

Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement

Key Measures

Improving student proficiency and closing the achievement gap are the cornerstones of the Department’s work. In FY 2006, the Department administered 74 distinct programs that supported Goal 2, Improve Student Achievement. From the universe of measures that help determine these programs’ effectiveness, the Department identified 11 key measures to report our progress. Results on these key measures are shown below.

See p. 30 for an explanation of the documentation fields for the key measures.

Reading Achievement

Research shows that students who fail to read well by the fourth grade have a greater likelihood of dropping out of school and diminished life opportunities. Providing consistent support for reading success from the earliest age has critically important benefits. As of FY 2006, \$5.3 billion has been expended on national reading initiatives. These funds provide assistance to support local efforts through competitive grants that enhance the school readiness of young children. Additional federal support for reading instruction goes to states through the large formula grants for disadvantaged students (Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies), for special education (Special Education Grants to States), and for vocational education (Vocational Education State Grants).

2.1.A Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies.	
The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade low-income students meeting state performance standards by scoring at or above proficient on state assessments in reading/language arts. [1066]	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2004	25
2005	22
2006	Target is 25
2005 target of 25 not met 2006 data expected Aug. 2007	

U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report.

2.1.B Special Education Grants to States.	
The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by scoring at or above proficient on state assessments in reading. [1519]	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2004	24
2005	13
2006	Target is 25
2005 target of 25 not met 2006 data expected Aug. 2007	

U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report.

Analysis of Progress. For measure 2.1.A, 22 out of the 34 states that tested fourth-grade students in reading/language arts in both 2004 and 2005 reported an increase in the percentage of these students scoring proficient or above on state assessments in reading/language arts. Although the target of 25 was just missed, the difference between the target and the actual is in part a reflection of the fact that only 34 states tested fourth-graders in this subject both years. A solid majority of the 34 states that did test both years showed increases.

Measure 2.1.B shows that there was a significant decrease in the number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above proficient on state assessments in reading/language arts. Although the target of 25 was not met, the difference between the target and the actual is in part a reflection of the fact that only 34 states tested fourth-

graders in this subject both years. A solid majority of the 34 states that did test both years showed increases.

This measure parallels the measure for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program (2.1.A) under the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. The Department has proposed regulations to provide flexibility to states to include in the calculations of the "proficient" scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities those who take assessments based on alternate achievement standards. Additional regulations have been proposed that would allow some children with disabilities to be proficient based on modified achievement standards.

Beginning in FY 2007 the reading/language arts measures will change from single state level indicators to student level indicators for each measure.

Data Quality. Data are self-reported by grantees.

Target Context. The FY 2006 targets were set prior to the receipt of data. The universe for these measures is 52 entities (50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico) that are required by *No Child Left Behind* to administer reading/language arts assessments in grades 3 through 8.

Additional information. Prior to the 2005-2006 school year, states only had to test one time during grades three through five and one time during grades six through nine, which is why there is not consistently two years of data across all states for these indicators.



2.1.C English Language Acquisition. The number of states that met the target for attainment of English language proficiency. [1830]	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2005	23
2006	Target is 29
New measure in 2006 2006 data expected Jan. 2007	

Analysis of Progress. New key measure for FY 2006.

Data Quality. Data are self-reported by grantees.

Additional Information. Baseline data reflect partial state data from the 2005 Consolidated State Performance Report. Beginning in FY 2007, data will be available through *EDFacts*.

U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report and Office of English Language Acquisition Title III Biennial Evaluation Reports.



Mathematics Achievement

American students' performance on international mathematics assessments provides a compelling rationale for intensive, targeted initiatives designed to strengthen the mathematics skills of our students. Results from the 2003 Program for International Student Assessment suggest that American high school students continue to lag behind students in other countries in mathematics, and the gap in mathematics learning between American students and students in other countries is widening.

On the Program for International Student Assessment, the United States 15-year-old students scored lower than 20 other countries belonging to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

To raise the number of highly qualified teachers in mathematics and science, and to increase the number of students reaching proficiency in these subjects, school districts use federal resources from

the Mathematics and Science Partnership program. The program connects university professors, business leaders, and staff from nonprofit or for-profit organizations with educators from high-need school districts to improve science and mathematics learning. The results from a descriptive analysis of successful applications to the program indicate that this partnership program is on track in meeting its goals.

