

**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT  
OF EDUCATION**

**LONG-RANGE PROGRAM PLAN  
2005-2010**



**REVISED DRAFT  
September 3, 2004**

## Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Agency Mission and Goals .....	1
Goals and Objectives .....	4
Outcomes with Performance Projection Tables.....	10
Linkages to Governor’s Priorities .....	19
Trends and Conditions .....	22
K-20 Education System.....	22
Accountability and Performance Funding.....	27
Community Colleges and Workforce Education .....	30
State Universities.....	33
Department of Education.....	33
Blind Services.....	34
Vocational Rehabilitation.....	37
Exhibit I: Agency Workforce Plan .....	41
Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards .....	42
Exhibit III: Performance Measure Assessment .....	55
Exhibit IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability .....	145
Glossary of Terms.....	238
Explanation of Acronyms .....	245

## **Agency Mission and Goals** ***“Highest Student Achievement”***

### **K-20 System Mission Statements**

As stated in Section 1008.31(3), Florida Statutes, “The mission of Florida’s K-20 education system shall be to increase the proficiency of all students within one seamless, efficient system, by allowing them the opportunity to expand their knowledge and skills through learning opportunities and research valued by students, parents, and communities. . . .”

The mission of the Division of Colleges and Universities is centered on “Promoting Excellence in Teaching, Research, and Public Service.” This mission is derived from Section 1004.01(1), Florida Statutes:

The Legislature finds it in the public interest to provide a system of postsecondary education which is of the highest possible quality; which enables all students to participate in the search for knowledge and individual development; which stresses undergraduate teaching as its main priority; which offers selected professional, graduate, and research programs with emphasis on state and national needs; which fosters diversity of educational opportunity; which promotes service to the public; which makes effective and efficient use of human and physical resources; which functions cooperatively with other educational institutions and systems; and which promotes internal coordination and the wisest possible use of resources.

The mission for the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education is provided in Section 1004.65(6), Florida Statutes: The primary mission and responsibility of community colleges is responding to community needs for postsecondary academic education and technical degree education.

### **K-20 System Goals**

The four statutory goals for Florida’s K-20 education system [Section 1008.31(3), Florida Statutes] are presented below with the associated definitions adopted by the Florida Board of Education:

*Highest Student Achievement:* Attainment of rigorous academic standards that consistently culminates in timely advancement to high school graduation and, after high school graduation, in qualification without remediation for either postsecondary education leading to a four-year degree or skilled employment.

*Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access:* Compatible curricula and standards that are consistently applied across educational levels and institutions so as to increase students’ interest in and qualification for degree- and certification-oriented postsecondary education.

*Skilled Workforce and Economic Development:* Effective matching of K-20 educational curricula and graduate proficiency standards with primary requirements for qualified employees from industries critical to Florida's future economic prosperity.

*Quality Efficient Services:* Effective management of K-20 resources (i.e., capital, operating, and human resources), consistently high responsiveness to customers, and accountability for results across the K-20 system.

These goals and their respective objectives are presented in priority order in the following section. Accompanying the goals and objectives are the outcome measures to be used in assessing progress towards the attainment of each objective.

### **Division of Blind Services**

The mission of the Division of Blind Services, pursuant to Chapter 413, Florida Statutes, is to empower people who are blind and visually impaired to reach self-determined goals. The Division's program and functional goals are to obtain employment outcomes and maximize independence and integration into the community for individuals of all ages who are blind or visually impaired. Therefore, the scope of the Division's program and its major activities must meet the needs of families with infants who are blind, students making the transition from school to work, working aged individuals who are blind, as well as older adults who face age-related blindness. Additionally, the Division is mandated to provide Braille and recorded publications to individuals who have print handicaps, thus including individuals who are not blind but have a disabling condition which requires recorded materials.

### **Division of Vocational Rehabilitation**

#### **Vision**

- ❖ We will be a high performing organization focused on results.
- ❖ We will focus on the needs of our customer.
- ❖ We will exemplify the best of public service.

#### **Mission**

Employment and Increased Independence for Floridians with Disabilities

#### **Major Goals**

- ❖ To place the eligible individuals served by the VR program in gainful employment.
- ❖ To return injured workers to suitable, gainful employment.

### **Strategic Objectives**

**Strategic Objective 1:** To improve services and employment opportunities for all clients for the Vocational Rehabilitation Program by closing the gaps in performance and service capacity.

**Strategic Objective 2:** To embrace opportunities for improving efficiency of service delivery.

**Strategic Objective 3:** To maximize the funding available for the delivery of services through the Vocational Rehabilitation Program.

**Strategic Objective 4:** To maintain an internal system of quality assurance within the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

**Strategic Objective 5:** To improve services and reemployment opportunities for injured workers of the Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services Program.

## Goals and Objectives

### ***Goal 1: Highest Student Achievement***

Objective 1A: To increase the number of students who graduate from high school and are prepared to enter the workforce and postsecondary education.

OUTCOME: Public high school graduation rate

Objective 1B: To ensure that students make annual learning gains sufficient to acquire the knowledge, skills, and competencies needed to master state standards.

OUTCOME: Student performance on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)

Objective 1C: To eliminate achievement gaps by improving the learning of all students as indicated by state assessment data.

OUTCOME: Number/percent of "A" schools

Objective 1D: To encourage communities, school boards, and schools to provide opportunities for involving parents, families, guardians, and other community stakeholders as collaborative partners in achieving school improvement and education accountability.

OUTCOME: Percent of schools improving one or more letter grades

Objective 1E: To increase the proportion of Associate in Arts (A.A.) degrees granted.

OUTCOME: The number of A.A. degrees granted annually

Objective 1F: To increase the proportion of A.A. degree transfers to state universities within two years.

OUTCOME: The percentage of annual A.A. degree transfers

Objective 1G: To increase the proportion of A.A. degree transfers to state universities who earn at least a 2.5 grade point average (g.p.a.) one year after they transfer.

OUTCOME: The percent of students who earn a 2.5 g.p.a. or above at a state university one year after transfer

Objective 1H: To monitor the number/percent of A.A. partial completers transferring to a state university with at least 40 credit hours.

OUTCOME: The number and percent of students who annually transfer to a state university with at least 40 credit hours

Objective 1I: To reduce or stabilize the number of students requiring remediation (college preparatory instruction).

OUTCOME: The number of students receiving college preparatory instruction

Objective 1J: To increase the percent of A.A. degree transfers to the State University System (SUS) who started in College Prep and who earn a 2.5 in the SUS after one year.

OUTCOME: The percent of A.A. degree transfers who started in College Prep and who earn a 2.5 in the State University System after one year

Objective 1K: To decrease the number/percent/Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs) of A.A. students who do not complete 18 credit hours within four years.

OUTCOME: The number/percent/FTEs of A.A. students who do not complete 18 credit hours within four years

***Goal 2: Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access***

Objective 2A: To increase the proportion of students seeking postsecondary education at Florida's community colleges.

OUTCOME: The number of students enrolled

Objective 2B: To provide adequate access to undergraduate and graduate education.

OUTCOME: Annual percentage increase in student FTEs in state universities

Objective 2C: To increase the percent of prior year graduates enrolled in community colleges.

OUTCOME: The percent of prior year graduates enrolled in community colleges

Objective 2D: To promote the offering of upper-level courses through concurrent-use agreements with universities on the community college campus.

