education.

To address these problems, the Department is giving priority to improving the quality of its rehabilitation and adult education programs, including identifying best practices and updating performance data systems to provide feedback for program improvement. It also is supporting work with other federal agencies to coordinate programs and improve employment outcomes for adults with disabilities and adults needing basic skills education, especially those on welfare.

Use of Evaluations and Assessments in Developing Goal 3

In developing our goals, objectives, and strategies in Goal 3, the Department has relied on a number of evaluations, research studies, and management analyses. Specifically,

- A number of research studies have been and are being conducted using data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics and the Census Department and targeted studies of specific populations affected by changes in legislation or policy. These studies are being used to assess the educational effects of the student aid programs and to help pinpoint where barriers to postsecondary education and lifelong learning remain for certain groups within the population. Strategies are then developed to help overcome these barriers.
- A series of management analyses—including the Direct Loan evaluation, customer satisfaction surveys, and studies of the “gatekeeping” process which determines which postsecondary institutions are eligible to participate in the student aid programs—aided in the identification of successes and problems in the management of the student aid programs. Another major source of evaluation information has been the General Accounting Office (GAO) reports on student financial aid management.
- Evaluations of the TRIO, adult education, and vocational rehabilitation programs were used to identify critical strategies for program improvement. For example, prior studies on adult education made it clear that the field urgently needs information on effective practices, a clear priority for evaluations of the program at this time, and improved state and local performance information, another priority.

Objectives, Indicators and Strategies

Objective 3.1: Secondary school students get the information and support they need to prepare successfully for postsecondary education.

Performance Indicators:

1. *Postsecondary education enrollment rates will increase each year for all students while the gap between low- and high-income and minority and non-minority high school graduates will decrease each year.*
2. *A majority of students age 12 through high school and their parents will have an accurate assessment of the cost of attending college and the aid available for college, by the year 2000.*
3. *The percentage of students from age 12 through high school who are aware of the academic requirements for college or postsecondary vocational enrollment will increase.*
4. *By October 2000, there will be a single point of contact that allows students to get information on federal student aid, apply for aid, and have their eligibility for aid determined within four days of electronic application.*

Research has shown that motivating students and families to anticipate and plan for college at an early age and providing students with needed non-financial support are at least as important as financial assistance in getting students to attend and complete college. This is particularly true for low-income students. In 1995, of students in 8th grade whose families were in the bottom third of the income distribution, only 44% had attended a postsecondary institution within two years of graduating from high school. However, 88% of low-income students who had taken a rigorous high school program had gone on to college. Providing students with the information and support they need to aspire to and be prepared for college is critical if we are going to increase college going rates for low- and middle-income students.

Core Strategies:

- **National campaign for middle-school students.** Launch a national campaign to motivate middle-school students and their parents to prepare for higher education by providing (1) information on the benefits of education beyond high school, academic requirements for college admission, and financial costs of attending postsecondary institutions; (2) the availability and value of financial aid; and (3) support services and programs available in their state and local areas. Special emphasis will be placed on developing strategies to reach low-income and first-generation college families.
- **Sector coordination.** Provide incentives and guidance for increased coordination between K-12 schools and postsecondary institutions to ensure that students are ready for college.
- **Outreach and dissemination initiatives.** Enhance the effectiveness of the TRIO Upward Bound and Talent Search programs by improving outreach and dissemination efforts and by applying the latest research on effective strategies to assist disadvantaged students.
- **Develop a student- and family-focused "system" to support postsecondary education using computer and information technologies.**
 - Develop procedures to provide students and families a simple mechanism for electronically applying for student financial aid through the world wide web (legislative authority may be needed for full implementation). This system will provide the prospective student a single point of contact for all federal student aid programs, and, eventually, with the cooperation of the postsecondary education community, to address all their financial aid questions, including estimates of likely federal aid amounts and costs associated with attending specific schools.
 - Work with the financial aid community and Congress to implement the use of a multi-year promissory note for student loans that will streamline application procedures, minimize delays in receiving funds, and provide better consumer information for borrowers.

Objective 3.2: Postsecondary students receive the financial aid and support services they need to enroll in and complete their educational program.

Performance Indicators:

5. *Unmet need (the percent of a student's total cost of education that is not met by student and family contribution and all sources of financial aid), a measure of opportunity or access to postsecondary education, will show decreases over time, especially for low-income students.*
6. *The percentage of borrowers with student loan debt repayments exceeding 10% of their income will remain stable or decline over time.*
7. *Graduation rates for all students in four-year and two-year colleges will improve while the gap in completion rates between low- and high-income and minority and non-minority students will decrease.*
8. *Participants receiving support services through the TRIO programs enroll in and complete postsecondary programs at rates higher than comparable non-participants.*

Education increasingly determines who will prosper in our economy and who will not. Most of today's good jobs require more skills and training than a high school diploma can provide. Proof of the critical importance of postsecondary education is the large and growing economic return to education. Fifteen years ago a worker with a college degree made 38% more, on average, than a worker with a high school degree. Today, that difference is 73%.

Economic efficiency and fairness require that we make at least 2 years of postsecondary education as universally available as a high school diploma is now. Unfortunately, the cost of college limits access for many low- and middle-income families. The average cost of attending a public college increased from 9% of the typical family's income in 1979 to 14% in 1994. The Administration has worked with Congress to enact tax relief and has succeeded in passing a comprehensive package of proposals—additional tax relief, increased grant aid and work-study assistance, and reduced borrowing costs—to help ensure that postsecondary education is affordable for all Americans.

Core Strategies:

- **Financial aid programs.**
 - Provide aid to postsecondary education students through the Pell Grant program, Campus-based programs (Supplemental Educational Opportunities Grants, Work-Study, and Perkins Loans), Federal Family Education Loan program, and Direct Student Loan program. Carry out activities to strengthen and improve the capacity of the schools to administer aid programs.
 - Help student loan borrowers manage their debt by informing students of the availability of flexible repayment options in the Direct Loan program, encouraging lenders in the FFEL program to also offer flexible repayment options, and working with postsecondary institutions to provide good debt management counseling before a student borrows, prior to their leaving school, and while they are in repayment.
- **New financial aid initiatives.** Provide financial support for postsecondary education to students and parents through the tax system by working with the Treasury Department to implement the two tax credits for postsecondary education. In particular, ED will work to ensure that all Americans who might benefit are informed about the new tax credits and know how to use them.
- **Support services.** Provide federal support and technical assistance for the higher education programs, in particular the TRIO and Aid for Institutional Development programs, that are key in providing the services needed to help disadvantaged students enter and complete postsecondary education.
- **Streamlined processes for aid delivery.** Initiate a pilot project with postsecondary schools to have their students receive federal aid disbursements through streamlined processes similar to those used for electronic benefits transfers.

Objective 3.3: Postsecondary student aid delivery and program management is efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive.

Performance Indicators:

9. *Customer satisfaction ratings among students, parents, and postsecondary institutions participating in the student aid programs will increase to 90% by the year 2000.*
10. *The annual number of students and families submitting or renewing their federal student aid applications electronically will continue to increase each year, almost doubling to 3 million by October 2000.*
11. *The accuracy and integrity of data supplied by applicants, institutions, lenders, and guaranty agencies will show continuous yearly improvements.*
12. *Evaluation of contracts for major OPE financial aid systems will indicate that better than fully successful performance, including quality, cost control, and timeliness, is being received by the government and the taxpayer.*
13. *There will be no material internal weaknesses identified in the student aid programs' portions of ED's department-wide financial statement audit, and there will be no issues related to the student aid programs that prevent ED from receiving an unqualified opinion on the financial statements.*
14. *The percentage of postsecondary institutions found to be in substantial compliance with federal requirements will increase each year.*
15. *The annual recovery rate on defaulted student loans will increase*
16. *The cohort default rates—the percentage of borrowers leaving school who default within two years—for the Federal Family Education Loan and the Direct Loan Program will decline to a level of 10% or less.*

In 1997-98, ED will provide almost \$43 billion through its student financial assistance programs (including grants, loans, and work-study) to help students attend postsecondary institutions. Ensuring the effective and efficient delivery of these funds is one of ED's highest priorities. In recent years, great strides have been made in improving the management of the student aid programs.

- Default rates dropped by over 50 percent, from 22.4% of loans entering repayment in FY 1990 to 10.7% of loans entering repayment in FY 1994.
- Improved institutional oversight by ED has led to the removal of 875 schools, including 672 schools from all student aid programs and an additional 203 from federal loan programs.
- ED has implemented rigorous certification standards resulting in the rejection of about 33 percent of the initial school applications to participate in the student aid programs in the last three years, double what the percentage was in 1990.
- Over 1,000 schools of questionable capacity have been placed on provisional certification during the past four years so that ED can move quickly to remove them from participating in the student aid program should problems arise.

While significant improvements have been made, a great deal still needs to be done before the management of the student aid programs is all that it should be. As noted in a number of reports by the General Accounting Office and the Inspector General, many problems still remain in how the student aid programs are operated. Perhaps the biggest of the remaining problems is that the various student aid systems are incompletely integrated, financial data from aid programs are only partially consolidated at the student level, and too many contractors use different operating systems. Correcting this situation will require the redesign and modernization of the federal financial aid system by using the latest information engineering and computer system technology. In addition, ED is also committed to strengthening its oversight of the student aid programs while reducing burden for high performing institutions.

Core Strategies

- **Customer satisfaction.**
 - Emphasize customer service in all facets of operation and continue to monitor satisfaction levels among students, parents, and postsecondary institutions participating in the student aid programs.
-

- Use the best of computer and information technologies to assist students and their parents in learning about and applying for student financial aid. This will include:
 - a simple and secure mechanism for electronically completing, through the world wide web, the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) used to apply for student financial aid.
 - a single point of contact for all federal student aid programs to address all financial aid questions, including estimates of likely federal aid amounts and costs associated with attending specific schools.
- **An integrated, accurate, and efficient student aid delivery system.**
 - Integrate the multiple student aid data bases based on student-level records.
 - Improve contract performance for major information systems through increased use of performance-based contracting and by following OMB criteria (i.e., Raines Rules) for technology system investment proposals.
 - Use mutually-agreed-upon industry-wide standards for data exchanges to stabilize data requirements, improve data integrity, and reduce costly errors.
 - Continue or expand data matches with other federal agencies—including the Internal Revenue Service, the Social Security Administration, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Selective Service, the U.S. Postal Service, and the Departments of Defense, Justice, and Housing and Urban Development—to help improve data accuracy and reduce burden on respondents (legislative authority may be needed for full implementation).
 - Increase the community's use of ED's web site as a principal source of financial aid information, programmatic and technical publications, and software.
- **Effective institutional oversight.**
 - Develop and utilize a risk management system in order to target compliance and enforcement activities on poorly performing institutions while reducing burdens on high performing ones.
 - Expand use of the case management approach to maximize the effectiveness of institutional oversight. This approach encompasses review of recertification applications, compliance audits, financial statements, risk management system inputs, program reviews, etc.
- **Legislative support for default reduction.** Seek legislative changes that (1) increase risk sharing in the loan programs to provide more incentives for lenders and guarantee agencies to prevent defaults and (2) obtain new authorities to improve our collections from defaulted borrowers.
- **Interagency coordination.** Work with the Internal Revenue Service on tax refund offsets and address matches, and with the Department of Treasury on administrative offsets and student loan interest rates.
- **Support innovations in the delivery of postsecondary education.** Coordinate with states, schools, and Congress to change financial aid laws and regulations to support innovations in the delivery of postsecondary education, such as distance education and the creation of virtual universities, while maintaining accountability in the use of federal funds.

Objective 3.4: Adults can strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime through lifelong learning.

Performance Indicators:

- 17. The percentage of individuals obtaining competitive employment who maintain employment and earnings 24 months after completion of vocational rehabilitation will increase significantly by 2002.*
- 18. In vocational rehabilitation, the percentage of all persons exiting the vocational rehabilitation system after receiving services who obtain competitive employment will increase each year.*
- 19. By 2002, the literacy skills of American adults will improve as shown by significantly fewer adults performing at the lowest proficiency level.*
- 20. Increasing percentages of adults enrolled in beginning adult basic education programs and English as a second language programs will achieve proficiency in basic skills as measured by standardized tests.*

As we move into the 21st century, the world of work is rapidly changing. No longer will it be typical for a person to stay in one job for their entire careers. Many workers will need to upgrade their skills and some will need to be retrained for entirely new jobs. Providing educational opportunities to these adult workers will lengthen their productive years and will also benefit the economy by creating a more flexible and more highly trained workforce. The Lifetime Learning tax credit and other provisions of the balanced budget passed in August 1997 will help make lifelong learning a reality for many workers. In addition, the federal student aid programs provide a great deal of financial support for adults returning to school—in 1995-96, 18% of undergraduate recipients of Title IV student aid were 30 years old or above.

For those adult Americans with disabilities, education must often be coupled with the provision of effective rehabilitation services in order for persons with disabilities to succeed in competitive labor markets. The quality of rehabilitation programs is critical to ensuring that our nation's citizens with disabilities are able to fully compete in the 21st century work world. The Department plans to increase the use of rehabilitation technology and will work to improve the efficiency of current rehabilitation programs.

For adult education participants, particularly in adult basic education, national data has shown that too few adults stay in the program long enough to receive a substantial benefit. Moreover, the research on effective programs is very limited. The Department is sponsoring several evaluation projects in an effort to improve the effectiveness of adult education programs and to better integrate them with other training programs and the reformed welfare system.

Core Strategies:

- **Provide financial support for lifelong learning.** As described in objective 3.2, the Department is committed to providing monetary support for adults wanting to return to school through the financial aid programs and the tax system. In addition, the balanced budget agreement extended Section 127 of the tax code allowing workers to exclude up to \$5,250 of employer-provided education benefits from their income.
 - **Financial support for adult education and vocational rehabilitation.** Provide grants to aid states in carrying out adult education and rehabilitation programs (Adult Education State Grants and Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants).
 - **Best practices for vocational rehabilitation.** Assist individuals with disabilities to achieve desired employment outcomes by identifying and disseminating information regarding best practices.
 - **Linking vocational rehabilitation indicators with high quality performance measurement systems.** Work with states to improve the state performance measurement systems in the vocational rehabilitation program in order to ensure progress toward performance indicators and identify areas for technical assistance.
-

- **Rehabilitation services interagency coordination.**
 - Encourage coordination between state vocational rehabilitation agencies and State-level job training programs by awarding grants for system changes.
 - Establish a federal interagency council to promote the employment of persons with disabilities. In concert with the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Defense, Veterans Administration, Commerce, Social Security Administration, Transportation, Justice, the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Board, Office of Personnel Management, and the Small Business Administration, carry out an initiative to set in place the requisite policies and actions needed to improve employment rates and outcomes for persons with disabilities and to reduce overlap in services and programs..
 - **Access to quality adult basic and secondary education.**
 - Expand the availability of high quality adult basic and secondary education to all adults lacking the necessary skills and credentials by encouraging the appropriate use of distance learning and other technologies and by coordinating with job training programs that integrate academic and workplace learning.
 - Through research by the National Center on Adult Learning and Literacy and effectiveness evaluations conducted by the Planning and Evaluation Service, identify and validate effective adult basic education and English as a second language practices and disseminate study findings in formats that are accessible to a wide audience.
 - **Sound adult education state and local program management.** Establish benchmarks for adult education performance systems on the levels of expected performance from effective programs and help improve state and local performance information systems to ensure that the information needed for good program management and improvement is available.
 - **Adult education an integral component of reformed welfare systems.** Strengthen the role of adult education in the new welfare-to-work systems by providing technical assistance to states and local programs on models for integrating work readiness activities into the basic skills delivery system.
-

Goal 4. Make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.