Highlights of the descriptive analysis show 90 percent of the partnership projects link content to state mathematics and science standards. Ninety-two percent offer teachers summer institutes with an average of 64 hours of instruction and 48 hours of follow-up instruction. Two-thirds administer content knowledge tests to teachers, conduct observations, and make pretest and posttest comparisons, and 92.2 percent include partnerships with professors from mathematics or science departments in key planning or oversight roles. The preliminary evaluation pointed to one potential problem area for many of the projects: the quality of project evaluation plans. In response to this finding, the Department enlisted the Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy to produce “How to Solicit Rigorous Evaluations of Mathematics and Science Partnerships Projects” for state coordinators of the programs.



2.2.A Title I Grants to Local Education Agencies. The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade low-income students meeting state performance standards by scoring proficient or above on state assessments in mathematics. [1067]	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2004	30
2005	30
2006	Target is 25
2005 target of 25 exceeded 2006 data expected Aug. 2007	

U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report.

2.2.B Special Education Grants to States. The number of states reporting an increase in the percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities meeting state performance standards by scoring at or above proficient on state assessments in mathematics. [1520]	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2004	26
2005	32
2006	Target is 25
2005 target of 25 exceeded 2006 data expected Aug. 2007	

U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report.

Analysis of Progress. For measure 2.2.A, 30 out of the 42 states that tested eighth-grade students in mathematics in both 2004 and 2005 reported an increase in the percentage of these students scoring proficient or above on state assessments in mathematics. The target of 25 was exceeded, despite the fact that only 42 States tested 8th graders in this subject both years.

The target for measure 2.2.B was exceeded. The number of states reporting increases in proficiency shows positive movement. More states reported that students with disabilities were achieving at or above proficient than had reported the previous year. This measure parallels a measure for the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program (2.2.B) under the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. The Department has provided flexibility to states to include in the calculations of the "proficient" scores of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities those who take assessments based on alternate achievement standards.

Also, beginning next year the mathematics measures will change from single state level indicators to student level indicators for each measurement.

Data Quality. Data are self-reported by grantees.

Target Context. The FY 2006 targets were set prior to the receipt of data. The universe for these measures is 52 entities (50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico) that are required by *No Child Left Behind* to administer mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8.

Additional information. Prior to the 2005-2006 school year, states only had to test one time during grades three through five and one time during grades six through nine, which is why there is not consistently two years of data across all States for these indicators. The number of states reporting an increase is continuing to slowly increase.



High School Completion

There is a consensus for high school reform among governors, business leaders, for-profit and nonprofit leaders, and the Department. This reform must start with an honest calculation of graduation rates.

Accurate graduation rates are crucial to meeting the requirements of *No Child Left Behind*. States are required to set high school graduation rate targets as one indicator for measuring a high school's progress.

One of the major complications for states in accurately calculating high school graduation rates is the lack of a comprehensive data collection system that tracks students over time. Until states have the capacity to collect these data, the Department has committed to publishing two sets of state graduation rates: state-reported rates and standardized rates prepared by the Department. According to a Government Accountability Office report, as of July 2005, 12 states used a graduation rate definition referred to as the cohort definition, which tracks students from when they enter high school to when they leave. Thirty-two states used a definition based primarily on the number of dropouts over a four-year period and the number of graduates. For its calculation, the Department uses enrollment and other data found in the Common Core of Data at the National Center for Education Statistics.

Additional effort to reform our nation's high schools is evident in the Department's initiative to support formula grants to state educational agencies that reserve a portion of the funds to support the development of additional reading/language arts and mathematics assessments as part of their state assessment systems. States award the remaining funds competitively to local educational agencies to implement targeted interventions in high-need secondary schools to increase student achievement and narrow achievement gaps.



2.3.A Special Education Grants to States. The percentage of students with disabilities that graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma. [1527]

Fiscal Year	Actual
1996	42
1997	43
1998	45
1999	47
2000	46
2001	48
2002	51
2003	52
2004	54
2005	54
2006	Target is 56

2005 target of 54 met
2006 data expected Aug. 2007

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs, section 618 state-reported data.

American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, Northern Marianas and the Bureau of Indian Affairs).

Analysis of Progress. The nation is continuing to make steady progress ensuring that students with disabilities graduate from high school at increasing rates within the mainstream curriculum.