OUTCOME: The number of students enrolled in baccalaureate programs offered on community college campuses

Objective 2E: To increase collaboration with K-20 partners in reducing the need for remediation at the postsecondary level.

OUTCOME: The percentage of community colleges that have formal articulation agreements addressing readiness with their local K-12 partners

Objective 2F: To increase mentorship/tutoring programs, including adoption of critically low-performing schools.

OUTCOME: The percentage of colleges engaged in mentoring/tutoring programs

Objective 2G: To identify needs for bachelor's degrees and to seek partnerships with public and private colleges and universities to offer those degrees on community college campuses.

OUTCOME: The number of programs offered through concurrent-use arrangements with public/private colleges and universities

Objective 2H: To increase the proportion of college preparatory students who enter college-level coursework associated with the A.A., Associate in Science (A.S.), Postsecondary Vocational Certificate, and Postsecondary Adult Vocational Certificate programs.

OUTCOME: The percent of students exiting the college preparatory program who enter college-level coursework associated with the A.A., A.S., Postsecondary Vocational Certificate, and Postsecondary Adult Vocational programs

Objective 2I: To facilitate the provision of developmental services to blind and visually impaired children.

OUTCOME: Number/percent of customers (children) successfully rehabilitated/transitioned from pre-school to school.

### ***Goal 3: Skilled Workforce and Economic Development***

Objective 3A: To increase the literacy rate of adult Floridians so that they have the knowledge and skills needed to compete in a global economy, prepare their children for success in school, and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

OUTCOME: Number of adult basic education and adult secondary education completion point completers who are found employed or continuing their education



Objective 3B: To monitor the percent of A.A. graduates who are employed full-time rather than continuing their education by tracking the percent which are in jobs earning at least \$10.00 an hour.

OUTCOME: The percentage of non-transfer A.A. graduates employed who are employed in high skill/high wage jobs found on the Workforce Estimating Conference list

Objective 3C: To monitor the number of A.A. graduates who have not transferred to a state university or an independent college or university who are found placed in an occupation identified as high skill/high wage on the Workforce Estimating Conference list.

OUTCOME: The number of A.A. graduates found placed in occupations identified as high skill/high wage on the Workforce Estimating Conference list

Objective 3D: To determine eligibility for services, provide counseling; facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, and independent living services; and provide job placement assistance to Blind Services' customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.

OUTCOME: The percentage of rehabilitation customers placed in competitive employment

Objective 3E: To provide Food Service Vending training, work experience, and licensing.

OUTPUT: Number of blind vending food service facilities supported

Objective 3F: To improve services and employment opportunities for all clients for the Vocational Rehabilitation Program by closing the gaps in performance and service capacity.

OUTCOME: Percent/number of all VR customers gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days

Objective 3G: To improve services and reemployment opportunities for injured workers of the Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services Program.

OUTCOME: Number of program applicants provided reemployment services.

Objective 3H: To provide services and reemployment opportunities for injured workers of the Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services.

OUTCOME: Percent of eligible injured workers receiving reemployment services with closed cases during the fiscal year and returned to suitable gainful employment

***Goal 4: Quality Efficient Services***

Objective 4A: To increase the supply of teachers who possess the competencies and demonstrate the performance needed to maximize learning among all students.

OUTCOME: Number/percent of teachers with National Board Certification

Objective 4B: To solve critical state problems through research.

OUTCOME: Annual percentage increase in research expenditures (state and sponsored research)

Objective 4C: To promote service to the public.

OUTCOME: Annual percentage increase of public service funds expended for public service to Pre-K-12 schools

Objective 4D: To increase the proportion of students graduating with total accumulated credit hours that are less than or equal to 120 percent of the degree requirement.

OUTCOME: The percent of students graduating with credit hours at or under 120 percent of the degree requirement

Objective 4E: To increase the proportion of A.A. students with 18 credit hours who graduate in four years.

OUTCOME: The percent of students graduating within four years, disaggregated by category

Objective 4F: To increase the amount of economically disadvantaged A.A. degree students with 18 credit hours who graduate with an A.A. degree within four years.

OUTCOME: The number and percent of economically disadvantaged students who graduate with an A.A. degree in four years

Objective 4G: To increase the amount of disabled A.A. degree students with 18 credit hours who graduate with an A.A. degree in four years.

OUTCOME: The number and percent of disabled A.A. degree students who graduate with an A.A. degree within four years

Objective 4H: To increase the amount of black male A.A. students with 18 credit hours who graduate with an A.A. degree within four years.

OUTCOME: The number and percent of black male students who graduate with an A.A. degree in four years

Objective 4I: To increase the amount of English as a Second Language (ESL) students with 18 credit hours who graduate with an A.A. degree within four years.

OUTCOME: The number and percent of English as a Second Language students who graduate with an A.A. degree in four years

Objective 4J: To provide Braille and recorded publications services.

OUTPUT: Cost per library customer served

## Outcomes with Performance Projection Tables

### GOAL #1: Highest Student Achievement

**OBJECTIVE 1A:** To increase the number of students who graduate from high school and are prepared to enter the workforce and postsecondary education.

**OUTCOME:** Public high school graduation rate

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
60.23%	66	68%	70%	72%	74%

**OBJECTIVE 1B:** To ensure that students make annual learning gains sufficient to acquire the knowledge, skills, and competencies needed to master state standards.

**OUTCOME:** Percentage of students in Grade 10 achieving Levels 3-5 on the FCAT in reading and mathematics

Reading:

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
30%	40%	45%	50%	55%	55%

Mathematics:

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
47%	60%	65%	70%	75%	75%

**OBJECTIVE 1C:** To eliminate achievement gaps by improving the learning of all students as indicated by state assessment data.

**OUTCOME:** Number/percent of "A" schools, reported by district

Baseline FY 1999-00	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
201/8.3%	1,200/45%	1,250/47%	1,300/49%	1,350/51%	1,400/53%

**OBJECTIVE 1D:** To encourage communities, school boards, and schools to provide opportunities for involving parents, families, guardians, and other community stakeholders as collaborative partners in achieving school improvement and education accountability.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of schools improving one or more letter grades

Baseline FY 1999-00	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
38%	35%	30%	25%	20%	20%

**OBJECTIVE 1E:** To increase the proportion of A.A. degrees granted.

**OUTCOME:** The number of A.A. degrees granted annually

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
29,000	29,880	31,500	32,500	33,500	35,500

**OBJECTIVE 1F:** To increase the proportion of A.A. degree transfers to state universities within two years.

**OUTCOME:** The percentage of A.A. degree transfers granted annually

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
69%	70%	71%	72%	73%	74%

**OBJECTIVE 1G:** To increase the proportion of A.A. degree transfers to state universities who earn a 2.5 grade point average (g.p.a.) or above after a year.

**OUTCOME:** The percent of students who earn a 2.5 g.p.a. or above one year after transfer

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
75%	73%	76%	77%	78%	79%

**OBJECTIVE 1H:** To monitor the number/percent of A.A. partial completers transferring to a state university with at least 40 credit hours.