To help students reach challenging academic standards, to build a solid foundation for learning for all students, and to ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning, the organization which acts as the spokesperson for these changes needs to be an organization that is committed to world-class quality efforts and customer satisfaction. The job of promoting the learning objectives espoused in our plan is an enormous task and requires an infrastructure that embraces quality, customer service, and innovative management techniques.

To be a leader in educational reforms, the Department has to be a leader in organizational and internal performance reforms. World class results for our customers requires world class talent. The recognition of this tremendous responsibility is the backbone of Goal 4. To achieve these results requires breakthrough thinking and accomplishments—accomplishments in the areas of strategic planning and goal-setting, customer service, educational research, technology both internally and externally, workforce planning and development, financial integrity, and an emphasis on integration of programs and reviews.

To become a high-performance organization, the Department must become “results and accountability driven.” We will be when we:

- Identify our customers and meet or surpass their needs
- Set goals and establish or improve our performance measurement systems to track progress
- determine how best to work with our partners to reach program goals
- Continually seek new ways to provide services more efficiently and with higher quality
- Support R&D and evaluation activities to identify best practices in education

During the past few years, we have made much progress in transforming ED into a high performance organization. But more remains to be done. The objectives in Goal 4 and objective 3.3 in Goal 3 identify critical management processes for the Department that need ongoing attention or further development.

Use of Evaluations and Assessments in Developing Goal 4

- The Department of Education was criticized in May 1993 by the General Accounting Office (GAO) in its report *Department of Education: Long Standing Management Problems Hamper Reforms* for not emphasizing good, sensible management techniques to accomplish its goals. This report further highlighted a lack of strategic planning, poor quality data, unqualified technical staff and a focus on short term fixes rather than long term solutions. The Department responded to this report in its first strategic plan, resolving some and still working on others.
- In 1993 and 1996, the Department conducted employee surveys that asked questions about the work experiences of all ED managers and staff. The results of these surveys were analyzed and helped to set the direction for some of the objectives in Goal 4.

- To identify ways to improve customer service, we've followed Executive Order 12862, "Setting Customer Service Standards," as well as used internal surveys of key offices and focus groups to establish strategies and measures for customer satisfaction. We surveyed telephone and employee responsiveness via a "mystery shopper" survey. We also reviewed several GAO reports that offered suggestions for ways to improve our service to customers.
- When our office of research and statistics was scheduled for reauthorization, the National Academy of Sciences was asked to consider how federally supported education research can better contribute to improving the nation's education. The Academy, through its National Research Council, convened 15 distinguished experts to conduct the study. Many of the recommendations in the report were adopted by OERI and also influenced selection of the strategies and indicators in this plan.
- To identify priorities for research, over 45 discussion groups were conducted for their input as to what they believed the national priorities for research in education should be. The resulting data and recommendations appear in the report *"Building Knowledge for a Nation of Learners: A Framework for Education Research 1997."*
- Evaluations of the new performance appraisal system, the human resource re-engineering, and the flexiplace systems are planned. These results will be also factored into the strategic direction of the management initiatives.
- To help introduce management innovations, POCs are joining in partnership to do management reviews and make recommendations on areas that can be improved through process improvement or through organizational development activities.
- For our information technology systems, a recent independent verification and validation study by KMPG Peat Marwick on the Department's network infrastructure and operations provided important recommendations on improving our system. The recommendations were used in developing strategies for objective 4.4 plus are being followed now as we improve our information systems.
- GAO's 1997 report on *Challenges in Promoting Access Excellence in Education* noted the importance of having a sound integrated information technology strategy to manage a portfolio of information systems. We have included an indicator on Information Technology Investment Review Board assessments of major systems to ensure systems are mission-driven and consistent with our information technology architecture.

Objectives, Indicators, and Strategies

Objective 4.1: Our customers receive fast, seamless service and dissemination of high-quality information and products.

Performance Indicators:

1. *By 2000, customers, internal and external, will agree that ED products, services, and information, including those on the Department's web site, are of high quality, timely, and accessible.*
2. *Department employees and front-line service centers meet or exceed established customer service standards by 1999.*
3. *Quarterly evaluation reports for the "One-Pubs" system, based on quality assurance surveillance, indicate that high standards of performance are achieved for dissemination of ED's information products by 1999.*

A person with a question is someone who needs help, not busy signals and unreturned phone messages. Customer service isn't just a slogan, it is a necessary focus of our organization. We believe that customers should have seamless access to information and services and are striving to meet the standards we have set for customer service. The Department relies on input from customers to improve our programs and services and has sought out feedback which has led to significant improvements in the way we do business. The Department also supports a variety of national dissemination activities that make available to educators, parents, and policymakers the best research-based information on educational practice.

Core Strategies:

- **Standards.** Set, meet and exceed customer service standards, especially on the front lines by providing employee training, regular feedback on performance, adequate resources, equipment, and incentives.
- **Customer feedback.** Develop a comprehensive, reliable system for receiving and acting upon customer feedback, including customer complaints.
- **One-stop shopping for customers.** Establish a "One-Pubs" system that enables our customers to receive publications and other information products without having to track them down from several offices.
- **Public outreach.** Conduct outreach activities to increase awareness and support for the Secretary's priorities among key constituency groups and the general public, using regional meetings and events, teleconferences, newsletters, targeted mailings, national conferences, satellite town meetings, information services via the Internet, and contacts with state and local governments and other federal agencies.
- **Full access.** Ensure that customers with disabilities have access to ED services and information by expanding our TTY system capacity and establishing an alternate format center to provide both braille and audiotape.
- **Employee resources.** Provide ED employees with technology needed to respond effectively to customer requests.

See Appendix A for the Department's customer service standards.

Objective 4.2: Our partners have the support and flexibility they need without diminishing accountability for results.

Performance Indicators:

- 4. States and school districts rate the Department's technical assistance, including assistance from the integrated reviews, as very useful in improving their performance.*
- 5. By 2002, the number of separate ED programs will decline significantly from the current 197 in FY 1997.*
- 6. Customers increasingly report that they have greater flexibility and report better understanding of ED rules.*
- 7. New discretionary grants processed using the re-engineered grant-making process are awarded each year on a timely basis.*
- 8. Reports from program monitoring teams and audit reports under the Single Audit Act show a reduction in significant recurring findings.*
- 9. The number of states participating in the Cooperative Audit Resolution and Oversight Initiative (CAROI) increases to meet the needs of our partners.*

Many ED programs serve similar target populations—for example, educationally disadvantaged children, although each program has a different focus and purposes. To improve teaching and learning for these children, the Department needs to be organized to promote the integration of federal programs with each other as well as with state and local programs.

Two important coordinated reviews are providing states with single contacts, coordinated guidance, and straightforward conflict resolution processes rather than multiple reviews. The Integrated Review Team initiative promotes joint technical assistance and monitoring activities among several offices and programs that are working with the same or greatly overlapping target populations or education providers. The Cooperative Audit Resolution and Oversight Initiative links program, auditing, and legal staffs with state program administrators to resolve financial issues. These new processes promote cooperative, rather than adversarial, relationships between the Department and our grantees.

Further, to better support our partners and ensure that the taxpayer gets results for their investment, we need to continue improving the key processes and systems supporting federal aid to education. Some of our legislative authorities will need revision to support the Government Performance and Results Act's focus on results. To make regulations helpful to achieving program goals and accountability, they should be as flexible and performance-oriented, and impose as little burden, as possible. The reengineered discretionary grants process will provide the grantee community one point of contact, more time to make proposals, and more technical assistance before and after grant awards.

Core Strategies:

- **Integrated program reviews.** Establish and implement a protocol for conducting grant program reviews that integrate program monitoring, technical assistance, and audit resolutions through a collaborative approach among program offices and with states.
- **Technical assistance system.**
 - Create a conceptual and operational framework for delivering technical assistance through technical assistance centers, conferences, integrated reviews, ED staff, and online services.
 - Link technical assistance, monitoring and auditing activities by providing the Integrated Review Teams with results of Cooperative Audit Resolutions, and other audit findings.
 - Evaluate the effectiveness of the Department's technical assistance.
- **Build civil rights partnerships.** Establish constructive and collaborative relationships with state education agencies, local education agencies, parents and community groups, and other stakeholders to achieve the shared objectives of civil rights compliance and securing positive changes for students in a timely manner.

- **Program streamlining and flexibility.**
 - During reauthorization, simplify legislation and design programs to be results-oriented.
 - Use the Department's waiver authorities to provide increased flexibility in exchange for increased accountability to States, school districts, and others in order to help all students achieve to challenging academic standards.
 - Support partnership states for Ed-Flex (the Education Flexibility Demonstration Partnership Program) in their implementation of the waiver authority delegated to the states under the Ed-Flex program.
 - Encourage consolidated planning at state and local levels.
- **Regulatory/legislative reinvention.**
 - Ensure appropriate flexibility, consistent with customer recommendations, program goals, and need for accountability in new legislation and regulations.
 - Set forth clear, straightforward expectations and options through simpler regulations and more timely, effective guidance.
 - In particular, develop postsecondary education reauthorization legislation that results in regulations and program operation guidelines that are straightforward and simplified for easier customer use.
- **Grants re-engineering.**
 - Ensure that the re-engineered decentralization of the discretionary grant-making process is operational by tracking output, closely monitoring developments to overcome roadblocks, and by providing comprehensive desk-level procedures and training for staff.
 - Ensure that formula and discretionary grants are issued to our partners in time for state and local program planning and operations, by requiring that program offices award grants by May 1 wherever beneficial to grantees.

Objective 4.3: An up-to-date knowledge base is available from education research to support education reform and equity.

Performance Indicators:

- 10. Peer reviews show that education research and statistics supported by the Department are of high quality, are focused on critical education reform issues, and contribute significantly to educational improvement.*
- 11. Education research meets the needs of our partners (e.g., states, schools, institutions of higher education, national associations) and our customers (teachers, parents, students, business) for reliable information on how to make schools more effective, as measured by biennial customer surveys.*
- 12. In major and selected other programs, increasing percentages of grantees demonstrate that their programs and services are based on sound research results.*
- 13. Dissemination of research and assessment findings reaches key customer bases and results in educational improvement.*

Investing in education research and evaluation contributes to our understanding of and efforts to improve education. Research and evaluation expands understanding of fundamental aspects of human development, learning, teaching, and schools and their environmental contexts. It points the way to effective elements of curriculum, instruction, and school organization. It provides the best basis for distinguishing worthwhile program and policies from fads. It helps educators assess the status of education systems and their progress toward various goals.

Because of its potential to influence the well-being of the nation's youth, education research must meet the highest professional standards of scientific inquiry so that results are trustworthy. The Department, in collaboration with the National Educational Research Policy and Priority Board, is developing standards to assure that supported activities are of the highest professional excellence. To ensure its relevance and application, research must remain firmly rooted in the everyday experience of students and teachers and the reality of schools.

Core Strategies:

- **Statistics.** Collect and effectively disseminate statistics annually on critical education issues used to inform the national research agenda and provide information for policy-making and program improvement.
- **National vision and priorities for research.**
 - Develop a comprehensive vision of the nation's needs for knowledge about education, and set clear priorities for education research to meet those needs.
 - Coordinate research, development, and evaluation activities across the Department to optimize the use of R&D funds for the priorities.
- **Financial support for R&D that supports national research priorities.** Support research on education reform and improvement through national education research institutes, regional educational laboratories, National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board, National Institute for Disability and Rehabilitation Research, the new Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Research to Practice program, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, and the International Education and Foreign Language Studies program.
- **Research dissemination.** Develop and implement a comprehensive dissemination system of effective practices that increases the education community's access and use of research-based products and services for education reform and improvement. Ensure that teachers, parents, and principals can obtain help in solving their school-related problems.
- **Feedback to ED staff.** Ensure that research findings and results of program evaluations are given to program offices to improve program design and implementation.
- **Research standards.** Ensure that Department-supported research and development meet the professional standards of the scientific community and are applied systematically and with rigor.

- **International benchmarks.** Develop and utilize knowledge about education systems and practices in other nations to stimulate educational improvement in the United States.
- **Use of the research.** Determine the extent to which the Department's grantees propose programs and services that are based on sound research results.

Objective 4.4: Our information technology investments are sound and used to improve impact and efficiency.

Performance Indicators:

- 14. All major information systems needing repair will be converted to Year 2000 compliance on or before the end of 1998 (giving time for validation and testing during 1998 and 1999).*
- 15. At least 90% of all employees assess productivity as "significantly improved" as a result of available technology, as shown by the employee survey in 2000.*
- 16. All Information Technology Investment Review Board assessments will show that major information systems are mission-driven, cost effective, consistent with our information technology architecture, and supported by performance-based contracts.*
- 17. Data reporting burden on the public will be reduced annually.*

The Department's information systems, consisting of data, software, hardware, and telecommunications, will be integrated and promote cost effectiveness and efficiency. Employees will access ED's reliable local and wide area network from standards-based workstations using modern, accessible, personal productivity software and hardware tools. Management of the data and systems processes will be closer to the user. Data warehousing will allow information to be shared among internal and external customers with increasing ease and with adequate security precautions, including issues related to privacy and confidentiality.

Through the construction of an Education Enterprise Data Model, the Department's data requirements will be identified and used to develop a departmental information architecture. This model and architecture will be designed so that redundancy is eliminated for new information systems, data will be captured once—where and when it is needed—and easily used by internal and external customers. The Internet world wide web will provide increased public access to ED information and for processing business transactions electronically.

Core Strategies:

- **Year 2000 compliance.** Implement a major Departmental effort to become "Year 2000 data compliant" to ensure that ED's data users and customers are not affected from data corruption resulting from hardware and software that cannot correctly process date-related information.
- **Network and PC infrastructure for the Department.** Ensure that the Department has a cost effective, efficient, accessible, and reliable network infrastructure, with modern workplace software and hardware, to promote productivity and meet business needs.
- **ED world wide web support.** Provide a robust, reliable, secure Internet service that effectively presents and distributes quality educational information and processes business transactions for our internal and external customers.
- **Cost effective major systems that deliver for ED and its customers.** Assess current and proposed major information systems—such as student financial aid systems as described in Goal 3, statistical systems (NCES), and financial systems (EDCAPS)—to ensure that they efficiently meet the business needs and mission of the Department. The Information Technology Investment Review Board will review new information technology investment proposals, conduct periodic reviews of on-going systems and expand the use of performance-based contracting.
- **Data warehousing.** Develop a Department-wide information collection and dissemination system using a data warehouse to provide easy access to ED data and eliminate data duplication.

Objective 4.5: The Department's employees are highly skilled and high-performing.

Performance Indicators:

18. *By 2000, a majority of ED managers will agree that staff knowledge and skills are adequate to carry out the Department's mission.*
19. *By 2000, the majority of employees demonstrate the basic computer competencies identified in the Department's computer competency standards.*
20. *By 2000, most employees indicate satisfaction with their work environment (e.g., physical surroundings, noise level, air quality), security, and accessibility.*
21. *By 2000, most employees and managers express high satisfaction with assistance on resolving employee disputes, and disputes are closed quickly and informally whenever possible.*
22. *Expert review of the quality of Department-sponsored employee training shows that the training is among the best in the federal government and is comparable to the best in the private sector.*
23. *By 2000, at least 70% of ED employees agree that the multi-evaluator General Performance Appraisal System (GPAS) improves individual employee performance and development, and aligns employee goals with the overall mission of the Department.*

High-performing organizations are characterized by workers who understand and support the mission of the organization in which they work. Individuals are valued as contributors to the organization mission; and high-performing organizations provide continuous learning opportunities and flexible work arrangements, to the extent possible. Over the next five years, the Office of Management will provide leadership in (1) expanding the capacity of employees to perform the mission of the Department, and (2) providing the best possible working conditions to support the Department's mission.