Data Quality. Data are self-reported by grantees.

Target Context. The graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students aged 14 and older with disabilities who graduated with a regular diploma by the total number of students with disabilities in the same age group who graduate with a regular diploma, receive a certificate of completion, reach the maximum age for services, die, drop out, or move and are not known to have continued in education.

Additional Information. This includes calculations for 57 entities (50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam,

2.3.B Special Education Grants to States. The percentage of students with disabilities who drop out of school. [1528]

Fiscal Year	Actual
1996	47
1997	46
1998	44
1999	42
2000	42
2001	41
2002	38
2003	34
2004	31
2005	28
2006	Target is 29

2005 target of 34 exceeded
2006 data expected Aug. 2007

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs, section 618 state-reported data.

District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, Northern Marianas and the Bureau of Indian Affairs).

Analysis of Progress. The FY 2005 target of 34 was exceeded. Dropout rates for students with disabilities continue to decline proportionally with the increase in graduation rates.

Data Quality. Data are self-reported by grantees.

Target Context. The dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students aged 14 and older with disabilities who dropped out or moved and are not known to have continued in education by the total number of students with disabilities in the same age group who graduate with a regular diploma, receive a certificate of completion, reach the maximum age for services, die, drop out, or move and are not known to have continued in education.

Additional Information. This includes calculations for 57 entities (50 states, the

Advanced Placement Participation

Enrollment in Advanced Placement courses has nearly tripled over the past decade. Participation by minority and low-income students has increased, but an access gap continues. According to the College Board, the number of students from low-income families who took the Board’s Advanced Placement exams increased more than 13 percent between 2004 and 2005. However, participation in advanced placement programs is still highly correlated with family income. In 2005, only 12 percent of all students who took Advanced Placement exams were from low-income families.

Some minority groups continue to be underrepresented among students who take Advanced Placement exams. According to the College Board, African American students make up 13.4 percent of the nation’s student population but only 6.4 percent take Advanced Placement exams. Hispanic students represent 13.4 percent of the nation’s student population and 13.6 percent of the students who take Advanced Placement exams. However, Hispanic students take approximately 53 percent of Advanced Placement Spanish Language exams and 77 percent of the Advanced Placement Spanish Literature exams.

Participation in advanced placement programs for low-income and minority students is associated with higher levels of postsecondary enrollment and completion. In his 2006 study, *The Toolbox Revisited*, Clifford Adelman found that participation in a challenging curriculum is related to students’ completion of a college degree. Advanced Placement courses strengthen the high school curriculum and hold students to high standards of achievement.

The focus on the learning of foreign languages is in line with the National Security Language Initiative, and efforts to increase challenging coursework in mathematics and science are critical to increased national security and America’s success in the global economy.



2.3.C Advanced Placement. The number of Advanced Placement tests taken by low-income public school students nationally. [1149]	
Fiscal Year	Actual
1999	87,149
2000	92,083
2001	105,138
2002	132,459
2003	157,334
2004	187,691
2005	223,263
2006	Target is 209,411
New measure for 2006 2006 data expected Jan. 2007	

Fee Reduction Summary Report.

Analysis of Progress. New key measure for FY 2006. This measure was adjusted to focus on public school students. Prior year data included data for public and non-public school students. The measure now aligns with the population served by the program. Prior year data are provided for historical purposes.

Data Quality. The Fee Reduction Summary Report is a year-end accounting file that provides a final count of Advanced Placement test fee reductions granted. Test fee reductions are provided to students with acute need.

Target Context. The FY 2006 target was established based on public and non-public school data. Targets for FY 2007 and forward

are calculated based on the previous year’s target plus ten percent.



Teacher Quality

The Department continues to work with states and school districts to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified, especially in core academic subjects. Monitoring visits to states indicate that states have made changes to their certification requirements. These changes include requiring more

PERFORMANCE DETAILS

GOAL 2: IMPROVE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

content knowledge, having teacher candidates pass written examinations, encouraging alternative certification programs, requiring teacher preparation institutions to improve their programs, requiring secondary school teachers to have a major in the subjects they teach, and implementing incentive systems to attract and retain highly qualified teachers.