**OUTCOME:** The number and percent of students who annually transfer to a state university with at least 40 credit hours

Baseline FY 1999-2000	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
16,821 (72%)	16,855 56%	56%	56%	56%	56%

**OBJECTIVE 1I:** To stabilize or decrease the number of students receiving college preparatory instruction.

**OUTCOME:** The number of First-Time in College students receiving college preparatory instruction.

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
100,000	118,471	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000

**OBJECTIVE 1J** To increase the percent of A.A. degree transfers to the State University System who started in College Prep and who earn a 2.5 in the SUS after one year.

**OUTCOME:** The percent of A.A. degree transfers who started in College Prep and who earn a 2.5 in the State University System after one year

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
75%	73%	75%	75%	75%	75%

**OBJECTIVE 1K** To decrease the number/percent/FTEs of A.A. students who do not complete 18 credit hours within four years.

**OUTCOME:** The number/percent/FTEs of A.A. students who do not complete 18 credit hours within four years

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
5,346/23% 2,275	5,346/23% 2,275	5,346/23% 2,275	5,346/23% 2,275	5,346/23% 2,275	5,346/23% 2,275

## GOAL #2: Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access

**OBJECTIVE 2A:** To increase the proportion of students seeking postsecondary education in the Florida Community College System.

**OUTCOME:** The number of students enrolled.

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
737,864	795,319	800,000	805,000	810,000	820,000

**OBJECTIVE 2B:** To provide adequate access to undergraduate and graduate education.

**OUTCOME:** Annual percentage increase in student full-time equivalents (FTEs) in state universities

Baseline	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
149,825 FTEs	5.27%	4.13%	3.66%	3.27%	3.27%

**OBJECTIVE 2C:** To increase the percent of prior year graduates enrolled in community colleges.

**OUTCOME:** The percent of prior year graduates enrolled in community colleges

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
30%	31%	32%	33%	34%	35%

**OBJECTIVE 2D:** To promote the offering of upper-level courses through concurrent-use agreements with universities on the community college campus.

**OUTCOME:** The number of students enrolled in baccalaureate programs offered on community college campuses

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
13,000	13,500	14,000	14,500	15,000	15,500

**OBJECTIVE 2E:** To increase collaboration with K-20 partners in reducing the need for remediation at the postsecondary level.

**OUTCOME:** The percentage of community colleges that have formal articulation agreements addressing readiness with their local K-12 partners

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**OBJECTIVE 2F:** To increase mentoring/tutoring programs including adoption of critically low-performing schools.

**OUTCOME:** The percentage of colleges engaged in mentoring/tutoring programs.

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
61%	70%	80%	90%	100%	100%

**OBJECTIVE 2G:** To identify needs for bachelor's degrees and to seek partnerships with public and private colleges and universities to offer those degrees on community college campuses.

**OUTCOME:** The number of programs offered through concurrent-use arrangements with public/private colleges and universities

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
234	371	400	450	475	525

**OBJECTIVE 2H:** To increase the proportion of college preparatory students who enter college-level coursework associated with the A.A., Associate in Science (A.S.), Postsecondary Vocational Certificate, and Postsecondary Adult Vocational Certificate programs.

**OUTCOME:** The percent of students exiting the college preparatory program who enter college-level coursework associated with the A.A., Associate in Science (A.S.), Postsecondary Vocational Certificate, and Postsecondary Adult Vocational programs

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
73%	74%	75%	76%	77%	78%

**OBJECTIVE 2I:** To facilitate the provision of developmental services to blind and visually impaired children.

**OUTCOME:** Number/percent of customers (children) successfully rehabilitated/transitioned from pre-school to school

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
36 (67.3%)	38 (70%)	41 (75%)	44 (80%)	44 (80%)	44 (80%)

### GOAL #3: Skilled Workforce and Economic Development

**OBJECTIVE 3A:** Increase the literacy rates and employability skills of adult Floridians.

**OUTCOME:** Number of adult basic education and adult secondary education completion point completers who are found employed or continuing their education

Baseline FY 1999-00	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
36,195	40,000	42,000	44,000	46,000	50,000

**OBJECTIVE 3B:** To monitor the percent of A.A. graduates who are employed full-time rather than continuing their education by tracking the percent which are in jobs earning at least \$10.00 an hour.

**OUTCOME:** The percentage of non-transfer A.A. graduates employed who are employed in high skill/high wage jobs found on the Workforce Estimating Conference list

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
59%	69%	69%	69%	69%	69%



**OBJECTIVE 3C:** To monitor the number of A.A. graduates who have not transferred to a state university or an independent college or university who are found placed in an occupation identified as high skill/high wage on the Workforce Estimating Conference list.

**OUTCOME:** The number of A.A. graduates found placed in occupations identified as high skill/high wage on the Workforce Estimating Conference list

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
2,931	2,553	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900

**OBJECTIVE 3D:** To determine eligibility for services, provide counseling; facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, and independent living services; and provide job placement assistance to Blind Services' customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.

**OUTCOME:** The percent of rehabilitation customers placed in competitive employment

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
64%	75%	85%	90%	95%	95%

**OBJECTIVE 3E:** To provide Food Service Vending training, work experience, and licensing.

**OUTCOME:** Number of blind vending food service facilities supported

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
151	153	153	153	153	153

**OBJECTIVE 3F:** To provide services and employment opportunities for all clients for the Vocational Rehabilitation Program by closing the gaps in performance and service capacity..

**OUTCOME:** Number/percent of all VR customers gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
11,500 (59.0%)	11,500 (65%)	11,500 (65.0%)	11,500 (65%)	11,500 (65%)	11,500 (65%)

**OBJECTIVE 3G:** To provide services and reemployment opportunities for injured workers of the Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services.

**OUTCOME :** Number of program applicants provided reemployment services

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
2,500	2,525	2,525	2,525	2,550	2,575

**OBJECTIVE 3H:** To provide services and reemployment opportunities for injured workers of the Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services.

**OUTCOME:** Percent of eligible injured workers receiving reemployment services with closed cases during the fiscal year and returned to suitable gainful employment

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
66%	76%	78%	80%	82%	84%

#### GOAL #4: Quality Efficient Services

**OBJECTIVE 4A:** To increase the supply of teachers who possess the competencies and demonstrate the performance needed to maximize learning among students.

**OUTCOME:** Number/percent of teachers with National Board Certification

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
0.02%	3.0%%	3.5%	4.0%	4.5%	5.0%

**OBJECTIVE 4B:** To solve critical state problems through research.

**OUTCOME:** Annual percentage increase in research expenditures (state and sponsored research)<sup>1</sup>

Baseline	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
\$1.006 billion	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%

<sup>1</sup> Additional resources made available for research would enable further investigation of possible solutions of the State's critical problems.

\* Based on 1999-00 Expenditure Analysis and 1999-00 Actual Expenditures for SUS Contracts and Grants

**OBJECTIVE 4C:** To promote service to the public.

**OUTCOME:** Annual percentage increase of public service funds expended for public service to Pre-K-12 schools

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
10%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%

**OBJECTIVE 4D:** To increase the proportion of students graduating with total accumulated credit hours that are less than or equal to 120 percent of the degree requirement.

**OUTCOME:** The percent of students graduating with credit hours at or under 120 percent of degree requirement

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
36%	36%	38%	39%	40%	41%

**OBJECTIVE 4E:** To increase the proportion of the A.A. students with 18 credit hours who graduate in four years.

**OUTCOME:** The percent of students graduating within four years, disaggregated by category

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
36%	33%	36%	39%	42%	45%

**OBJECTIVE 4F:** To increase the amount of economically disadvantaged A.A. degree students with 18 credit hours who graduate with an A.A. degree within four years.