The results of the Department's 1996 Employee Survey highlighted the need for additional work on transforming the Department into a high-performing organization. For example, the survey found dissatisfaction with the Department's dispute resolution processes. The survey also identified a perceived inequity between services, including training and facilities, for employees in the regions versus headquarters. Strategies and performance measures have been developed to help make improvements in these areas and to assess whether recent innovations, including the multi-input performance appraisal system, have yielded increased productivity and morale.

Core Strategies:

- **Ensuring high staff performance.**
 - Offer incentives to employees to develop innovative approaches for completing work and accomplishing the Department's mission.
 - Provide meaningful training and development opportunities to all employees consistent with identified needs.
 - Develop specific standards of computer competency for all staff.
 - Continue the Department's efforts to provide a family-friendly workplace, including family and medical leave, flexible work schedules, flexiplace, and educational volunteer initiatives.
 - Assess whether the redesigned employee performance appraisal system is effective in promoting desired employee performance and employee development.
- **A fair, efficient, and responsive workplace.** Continue to re-engineer the Department's equal employment opportunity (EEO) operations and assess progress to date on the newly implemented Informal Dispute Resolution Center.
- **A healthy, safe, secure and accessible workplace for all employees.** Move headquarters employees back to renovated quarters and make improvements to other department offices or relocate staff to improved quarters.

Objective 4.6: Management of our programs and services ensures financial integrity.

Performance Indicators:

24. *By June 1998, the Education Central Automated Processing System (EDCAPS) will be fully implemented and providing assistant secretaries, the Chief Financial Officer, and program managers with consistent, timely, and reliable financial and program information, through an assessment by the Information Technology Investment Review Board.*
25. *Evaluation of contracts will indicate that better than fully successful performance, including quality, cost control, timeliness, and other factors, is being received by the government and the taxpayer.*
26. *Auditors issue a clean opinion on the Department-wide annual financial statements every year.*
27. *The Department's fund control system and staff continue to prevent anti-deficiency violations, while ensuring timely awards of grants and contracts and maximizing the use of available budget resources.*

We must ensure that taxpayer dollars are used effectively as intended by the Administration and Congress, and that fraud, waste and abuse is at a minimum. To obtain reliable results, systems must be in place to provide reliable and timely information. The Education Department's Central Automated Processing System—currently in development—will satisfy that need.

For the past four years, we have received disclaimers of audit opinions because of our auditor's concerns with the integrity of the data supporting our cost estimates for the Federal Family Education Loan Program. We will not be satisfied with financial management and program accountability in this Department until we receive consistently unqualified audit opinions. The Department has also worked to improve management and delivery of federal student financial assistance, as described earlier in Objective 3.3.

Core Strategies:

- **Centralized core data.**
 - Provide timely and reliable information to program offices to help them manage their programs through EDCAPS.
 - Continue to convert funds control system and processes to the EDCAPS environment to prevent unlawful expenditure of funds.
- **Performance-based contracting, reduced outsourcing.** Control costs by implementing performance-based contracting and by repatriating work contracted out where effective and where possible within FTE ceilings. Improve work statements and cost estimates through continued training and by independent evaluations of content and organization that provide feedback on quality.
- **Financial integrity.** Enhance the Department's credibility by obtaining a clean audit opinion on annual financial statements.
- **Staff skills.** Provide training and incentives for both financial and program staff to acquire core financial management competencies.

Objective 4.7: All levels of the agency are fully performance-driven.

Performance Indicators:

28. *Employees recognize the strategic plan as meaningful and understand how their work supports achieving the plan's goals and objectives.*
29. *Senior leadership and managers' reviews of performance indicator data result in appropriate follow-up actions.*
30. *Independent assessments verify that all large and selected other ED programs have comprehensive, high-quality performance measurement systems that are used for program improvement and accountability by 1999.*
31. *By 1999, all ED program managers assert that the data used for their program's performance measurement are reliable and valid or have plans for improvement.*
32. *Managers agree that policy, budget, and resource allocation decisions are aligned with the strategic priorities of the Department.*

The Government Performance and Results Act ("the Results Act") provides the Department with strong support and guidance for new ways of operating and improving our programs. The Act's focus on results affects all aspects of an organization and its operations—drafting legislation and regulations, ensuring program quality and financial integrity, employee appraisals and assessment, program performance measurement, and more. Two critical elements in this process are:

- Developing strategic plans—agency-wide and for individual programs—to lay on the line our understanding of what we are to accomplish and how we know that we've succeeded.
- Establishing or improving performance measurement systems and evaluations that provide high-quality performance information on the results of our efforts and what is needed to improve.

When orienting our program management to focus on results, it is important to consider the specific context in which we carry out our mission. The Department operates in a broad, multi-level system of education providers and community interests when carrying out its programs and policy initiatives. Program outcomes for education are almost always the joint results of state, local, institutional, and federal efforts, rather than of federal programs acting in isolation.

Core Strategies:

- **Agency performance on strategic plan and program indicator plans.**
 - Track and give feedback on implementation of plans.
 - Provide a report card on overall agency performance as well as that of individual offices.
- **Collaboration with partners.** Actively involve our education partners in development and implementation of the strategic plan and program performance plans.
- **Performance measurement and evaluation.**
 - Ensure that key program activities are subject to periodic, high-quality performance measurement, ranging from meaningful, accurate grantee performance reports to independent evaluations and customer surveys.
 - Align program evaluations and national assessments to support the strategic plan and program performance plans.
 - Improve local grantee performance measurement systems through disseminating models, technical assistance, and legislative and regulatory changes.
 - Develop standards of successful performance for key processes and programs by 1999.
 - Revise managers' performance agreements so that they are rated on the quality of their program's or service's performance measures and, if needed, plans for improvement.
- **Analytic agenda.** Launch an analytic agenda for the Department's seven priority initiatives to improve the underlying knowledge base in support of the initiatives.
- **Budget priorities and allocations reflect strategic plan and annual performance plans.**
 - Establish annual budget priorities linked to federal and Department priorities.
 - Align resources to support the Department's strategic and annual plans.

Resources

The Department's success in achieving its goals and objectives will depend upon the resources available to support them. The Department is responsible for two types of program funding—(1) Congressional appropriations for its programs and services and (2) student loans provided by ED or guaranteed and provided by lending institutions. Key resources supporting these include program administration funds and staffing.

These resources can be allocated towards meeting our goals as demonstrated in the following table. While some of our programs are targeted at particular objectives, many programs support more than one objective (see the relationship chart starting on page 51). In particular, we have a number of major programs that support Goals 1 and 2, such as Title I Grants for Disadvantaged Children. For that reason, the resources are grouped at the level of goals, and the resources supporting Goals 1 and 2 are aggregated in the table.

Table 1 Estimated Distribution of Department of Education Funding and Staff to Strategic Plan Goals FY 1997 Appropriations						
	Program Funding		Administration Funding		Staffing (FTE)	
	Budget Authority (\$000s)	Percent of Total	Salaries & Expenses (\$000s)	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Goal 1 and Goal 2						
<i>ED's K-12 programs</i>						
Goal 3						
<i>Postsecondary, vocational rehabilitation, and adult education programs</i>						
Goal 4						
Research (OERI, NIDRR, IDEA Research to Practice, FIPSE)						
Civil Rights (OCR, Title IV Training and Advisory Services, Women's Educational Equity)						
Management/operations						
Total Funding						

Table 2
Estimated Distribution of Department of Education
Program Administration Funds to Strategic Plan Goals, by Type of
Activity
FY 1997 Appropriations

	Salaries & Expenses (\$000s)	Percent of Total
Goal 1 and Goal 2 (ED's K-12 education programs)		
Salaries		
Contracts		
Other		
Subtotal		
Goal 3 (postsecondary, vocational rehabilitation, and adult education programs)		
Salaries		
Contracts		
Other		
Subtotal		
Goal 4		
Research		
Salaries		
Contracts		
Other		
Subtotal		
Civil rights		
Salaries		
Contracts		
Other		
Subtotal		
Management/operations		
Salaries		
Contracts		
Other		
Subtotal		
Total funding		

Relationship of Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives to Annual Performance Goals

The Department is committed to being held accountable for measuring and reporting results on its goals and objectives. The annual performance plan will be one tool for setting goals, tracking progress, and identifying areas for improvement.

The Department's annual performance plan is constructed from the budget justifications and performance indicator plans for all our programs. The performance indicator plans lay out goals, objectives, performance indicators and targets, data sources, and key strategies for all programs in the Department. They are directly linked to the Department's budget for each program area. In some cases, several budget line items have been aggregated into a single performance plan. The individual programs are separately identifiable, however, with at least one objective specified for them.

The annual plans—budget and performance plans—will identify where they relate to the agency strategic plan. In addition, the relationship goes both ways. This strategic plan is based, in part, on objectives and indicators in draft performance plans prepared for our key programs last winter 1997.

The following table links the Department's programs to the objectives in this strategic plan. It is intended to show where programs have a significant amount of activities or products supporting an objective.

FY 1997 Appropriation (\$000s)[illegible]

FY 1997 Appropriation (\$000s)

Support for Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives by Department of Education Programs

		IDEA State Improvement	IDEA research to practice	IDEA personnel preparation	IDEA parent information centers	IDEA technology and media services	Vocational rehabilitation grants to States	Vocational rehabilitation grants for Indians	Client assistance State grants	Training	Special demonstration programs	Migratory workers	Recreational programs	Protection and advocacy of individual rights	Projects with industry	Supported employment State grants	Independent living	Program improvement	Evaluation	Helen Keller National Center	Natl. Institute on Disability & Rehabilitation Research	Assistive technology	American Printing House for the Blind	National Technical Institute for the Deaf	Gallaudet University	Vocational education State grants (Perkins)	Vocational education national programs	Tribally controlled postsec. vocational institutions	Adult education State grants, evaluation, tech. assist.	National Institute for Literacy	Literacy programs for prisoners	Pell grants
		\$26,988	\$97,140	\$80,735	\$15,535	\$30,023	\$2,164,038	\$12,000	\$10,392	\$39,629	\$18,942	\$1,850	\$2,596	\$7,657	\$22,071	\$38,152	\$74,687	\$2,391	\$1,587	\$7,337	\$69,990	\$36,109	\$6,680	\$43,041	\$79,182	\$1,122,698	\$13,497	\$2,919	\$345,337	\$4,491	\$4,723	\$5,919,000
Goal 1: K-12 education system																																
1.1 States develop and implement standards							X	X													X					X	X					
1.2 School to work																																
1.3 Strong, safe and drug-free schools																																
1.4 Talented and dedicated teachers		X	X		X															X	X											
1.5 Families and communities																				X	X											
1.6 Public school choice																																
1.7 Technology						X																										
Goal 2: K-12 education system																																
2.1 All children ready to learn					X																											
2.2 Third grade reading																																
2.3 Eighth grade math																																
2.4 Special populations help		X	X	X	X	X			X											X	X	X	X			X						
Goal 3: Postsecondary education and lifelong learning																																
3.1 Secondary school students—Information and support								X																	X	X			X			X
3.2 Postsecondary students—financial aid and support												X	X	X	X	X	X				X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3.4 Lifelong learning							X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X															
Goal 4: High-performance organization																																
4.3 Research, evaluation and improvement		X																X	X	X	X										X	
Civil rights, direct support									X						X		X															

Support for Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives by Department of Education Programs

FY 1997 Appropriation (\$000s)

FY 1997 Appropriation (\$000s)		Support for Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives by Department of Education Programs																														
		Campus-based programs	State student incentive grants	Federal Family Education Loans	Direct Student Loans	Aid for institutional development (Title III)	Minority science improvement	Fund for the Improvement of Postsec. Education	International education, foreign language studies	Urban community service	Minority teacher recruitment	Interest subsidy grants	Mary McLeod Bethune Memorial Fine Arts Center	Edmund S. Muskie Foundation	Calvin Coolidge Memorial Foundation	Claiborne Pell Inst. for Int. Relations & Public Policy	TRIO programs	National early intervention scholarships/partnerships	Byrd honors scholarships	George Bush fellowships	Javits fellowships	Graduate assistance in national need	Howard University	College Housing and Academic Facilities Loans	National education research institutes	Regional educational laboratories	National dissemination activities	Statistics and assessment	Eisenhower prof. development Federal activities	Regional technology in education consortia	Star schools	Ready to learn television
Goal 1: K-12 education system		\$1,591,407	\$50,000	\$3,269,318	\$291,665	\$194,846	\$5,255	\$18,000	\$59,751	\$9,200	\$2,212	\$15,673	\$1,400	\$3,000	\$1,000	\$3,000	\$509,463	\$3,600	\$29,117	\$3,000	\$5,931	\$24,069	\$198,000	\$3,000	\$54,000	\$51,000	\$18,567	\$82,617	\$13,342	\$10,000	\$30,000	\$7,000
1.1 States develop and implement standards																									X	X	X	X	X	X		
1.2 School to work																									X			X				
1.3 Strong, safe and drug-free schools																												X				
1.4 Talented and dedicated teachers									X	X															X	X		X	X	X	X	
1.5 Families and communities																	X									X		X				X
1.6 Public school choice																												X				
1.7 Technology									X																	X		X	X	X	X	X
Goal 2: K-12 education system																																
2.1 All children ready to learn																									X	X		X				X
2.2 Third grade reading																									X	X		X				X
2.3 Eighth grade math																									X	X		X	X	X	X	X
2.4 Special populations help																X									X	X		X			X	X
Goal 3: Postsecondary education and lifelong learning																																
3.1 Secondary school students—information and support						X	X	X									X	X											X			
3.2 Postsecondary students—financial aid and support	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X			
3.4 Lifelong learning																				X	X		X		X				X			
Goal 4: High-performance organization																																
4.3 Research, evaluation and improvement								X	X																	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Civil rights, direct support																												X				

Key External Factors that Could Affect Achievement of ED's Goals and Objectives

Although the Department's plan is predicated upon partnerships with state and local education agencies, public and private postsecondary education institutions, and financial institutions to achieve its mission of education quality and access, some factors are largely outside the scope of this joint partnership for learning. These external factors include:

Effects from an economic downturn.

- Declines in State and local school tax revenues would affect their ability to serve growing enrollments from the baby-boom echo as well as implement needed education reforms.
- Postsecondary enrollments often rise during downturns, requiring additional funding resources.
- Tuition cost increases affect student loan and grant requirements.
- Student loan defaults go up during recessions, when graduates lose jobs or are unable to find jobs.
- Higher interest rates increase costs to students for their student loans.

Departmental response: Consider increases in federal elementary and secondary education funding supporting expanded program needs generated from growing student enrollments. At the postsecondary level, the Department will continue to strengthen its information to students about flexible repayment options and its gatekeeping oversight, particularly during periods of economic slowdown or downturn.

Actions by individual families critical to education, especially early learning. The Department is limited in its ability to provide information to families. As a consequence, many families may not understand their role in their children's learning, particularly during the important early years of life, which new brain research finds is critical to future intellectual development.

Departmental response: Expand family involvement outreach strategies through the Partnership for Family Involvement in Education and federal programs reaching young children to inform families of the importance of early learning.

State capacity and willingness to implement challenging standards. It is ultimately a State decision to adopt and support challenging standards. States and communities need to continue to establish and be held accountable for high academic standards, even where these standards are initially very tough for a significant proportion of their students to meet.

Departmental response: Use federal leadership and recognition to reinforce state efforts in setting high standards. Encourage State participation in voluntary, Department-sponsored national tests that could provide them with uniform benchmarks to reinforce challenging State standards.

Local schools' capacity to invest in long-term improvements. School systems, under pressure to demonstrate short-term gains, may not make long-term investments. Yet, for the new and demanding reforms to succeed, school systems will need to undertake long-term investment in professional development and other capacity building activities.

Departmental response: Work with program and technical assistance providers to highlight the importance of sustained professional development aligned with standards. In addition, the Department will emphasize the importance of professional development in its performance indicators.