Many local educational agencies had difficulty ensuring their special education and secondary mathematics and science teachers were highly qualified. In spring 2006, the Department reviewed states' progress in meeting the highly qualified teacher requirement and requested states to submit revised plans for reaching the requirement of having all teachers highly qualified by the end of SY 2006–07. *No Child Left Behind* requires that all public school teachers of core academic subjects meet the qualifications outlined in the definition by the end of SY 2005–06.

For the first time, the Congress legislated the goal that teachers in every core academic class have a bachelor's degree, have a state license or a certificate, and be competent in the subjects they teach. In addition, the recently reauthorized *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* addresses teacher qualification and requires all special educators who teach core academic subjects to be highly qualified. Resources provided states to meet the goal of a "highly qualified teacher" in every core academic class include major funding from the \$3 billion Improving Teacher Quality State Grants and the \$68 million Teacher Quality Enhancement programs.

2.4.A Improving Teacher Quality State Grants. The percentage of core academic classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers. [1180]		2.4.B Improving Teacher Quality State Grants. The percentage of core academic classes in elementary schools taught by highly qualified teachers. [1182]		2.4.C Improving Teacher Quality State Grants. The percentage of core academic classes in secondary schools taught by highly qualified teachers. [1183]	
Fiscal Year	Actual	Fiscal Year	Actual	Fiscal Year	Actual
2003	74	2003	85	2003	80
2004	86	2004	91	2004	88
2005	90	2005	93	2005	89
2006	Target is 95	2006	Target is 95	2006	Target is 92
2004 actual updated 2005 target of 90 met 2006 data expected Dec. 2007		2004 actual updated 2005 target of 90 exceeded 2006 data expected Dec. 2007		2004 actual updated 2005 target of 85 exceeded 2006 data expected Dec. 2007	

U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report, grantee submissions.

Analysis of Progress. The data reported through the *Consolidated State Performance Report* show that states are about 90 percent of the way toward having all classes taught by highly qualified teachers.

Data Quality. During monitoring visits to states over the past three years, the Department found that many states were confused about the definition of "highly qualified teacher", particularly for special education teachers; therefore, previous years' data may not have been entirely accurate. Most states are now using the correct definition, and data are now considered to be generally accurate.

Discontinued Strategic Measures

The following measures were discontinued after FY 2005 but were reported as pending in the *FY 2005 Performance and Accountability Report*. The latest data are reported below.

Measure		Fiscal Year Discontinued	Target	Actual	Status	
2.3.20– 2.3.22	The percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds who have completed high school.	All Students	2004	87.5	87.5	Target met
		African American Students	2004	85.5	83	Target not met
		Hispanic American Students	2004	69.0	70	Target met
2.14	Vocational Education State Grants. The percentage of vocational concentrators meeting state-established academic standards.	2005	77	78	Exceeded target	
2.19	The percentage of program completers who are highly qualified teachers.	2005	80	95	Exceeded target	

Sources and Notes

- 2.3.20–2.3.22 Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, *America’s Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being, 2005*.

Previously reported FY 2002 data were estimated and preliminary. Final data were 87.3 percent (all students), 84.8 percent (African Americans), and 67.9 percent (Hispanic Americans).
- 2.14 U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Vocational Technical Education Annual Performance and Financial Report.
- 2.19 U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, Teacher Quality Enhancement Program Performance Report.

Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement Program Performance Summary

Seventy-four of our grant programs most directly support Goal 2. These programs are listed below. In the table, an overview is provided for the results of each program on its program performance measures. (See p. 31 for the methodology of calculating the percentage of targets met, not met, and without data.) Individual program performance reports are available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2006report/program.html>. Appropriation and expenditure data for FY 2006 are included for each of these programs.

Program Name	PART Rating	Appropriations† FY 2006 \$ in millions	Expenditures‡ FY 2006 \$ in millions	Program Performance Results Percent of Targets Met, Not Met, Without Data											
				FY 2006			FY 2005			FY 2004			FY 2003		
				% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data
APEB: American Printing House for the Blind	RND	18	19	38	54	8	60	40	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
CFAA: Supplemental Education Grants	NA	18	16							/// (not funded)			/// (not funded)		
CRA: Training and Advisory Services	RND	7	7	100	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	100	0	0	100
ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers	A	981	838	0	0	100	0	100	0	45	55	0	38	62	0
ESEA: Advanced Credentialing	NA	17	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0			
ESEA: Advanced Placement	ME	32	29	40	20	40	0	0	100	100	0	0	100	0	0
ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity	NA	34	33	33	67	0	100	0	0	0	100	0			
ESEA: Arts In Education	NA	35	38	0	0	100	0	0	100						
ESEA: Charter Schools Grants	A	215	187	25	13	62	50	50	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
ESEA: Civic Education: Cooperative Education Exchange	NA	12	13				100	0	0						
ESEA: Comprehensive School Reform	A	8	238	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100
ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities	NA	37	33	0	0	100	100	0	0	50	50	0	///		
ESEA: Dropout Prevention Programs	NA	5	3												
ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development	NA	15	12	0	0	100	0	67	33	67	33	0			