**OUTCOME:** The number and percent of economically disadvantaged students who graduate with an A.A. degree in four years

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
2,138 (34%)	2,138 (34%)	34%	34%	34%	34%

**OBJECTIVE 4G:** To increase the amount of disabled A.A. degree students with 18 credit hours who graduate with an A.A. degree within four years.

**OUTCOME:** The number and percent of disabled A.A. degree students who graduate within four years

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
153 (31%)	153 (31%)	33%	34%	35%	35%

**OBJECTIVE 4H:** To increase the amount of black male A.A. students with 18 credit hours who graduate with an A.A. degree within four years.

**OUTCOME:** The number and percent of black male students who graduate with an A.A. degree in four years

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
126 (18%)	126 (18%)	19%	20%	21%	22%

**OBJECTIVE 4I:** To increase the amount of English as a Second Language (ESL) students with 18 credit hours who graduate with an A.A. degree within four years.

**OUTCOME:** The number and percent of English as a Second Language students who graduate with an A.A. degree in four years

Baseline FY 1998-99	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
105 (31%)	105 (31%)	32%	33%	34%	35%

**OBJECTIVE 4J:** To provide Braille and recorded publications services.

**OUTCOME:** Cost per library customer served

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10
\$19.65	\$19.65	\$19.65	\$19.65	\$19.65	\$19.65

## Florida Department of Education Linkages to Governor's Priorities

Goals that link to the Governor's priorities of 1. Improve Education, 2. Strengthen Families, 3. Promote Economic Diversity, 4. Reduce Violent Crime and Illegal Drug Use, 5. Create a Smaller, more effective, more efficient government, and 6. Enhance Florida's Environment and Quality of Life for the five-year planning period:

### 1. Improve Education

Goal #1: Highest Student Achievement

Objective 1A: Increase high school graduation rate

Objective 1B: Increase percentage of students mastering state standards

Objective 1C: Eliminate achievement gaps

Objective 1D: Improve school grades

Objective 1E: Increase number of A.A. degrees

Objective 1F: Increase percentage of A.A. degree transfers

Objective 1G: Increase percentage of successful A.A. degree transfers

Objective 1H: Decrease number of non-A.A. degree transfers

Objective 1I: Reduce the number of students requiring remediation

Goal #2: Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access

Objective 2B: To provide adequate access to undergraduate and graduate education

Objective 2E: Increase collaboration among K-12 and postsecondary sectors

Objective 2F: Increase mentorship/tutoring at low-performing schools

Objective 2H: Increase proportion of college preparatory students who advance to college-level coursework

### 2. Strengthen Families

Goal #3: Skilled Workforce and Economic Development

Objective 3F: To improve services and employment opportunities for all clients for the Vocational Rehabilitation Program by closing the gaps in performance and service capacity

Goal #4: Quality Efficient Services

Objective 4F: Increase graduation rate of the economically disadvantaged

Objective 4G: Increase graduation rate of disabled students

Objective 4H: Increase graduation rate of black males

Objective 4I: Increase graduation rate of students for whom English is a second language

### 3. Promote Economic Diversity

Goal #3: Skilled Workforce and Economic Development

Objectives 3B & 3C: Increase number of persons placed in high skill/high wage occupations

Objective 3E: To provide Food Service Vending training, work experience, and licensing

Objective 3F: To improve services and employment opportunities for all clients for the Vocational Rehabilitation Program by closing the gaps in performance and service capacity

4. Reduce violent crime and illegal drug use

Goal #4: Quality Efficient Services

Objective 4B: Solve critical state problems through research

5. Create a Smaller, More Effective, More Efficient Government

Goal #2: Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access

Objective 2I: To facilitate the provision of developmental services to blind and visually impaired children.

Goal #3: Skilled Workforce and Economic Development

Objective 3F: To improve services and employment opportunities for all clients for the Vocational Rehabilitation Program by closing the gaps in performance and service capacity

Objective 3G: To improve services and reemployment opportunities for injured workers of the Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services Program

Goal #4: Quality, Efficient Services

Objective 4D: Increase percentage of students graduating with credit hours less than or equal to 120 percent of the degree requirement

6. Enhance Florida's Environment and Quality of Life

Goal #2: Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access

Objective 2A: Increase proportion of students seeking postsecondary education

Goal #3: Skilled Workforce and Economic Development

Objective 3A: To increase literacy rate of adult Floridians

Objective 3D: To determine eligibility for services, provide counseling; facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, and independent living services; and provide job placement assistance to Blind Services' customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers

Objective 3F: To improve services and employment opportunities for all clients for the Vocational Rehabilitation Program by closing the gaps in performance and service capacity

Objective 3G: To improve services and reemployment opportunities for injured workers of the Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services Program

Goal #4: Quality Efficient Services

Objective 4B: Solve critical state problems through research

Objective 4C: Promote public service

Objective 4J: Provide Braille and recorded publications services.

## Trends and Conditions

### K-20 Education System

In support of the overarching mission of the Department of Education—"Improving Student Achievement"—the State Board of Education on March 16, 2004 approved revisions to its eight strategic imperatives, as follows:

1. Increasing the Supply of Highly Qualified K-12 Teachers
2. Set, Align, and Apply Academic Standards Consistently at Every Level of the K-20 Education System
3. Increasing Rates of Learning and Completion
4. Improving the Quality of School Leadership at all Levels
5. Improve the Quality and Increase the Quantity of all Educational Options
6. Aligning the Workforce's Education with the Skill Requirements of the New Economy
7. Aligning Financial Resources with Performance Expectations
8. Achieving World-Class Nationally Recognized Institutions of Higher Learning by Improving Access, Funding, Performance, and Accountability.

Since their initial adoption in June 2002, the strategic imperatives have served to guide policymaking, planning, and budgetary decisions both at the state level and throughout the K-20 governance structure, including institutional boards of trustees and district school boards. By consistently adhering to these visionary goals, each sector has achieved notable results. The department's *Long-Range Program Plan, 2005-10* is directed toward improving upon these results, implementing constitutional and legislative mandates, and adhering to budget guidelines adopted by the State Board of Education.

Work is underway to provide the State Board of Education with information about Performance Results from the K-20 education system. Information will be presented to the Board on August 16 and 17, 2004, and will become incorporated into the subsequent version of the plan as a part of the planned budget workshop and Board meeting.

### Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test Results

Results from the 2004 administration of the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) showed that more than half of the Florida students who take the test in grades 3 – 10 are reading at or above grade level (Level 3). Students showed improvement in reading at every grade level, except 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>. The greatest improvements over last year continued to be in reading in the elementary grades, with 68 percent of third- and fourth-grade students reading at or above grade level (compared to 55 percent in 2001). In mathematics, 56 percent of all students performed at or above grade level, compared to 48 percent in 2001. The percentage of students scoring at or above grade level in mathematics increased at every grade level except 6<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>. The improvements among African American and Hispanic students were considerably greater than those for white students.