American society's tolerance for drug and alcohol use. Widespread social tolerance for drug and alcohol use is a countervailing influence to prevention activities by schools and educators who receive federal assistance for drug-education and prevention activities.

Departmental response: Work with others in the Administration to develop and disseminate the best information available on effective intervention strategies and will use the visibility of federal leadership to discourage tolerance for drug use.

Other social supports for disadvantaged children and families. At the federal level, many social services supporting children and youth fall largely outside the jurisdiction of the Department of Education. The Department has limited ability to reinforce education reforms in high-risk communities through improved opportunities for low income children in health care, recreation and safe and drug-free environments.

Departmental response: Actively coordinate programs and activities with other federal agencies providing related services to children and youth.

Business community's support for education, particularly school-to-work. Short-term economic considerations may limit the willingness of employers to support Departmental efforts by undertaking effective school-to-work partnerships and linking hiring with a student's education achievement.

Departmental response: Persuade employers to build a stronger workforce through supporting high-quality school-to-work activities, including meaningful work experiences. Support efforts to provide employers with access to objective student performance information.

Program Evaluations

The Department's Planning and Evaluation Service is coordinating evaluation activities to provide valid and reliable information for performance measurement. A supplementary document to this plan, *U.S. Department of Education's Strategic Plan: Supplementary Information on Performance Indicators and Supporting Studies*, includes information on the indicators and data sources, including evaluations and major statistics and assessment projects that will support this strategic plan. The following section outlines the Department's evaluation strategies in general and highlights some of the evaluations and studies that support the goals and objectives.

Evaluation strategies

Examples of existing or planned evaluation and assessment strategies to provide sound performance measurement through program evaluation include:

- Systematic collection of elementary, secondary, and postsecondary student outcome data using federal and state statistical sources. (*National Assessment of Educational Progress; National Postsecondary Student Aid Study; Department of Labor's National Longitudinal Study of Youth*)
- Wider use of customer surveys. (*Federal Direct Student Loan Program Evaluation*)
- Expert reviews of the quality of Department-funded research, development, and program improvement programs and products. (*Evaluation of the Regional Education Labs*)
- Impact evaluations using time-series design or experimental design (random assignment/control group methodology) to provide comparative information on program effectiveness and to help identify "what works." (*Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance; Evaluation of the TRIO Upward Bound program; National Evaluation of the School-to-Work Program; Evaluation of Effective Adult Basic Education Programs*)
- Program evaluation guidance and assistance to program office staff and grantees to improve the reporting and use of sound program information. (*Guide to Program Outcome Measurement for the U.S. Department of Education; Title I Parent Compact Guide*)

Coordination of data collections and reduction of data burden

The Department is also taking steps to ensure that evaluations and performance measurement avoid data duplication and meet high standards of data quality.

Internal coordination. Several initiatives for internal coordination are underway. Two key ones include:

- *Cross-office coordination of data.* In 1996, the Department established the Data Coordination Committee reporting to the Deputy Secretary with representatives from all offices. Its mission is to review data quality, burden, and duplication issues. The committee also works with key partners such as state education agencies in this process.
- *Staff reviews of performance indicators.* Under the leadership of the Deputy Secretary, the Planning and Evaluation Service, Budget Service, and National Center for Educational Statistics are working collaboratively to review program performance indicators with the responsible program offices for content, methodology, and quality of data sources.

Other federal agencies. Program offices have worked with evaluation and statistics agencies in other federal departments—for example, using Health and Human Services' Monitoring the Future survey for data useful for drug prevention, the National Science Foundation's data on minority participation in science and engineering, and Labor's National Longitudinal Study of Youth for school to work.

ED's Inspector General. The Inspector General will be conducting independent reviews of the quality and reliability of selected performance measures.

Examples of program evaluations

The Department has an active evaluation program involving several offices and coordinated by the Planning and Evaluation Service. Most current evaluations relate closely to the goals and objectives of this plan. Future ones will align even more closely and will fill in knowledge gaps where possible.

For a comprehensive list and description of evaluation, statistics, and assessment studies that support the goals and objectives of this plan, see *U.S. Department of Education's Strategic Plan: Supplementary Information on Performance Indicators and Supporting Studies*.

Program evaluations that support this plan include:

Goals 1 and 2 (K-12) Outcome Indicators

- Special analyses of data from the **National Assessment of Educational Progress** on the progress of Title I and high-poverty schools and disadvantaged students relative to the nation.
- **Analyses of annual state and local performance reports** on student results from state and local assessments.
- Assessment information through the **Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance**, supplemented with data from the **Longitudinal Survey of School Implementation of Standards-Based Reform and Title I**

Goal 1: Helping Students Achieve to Challenging Standards

- **Crosscutting Evaluation of Federal Efforts to Assist in School Reform**, which will provide baseline indicators of the planning process and early implementation of standards development and key provisions in federal programs, including awareness, problems encountered, and assistance and support from Goals 2000, Title I and other sources.
- **Targeting and Resource Allocation Study**, which will examine how federal resources from Goals 2000 and Elementary and Secondary Education Act grants are used at the school and district levels to support legislative objectives.
- **National Evaluation of School-to-Work Systems**, a five-year study, that is determining whether school-to-work is a viable long-term educational strategy that is accessible to all students.
- **Study of Local Activities under Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA)**, collecting information on local policy development, including planning, implementation, and evaluation of SDFSCA activities, including progress in achieving measurable goals and objectives and in using research-based approaches.
- **Study on School Violence and Prevention: Evaluation of Promising Programs**, which will report on disorder and violence in schools nationally, the effectiveness of promising approaches to preventing violence in schools, and distinguishing characteristics of safe schools in various locales.
- **Evaluation of Title II Professional Development**, which is examining the quality of professional development supported by the Title II Eisenhower Program, its alignment with broader reform efforts, and its impact on teachers' classroom practice.

- **Evaluation of the Charter Schools Program**, a new study planned for FY 1998, that will track the effects of federally supported charter schools on increasing school flexibility and performance accountability for meeting state content and performance standards.
- **Evaluations of federal support for technology** will examine the extent to which federal programs are promoting access and effective use of modern technology that is supportive of challenging curriculum and instruction and the potential for well-implemented technology to improve learning.

Goal 2. Build a Solid Foundation for Learning for All Children

- **Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance**, which is assessing the extent to which systemic reform can work for all children when properly implemented. It will analyze the extent to which curriculum and instruction are changing in leading reform states and the impact in Title I schools.
- **Longitudinal Survey of Schools**, a study that includes special samples of schools that serve large concentrations of limited-English proficient students, migrant students, and Native American students.
- **National Evaluation of Even Start**, which documents how these intergenerational literacy projects operate, progress and outcomes for families—including the readiness of young children for school, and promising practices that may be used for program improvement.

Goal 3. Ensure Access to Postsecondary Education and Lifelong Learning.

- **Upward Bound Evaluation**, a random assignment evaluation designed to assess the effects of Upward Bound on students' preparation for college, high school graduation, college entry and achievement.
- **College preparation studies**, a set of related research studies, focus groups, and surveys to help formulate the national campaign aimed at encouraging middle-school students and their parents to prepare for college.
- **Secondary data analyses of the effects of student aid programs** that analyze NCES and Census data to assess the targeting of aid, maintaining affordability to postsecondary education, and equalizing educational attainment across income groups.
- **Student Support Services Evaluation**, a longitudinal evaluation assessing the effects of TRIO's Student Support Services program on college retention and graduation, grades, and transfer behavior from 2-year to 4-year institutions.
- **Title III Performance Measurement Study**, a study to develop a system of performance indicators for judging the success of the Title III Strengthening Developing Institutions programs.
- **Direct Loan Evaluation**: A comprehensive evaluation of the management outcomes of the Direct Loan program—e.g., institutional, student, and parent satisfaction; operational efficiency; and Departmental support.
- **Customer satisfaction surveys**: Surveys of postsecondary institutions and students satisfaction with the operation and delivery of the student aid programs.
- **Gatekeeping studies**: A set of studies examining how various components of the gatekeeping process—e.g., accreditation, state licensure, outcome reporting, etc.—are functioning.
- **"What Works" Study for Adult English as a Second Language (ESL) Students**, a comparative evaluation of which instructional practices are most effective for adult ESL students who have low native-language literacy and a description of adult ESL at the classroom and program levels in the six States that comprise more than 75 percent of all ESL enrollments.
- **Evaluation of Effective Adult Basic Education Programs and Practices**, a study that is identifying and validating the key elements of effective programs for low-literate learners.
- **Longitudinal Study of the Vocational Rehabilitation Service Program**, an investigation of the short and long-term outcomes achieved by rehabilitation services consumers and the extent of return on the program's investment.

Development and Implementation of the Plan

Drafting the plan

The Department of Education first developed a strategic plan in 1994. That plan started the transformation of the Department into a high performance organization, and gave us experience at both developing plans and in using a plan to track implementation of key priorities. This new strategic plan builds on our first plan and incorporates information from several other key documents:

- President Clinton's Call to Action for American Education
- Secretary Riley's Seven Priorities for the Department of Education
- An update to the Department's first plan prepared by Department assistant secretaries
- Program indicator plans developed by most major programs in the Department
- Several reports by the General Accounting Office (GAO) on further management reforms needed.
- FY 1993 and 1996 employee surveys.

During the spring and summer of 1997, drafts of this plan were prepared and circulated within the Department widely. Meetings were held with the Labor-Management Partnership to receive feedback on the plan. Assistant secretaries were asked to meet with their staffs to discuss the plan, obtain ideas for changes, and also begin to discuss how the plan would be implemented by their offices. The Deputy Secretary personally reviewed the plan in detail and approved substantive changes.

Consultations

The Department consulted extensively with outside interested parties on this strategic plan, and made changes as a result of those consultations. Even where we did not make changes, we distributed the comments to appropriate offices to take into account when administering programs and new initiatives.

- **Congress.** The Department provided copies of the draft strategic plan to Congressional authorizing, appropriations, budget, and government operations committees—House and Senate, majority and minority staffs. We met with staff from the House appropriations and authorizing committees, as well as Senate authorizing and budget committee staff and with Senator Frist's staff.

In addition to comments received during the meetings, House Congressional staff provided us their "Interim Evaluation" of the Department's draft strategic plans (the "Scorecard"). We also received a letter with comments from Congressmen Bill Goodling and William Clay—chairman and ranking minority member for the House Committee on Education and the Workforce.

- **General Accounting Office (GAO).** A letter report reviewing the strategic plan provided valuable insight and helped to identify major areas for improvement.
- **Stakeholders.** The Department's stakeholders include all members of the education community—state and local governments, school districts, and postsecondary institutions. The Department mailed the draft strategic plan to over 200 key stakeholder organizations, requesting comments and suggestions for improvement. We received valuable feedback from a number of those groups.

In addition, many assistant secretaries and heads of major program offices discussed draft program-level performance indicator plans with their grantees and stakeholder groups. A few examples include:

- The assistant secretary for vocational and adult education shared the vocational education and adult education plans with state directors to get feedback and suggestions for improvement.
 - The assistant secretary for bilingual education and minority language affairs presented the draft bilingual education performance indicator plan to the annual conference of the National Association for Bilingual Education. There was a standing-room-only turnout—the field was very interested in the indicator plan—and a positive response overall.
 - The assistant secretary for postsecondary education has shared and discussed the set of postsecondary student financial aid indicator plans at regular meetings with key stakeholders.
- **ED Internet home page.** The Department's world wide web pages include the entire strategic plan in HTML and .PDF formats and offers the opportunity to comment electronically to Strategic_Plan@ed.gov or by letter. The Department received several comments from members of the public.
 - **Other Federal agencies.** The Department consulted with relevant federal agencies on our respective strategic plans, including the Departments of Health and Human Services, Labor, and Treasury; the National Science Foundation; the Social Security Administration; and the Office of National Drug Control Policy.
 - **Office of Management and Budget.** The Department held meetings and discussions with OMB staff and provided drafts for OMB review.
 - **Council for Excellence in Government.** The Department of Education was one of several agencies selected by the Council for review.

Next steps: communication, alignment, and implementation

Communication. Once completed, the Department's plan will be given to all employees in hard copy, as well as featured on the ED website (<http://www.ed.gov/pubs/>). We will also send it to chief state school officers and national associations that work with us on educational reform and improvement. The Deputy Secretary will hold sessions with individual offices to discuss how the plan affects their programs and services, as well as work with the Department's Labor-Management Partnership Council to ensure that every employee understands how their work contributes to achieving the plan's goals and objectives.

Alignment. During fall 1997, and as needed thereafter, alignment of key documents with the strategic plan will occur. These documents include our annual plan (individual program performance plans for more than 90 activities in the agency), budget justifications, and implementation plans for the Department's seven priority initiatives (cross-cutting plans that involve leadership and program activities).

Implementation. Reporting on progress and barriers to progress will start immediately with the publication of this plan. "Objective leaders"—senior officers responsible for the individual objectives—will report to the Deputy Secretary and senior officers periodically. Also, staff and program offices will work jointly on reviewing progress under the individual program performance plans, which represent major activities and resources for accomplishing the plan's goals. We plan to put up performance indicator reports on the ED website, with periodic updates, for use internally and by outside interested parties as well. Finally, we will implement analytic agendas for strategic plan objectives reflecting the seven priority initiatives to improve the information base in those areas.

Appendix A: Department of Education's Customer Service Standards

U.S. Department of Education's Customer Service Standards

(Issued June 1996)

If you contact us with an inquiry about the Department of Education or ask for other information:

- We will answer your written inquiry within 15 working days.
- If you telephone us, you will speak to a knowledgeable person who will answer your question or refer it properly. You will receive no more than two referrals.
- We will answer phone calls promptly, within three rings, and return all voice-mail messages within 48 hours.
- We will respond to your e-mail messages within 48 hours.
- If you have a personal appointment with a Department Employee, you will not be kept waiting.

If you request one of our publications or documents:

- Requests for single copies of publications by telephone will be sent within 48 hours.
- Request for single copies by mail and all bulk orders will be filled within 72 hours.
- Publications and documents will be made available in alternative formats on request.
- We will give you the option to receive information in electronic form where possible.

If you contact us about a complaint:

- We will respond to written complaints within 15 working days.
- If you telephone us with a complaint, we will advise you on the telephone or refer your complaint to the proper source.

If you are a prospective grant applicant or existing grantee, or if you are a prospective or current recipient of student of student financial assistance:

- We will disseminate timely and accurate information on grant opportunities and provide clear guidelines for grant proposals and criteria for selection.
 - We will disseminate timely and accurate information on student financial aid application procedures and program provisions.
 - We will acknowledge receipt of requests for administrative actions and other inquiries within 48 hours.
 - Final response on administrative actions will be completed in 30 calendar days.
 - Grant award documents will clearly identify which requests should be referred to the grant specialist or program specialist and which grantee actions do not require approval.
 - We will provide timely, accurate, and dependable technical assistance.
 - We will provide information that explains the final funding decision.
 - We will institute sensible reporting requirements and, when conducting monitoring and site visits, perform exit interviews and make final monitoring reports available within 30 days.
-
-

Supplementary Information on Performance Indicators and Evaluations and Other Studies

**U.S. Department of Education
Strategic Plan, 1998-2002**

August 1997

Contents

Introduction	3
Acronyms	4
 Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources	 5
Goals 1 and 2: K-12 key outcome indicators	5
Goal 1. Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.	7
Goal 2. Build a solid foundation for learning for all students.	14
Goal 3. Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning.	18
Goal 4. Make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.	23
 Evaluations and Other Studies	 29
Elementary and Secondary Education Program Evaluations	29
Postsecondary, Vocational, School-to-Work, and Adult Program Evaluations	31
National Statistics and Assessment Studies	36
Grantee Reporting Systems	42
Other Surveys and Studies	43

Introduction

The U.S. Department of Education has developed a strategic plan for 1998-2002 that complies with the Government Performance and Results Act, including goals, objectives, strategies, and information on relevant program evaluations. In addition, the Department has included in its plan performance indicators, to provide feedback on progress towards the goals and to hold the agency accountable for performance. This document includes two tables providing detailed information on indicators and data sources in the Department's strategic plan.