Program Name	PART Rating	Appropriations†	Expenditures ‡	Program Performance Results											
				Percent of Targets Met, Not Met, Without Data											
				FY 2006			FY 2005			FY 2004			FY 2003		
FY 2006 \$ in millions	FY 2006 \$ in millions		% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	
ESEA: Early Reading First	NA	103	89	0	0	100	100	0	0	100	0	0	///		
ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians	NA	34	34	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	100	0			
ESEA: Educational Technology State Grants	RND	272	552	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	100	0
ESEA: English Language Acquisition	NA	669	647	0	0	100	60	0	40	20	0	80	30	0	70
ESEA: Even Start	I	99	226	0	0	100	20	80	0	50	50	0	50	0	50
ESEA: Excellence in Economic Education	NA	2	1	0	0	100	0	0	100				/// (not funded)		
ESEA: Foreign Language Assistance	NA	22	16	0	0	100	100	0	0						
ESEA: Fund for the Improvement of Education Programs of National Significance	NA	12	228												
ESEA: Impact Aid Basic Support Payments	RND	1,092	989	50	50	0									
ESEA: Impact Aid Payments for Children with Disabilities	RND	49	42	0	50	50	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
ESEA: Impact Aid Construction	A	18	40	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
ESEA: Impact Aid Facilities Maintenance	NA	5	4												
ESEA: Impact Aid Payments for Federal Property	RND	64	70	0	50	50									
ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants	ME	2,887	2,711	0	0	100	80	20	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
ESEA: Indian Education Grants to Local Educational Agencies	NA	95	82				25	75	0	0	0	100	0	67	33
ESEA: Javits Gifted and Talented Education	NA	10	12	0	0	100	100	0	0						
ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries	NA	19	20	0	0	100	0	50	50	50	50	0			
ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance	A	107	108	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100
ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships	NA	182	142	0	0	100	0	0	100	50	50	0	/// (program reconfigured)		
ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program	NA	387	406	0	0	100	0	0	100	17	33	50	88	13	0
ESEA: National Writing Project	RND	22	20	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	100	0			

Program Name	PART Rating	Appropriations†	Expenditures ‡	Program Performance Results												
				Percent of Targets Met, Not Met, Without Data												
				FY 2006			FY 2005			FY 2004			FY 2003			
FY 2006 \$ in millions	FY 2006 \$ in millions		% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data		
ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program	RND	50	73	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	100	0	75	0	25
ESEA: Parental Information and Resource Centers	RND	40	40	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	100
ESEA: Reading First State Grants	NA	1,029	1,057	0	0	100	0	0	0				11	11	78	
ESEA: Reading Is Fundamental/ Inexpensive Book Distribution	NA	25	24	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	
ESEA: Ready to Teach	NA	11	9	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100				
ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television	RND	24	23	0	0	100	50	25	25	0	0	100	0	0	100	
ESEA: Rural Education	NA	169	170	0	0	100	67	33	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	
ESEA: School Leadership	NA	15	14	0	0	100	0	0	100	100	0	0				
ESEA: Smaller Learning Communities	RND	94	120	0	0	100	0	0	100	33	67	0	0	100	0	
ESEA: Special Programs for Indian Children	NA	19	21	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100				
ESEA: Star Schools Program	NA	15	16	0	0	100										
ESEA: State Assessments	A	408	417	50	33	17	40	60	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	100
ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs	RND	99	229	0	0	100	75	25	0	50	50	0	100	0	0	
ESEA: Striving Readers	NA	30	4				///			/// (not funded)			/// (not funded)			
ESEA: Teaching American History	RND	122	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	
ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies	NA	12,713	12,597	0	0	100	33	67	0	25	0	75	100	0	0	
ESEA: Transition to Teaching	A	44	42	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	100	0	50	0	50	
ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers	A	15	16	0	0	100	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	
ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice	NA	26	29	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	
ESEA: Women's Educational Equity	NA	3	3	0	0	100	0	0	100							
ESRA: Comprehensive Centers	RND	56	31	0	0	100	///			/// (not funded)			/// (not funded)			