### National Assessment of Education Progress Results

Results from the 2003 administration of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) showed Florida to be the only state to make significant improvement in fourth grade reading. Florida surpassed the national average in fourth grade reading and is at the national average in fourth grade math for the first time. While eighth grade achievement is consistent with national trends, Florida's mathematics scores improved more than the national average. In fourth grade reading, the average score for Florida's Hispanic students rose, while it remained constant for the rest of the nation. Florida's African American students also made progress; whereas the average score for their national counterparts fell. The improvement among African American students in Florida since 1998 is more than twice the national gain. In eighth grade reading, average scores fell both in Florida and nationally; however, the average score for Florida was higher than in 1998, while nationally it remained the same.

### School Grades and Adequate Yearly Progress Results

In 1999, when the current methodology for computing school grades under the A+ Plan for Education was introduced, only 515 schools (21 percent) earned an "A" or a "B." By 2004, the number of schools in that category rose to 1,259 (68 percent). By the same token, the number of "D" and "F" schools was 677 (28 percent) in 1999 and just 233 (9 percent) in 2004. The A+ Plan required standards to be raised twice during this period, adding strength to these positive trends. In addition, a significant correlation exists between Florida's school grading system and the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirements of the national "No Child Left Behind" Act (NCLB). Both base their computations on FCAT results and emphasize the scores of the lowest performing students. In order to earn AYP status, however, a school must also demonstrate positive achievement levels in subgroups of students classified by race/ethnicity, socio-economic status, English language proficiency, and learning exceptionalities. Of the 1,259 "A" schools, 1,156 satisfied 90 percent or more of the AYP criteria. Similarly significant ratios exist between "B" schools' meeting 80 percent or more of the AYP criteria, "C" schools' meeting 70 percent or more of the AYP criteria, "D" schools' meeting 60 percent of the AYP criteria, and "F" schools' meeting 50 percent or more of the AYP criteria.

### Assistance Plus Results

Another initiative driven by student FCAT performance and school grades is Assistance Plus, which targets remedial strategies and additional resources to schools graded "F". Almost half of the 35 schools graded "F" in 2003 had improved to a "D" or a "C" by 2004. Approximately one-third maintained their failing status, and the balance were either closed or did not meet the criteria for receiving a grade. The scores for the schools that improved increased by an average of 20 percent. The Assistance Plus initiative was enhanced for the 2004-05 school year with the addition of six new requirements: 1) District school boards are to declare an emergency, enabling them to suspend provisions of collective bargaining agreements to facilitate the reassignment of teachers to under-performing schools; 2) districts had to submit corrective action plans to the State Board of Education by July 15, 2004; 3) districts are to adopt a budget that includes a special category to support school improvement at F schools and prioritize Supplemental

Academic Instruction categorical funds to serve students in these schools; 4) districts are to implement policies that deter social promotion at all grade levels; 5) school staff, parents, and students are to agree on individual success plans, written as contracts to facilitate promotion to the next school level; and 6) districts are to take emergency action to close charter schools that continue to fail.

### Reading Initiative Results

The results on state and national reading tests cited above indicate that Florida students are making progress, but that a continued emphasis must be placed on raising skills to grade level throughout the K-12 continuum. The department's *Just Read, Florida!* Office serves as the central resource repository for local reading and remediation efforts. This office also coordinates the multiple reading initiatives championed by Governor Jeb Bush and the legislature. For Fiscal Year 2004-05, these include over \$90 million to attain the goal of having all students reading on grade level or higher by 2012. The first priority for Supplemental Academic Instruction categorical appropriation expenditures is the training of teachers in research-based instructional methodologies, and \$25 million from this appropriation is specifically allocated to reading instruction for students who have not met the standards required for promotion or graduation.

In August 2003, the governor announced \$500,000 in new funding to support family literacy programs. The Family Literacy Initiative Sustainability Grants provided continued backing for 12 family literacy programs across the state. Family literacy encompasses a unique educational approach that includes four separate but integrated components. Parents receive adult education, often focusing on improving job skills or English language skills. Children receive individualized education appropriate for their age and developmental level. In addition, parents take part in classes to help them understand their children's literacy development in order to learn ways to support that development at home. The Governor's Family Literacy Initiative is a unique effort between the Governor's Office and the Volunteer Florida Foundation. The goals of the program are to establish literacy as a value in every family, and reinforce the belief that home is a child's first school, parents are a child's first teachers, and reading is a child's first subject. Initiated as a pilot program in southeast Florida, the program has grown statewide and has served nearly 7,000 adults and children.

### Constitutional and Legislative Mandates

*Class Size Amendment:* Passed in 2002 with full implementation to be accomplished by 2010, the Class Size Amendment received over \$1 billion in state funding last year and was appropriated an additional \$979 million in FY 2004-05. Class size averages are to be calculated at the district level for the first three years of the phase-in period to determine districts' compliance with class size reduction requirements. During the subsequent two years, class size averages will be calculated at the school level. Thereafter, they will be calculated at the classroom level. As of January 2004, 72 percent of Florida's students were attending classes that exceeded the constitutional caps. The following table summarizes the progress that was made at each grade level grouping between the baseline year and the first year of funding.

**Table 1: Comparison of District Class Sizes, 2003 - 2004**

<b>Grade Grouping</b>	<b>2003 Baseline</b>	<b>2004 District Averages</b>	<b>Change</b>
K – Grade 3	23.07	20.54	-2.53
Grades 4 – 8	24.16	22.43	-1.73
Grades 9 – 12	24.10	24.06	-0.04

Prior to the beginning of the 2004-05 school year, 50 of 67 school districts had met the requirement to meet the constitutional cap or to reduce by at least two the number of students from the baseline year in all grade groupings at the district level. For grades K – 3, 30 districts had reached the cap of 18 students; 53 districts had reached the cap of 22 students in grades 4 – 8; and 62 districts had reached the cap of 25 students in grades 9 – 12.

The following table depicts the percentages of schools and classrooms statewide that are over the appropriate cap.

**Table 2: Percentages of Schools and Classrooms Over Cap**

<b>Grade Grouping</b>	<b>Schools Over Cap</b>	<b>Classrooms Over Cap</b>
Grades K – 3	67%	71%
Grades 4 – 8	45%	56%
Grades 9 – 12	25%	50%

*Voluntary Universal Pre-kindergarten:* The governor’s veto of House Bill 821 may trigger a special session of the legislature following the November elections in order to meet the fall 2005 deadline for implementing the Voluntary Universal Pre-kindergarten (VPK) constitutional amendment. Ensuing legislation is likely to address the concerns raised by the governor and others, including the department. The central issues to be resolved include the following [quotations from the governor’s veto message]:

- Programmatic Oversight—“The State Board of Education should be entrusted, after appropriate study and analysis, to establish performance measures and standards. The proper venue for day-to-day oversight of this program, for ensuring its integrity and the integrity of its providers, and for measuring outcomes lies with the Department of Education under the direction of the State Board of Education.”
- Classroom Supervision—“Although this bill includes provisions designed to ensure the safety and welfare of children participating in the program . . . child safety and welfare can better be protected by ensuring that a sufficient number of adults are present in each classroom.”
- Interagency Collaboration—“Any attempt to faithfully implement the program should not constrain communication and collaboration between the Department of Education, the Agency for Workforce Innovation, and the Department of Children and Families.”

- Workforce Training—“Committed and well trained staff will help VPK succeed. Toward that end, I support language that enhances the quality and emerging literacy focus of Child Development Associate (CDA) programs, establishes professional development goals and provides articulation to associate degree programs for CDA graduates from accredited community colleges and vocational training programs.”
- Choice Options—“The legislation should also permit all types of providers, including public, private, faith-based, and family child care homes, to participate in all of the VPK choices afforded to parents. VPK program choices should not be limited to only one type of provider.”