Performance Indicators. The first table lists all indicators in the order they are in the strategic plan; provides examples of baseline data—or, if not available, then available related data that may inform the issue; and gives the intended data sources. The Department will work during the next year to set up new data collections or redirect current ones to provide data for all indicators in the plan.

Evaluations and Other Studies. The Department has an active evaluation program, national statistics and assessment studies, and grantee/institution information systems to provide information supporting the strategic plan. Our studies and surveys provide information on student progress, education system improvement, the effects of specific programs and initiatives, and even the management of the Department. We also use data from studies and surveys by other agencies where available.

The second table describes the key studies that will inform the implementation of goals and objectives in the strategic plan. The table includes the study's title, what agency sponsors it and who carries it out, the sample population, the nature of the data collected, and when the data are or will be collected. It is grouped by evaluations, statistics and national assessment studies, grantee performance systems, and other studies. Within each section, studies are listed alphabetically by title.

Acronyms

**For offices in the U.S. Department of Education
used in these tables.**

ED	Department of Education
PES	Planning and Evaluation Service
NCES	National Center for Education Statistics
OERI	Office of Educational Research and Improvement
OESE	Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
OVAE	Office of Vocational and Adult Education
OPE	Office of Postsecondary Education
OSERS	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
Goals 1 and 2: K-12 key outcome indicators			
Goal 1. Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment. Goal 2. Build a solid foundation for learning for all students.	1. The number of students with access to high quality education increases each year.	Baseline under development.	Data source to be determined.
	2. Increasing percentages of all students will meet or exceed basic, proficient, and advanced performance levels in reading, math and other core subjects on such measures as the National Assessment of Educational Progress and state assessments aligned with challenging standards.	60% of 4th graders, 70% of 8th graders, and 75% of 12th graders scored at or above the basic level in reading in 1994 (National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1994). 64% of 4th graders, 62% of 8th graders, and 69% of 12th graders scored at or above the basic level in mathematics in 1996 (NAEP, 1996).	- NCES: National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Reading, biennially, 1996 - NAEP Math, biennially, 1998 - State Assessments, annually
	3. Students in high-poverty schools will show continuous improvement in reaching proficiency levels comparable to that for the nation.	32% of 4th graders from families with low educational attainment scored at least at the basic proficiency level in reading compared to 70% of children with college-graduate parents. (NAEP, 1994). 39 % of low-income 8th graders scored at least basic proficiency in mathematics compared to 71% of other 8th graders (NAEP, 1996).	- NAEP Reading, biennially, 1996 - NAEP Math, biennially, 1998
	4. High school attendance and graduation will increase, particularly in high-poverty schools and among students with disabilities and others at risk of school failure.	Children from poor families were three times more likely to drop out of high school than other children (Dropout Rates in the United States, 1993).	- U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, annually - NCES: Common Core of Data surveys, annually - NCES: Analysis of National Education Longitudinal Study Data and Beginning Postsecondary Students Study Data, 1998

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources
U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	5. The percentage of high school graduates, including vocational concentrators, who complete at least three years of science and three years of math will increase 10 percent between 1996 and 2000.	<i>In 1994, 51 percent of all high school graduates took at least three years of science and three years of math. (Condition of Education, 1996)</i> <i>Baseline data for 1996 high school graduates in School to Work systems is currently being collected.</i>	NCES: High School Transcripts Study: Changes in math-science course-taking to be measured from transcripts collected for high school graduates, 1998
	6. Increasing numbers of high school students will complete advanced placement courses each year.	<i>83 out of 1,000 11th and 12th grade students in 1996 received passing scores on Advanced Placement (AP) exams (The College Board—AP, 1996).</i>	The College Board—AP, annually
	7. Students in high-poverty schools served by federal programs will show comparable increases in completion of challenging course work—including advanced placement courses—that will enable them to pursue higher education or other options.	<i>Baseline under development.</i>	National Longitudinal Study of Youth, 1998-2000
	8. High school graduates successfully transition into employment, further education, or the military.	<i>Baseline under development.</i>	Data source to be determined.

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
Goal 1. Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.			
1.1 States develop challenging standards and assessments for all students in the core academic subjects.	9. By 1998, all states have challenging content and performance standards in place for two or more core subjects.	33 states report content standards in 2 or more core subjects. (CCSSO, 1996) 22 states report performance standards in 2 or more core subjects. (CCSSO, 1996) 29 states have been assessed by the AFT as having standards in at least 3 core subjects that are clear, specific and well-grounded in content. (American Federation of Teachers, 1997) - An independent, expert panel found that math and/or science curriculum frameworks documents from six states (out of nine states reviewed) had many high quality characteristics, including reflecting the influence of the national standards.	- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), annual, 1997-2002 - Goals 2000 Annual Reports, 1997-2002 - Baseline State Survey, Planning and Evaluation Service, 1997 - American Federation of Teachers, 1997 - Eisenhower State Curriculum Frameworks Evaluation, Planning and Evaluation Service, 1997
	10. By 2001, all states have assessments aligned to challenging content and performance standards for two or more core subjects.	23 states report assessments aligned with content standards, curriculum frameworks, or state goals. (CCSSO, 1996) - Analysis of state assessment results against National Assessment of Educational Progress state results reveals wide discrepancy in how proficiency is defined by several states (Southern Regional Education Board, 1996).	- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), annual, 1997-2002 - NAEP/State analysis, Planning and Evaluation Service, 1997
	11. By 2002, most of the general public and parents are aware of the importance of challenging academic standards for all children, including at least the majority of parents from low-income families.	82% of the general public supports setting up clear guidelines for what students should learn and teachers should teach in every major subject. (Public opinion poll, 1994 & 1996) 61% of Americans say academic standards are too low in their own local schools. (Public opinion poll, 1996) 33% of public supports raising academic standards much higher, 42% say somewhat higher. (Public opinion poll, 1996)	Public opinion polls dependent on private funding, unless Department supports.

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
1.2 Every state has a school-to-work (STW) system that increases student achievement and broadens career opportunities.	12. High school graduates from school-to-work systems or from vocational concentrations successfully transition into employment, further education, or the military.	• <i>Baseline under development</i>	• Data source to be determined.
	13. Employers are highly satisfied with the productivity and work-readiness skills of graduates from school-to-work systems or vocational concentrations.	• <i>Baseline under development.</i>	• Data source to be determined.
	14. By fall 2000, the percentage of vocational concentrators passing industry-recognized tests on technical skills increases at least 10%.	• <i>Baseline under development.</i>	• Data source to be determined.
	15. Two million youth will be engaged actively in school-to-work systems by 2000.	• <i>One million high school youth participated in 1996 (STW Progress Measures, June 1996)</i>	• STW progress measures for 1997-2000
	16. An increasing percentage of secondary schools will provide opportunities for students to achieve industry-recognized skill standards.	• <i>Baseline under development.</i>	• Data source to be determined.
	17. Thirty percent of high schools will have the key school-to-work system components in place by 2000.	• <i>59 percent of participating high schools had classes in which academic and work related curriculum are integrated. (STW Progress Measures, June 1996)</i> • <i>51 percent of high schools in participating local partnerships had classes in which work-based learning was connected to school curriculum. (STW Progress Measures, June 1996)</i>	• STW progress measures, collected annually.
	18. All youths with disabilities age 14 and older will have IEPs with statements of transition service needs that focus on courses of study in an advanced placement or vocational education program.	• <i>Baseline under development.</i>	• Data source to be determined.

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
1.3 Schools are strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free.	19. Recent increasing rates of alcohol and drug use (alcohol, marijuana, tobacco) among school-aged children will slow and begin to fall by 2000.	- Annual use of marijuana: 8th grade, 7%; 10th grade, 15%; 12th grade, 22% (<i>Monitoring the Future</i>, 1992). - Annual use of alcohol: 45%, 8th grade; 63%, 10th grade; 73%, 12th grade (<i>Monitoring the Future</i>, 1993).	Monitoring the Future, annual
	20. Rates of alcohol and drug use in schools will slow and begin to fall by 2000	- Use of marijuana in school, past year: 8th grade, 3%; 10th grade, 5%; 12th grade, 5%; (<i>Monitoring the Future</i>, 1992). - Use of alcohol in school, past year: 8th grade, 4%; 10th grade, 7%; 12th grade, 7%; (<i>Monitoring the Future</i>, 1992). - Use of cigarettes or chewing tobacco in school, past 30 days: 8th grade, 7%; 10th grade, 13%; 12th grade, 14%; (<i>Monitoring the Future</i>, 1992).	Monitoring the Future, annual
	21. The number of criminal and violent incidents in schools by students will show continuous decreases between now and 2002.	12th graders injured with a weapon: 5% (<i>Monitoring the Future</i>, 1993). 12th graders who had something stolen: 41% (<i>Monitoring the Future</i>, 1993).	- National Crime Victimization Survey, 1999, triennial - Monitoring the Future, annual - Fast Response Survey, 1997
	22. The percentage of students reporting tolerant attitudes toward drug and alcohol use will decline significantly between now and 2002.	- Disapprove of trying marijuana: 8th grade, 82%; 10th grade, 75%; 12th grade, 70% (<i>Monitoring the Future</i>, 1992). - Disapprove of trying alcohol: 8th grade, 52%; 10th grade, 40%; 12th grade, 33% (<i>Monitoring the Future</i>, 1992).	Monitoring the Future, annual
	23. By 1999, all local education agencies participating in the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program will use prevention programs that are based on the Department's principles of effectiveness.	Widespread use of programs that research has not shown to be effective.	Survey, to be developed by the Planning and Evaluation Service, 1998
	24. By 1999, all states will conduct periodic statewide surveys or collect statewide data on alcohol and drug use of students and incidents of crime and violence in schools.	In 1995, 24 states and territories that participated in the Youth Risk Behavior Survey had data representative for the state. (<i>ED/Safe and Drug Free Schools Act Survey</i>, 1997)	ED/Safe and Drug Free Schools Act Performance Report, annual

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	25. The percentage of teachers who are trained to address discipline problems in the classroom will increase significantly by 2000.	No existing data.	
1.4 A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America.	26. Throughout the nation the percentage of secondary school teachers who have at least a minor in the subject they teach increases annually.	23% of teachers do not have at least a minor in their main teaching field. (Schools and Staffing Survey, 1990-91).	Schools and Staffing Surveys, 1999-2000
	27. The number of nationally board certified teachers increases continually to 105,000 by 2006.	Approximately 575 teachers were nationally-board certified, as of spring 1997. (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1997)	National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, annually
	28. The percentage of teachers and principals across the nation who rate other teachers as very effective increases annually.	Baseline under development.	Data source to be determined.
	29. By 2002, 75 percent of states will raise initial teacher certification standards to align with high content and student performance standards.	Data show that 9.3% of new teachers who have taught for less than one year leave teaching; 6.4% of new teachers who have taught for one full year leave teaching; 9.1% of new teachers who have taught for two years leave teaching; and 7.8% of new teachers who have taught for 3 years leave teaching. (Teacher Follow-up Survey, 1994-95, of the Schools and Staffing Survey, 1999-2000).	Surveys by national organizations such as the Council of Chief State School Officers— State Policies and Practices Survey, every 2 years, next in January, 1998; American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
	30. The percentage of qualified new teachers who leave the profession within the first 3 years continuously decreases.	30% of all new teachers currently leave the profession within the first three years.	Teacher Follow Up Survey from Schools and Staffing Surveys (1999-2000)

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
1.5 Families and communities are fully involved with schools and education.	31. The percentage of students who come to school prepared for learning and having completed their homework will increase substantially over the next five years, especially among children from low-income families.	79% of parents of K-6 students indicated they check their child has completed homework every day or almost every day (IEL/Marttila & Kiley, <i>A Study of Attitudes Among the Parents of Primary-School Children</i>, 1995). - Teachers indicate that 12% of their Chapter 1 students and 7% of their non-Chapter 1 students have absenteeism problems. Teachers indicate that 15% of their Chapter 1 students and 9% of their non-Chapter 1 students get inadequate rest. Teachers indicate that 21% of their Chapter 1 students and 17% of their non-Chapter 1 students have hygiene problems. (Prospects Interim Report, 1993)	- Follow-up Survey of Schools, 1997 - Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1998 - National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998.
	32. The percentage of young children who read regularly at home with their parents and on their own (at least 15 minutes a day, five days a week) will increase to 90% by 2002.	52% of parents of K-6 students indicate they read to or with their child almost every day (NHES 1993, 1995, in 1995 Goals Report). 72% of parents whose children are ages 3-5 indicate they read to their children or tell them stories regularly (IEL/Marttila & Kiley, <i>A Study of Attitudes Among the Parents of Primary-School Children</i>, 1995).	National Household Education Survey, 1999.
	33. The percentage of parents who meet with teachers about their children's learning will show continuous improvement, reaching 90% by 2002.	71% of parents reported that they went to a regularly scheduled parent-teacher conference or meeting (National Household Education Survey, 1996). 92% of schools surveyed reported that they held parent-teacher conferences. 57% of those schools reported that most or all parents attended (Fast Response Survey System, 1996).	National Household Education Survey, 1999.

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources
U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	34. The percentage of parents who say that the school actively encourages and facilitates family involvement by respecting, welcoming, and responding to parents' concerns and interests and by involving them in decisions regarding their children will show continuous improvement.	- Percentage of parents who agreed with the statement: "I am respected by the teachers and principals.": 39% of 1st grade parents 34% of 4th grade parents 23% of 8th grade parents (Prospects analysis by Abt Associates, 1995, as cited in the 1995 Goals Report). - Percentage of schools reporting that parent input is considered to a moderate or great extent in making decisions on school issues: Allocation of funds, 39%; Curriculum or overall instructional programs, 47%; Discipline policies and procedures, 50%; Monitoring and evaluating teachers, 5%. (Fast Response Survey System—Survey on Family and Schools Partner-ships in Public Schools, K-8, 1996).	Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1998
	35. By 2002, the number of children participating in after-school programs doubles, from 1.7 million to 3.4 million children.	1.7 million children (1996)	Data source to be determined.
1.6 Public school students and parents have more choice of schools.	36. By 2002, 25 percent of all public school students in grades 3-12 will attend a school that they or their parents chose.	12% (1993)	National Household Education Survey; 1999
	37. By 2000, a minimum of 40 states will have charter school legislation.	11 states (1994) 26 states (1996) 29 states (August, 1997)	Program files; annually
	38. By 2002, there will be 3,000 charter schools in operation around the nation.	64 charter schools (1994-95) 428 charter schools (January 1997)	Program files; annually
	39. By 2002, there will be 6,000 magnet schools in operation around the nation.	4,125 (1997)	Magnet Schools of America Annual Directory; annually

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	40. School districts will increasingly make choice available to their students through magnet schools, charter schools, and open enrollment policies.	34% (1993-94)	Schools and Staffing Survey; 1999-00
1.7 Schools use advanced technology for all students and teachers to improve education.	41. The ratio of students per modern multimedia computer will improve to 5:1 by 2000.	35:1 (1996 Q.E.D., Inc.).	Advanced Telecommunications and U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey, annual data elements 1997-2002.
	42. The percentage of public school instructional rooms connected to the Information Superhighway will increase from 14 % in 1996 to 25 % in 1998, and higher percentages thereafter.	14 percent in 1996: (Advanced Telecommunications in U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey).	Advanced Telecommunications and U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey, annual data elements 1997-2002.
	43. At least 50 percent of teachers will integrate high-quality educational technology, high-quality software, and the Information Superhighway into their school curriculum for effective support of student learning by 2001.	20% of teachers in 1996 use advanced telecommunications for teaching (Advanced Telecommunications in U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey)	- Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998, 1999. - State annual report cards (voluntary)
	44. At least 60 percent of teachers, school administrators, and school librarians will receive professional development that enables them to effectively use modern multimedia computers and the Information Superhighway to help students learn by 2001.	Training in advanced telecommunications mandated by school, district or teacher certification agency for 13% of teachers and 31% encouraged by incentives in 1996 (Advanced Telecommunications in US Public Elementary and Secondary Schools)	- Advanced Telecommunications in U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey, annual data elements 1997-2002. - Evaluation of Technology Literacy Challenge Fund 1997 - Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998, 1999. - State annual report cards (voluntary)