Program Name	PART Rating	Appropriations†	Expenditures ‡	Program Performance Results Percent of Targets Met, Not Met, Without Data											
				FY 2006			FY 2005			FY 2004			FY 2003		
				% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data
ESRA: National Assessment	E	88	51	(off year for collection)			100	0	0	(off year for collection)			0	100	0
ESRA: Regional Educational Laboratories	NA	66	18	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	100	0	0
ESRA: Statewide Data Systems	NA	25	3				///			/// (not funded)			/// (not funded)		
HEA: High School Equivalency Program	RND	19	19	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	100	0	0
HEA: State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders	NA	23	19	100	0	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	0	100	0
HEA: Teacher Quality Enhancement and Teacher Incentive Fund	RND	157	86	0	0	100	67	33	0	0	0	100	0	0	100
HERA: Aid for Elementary and Secondary Education (Hurricane Relief)	NA	1,635	973	NA											
IDEA: Special Education Grants for Infants and Families	RND	436	471	0	67	33	33	67	0	25	50	25	67	0	33
IDEA: Special Education Grants to States	A	10,583	10,676	13	0	87	34	33	33	0	100	0	43	43	14
IDEA: Special Education Parent Information Centers	RND	26	25	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	50	0	50
IDEA: Special Education Personnel Preparation	RND	90	84	0	0	100	25	25	50	0	0	100	0	33	67
IDEA: Special Education Preschool Grants	RND	381	390	0	67	33	0	50	50	0	100	0	0	100	0
IDEA: Special Education State Personnel Grants	NA	50	50	0	0	100	///			/// (not funded)			/// (not funded)		
IDEA: Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination	RND	49	57	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	25	75
IDEA: Special Education Technology and Media Services	NA	38	38	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	100	0	40	60
MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths	NA	62	81	0	0	100	100	0	0	33	33	33	67	0	33

Program Name	PART Rating	Appropriations†	Expenditures ‡	Program Performance Results											
				Percent of Targets Met, Not Met, Without Data											
				FY 2006			FY 2005			FY 2004			FY 2003		
FY 2006 \$ in millions	FY 2006 \$ in millions		% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	% Met	% Not Met	% No Data	
VTEA: Occupational and Employment Information	RND	0	9	0	0	100	50	50	0	50	50	0			
VTEA: Tech-Prep Demonstration	NA	0	3	0	0	100	33	67	0						
VTEA: Vocational Education National Programs	NA	9	11	0	0	100	40	60	0	60	40	0			
VTEA: Tech-Prep Education State Grants	RND	105	112	27	13	60	50	50	0	27	73	0	14	86	0
VTEA: Vocational Education State Grants	I	1182	1,185												
Administrative and Support Funding for Goal 2#	NA	5	5	#			#			#			#		
TOTAL		37,620	*37,306												

† Budget for each program represents program budget authority.

‡ Expenditures occur when recipients draw down funds to cover actual outlays. FY 2006 expenditures may include funds from prior years' appropriations.

■ A shaded cell denotes that the program did not have targets for the specified year.

/// Denotes programs not yet implemented. (Programs are often implemented near the end of the year they are first funded.)

The Department does not plan to develop performance measures for programs, activities, or budgetary line items that are administrative in nature or that serve to support other programs and their performance measures.

* Expenditures by program do not include outlays in the amount of \$90 million for prior years' obligations for Goal 2 programs that were not funded in FY 2006 and FY 2006 estimated accruals in the amount of \$304 million.

- APEB: Act to Promote the Education of the Blind
- CFAA: Compact of Free Association Act, Amendments of 2003
- CRA: Civil Rights Act
- ESEA: Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
- ESRA: Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002
- HEA: Higher Education Act of 1965
- HERA: Hurricane Education Recovery Act
- IDEA: Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
- MVHAA: McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act
- VTEA: Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act

- PART Rating**
- E = Effective
 - ME = Moderately Effective
 - A = Adequate
 - I = Ineffective
 - RND = Results Not Demonstrated
 - NA = Program has not been assessed