Prior to the passage of implementing legislation, the governor has directed the Department of Education, under the direction of the State Board of Education, to refocus the statewide school readiness assessment on emerging literacy skills, develop literacy-focused curriculum standards, and lay the foundation for program integrity and accountability measurement. The Florida Partnership for School Readiness and Agency for Workforce Innovation are to accelerate preparation of the statewide, single point of entry system for enrollment and continue to encourage local school readiness coalitions to consolidate administrative functions. The Department of Children and Families is to pursue improvement in the quality and consistency of Child Development Associate training programs. These agencies are to work collaboratively with staff of the Executive Office of the Governor on pre-kindergarten implementation plans and legislative budget requests for the 2005-2006 fiscal year

*Middle Grades Reform Act:* The vision for the Middle Grades Reform Act (SB 354) is “To provide added focus and rigor to academics in the middle schools. Using reading as the foundation, all middle school students will receive rigorous academic instruction through challenging curricula, delivered by highly qualified teachers, in schools with outstanding leadership, which are supported by engaged and informed parents. Students leaving the 8<sup>th</sup> grade will be ready for success in high school.” Among the driving forces of reform are, once again, FCAT data. Of the 585,866 students in grades 6 – 8 who participated in the reading portion of the 2003 FCAT, 46 percent of 6<sup>th</sup> graders were below grade level, 49 percent of 7<sup>th</sup> graders were below grade level, and 52 percent of 8<sup>th</sup> graders were below grade level. Similarly high percentages were reported for students participating in the math FCAT that year: 53 percent of 6<sup>th</sup> graders scored at Level 1 or 2, 52 percent of 7<sup>th</sup> graders scored at Level 1 or 2, and 44 percent of 8<sup>th</sup> graders scored at Level 1 or 2.

There are four key components in the reform effort. The first is to ensure that the middle grades curriculum and course offerings are based on effective, research-based programs. The second is the implementation of a rigorous reading requirement in middle grades schools where fewer than 75 percent of students are reading on grade level. The third is the development of personal middle school graduation plans for entering 6<sup>th</sup> grade students who scored below Level 3 in reading or math in 5<sup>th</sup> grade. The fourth is to conduct a comprehensive study of middle school academic requirements, attendance

policies and strategies, teacher quality, school leadership, and parental and community involvement.

*Educator Recruitment, Certification, and Preparation:*

In keeping with Florida's goals to provide every child with a high quality teacher and principal in a safe classroom environment, SB 2986 targets educator preparation, certification, retention, and discipline. This act provides authority to the State Board of Education to review national certificates for use toward initial certification requirements. It also requires the department to establish a statewide Teacher Appreciation Week and to create guidelines and identify best practices for mentoring first-time teachers. The department also must design an online toolkit with the latest research-based information on reading and other subject areas, and send all teachers by e-mail information that affects them in substantive legislation and the General Appropriations Act. In addition, the Commissioner of Education is to pursue a plan for High, Objective, Uniform State System of Evaluation (HOUSSE) for experienced teachers to use in meeting the highly qualified teacher requirements of the No Child Left Behind act.

*Student Progression and Graduation:* SB 364 addresses accelerated high school graduation options, alternative assessments, Classrooms for Kids, the rights of parents and students with reading deficiencies, and third grade progression. This legislation places additional requirements on high school students opting for a three-year graduation program and extends the policy allowing students to use concordant scores on the ACT or SAT to meet FCAT graduation requirements. In addition, the State Board of Education must adopt standards that provide reasonable expectation that a retained third grade student has made sufficient progress to master appropriate 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading skills.

Underlying this legislation are studies related to the post-secondary destinations of high school students and the outcomes of students retained in the third grade. In 2004, 63 percent of students earning standard high school diplomas continued their education. Of these, 56 percent enrolled in a community college, 35 percent attended a public university, 6 percent attended a private college or university, and 3 percent attended a technical center. In contrast, 58 percent of 12<sup>th</sup> grade students not passing the FCAT continued their education beyond high school. Of these, 31 percent attended a community college and 69 percent attended a technical center.

In 2004, 59 percent of retained third grade students scored in achievement level 2 or higher. Twenty percent were in need of remediation but were eligible for a good cause exemption. Fifteen percent were in need of additional remediation but could still be eligible for promotion through alternative assessment or acceptable student portfolio. A final 6 percent were promoted in mid-year.

*Accountability and Performance Funding*

October 8, 2003, was the final meeting of the five task forces appointed to make recommendations for K-20 Education Performance Accountability in Florida. Their recommendations respond to the requirement to design the components of a single, unified accountability system. That system and its components are required in law, s.

1008.031, F.S., as amended by the 2003 Legislature in HB 915. According to that statute, the State Board of Education has the final responsibility to recommend an accountability system and an associated performance funding formula to the Legislature by December 1, 2004. The Task Force recommendations are meant to assist the Commissioner of Education, his Policy Council, and the State Board of Education with the system design. The involvement of the task forces was to assure that the Department of Education collaborated with each delivery sector in building the accountability process. Positive results from accountability depend upon broad awareness of the desired results, especially among those in contact with students.

The K-20 Task Force recommended the following descriptions of performance-based funding. The members did not recommend standards, benchmarks, or improvement targets as referenced in law, but they wished to provide these statements as general guidelines. They anticipated that any formula recommended by the State Board of Education would be available with historical data prior to its application to funding.

#### *Process Framework Guidelines*

- Funding should be determined by a combination of workload funding and performance funding
- The goal of the process is to improve performance within a K-20 context
- The performance funding model should reflect K-20 and sector expectations and should include minimum standards, improvement targets, and recognition for reaching or sustaining high levels of performance on multiple measures

#### *Process Implementation Guidelines*

- The performance funding model should be pilot tested using actual data so that the consequences of various scenarios might be analyzed prior to implementation
- Implementation of performance funding should occur over time, taking into consideration the currency of accountability data and the ability of education providers to affect outcomes
- Performance expectations should be based on school district or institution performance history and use peer measures where appropriate
- Some performance measures will require further development; such measures should not be included in the funding process until developed

#### *Process Performance Funding Guidelines*

- High performers should retain spending flexibility; low performers should be required to direct proportions of funds to performance-improvement efforts; unearned funds should be used at the discretion of the school district or institution
- Performance funding measures should be weighted so as to reflect sector expectations
- Performance funding should unify all operations within school districts and institutions around the four goals
- The system should include measures that reflect individual school district or institution level priorities/service

While final recommendations are pending, documentation detailing the proposed accountability measures and standards and funding formulae for each sector is available at <http://www.k20accountability.org/>.

#### Current Funding and Budget Guidelines

The budget guidelines and priorities for 2005-06 are predicated upon appropriations for the current year. In 2004-05, funding for K-12 public schools rose by more than \$1 billion over the prior year through the Florida Education Finance Program, an increase of 7.3 percent. This represented a per student increase of \$269, or 4.9 percent. These increases exceeded the expected 2.3 percent increase in enrollment to 2,615,127. Funding for class size reduction implementation was \$978.8 million; continued funding for school recognition was \$140-\$160 million; and Just Read, Florida! appropriations totaled \$90.7 million. The appropriation for non-recurring, non-FEFP funds was \$21.1 million. Funding for virtual education was \$13.4 million at the high school level and \$4.6 million for grades K – 8.