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources
U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	45. Students in high-poverty schools and students with disabilities will have access to advanced technology (including assistive technology for students with disabilities) that is comparable to that in other schools by the year 2001.	- Internet access by 53% of high poverty schools, compared to 78% in low poverty schools :1996 (Advanced Telecommunications in U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey) - Disability data pending receipt of data from the Office of Research and Improvement (OERI)	- Advanced Telecommunications in U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey, annual data elements 1997-2002. - Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998, 1999
Goal 2. Build a solid foundation for learning for all students.			
2.1 All children enter school ready to learn.	1. Kindergarten and first grade teachers increasingly report that their students enter school with readiness skills for reading and math.	Baseline under development.	- Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, 1999 - Propose new cohort for 2003, working with NCES and ACYF
	2. The disparity in preschool participation rates between children from high- income families and children from low-income families declines continuously year by year.	28% (National Household Education Survey, 1991) 25% (Current Population Survey, 1995)	- National Household Education Survey, 1999 - Current Population Survey, annual
	3. The percentage of 0- to 5-year-olds whose parents read to them or tell them stories regularly increases.	66% of 3- to 5-year-olds' parents read to them or tell them stories regularly (National Household Education Survey, 1993)	- National Household Education Survey, 1999 - Child Development Supplement to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, 1998
2.2 Every child reads independently by the end of the third grade.	4. All students achieve to the basic level in reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) by 2002.	60% of 4th graders scored at or above the basic level in reading (National Assessment of Educational Progress—NAEP, 1994).	NCES: NAEP, biennially, 1996
	5. Increasing percentages of fourth graders will meet proficient and advanced levels in reading on NAEP.	60% of 4th graders scored at or above the basic level in reading (National Assessment of Educational Progress—NAEP, 1994).	NAEP, biennially, 1996
	6. At least 20 states implement the national reading test by 1999; all states implement the national reading test by 2002.	5 states, the Department of Defense Schools, and 15 urban school districts have signed up to implement the national voluntary test (Department of Education records, 1997).	Department of Education records, 1997-2002

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	7. By 2001, the America Reads Challenge corps prepares tutors for 3 million children, including at least 100,000 college work-study annually.	Baseline under development	America Reads program files, annually
	8. Increasing percentages of teachers of kindergarten through third grade complete intensive professional development to enable them to skillfully teach reading.	Baseline under development	- Planning and Evaluation Service: Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998 - NCES: Schools and Staffing Surveys, 1999-2000
2.3 By the end of the eighth grade, every student will master challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry.	9. More eighth graders reach the basic level or higher levels of proficiency in math on the National Assessment of Educational Progress: at least 60% will score at the international median by 2002; at least 15% will be in the top 10% internationally by 2002.	61% of students scored at or above the basic level in 1996; 56% in 1992; and 51% in 1990. (National Assessment of Educational Progress—NAEP, 1996)	- NAEP, biennial, 1998 - National Voluntary test, 1999
	10. At least 20 states implement the national math test by 1999; all states by 2002.	5 states, the Department of Defense Schools, and 15 urban school districts have signed up to implement the national voluntary test (Department of Education records, 1997).	Department records, 1997-2002
	11. Each year, more new teachers enter the workforce with adequate preparation to teach challenging mathematics to students in kindergarten through eighth grade	The average number of undergraduate mathematics courses K-8 teachers took was 3 (Schools and Staffing Surveys, 1993-94).	- NCES: Schools and Staffing Surveys, 1999-2000 - NCES: Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study - States' pass rates on rigorous licensing exams, 1997-2002
	12. Each year, more teachers in grades 5-8 complete intensive professional development to enable them to teach challenging mathematics.	Baseline under development.	- Planning and Evaluation Service: Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998 - NCES: Schools and Staffing Surveys, 1999-2000

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources
U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	13. By 1998, schools have access to and use information on best practices for math instruction.	67% of all teachers reported using curricula aligned with high standards in math. (Baseline Survey of Schools, 1996) 82% of all teachers reported using instructional strategies (i.e., hands-on activities, cooperative learning) aligned with high standards in math. (Baseline Survey of Schools, 1996) 22% of all teachers reported using innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction in math. (Baseline Survey of Schools, 1996)	- Planning and Evaluation Service: Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1997-99 - Planning and Evaluation Service: Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998 - Office of Education Research and Improvement: Percent of textbooks and instructional materials that independent experts consider exemplary and align with high standards, 1998
2.4 Special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards.	14. States will implement appropriate procedures for assessing and reporting progress towards achieving to high standards by students who have disabilities, are limited English proficient, or are children of migrant workers, by 2001.	State assessment staff report that 24 states include LEP students in testing for Title I, and 17 include students with disabilities. (ED State Implementation Survey, 1997)	- Follow-up ED State Implementation Survey, 1999 - Title I Performance Reports, 1998-2002
	15. The number of schools using comprehensive, research-based approaches to improve curriculum and instruction and support services for at-risk students annually increases.	Baseline under development	- Follow-up Survey of Schools, 1997 - Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998-1999

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources
U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	16. Administrators and educators working with at-risk children will have access to and use high-quality information and technical assistance on effective practices provided by Department- sponsored technical assistance and research centers as well as through professional associations and publications.	- State officials identify oral and written federal sources of information and assistance, as well as professional associations and publications as most helpful. Districts rely most heavily on state sources, professional associations, and education publications. (Baseline surveys in "Reports on Reform from the Field," June 1997). - Principals rely most often on institutes or workshops, other principals, LEAs, and state- or district-sponsored conferences for information and technical assistance. Direct support to schools from the U.S. Department of Education was uncommon (Public School Survey on Education Reform, 1997).	- Cross-cutting District Survey and Case Studies, 1998 - Follow-up State Survey, 1999; Follow-up Survey of Schools, 1997 - Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998-1999
	17. Bilingual education and special education resources focus on improving the skills of school staff working with special populations.	Baseline under development.	Data source to be determined.
	18. Federal technical assistance and other support to states will result in annual increases in the number of states and local school districts with the capacity to disaggregate and report out assessment data aligned with standards for at-risk students.	12 states report data disaggregated by economic disadvantage, 16 by race/ethnicity, and 1 by migrant status. (State Accountability Reports, 1997) 12 states report fully implementing disaggregated reporting procedures (ED State Implementation Survey, 1997).	- Crosscutting Survey of Local Districts, 1998 - Follow-up State Survey, 1999

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
Goal 3. Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning.			
3.1 Secondary school students get the information and support they need to prepare successfully for postsecondary education.	1. Postsecondary education enrollment rates will increase each year for all students while the gap between low- and high-income and minority and non-minority high school graduates will decrease each year.	- High income students enrolled in college at a rate that was 49 percentage points higher than the rate for low-income students. (Analysis of Current Population Survey, 1995) - White students enrolled in college at a rate that was 13 percentage points higher than the rate for black students and 11 percentage points higher than Hispanic students. (Analysis of Current Population Survey, 1995)	Current Population Survey, annual.
	2. A majority of students age 12 through high school and their parents will have an accurate assessment of the cost of attending college and the aid available for college, by the year 2000.	- In 1996, the general public overestimated postsecondary tuition by \$2,330 in two-year public colleges, \$3,148 in four-year public universities, and \$4,990 in four-year private universities. (American Council on Education survey, 1996) - In 1988, 11.4% of parents of 8th graders agreed with the statement, "I do not see anyway of getting enough money for my 8th grader to go to college" and 16.5% had not thought about college costs. (Analysis of data from the 1988 National Education Longitudinal Survey)	- A survey of middle school parents will be conducted in 1997. - No determination has yet been made regarding how data will be collected from students.
	3. The percentage of students from age 12 through high school who are aware of the academic requirements for college or postsecondary vocational enrollment will increase.	Baseline under development.	No determination has yet been made regarding how data will be collected from students.

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	4. By October 2000, there will be a single point of contact that allows students to get information on federal student aid, apply for aid, and have their eligibility for aid determined within four days of electronic application.	Current processing of electronic applications is approximately 8 days. (OPE program data, 1997)	OPE program data.
3.2 Postsecondary students receive the financial aid and support services they need to enroll in and complete their educational program.	5. Unmet need (the percent of a student's total cost of education that is not met by student and family contribution and all sources of financial aid), a measure of opportunity or access to postsecondary education, will show decreases over time, especially for low-income students.	In 1992-93, percent of unmet need was 30% for all students ranging from 54% for low-income independent students to 4% for upper-income dependent students. (Analysis of data from the 1992-93 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study)	National Postsecondary Student Aid Study, 1997 and 2001.
	6. The percentage of borrowers with student loan debt repayments exceeding 10% of their income will remain stable or decline over time.	Among 1992-93 bachelor's degree recipients making loan payments, 31% had required payments that were 10% or more of their income. (Analysis of data from the 1994 Baccalaureate and Beyond study)	Baccalaureate and Beyond Study, 2001.
	7. Graduation rates for all students in four-year and two-year colleges will improve while the gap in completion rates between low- and high-income and minority and non-minority students will decrease.	- Among students in the lowest income quartile entering college in 1990, 34% had graduated by 1994 compared to 57% of students in the highest income quartile. (Analysis of data from the 1994 Beginning Postsecondary Student study) - Among white students entering college in 1990, 51% had graduated by 1994 compared to 42% of black students and 45% of Hispanic students (Analysis of data from the 1994 Beginning Postsecondary Student study)	Beginning Postsecondary Student study, 1998 and 2001.

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources
U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	8. Participants receiving support services through the TRIO programs enroll in and complete postsecondary programs at rates higher than comparable non-participants.	- For low-income, first-generation college students participating in the Student Support Services program, 61 percent who began at two-year schools and 80 percent who began at four-year schools were still enrolled in college in the third year. (Student Support Services Evaluation, 1997) - Compared to a control group, 1992 Upward Bound participants earned about one credit (Carnegie unit) more than nonparticipants. Participants earned more credits than non-participants in science, math, English, foreign languages and social studies. (Upward Bound Evaluation, 1997)	- Upward Bound evaluation, 1997 - Student Support Services evaluation, 1999
3.3 Postsecondary student aid delivery and program management is efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive.	9. Customer satisfaction ratings among students, parents, and postsecondary institutions participating in the student aid programs will increase to 90% by the year 2000.	- In 1995-96, 79% of postsecondary institutions and 84% of borrowers participating in the FFEL program and 83% of postsecondary institutions and 85% of borrowers participating in the Direct Loan program indicated overall satisfaction with their loan program. (Direct Loan Evaluation, 1997) - In addition, 73% of postsecondary institutions indicated that overall they were pleased with the assistance they received from ED in managing and administering the student aid programs. (Higher Education Survey #20, 1996)	- Direct Loan Evaluation, 1997 and 1998. - Customer Satisfaction Surveys, annual beginning in 1997.
	10. The annual number of students and families submitting or renewing their federal student aid applications electronically will continue to increase each year, almost doubling to 3 million by October 2000.	In the 1996-97 award year, 1.7 million applications were filed electronically. (OPE program data, 1997)	OPE program data.

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources
U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	11. The accuracy and integrity of data supplied by applicants, institutions, lenders, and guaranty agencies will show continuous yearly improvements.	Baseline under development.	Analysis of NSLDS and other systems data.
	12. Evaluation of contracts for major OPE financial aid systems will indicate that better than fully successful performance, including quality, cost control, and timeliness, is being received by the government and the taxpayer.	Baseline under development.	Contract performance and monitoring reports are being developed which would be completed monthly for all major contracts.
	13. There will be no material internal weaknesses identified in the student aid programs' portions of ED's department-wide financial statement audit, and there will be no issues related to the student aid programs that prevent ED from receiving an unqualified opinion on the financial statements.	No material weaknesses were identified in the Pell Grant, Campus-Based, and Direct Loan program portions of ED's 1995 department-wide financial statement audit. Three material internal control weaknesses were cited in the FFEL portion of the audit. (Financial audit, 1995)	Financial Statement Audits, annual.
	14. The percentage of postsecondary institutions found to be in substantial compliance with federal requirements will increase each year.	Baseline under development.	OPE/Institutional Participation and Oversight Service data, annual.
	15. The annual recovery rate on defaulted student loans will increase.	The recovery rate—the amount collected in a given year divided by the total amount of defaulted loans available for collection—is estimated to be 7% in 1997. (OPE program data, 1997) (The recovery rate appears low because it divides an annual number by a cumulative one. Eventually, ED will collect 60% of the principal and interest owed on defaulted loans.)	OPE/Debt Collection Service data, annual.

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources
U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	16. The cohort default rates--the percentage of borrowers leaving school who default within two years--for the Federal Family Education Loan and the Direct Loan Program will decline to a level of 10% or less.	For borrowers entering repayment in FY 1990 - 1994, default rates were 22.4%, 17.8%, 15.0%, 11.6%, and 10.7 respectively, dropping by more than 52% over the five year period. (OPE program data, FY 1990-94)	OPE data, annual.
3.4 Adults can strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime through lifelong learning.	17. The percentage of individuals obtaining competitive employment who maintain employment and earnings 24 months after completion of vocational rehabilitation will increase significantly by 2002.	- Baseline to be determined using the long-term follow up methodology currently being developed as a part of the Section 106 Standards and Indicators. - Baseline also from Vocational Rehabilitation Longitudinal Study, 1998	- Data to be collected periodically using methodology developed for the Section 106 Standards and Indicators - Vocational Rehabilitation Longitudinal Study, 1998
	18. In vocational rehabilitation, the percentage of all persons exiting the vocational rehabilitation system after receiving services who obtain competitive employment will increase each year.	61 percent (Rehabilitation Services Administration State Data, 1996)	Rehabilitation Services Administration state data, annual collection.
	19. By 2002, the literacy skills of American adults will improve as shown by significantly fewer adults performing at the lowest proficiency level.	Between 40 and 44 million adults performed in the lowest of five proficiency levels. (1992, NALS)	NALS II, 2004
	20. Increasing percentages of adults enrolled in beginning adult basic education programs and English as a second language programs will achieve proficiency in basic skills as measured by standardized tests.	Baseline under development.	- Adult Education Management Information System and its successor, a new national data reporting system. Annual collection. - Evaluation of adult education programs.

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources
U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
Goal 4. Make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.			
4.1 Our customers receive fast, seamless service and dissemination of high-quality information and products.	1. By 2000, customers, internal and external, agree that ED products, services, and information, including those on the Department's web site, are of high quality, timely, and accessible.	On a scale of 1-5, customers rated the World Wide Web site on: timeliness, 4.25; ease of finding information, 3.85; overall usefulness, 4.07. (World Wide Web customer survey, 1997)	World Wide Web customer survey, ongoing
	2. Department employees and front-line service centers meet or exceed established customer service standards by 1999.	71% of customers were completely or somewhat satisfied with telephone service. (Phone survey, 1996) [Additional data on phone service and control correspondence available.]	- Phone survey follow up, 1997 - Control correspondence survey follow up, 1997 - Additional surveys of customer service standards being planned
	3. Quarterly evaluation reports for the "One-Pubs" system, based on quality assurance surveillance, indicate that high standards of performance are achieved for dissemination of ED's information products by 1999.	78% of publications were received within 8 days of request; 22% of publications were never received. (Phone survey, 1996)	Publications contractor surveillance plan, monthly reports beginning 1998
4.2 Our partners have the support and flexibility they need without diminishing accountability for results.	4. States and school districts rate the Department's technical assistance, including assistance from the integrated reviews, as very useful in improving their performance.	- States rate oral and written information as most helpful; the comprehensive centers are considered the least helpful form of technical assistance by state administrators of federal programs. (Baseline surveys in "Reports on Reform from the Field," June 1997) - Districts rely more upon 'other' sources of information and states than the federal government for assistance. (Baseline surveys in "Reports on Reform from the Field," June 1997) [Will include data on integrated reviews from state survey.]	- Follow-up State Survey, 1999 - Cross-cutting District Survey and Case Studies, 1998
	5. By 2002, the number of separate ED programs will decline significantly from the current 197 in FY 1997.	95 programs (Department records, 1997)	Review of Department records, annual, 1998-2002

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	6. Customers increasingly report that they have greater flexibility and better understanding of ED rules.	Baseline under development.	- Regulatory Reinvention Initiative reports - Focus groups with customers affected by regulations - Recommendations and feedback from customers
	7. New discretionary grants processed using the re-engineered grant-making process are awarded each year on a timely basis.	Percent of total new grants planned that were awarded on time. (<i>Grants and Contracts Management System, 1996</i>)	- Grants and Contracts Management System, 1997 - Education Central Automated Processing System, Grant Application and Payment System, 1998-2002
	8. Reports from program monitoring teams and audit reports under the Single Audit Act show a reduction in significant recurring findings.	Baseline under development. (<i>Audit reports from a random sampling of states, 1996</i>)	Audit reports from tracking the same states sampled, annual, 1997-2000
	9. The number of states participating in the Cooperative Audit Resolution and Oversight Initiative (CAROI) increases to meet the needs of our partners.	- Common Audit Resolution System — 1995: 0 states — 1996: 3 states — 1997: 10 states	Common Audit Resolution System, 1997-2002
4.3 An up-to-date knowledge base is available from education research to support education reform and equity.	10. Peer reviews show that education research and statistics supported by the Department are of high quality, are focused on critical education reform issues, and contribute significantly to educational improvement.	Baseline under development.	Data source to be determined.
	11. Education research meets the needs of our partners (e.g., states, schools, institutions of higher education) and our customers (teachers, parents, students, business) for reliable information on how to make schools more effective.	- Evaluation of the Eisenhower Regional Consortia Customer Survey, 1996 - NCES Annual Customer Survey, 1996 - Centers Final Report, 1996	- Customer surveys of key customers and stakeholders - Longitudinal Evaluation of Schools, 1999 - Specific customer surveys for ERIC, the Centers, and the Regional Labs - Regional Lab Program Evaluation

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources **U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002**

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	12. In major and selected other programs, increasing percentages of grantees demonstrate that their programs and services are based on sound research results.	Baseline under development	- Review by national experts (peer review) - Phase III standards
	13. Dissemination of research and assessment findings reaches key customer bases and results in educational improvement	Baseline under development.	Data source to be determined.
4.4 Our information technology investments are sound and used to improve impact and efficiency.	14. All major information systems needing repair will be converted to Year 2000 compliance on or before the end of 1998 (giving time for validation and testing during 1998 and 1999).	7 mission critical systems need repair. (Internal reporting on inventory of systems, 1997)	- Inventory of systems being repaired, ongoing, 1997-2002 - Inventory of equipment, ongoing, 1997-2002 - Monitoring of status, ongoing, 1997-2002
	15. At least 90% of all employees assess productivity as "significantly improved" as a result of available technology, as shown by the Employee Survey in 2000.	70 percent agree. (Employee Survey, 1996)	Employee Survey, 2000
	16. All Information Technology Review Board assessments will show that major systems are mission-driven, cost effective, consistent with our information technology architecture, and supported by performance-based contracts.	Baseline under development.	Data source to be determined.
	17. Data reporting burden on the public will be reduced annually.	10 percent reduction in 1996 (Analysis of information collection forms, 1996)	- Information collection forms, annual, 1997-2002 - Review of forms, ongoing, 1997-2002
4.5 The Department's employees are highly skilled and high-performing.	18. By 2000, a majority of ED managers will agree that staff knowledge and skills are adequate to carry out the Department's mission.	Baseline under development.	Data source to be determined.

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	19. By 2000, the majority of employees demonstrate the basic computer competencies identified in the Department's computer competency standards.	Baseline under development.	Data source to be determined.
	20. By 2000, most employees indicate satisfaction with their work environment (e.g., physical surroundings, noise level, air quality), security, and accessibility.	- In 1993: Satisfaction with work environment, 31%; security, 39%; accommodations for persons with disabilities, 48%; 79% indicated work environment affects quality of work. (Employee Survey, 1993) - In 1996: Satisfaction with work environment, 49%; security, 50%; accommodations for persons with disabilities, 62%. (Employee Survey, 1996)	Planned Assessment, 2000
	21. By 2000, most employees and managers express high satisfaction with assistance on resolving employee disputes, and disputes are closed quickly and informally whenever possible.	29% satisfaction with grievance process (Employee Survey, 1993) 29% resolved at counseling (EEO 462 Report, 1993) 548 average lapsed days for formals (EEO 462 Report, 1993)	- Planned Assessment, 2000 - Tracking Reports on EEO and IDRC activities, ongoing
	22. Expert review of the quality of Department-sponsored employee training shows that the training is among the best in the federal government and comparable to the best in the private sector.	Baseline under development.	Evaluation study
	23. By 2000, at least 70% of ED employees agree that the multi-evaluator General Performance Appraisal System (GPAS) improves individual employee performance and development, and aligns employee goals with the overall mission of the Department.	- Previous GPAS system did not serve to improve employee performance or development. (Final Report of Performance Evaluation Improvement Team) 47% agree they receive feedback on performance. (Employee Survey, 1993) 34% agree they receive guidance on career development from supervisors. (Employee Survey, 1993) 48% agree performance agreement reflects fit in ED. (Employee Survey, 1996)	- GPAS Evaluation Report, August 1997 - Follow-up evaluation and/or employee survey, 2000

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
4.6 Management of our programs and services ensures financial integrity.	24. By 1999, the Education Central Automated Processing System (EDCAPS) will be fully implemented and providing assistant secretaries, the Chief Financial Officer, and program managers with consistent, timely, and reliable financial and program information, through an assessment by the Information Technology Investment Review Board.	Baseline available starting 1998.	- Education Central Automated Processing System, 1998-2002 - Employee Survey, 2000
	25. Evaluation of contracts will indicate that better than fully successful performance, including quality, cost control, timeliness, and other factors, is being received by the government and the taxpayer.	Will establish the baseline with 1997 data.	Agency evaluations of contractor performance, annually
	26. Auditors issue a clean opinion on the Department-wide annual financial statements every year.	Disclaimer on Audit Opinion (Inspector General-contracted audit report, FY 95)	Inspector General-contracted audit report, FY 1997-2002
	27. The Department's fund control system and staff continue to prevent anti-deficiency violations, while ensuring timely awards of grants and contracts and maximizing the use of available budget resources.	FY 1997: 0 violations.	Annual end-of-year Budget Execution and Treasury reports on planned and actual obligations; ongoing ED grant and contract award schedule reports

Performance Indicators: Preliminary Examples of Baseline Data and Data Sources
U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

Goal and Objective	Indicators	Existing baseline data (source, year)	Data source and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
4.7 All levels of the agency are fully performance-driven.	28. Employees recognize the strategic plan as meaningful and understand how their work supports achieving the plan's goals and objectives.	- In 1993: 60% of employees have a clear understanding of how the goals and strategies of their principal office support the mission of the Department. (Employee Survey, 1993) - In 1996: 74% of employees have a clear understanding of how the goals and strategies of their principal office support the mission of the Department. (Employee Survey, 1996)	Employee Survey, 2000
	29. Senior leadership and managers' reviews of performance indicator data result in appropriate follow-up actions.	Baseline under development	- Tracking system for strategic plan indicators, 1997-2002 - Ongoing progress reports on objectives, 1997-2002 - Employee Survey, 2000
	30. Independent assessments verify that all large and selected other ED programs have comprehensive, high quality performance measurement systems that are used for program improvement and accountability by 1999.	Baseline under development	Department-funded assessment by a respected independent organization, 2000
	31. By 1999, all ED program managers assert that the data used for their program's performance measurement are reliable and valid or have plans for improvement.	Baseline under development	Performance appraisal criteria
	32. Managers agree that policy, budget, and resource allocation decisions are aligned with the strategic priorities of the Department.	Baseline under development	Employee Survey, 2000

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
Elementary and Secondary Education Program Evaluations					
1.	Baseline State Implementation Study (national evaluation of Title I, Goals 2000, and other K-12 programs)	Planning and Evaluation Service (PES) Contractor: Policy Studies Associates	Federal program directors and state research or evaluation specialists in state education agencies	Information on preliminary implementation of new provisions of state-administered Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) and Goals 2000 programs. Key issues will include standards development, assessment systems, technical assistance, and state supports for school improvement. Focus is on how legislative framework and federal resources are incorporated into the context of state school improvement efforts.	1996
2.	Cross-cutting District Survey and Case Studies (national evaluation of local-level implementation of programs authorized under ESEA and Goals 2000, with an emphasis on Title I)	PES Contractor: Policy Studies Associates and Urban Institute	District administrators of Federal ESEA and Goals 2000 programs	This study is analyzing districts' efforts to support the implementation of ESEA programs—particularly Title I, and Goals 2000 within the context of state and local reforms. Particular attention will be paid to program governance, in addition to supports for effective instruction, and family/community partnerships.	1998
3.	District Implementation Study (baseline national survey of local district implementation of federally-supported reforms through Goals 2000 and Title I)	PES Contractor: Urban Institute	District administrators of Federal ESEA and Goals 2000 programs	This study collected baseline information on districts' efforts to support the implementation of ESEA programs—particularly Title I, and Goals 2000 within the context of state and local reforms.	1997
4.	Follow-Up State Implementation Study (Follow-up national evaluation of Title I, Goals 2000, and Other State-Administered Elementary/Secondary Programs)	PES	Federal program directors and state research or evaluation specialists in state education agencies	Follow-up information on implementation of new provisions of ESEA programs and Goals 2000. Focus is on how legislative framework and federal resources are incorporated into the context of state school improvement efforts. Key issues will include standards development, assessment and accountability systems, technical assistance, and state supports for school improvement.	1998

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
5.	Follow-Up Survey of Schools (evaluation of standards-based reform, Title I and Goals 2000 supports for reform)	PES Contractor: Westat	Public school principals.	Information on understanding and implementation of state-established content and performance standards and Title I provisions supporting use of those standards.	1997
6.	Implementation of Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act (SDFDSA) Program	PES Contractor: Westat	National sample of LEAs	Information on LEA implementation of the SDFSCA program, including planning, uses of funds, evaluation, and goals and objectives.	1998 (may be repeated.)
7.	Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance (evaluation of the implementation impact of IASA on changing school systems and improving student performance)	PES Contractor: Westat	80 schools in 20 moderate to high poverty school districts in 7 states.	Information on the implementation of Title I's reauthorization in teaching and learning, focusing on the curriculum and instruction enacted in classrooms, on student performance as measured by a nationally uniform instrument, and on how these change over time.	Spring 1997, 1998, 1999
8.	National Longitudinal Survey of Schools (evaluation of Title I in the context of standards-based reform)	PES Contract to be awarded 9/97	School principals, teachers, parents	The national longitudinal survey of schools will examine how schools are implementing standards-driven improvements, with a particular focus on implementation of the new provisions in the Title I program supporting such improvements. The study will look at how schools use their outcome data to change classroom practice and how they measure progress continuously.	1998, 1999
9.	National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): State Analysis	PES	Secondary analysis of student assessment data on state assessments	Comparison of performance on NAEP to performance on state assessments	1997

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
10.	Public School Surveys on Education Reform (baseline evaluation of standards-based reform and Title I supports for reform)	PES and NCES (National Center for Educational Statistics) Contractor: Westat	Public school principals and teachers	These two surveys collected baseline data on principals' and teachers' perceptions of systemic education reform and the extent to which reform activities are being implemented in their schools. Both principals' and teachers' surveys focused on high standards for all students and alignment of curricula, instruction, textbooks, innovative technologies, and student assessment with these high standards. They also addressed parent involvement, information needs, and effective sources of information for principals and teachers. The teachers' survey also collects initial data about professional development. The principals' survey specifically addresses changes in Title I since reauthorization.	1996
Postsecondary, Vocational, School-to-Work, and Adult Program Evaluations					
11.	College Preparation Studies	PES	Middle-grade students and their parents.	Research studies are being done using the National Education Longitudinal Survey (NELS) to identify key factors affecting which eighth grade students enrolled in college within two years of expected high school graduation and which did not. In addition, a series of focus groups and a survey of middle school parents are being conducted to develop a better understanding of what information parents of middle school students want and need concerning the benefits, academic requirements, and cost of college and the availability of student aid. These studies will be used to help formulate the national campaign aimed at encouraging middle-school students and their parents to prepare for college.	Research analyses: 1996 and 1997. Surveys and focus groups: 1997. Future studies are planned for 1998.

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
12.	Evaluation of Effective Programs and Practices for Adult ESL Students	PES and OVAE (Office of Vocational and Adult Education) Contractor: American Institutes for Research (AIR)	Adult participants in English as a second language programs who have low native-language literacy.	Data on learning gains and persistence, and such longer-term outcomes as advancement to higher level English-language instruction, securing employment or job promotions, and removal from welfare.	1998-2000
13.	Evaluation of Effective Adult Basic Education Programs and Practices	PES and OVAE Contractor: Abt Associates Inc.	Participants in low-level Adult Basic Education classes.	Data on learning gains and persistence, and such longer-term outcomes as advancement to higher level literacy instruction, securing employment or job promotions, and removal from welfare.	1998-2000
14.	Longitudinal Study of the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Service Program	PES and OSERS (Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services) Contractor: Research Triangle Institute (RTI)	A sample of 8,500 current and former VR consumers at 37 VR offices.	Information on the characteristics of VR consumers and local VR agency offices; the impact of local economic and environmental factors on services and outcomes; and short and long-term outcomes achieved by VR consumers and their satisfaction with the program.	1994-1998

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
15.	National Direct Loan Evaluation	PES Contractor: Macro, Inc.	Representative samples of postsecondary institutions, students, and parents participating in the Direct Loan and Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) programs.	The evaluation centers on three major issues: 1). Institutions' Administration of the Direct Loan Program: The focus is on identifying areas where Direct Loan institutions are having problems and also on identifying and disseminating best practices. These data will be collected through mail surveys of Direct Loan institutions and site visits to schools. 2). Borrower Understanding and Repayment Experience: Direct Loan and FFEL borrowers are surveyed to determine their satisfaction with their loan program as well as their knowledge and understanding of the loan origination and repayment processes. Information will be obtained through telephone surveys of Direct Loan and FFELP borrowers who are in-school as well as in-repayment. 3). ED's Administration of the Direct Loan Program: The evaluation will focus on the outcomes of ED's administration rather than internal processes with the exception of certain key areas. Outcomes will be assessed mainly through institutions' and borrowers' satisfaction with ED provided information and services obtained in surveys of Direct Loan and FFELP institutions and borrowers as well as interviews of ED and other Federal Officials, and reviews of documents and reports.	Case studies annually from 1994 to 1998. Institutional surveys annually from 1995 to 1998. Borrower surveys 1996, 1997, and 1998. ED interviews annually from 1994 to 1998. Key aspects of the evaluation will be continued in future years.
16.	National Evaluation of School-to-Work	PES Contractor: Mathematica Policy Research (MPR)	Surveys of 12th grade students; transcripts; follow-ups, surveys of local partnerships; case studies of eight states and 39 communities.	Information on participation, high school programs of study, postsecondary enrollment and employment; STW implementation	1996-2000

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
17.	Postsecondary Gatekeeping Studies	PES	Purposive samples of postsecondary institutions, accrediting agencies, and states chosen either because of the type of instruction being provided or to identify and disseminate best practices.	Several studies have been or will be conducted assessing how the gatekeeping process is functioning. Examples of these studies include an: examination of state oversight practices since the 1992 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act; assessment of the standards used in accrediting Associates in Applied Sciences Degrees; exploration of the use of secondary data sources, such as unemployment insurance files, to determine employment outcomes for students attending vocationally-oriented programs; and analysis of the standards employed by accrediting associations in reviewing graduation and placement rates in proprietary institutions.	Variable depending on emerging issues.
18.	Postsecondary Customer Satisfaction Surveys	PES and Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE)	Representative samples of postsecondary institutions and students participating in the postsecondary education programs.	Surveys have been or are being conducted of postsecondary institutions satisfaction with the operation and management of the student aid programs, TRIO, and the National Student Loan Data System and student aid applicants' satisfaction with the application process.	Institutional surveys 1995 and 1997. Applicant survey 1997. Additional surveys will be conducted in future years.
19.	Postsecondary Secondary Data Analyses	PES	Analysis of information previously collected through NCES or Census surveys or in ED administrative files.	Studies attempt to assess the effectiveness of the student aid programs by analyzing a number of issues including the educational attainment of low- versus high-income students, trends in the affordability of postsecondary education, debt burden, and the distribution of aid across student characteristics.	Annual with the type of analysis dependent on emerging policy issues and data availability.