In the area of workforce education, \$18.5 million for adults with disabilities was transferred to the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Workforce administered funds were increased to \$388.7 million.

The community college matching grants program was fully funded at \$50.8 million. An additional \$7.8 million was appropriated to fund baccalaureate degree programs at community colleges, and a tuition increase of 5 percent was authorized.

State universities received funding of \$61.5 million to accommodate enrollment growth of 11,496 students. The total budget of \$2.2 billion included an increase of \$110 million for education and general activities. Tuition increases of 7.5 percent for in-state students and 12.5 percent for out-of-state students were also authorized.

Within this context, the State Board of Education on July 12, 2004 adopted Budget Guidelines and Priorities for 2005-06, as follows:

#### *Priority One: Instruction and Access to Instruction*

- Improving Student Achievement, especially Reading
- Enrollment for PreK-12, including class size reduction funding
- Access to Higher Education
- Eight Strategic Imperatives Adopted by State Board
- Implementing a Performance Funding Model

#### *Priority Two: General Financial Obligations*

- Annualization of funding for prior year New Programs that were funded for less than 12 months
- Construction, Restoration, and Renovation of Education Facilities
- Partially Funded or Phased-In Projects
- Office of Student Financial Assistance
- Client services for Vocational Rehabilitation and Blind Services

- Funds Allocated to Local Boards to Respond to Community Needs and Institution-Level Strategic Plans

The specific projects and funding requirements are detailed in the pending Legislative Budget Request.

## **Community Colleges and Workforce Education**

### Community Colleges

The Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education (DCCWE) is committed to increasing access and student success. Several projects have been undertaken to further DCCWE in its commitment.

The most recent is Achieving the Dream. Four of Florida's community colleges were selected to participate in "Achieving the Dream", a multi-year initiative designed to enhance the academic success of low-income and minority students. Broward Community College, Hillsborough Community College, Tallahassee Community College, and Valencia Community College are among the twenty-seven community colleges in five states that are participating. According to the reviewers, those colleges selected most effectively demonstrated their commitment to increasing student success and best communicated their vision for accomplishing this at their institutions.

Achieving the Dream is funded by the Lumina Foundation and partnered with the American Association of Community Colleges. Each college will receive a \$50,000 investment grant to develop plans for addressing the academic success of low-income and minority students, and will be eligible for additional funding to implement their plans.

Additionally, all 28 of Florida's community colleges are participating in the first year of the statewide effort to conduct the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). Several of Florida's community colleges have previously conducted this survey at their own institutions, but this year all 28 are participating in an effort to gather useful information on student engagement. CCSSE's survey instrument, The Community College Student Report, provides information on student engagement, a key indicator of learning and, therefore, of the quality of community colleges. The survey, administered to community college students, asks questions that assess institutional practices and student behaviors that are correlated highly with student learning and student retention. The Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education will develop workshops to assist institutions in interpreting and using the results of the survey.

Colleges will soon play a larger role in preparing teachers, as well as paraprofessionals and in-service training for educators as a result of significant legislative changes this year. Through 2004 legislative action (SB 2986), community colleges are now authorized to create Educator Preparation Institutes with Department of Education approval. These institutes will address Florida's pressing needs in professional development for teachers, substitute teacher preparation, paraprofessional training, and



alternative teacher certification. They will also enhance the ability of community colleges to assist the state in meeting federal No Child Left Behind requirements.

Florida now has four distinct pathways to teacher certification. Serving one of these pathways, Educator Preparation Institutes meet the need for increased access for baccalaureate degree holders to become certified teachers. The Educator Preparation Institute's route to alternative teacher certification is different from other competency-based options in that SB 2986 does not require a prospective teacher to be employed in a school in order to begin or complete the program.

The Distance Learning Consortium provides a means of expanding access to students while saving individual institution funds via state level licenses on software and other types of electronic equipment. The Consortium provides hosting services for multiple web-based learning initiatives, an enterprise-level learning management system for the delivery of educational courses and programs operated by the department and other state agencies, and an ongoing representative forum for institutions to compare distance learning policies and share best practices.

The College Center for Library Automation is a national leader in library and information services for both community college students and institutions. It provides a statewide electronic library management system and enhances learning by giving students electronic access to online library catalogs and content-rich database resources regardless of time of day or their location. Unfortunately lack of funds in recent years has meant that many electronic research databases have not been available to students, impacting their ability to access the latest quality information in many fields.

Finally, to continually monitor student access and student success, DCCWE conducts its own research projects including: program reviews (as required by Sections 1001.02 (6) and 1001.03 (13), Florida Statutes), accountability procedures (as required by Sections 1008.41-45, Florida Statutes), and shorter studies known as Data Trends and Fast Facts.

Florida's community colleges have long provided the main entry point for postsecondary education to all the citizens of Florida. In 2000-01, the Florida Community College System (FCCS) served 79% of all minority students enrolled in public lower division classes. FCCS students also received 3.5 times as many Pell Grant awards as State University System (SUS) students and 1.9 times as many Florida Public Student Assistance Grants (FPSAG) as SUS students. FCCS enrolled one-third as many Bright Futures recipients as SUS during 2000-01. In 2001-02, FCCS tuition and fee charges as a percentage of median household income was 4%, the lowest of all institution types.

DCCWE also found that high school students who enroll in community college Dual Enrollment programs are enrolling in colleges and universities at rates significantly higher than students who do not enroll in these accelerated articulation programs. Moreover, Hispanic and African American students who took Dual Enrollment courses are enrolling in higher education at higher rates than whites or any other ethnic group.

Through internal research, student engagement surveys, and external grants, DCCWE is able to continue its commitment to increase student access to postsecondary education and to strive towards student success.

### Workforce Education

Florida's Workforce Education programs are beginning to receive renewed interest and focus as a result of a new Task Force Chaired by Lt. Gov. Toni Jennings which began its work in July 2004. During the recent legislative session House Bill 769, which revises a number of provisions relating to career education, was passed.

The bill requires Florida's Commissioner of Education to convene a task force to conduct a comprehensive study of workforce education and the Commissioner shall make recommendations to the Governor and Legislature by December 2004. Chaired by Lt. Governor Toni Jennings, the Task Force is comprised of several business and education leaders throughout the state. The charge of this Task Force on Career Education is to make recommendations on funding and allocation models, improvement to articulation, implementation of innovative programs, and the improvement of guidance counseling and advisement. The recommendations should support and encourage innovative thinking, exemplary practices, and research-based programs.

Workforce Education staff members are focusing on improved access to career education programs, improvements to curriculum, and new program development. The following are specific initiatives both in progress and in the planning stages.

Expansion of Career Cluster concept: Career Clusters refer to grouping related occupations with similar training and experience requirements to maximize educational efficiency. Aligning career education programs within a designated cluster provides a way for schools to organize instruction and student experience around 14 broad categories that encompass virtually all occupations from entry through professional levels. Moreover, this approach encourages articulation between secondary and postsecondary educational agencies.

Educational Transition: Too often, adults who acquire literacy skills do not pursue workforce education options and therefore limit their earning potential. The Adult Education Office is developing programs and advisement strategies to facilitate the ability of ESOL and GED students to enroll in and successfully complete career education programs. One of the expected outcomes of this initiative is to increase the number of students who obtain access High Skill/High Wage training and employment.