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
20.	Targeted Student Aid Studies	PES	Representative samples of specific populations who are affected by changes in legislation or policy.	Small, one-time surveys of specific populations are conducted to assess the effects of major changes in student aid policy. Examples of this type of study are surveys of students affected by changes in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA) and students and institutions participating in the Federal Work-Study (FWS) program.	Study of 1992 HEA reauthorization was completed in 1997. FWS study: 1997-98. Planned study of next HEA reauthorization to begin in 1999.
21.	Title III (Higher Education Act) Performance Measurement Study	PES	Institutions participating in the Title III (Higher Education Act, HEA) program.	This study is designed to develop a system of performance indicators for judging the success of the Title III programs. The four goals of the study are to: 1) define program goals in measurable terms; 2) determine how federal management activities contribute to program goals; 3) determine how institutional activities contribute to program goals; and 4) establish an annual progress report. Information to accomplish these goals will be obtained from a survey of all Title III participating institutions and case studies at between 30 and 40 selected sites.	Both the survey and case studies will be conducted in 1997.

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
22.	TRIO-Student Support Services (SSS) Evaluation	PES Contractor: Westat, Inc.	A nationally representative sample of 2,900 students participating in SSS projects at 30 colleges and a control group of 2,900 students consisting both of students at the 30 SSS institutions who did not participate in the program and students at 20 matched institutions not participating in the SSS program. Case studies were conducted at the 50 schools.	Data are being collected to assess the effects of the SSS program on college retention and graduation, GPA, and transfer behavior (from 2-year to 4-year institutions). A second and equally important focus of the evaluation is the identification of effective services and practices for program improvement.	A baseline survey was conducted in 1991-92 with a follow-up in 1994 and another planned for 1997. College transcripts were/will be collected with each survey.
23.	TRIO-Upward Bound Evaluation	PES Contractor: Mathematic Policy Research	A nationally representative sample of 67 Upward Bound (HEA) projects hosted by two and four year colleges, from which 2,700 eligible applicants were randomly assigned to Upward Bound or to a control group.	Data are being collected to assess the effects of Upward Bound (HEA) on students' preparation for college, high school graduation, college entry and achievement. Impacts are estimated by comparing students in Upward Bound to the control group on a range of measures, including grades, course-taking, attitudes and educational expectations. Additional data will be collected to assess longer term impacts on college persistence and graduation.	A baseline survey was conducted beginning in December 1992, with follow-up surveys undertaken in 1994 and 1996, at which time high school transcripts were also collected. Future surveys will capture data on college persistence and graduation.
National Statistics and Assessment Studies					
24.	Advanced Telecommunications and US Public Elementary and Secondary School Survey	National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)	National sample of US elementary and secondary schools.	Information on school and classroom access to Internet, local area networks, and computers	1995, 1996, 1997 Annually
25.	Baccalaureate and Beyond (B&B)	NCES	A representative sample of graduating college seniors. Beginning in 1992-93, every other NPSAS serves as the basis for a new BPS study.	Information on time to degree, teacher preparation, early careers of professionals (including teachers), debt burden, and graduate/first professional access and choice. Data are collected from ED student aid administrative and student interviews.	1992-93 cohort: follow-ups in 1994 1997. 1999-2000 cohort: follow-up in 2001.

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
26.	Beginning Postsecondary Students (BPS)	NCES	A representative sample of first time beginning students, including non-traditional older students and recent high school graduates. Beginning in 1989-90, every other NPSAS serves as the basis for a new BPS study.	Information on persistence, progress, and attainment from initial time of entry into postsecondary education through leaving and entering the work force. Data are collected from ED student aid administrative and student interviews.	1989-90 cohort: follow-ups in 1992 and 1994. 1995-96 cohort: follow-ups in 1998 and possibly 2001
27.	Child Development Supplement to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics	Department of Health and Human Services' National Institute for Child and Human Development (NICHD)	Nationally representative sample of 3,200 zero-to-twelve-year-old children	Data on the cognitive, behavioral, and health status of 3,200 children obtained from the mother, a second caregiver, an absent parent, the teacher, the school administrator, and the child; a comprehensive accounting of parental and caregiver time inputs to children as well as other aspects of the way children and adolescents spend their time; teacher-reported time use in elementary and preschool programs; and other-than-time use measures of other resources such as the learning environment in the home.	Collected in 1997, to be released by November 1998
28.	Common Core of Data Surveys	NCES	Fifty states, the District of Columbia, and five outlying areas from the universe of state-level education agencies.	Information on staff and students is collected at the school, local education agency or school district (LEA), and state levels. Information about revenues and expenditures also is collected at the state level, and NCES joins the Bureau of the Census in collecting school district finance data.	Annually
29.	Current Population Survey (CPS)/ Annual Demographic Survey-March Supplement	Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics and Department of Commerce's Bureau of the Census	Civilian noninstitutional population including persons 16 years of age and older residing in the 50 states and the District of Columbia who are not inmates of institutions (e.g., penal and mental facilities, homes for the aged), and who are not on active duty in the Armed Forces.	Labor force data including income, labor force participation, and school enrollment (currently enrolled, level of school, and full time/part time status of enrollment).	1940-present, annually

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
30.	Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (ECLS)	NCES	A sample of kindergartners from a wide variety of public and private kindergarten programs and from diverse racial-ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. One cohort will be followed longitudinally through the 5th grade. Information will be collected from the children, their parents, teachers, and school administrators.	Data on the different environments in which children live and learn — children's neighborhoods, families, schools, and classrooms.	1998-2004 Beginning in 1998, data collection will occur in the fall and spring of the kindergarten year and in the spring of first, third, and fifth grades.
31.	High School Transcripts Studies	NCES	High School Class of 1982, 1987, 1990, 1991, 1994, 1998.	Changes in course-taking patterns will be measured from transcripts collected for high school graduates	1982, 1987, 1990, 1991, 1994, 1998
32.	Monitoring the Future (MTF)	Department of Health and Human Services' National Institute on Drug Abuse Grantee: University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research	National sample (from selected nationally representative LEAs) of 8th, 10th, and 12th grade students.	National data on alcohol and drug usage and attitudes, and on victimization in schools.	Annually (12th grade since 1975; 8th and 10th grade since 1991)

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
33.	National Longitudinal Study of Youth (NLSY)	Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics	Six cohorts of men and women who were selected to be representative of all Americans born during a given time. Cohorts include "older men," "mature women," "young men," and "young women," and children born to women in the 1979 survey. Cohorts include persons of civilian and military backgrounds.	Information about the life and labor market experiences of six groups of men and women at different points in time. Includes basic demographic, educational and labor market data on youth (including out-of school youth)	1966-present Data collections in 1966, 1967, 1968, 1979, 1981 1986, 1990, 1994, 1995, 1997
34.	National Longitudinal Survey of Youth: Supplement on School-to-work	National School-to-Work Office and Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics	Nationally representative sample of 12-17 year olds; school administrator survey	NLSY has been supplemented by additional items relevant to the STW experience; i.e., participation in career majors, job shadowing, career counseling, work-site activities and participation in various STW programs.	Baseline student survey in 1997; follow up surveys annually. School administrator survey in 1997.
35.	National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS)	NCES	A representative sample of all students enrolled at any time during the year in less-than-2-year institutions, community and junior colleges, 4-year colleges, and major universities located in the United States and Puerto Rico at the undergraduate, graduate, and first-professional levels.	Detailed data on all forms of student financial aid received as well as student demographics, family income, education expenses, employment, educational aspirations, parental demographic characteristics, parental support, and how students and their families meet the costs of postsecondary education. Data are collected from ED student aid administrative records, institutional records, and student and parent interviews.	1986-87, 1989-90, 1992-93, 1995-96, 1999-2000, and every fourth year thereafter.

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
36.	National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS)	NCES Contractor for NALS 1992: Educational Testing Service (ETS)	Adults ages 16 and over living in U.S. households, and inmates from 80 federal and state prisons.	NALS 1992 assessed the literacy skills of the U.S. adult population using simulations of three kinds of literacy tasks that adults would ordinarily encounter in daily life (prose literacy, document literacy, and quantitative literacy). Other data collected included demographic characteristics, educational backgrounds, reading practices, and labor market experiences.	1992, 2002
37.	National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): Elementary and Secondary School Students Survey	NCES	Students in the 4 th , 8 th , and 12 th grades in public and private schools.	Knowledge, skills, and performance of the nation's children and youth in reading, mathematics, science, writing, history, geography and other selected subjects. <i>Assessments in reading and mathematics are collected at least every 2 years, in science and writing at least every 4 years, and in history or geography and other selected subjects at least every 6 years.</i>	1969-present Selected collections: - reading, 1996, 1998, 2002 - math, 1996, 2000 - science, 1996, 2000 - writing, 1998, 2002 - history, 1994, 2001 - geography, 1994, 2001
38.	National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS): School Crime Supplement	Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics for main survey. NCES supports the School Crime Supplement Contractor: U.S. Census Bureau	National sample of households; School Crime Supplement sample is 10,000 12-19 year old students in NCVS households	The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) is the nation's primary source of information on criminal victimization. Each year, data are obtained from a nationally representative sample of roughly 49,000 households comprising more than 100,000 persons on the frequency, characteristics and consequences of criminal victimization in the United States. The School Crime Supplement focuses on victimization of students.	Overall survey is annual; School Crime Supplement 1989, 1995 (planned release 1997), 1999 and triennially thereafter.
39.	National Education Longitudinal Survey of 1988 (NELS:88)	NCES	A representative sample of students enrolled in the eight grade in 1988. The sample was freshened in 1990 to represent all tenth graders and 1992 to represent all twelfth graders.	Information on high school transitions; including academic preparation, course taking, vocational education, and drop-outs; student and parent demographics; and college access and choice. Data are collected from students, parents, teachers, and school principals as well as high school transcripts.	1988, 1990, 1992, 1994, 2000.

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
40.	National Employer Survey	National School-to-Work Office and U.S. Census Bureau Contractor: Wharton School	3200 employers	Information on employer involvement with schools, and school-to-work in particular, and measure the costs and benefits to employers of such involvement.	1994, 1997, 1998, 2000?
41.	National Household Education Survey (NHES)	NCES	Households in the noninstitutionalized civilian population of the U.S.	Data on high-priority education topics are collected on a rotating basis. Topics have included early childhood education, adult education, school readiness, safety and discipline, parent/family involvement in education, and adult/youth civic improvement.	1991, 1993, 1995, 1996, 1999?
42.	National Voluntary Tests in Reading and Mathematics	ED Contract to be awarded	4th and 8th graders in participating areas.	Knowledge, skills, and performance of the nation's children and youth in reading and mathematics.	Assessments in reading and mathematics will be collected annually, 1997-2002
43.	Schools and Staffing Surveys (SASS)	NCES	Principals and teachers; public and private schools; school districts.	Demographics of the K-12 student population, varying demand for teachers in all regions of the nation, educational qualifications of school teachers and administrators, and working conditions of teachers. It is a unified set of surveys that allows linkages of teachers, schools, school districts, and administrator data.	1987-88, 1990-91, 1993-94, 1999-2000

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
Grantee Reporting Systems					
44.	Adult Education National Data Reporting System	OVAE Contract to be awarded	States	Student participation and program performance and financial data for the Adult Education State Grant program.	Annually
45.	National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS)	OPE	Administrative records on all students borrowing through the federal student loan program.	Information on the characteristics and status of all student loan borrowers. Used both for administrative purposes—verifying defaulted loan status, student status confirmations, etc.—and research.	Constantly updated with information from postsecondary institutions, lenders, and state guarantee agencies.
46.	Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act Performance Report	PES and OESE (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education) Contractor: Westat	State coordinators (SEA and Governor's office) for state formula grant program.	Information on program implementation, prevalence and incidence of drug and alcohol use and violence in schools, progress in achieving measurable goals and objectives.	Annual (first report due 1997)
47.	School-to-Work State Progress Measures	National School-to-Work Office: ED and Department of Labor Contractor—MPR Associates	School-to-Work (STW) partnerships in states with implementation grants and all direct federal grantees.	In collaboration with the national School-to-Work Office, states have led the way in defining measures of student, school, and employer participation in career awareness, career exposure, career exploration, and work-based learning activities, as well as "leveraged" funding for STW. Over the next	1996, annually
48.	State annual report cards	OESE	State educational agencies (voluntary)	Information on state educational technology plan and other activities related to the Educational Technology Challenge Fund.	1997, annually.

Evaluations and Other Studies

U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
Other Surveys and Studies					
49.	Advanced Placement (AP) Examination Data	The College Board	High school students taking AP exams in public and private schools.	Knowledge, skills, and performance of high school students on AP examinations.	Annually
50.	Key State Education Policies on K-12 Education	Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)	State education agencies	Information on state development of content standards, graduation, teacher licensure, time and attendance.	Biennially; next in 1998
51.	<i>Magnet Schools of America Annual Directory</i>	Magnet Schools of America, Inc.	Districts/schools with magnet programs nationally	Name of school, school mailing address, school phone number, district location, name of principal, grades served, type of program (whole school or program within a school), and theme type (e.g., math, performing/fine arts, Montessori).	Updated continuously
52.	<i>Making Standards Matter: 1997</i>	American Federation of Teachers	State education agencies	Information on state development of academic standards in the core subjects. Report also assesses quality of standards.	1995, 1996, 1997; annually
53.	<i>Setting Education Standards High Enough</i>	Southern Regional Education Board	Secondary analysis of student assessment data, for grades 4 & 8	Comparison of performance on NAEP to performance on state assessments	1996
54.	State Student Assessment Programs Database	OERI and Council of Chief State School Officers. Grantee: North Central Regional Educational Lab (NCREL)	State education agencies	Information on state assessment systems.	1996, 1997; annually
55.	States' pass rates on rigorous licensing exams	PES Contractor: Westat	Teachers taking the National Teacher Exam/Praxis in 50 states.	Pass rates on the National Teacher Exam/Praxis	1997-2002, annually
56.	Textbook and Instructional Materials Analysis	OERI Independent Expert Panel	Textbooks and instructional materials on the market.	Percent of textbooks and instructional materials that independent experts consider exemplary and align with high standards.	1998