E-Learning: Over the next year, Workforce Education will continue to expand existing e-learning and other distance educational programs for student education and professional development. By strengthening the collaboration of existing e-learning consortia and supporting the development of the Orange Grove learning repository project, it is projected that e-learning will become an increasingly

viable avenue for secondary and adult students to obtain academic and workforce skills.

**Emerging Occupations:** Through partnerships with business and industry, staff will continue to identify, expand, enhance, and develop opportunities for new emerging occupations in Florida.

**Improvements to Articulation:** Workforce Education staff will continue to encourage and facilitate articulation agreements between and among secondary and postsecondary institutions to ensure quality programs and expand educational options for students.

**Career Academies:** A focus will be on establishing, maintaining and assessing effectiveness of secondary career academy programs that offer student training for high demand occupations throughout Florida

Additional initiatives will be addressed, based on the recommendations from the Task Force on Career Education.

### **State Universities**

On April 22, 2004, the Board of Governor's (BOG) of the State University System adopted budget guidelines for the preparation of the 2005-06 university budgets. The Board approved the goals and objectives from the draft Strategic Plan as a basis for the budget as follows:

1. Access and Production of Degrees
2. Meeting statewide professional and workforce needs
3. Building world-class academic programs and research capacity
4. Meeting community needs and fulfilling unique institutional missions.

On July 22, 2004, the BOG approved a budget request to be transmitted through the State Board of Education to the Governor and Legislature.

### **Department of Education**

With the resources available to the Department of Education (State Board of Education Budget), work continues to improve the delivery of services to the clients of the Department. For example, the process for issuing teacher certificates has been automated and the amount of time that elapses before the issuance of certificates has reduced.

### **Blind Services**

The table below briefly describes the legal mandates for the Division of Blind Services (DBS) followed by the authority for these tasks.

Mandates	Authority
Ensure the greatest possible efficiency and effectiveness of services to individuals who are blind: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Aid individuals who are blind in gaining employment including the provision of job training s. 413.011(d), F.S.;</li> <li>b. Provide independent living training so individuals who are blind can benefit from their community in the same manner as their sighted peers s. 413.011(f), F.S.;</li> <li>c. Provide library service to the blind and other physically disabled persons as defined in federal law and regulations in carrying out any or all of the provisions of this law s. 413.011 (h), F.S.; and,</li> <li>d. Promote the employment of eligible blind persons, including the training and licensing of such persons as operators of vending facilities on public property s. 413.041, F.S.</li> </ol>	Chapter 413, Florida Statutes
Expand the specialized early intervention services for visually impaired children, birth through 5, and their families on a statewide basis.	Chapter 413, Florida Statutes
Aid individuals who are blind toward gaining employment including the provision of job training.	Title I, Rehabilitation Act, as Amended (CFR 34 Part 361)
Provide independent living training so individuals who are blind can benefit from their community in the same manner as their sighted peers.	Title VII, Rehabilitation Act, as Amended (CFR 34 Part 361-367)
Promote the employment of eligible blind persons, including the training and licensing of such persons as operators of vending facilities on public property.	The Randolph-Sheppard Vending Stand Act (PL 74-732) and 34 CFR Part 395
Provide Braille and talking book reading materials in compliance with the standards set forth by the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.	Pratt-Smoot Act (PL 89-522)

The goals and objectives for this Division are logical outcomes of both state and federal mandates. The Division's program and functional objectives are to obtain employment outcomes and maximize independence and integration into the community for individuals of all ages who are blind or visually impaired. Therefore, the scope of the Division's program and its major activities must be to meet the needs of families with infants who are blind, students making the transition from school to work, working aged individuals

who are blind, as well as older adults who face age related blindness. The four major program functions listed subsequently were developed for meeting the diverse needs of individuals who are blind or visually impaired.

- Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling; facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, and independent living services; and provide job placement assistance to Blind Services' customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.
- Provide Food Service Vending training, work experience, and licensing.
- Facilitate the provision of developmental services to blind and visually impaired children.
- Provide Braille and recorded publications services.

The subsequent table indicates the estimated outputs for each Division function for a period of five years.

<b>Function</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>04/05</b>	<b>05/06</b>	<b>07/08</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>08/07</b>
Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, and independent living services, and provide job placement assistance to Blind Services' customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers	Annual # of customers provided these services	13,100	13,100	13,100	13,100	13,100
Provide Food Service Vending training, work experience, and licensing	Annual # of vending facilities supported	153	153	153	153	153
Facilitate the provision of developmental services to blind and visually impaired children	Annual # of customers provided these services	890	890	890	890	890
Provide Braille and recorded publications services (2.2 percent)	Annual # of customers provided these services	42,062 (+1%)	42,483 (+1%)	42,908 (+1%)	43,337 (+1%)	43,770 (+1%)

The first function area, (Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, and independent living services, and provide job placement assistance to Blind Services' customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.) ensures that individuals who are blind or severely visually impaired are

served at any age. These services are provided through the following three program areas.

- Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Program: Assists individuals who are blind or visually impaired to gain, maintain or retain employment.
- Independent Living Adult Program (ILAP): Enables individuals who are blind or visually impaired to live independently in their homes and communities with the maximum degree of self-direction.
- Children's and Families Program: Facilitates children who are blind or visually impaired in participating fully within family, community and educational settings and ensuring development to the child's full potential.

The Rehabilitation Center for the Blind, a residential facility in Daytona Beach offers, a variety of services to clients on a statewide basis including: assessment and counseling, training in independent living skills, vocational training. Services are also provided to clients at the local level through contracts with community Rehabilitation Program and Centers for Independent Living.

The Division examined key outcomes for each of these programs as well as for the Braille and Talking Book Library. A recap of customers and key partners, and an examination of strengths and weakness and critical issues were used to develop an action plan and projects for the upcoming year.

While these plans were detailed by programmatic areas a few general trends crossed all areas. First there is a need for more awareness, be it public awareness, employer awareness, or potential customers. There is a limited number of partnerships to assist in the delivery of services (e.g. community rehabilitation programs to provide services to children from birth to five, reduction of subregional library network). There is also a need, specifically in the three rehabilitation programs, to maintain and train qualified staff.

The Division is not revising or proposing any new programs and/or services within its plan. No potential policy changes affecting the agency budget request or Governor's Recommended Budget are needed. There are no requested changes which would require legislative action, including the elimination of programs, services and/or activities. There currently are no task forces or studies in progress. Internally, the Division periodically contracts for studies required under its federal funding source.

## **Vocational Rehabilitation**

The Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) assists eligible individuals with disabilities who require rehabilitation services to prepare for, enter, engage in, or retain employment. Both federal and state guidelines are followed in administering the vocational program. Federal guidelines are used in deciding whether a person is eligible to participate in the program. Specifically, the three eligibility criteria are that an individual (1) must have a physical or mental impairment to employment, (2) can benefit in terms of an employment outcome from receiving VR services, and (3) requires VR services to prepare for, retain, or regain employment.

In the spring of 2002, the Florida Legislature passed House Bill 1825 (now Chapter 2002-02, Laws of Florida), which changed the governance structure of the rehabilitation program in Florida. As a result of this legislative change, the Division began transitioning to re-structure the organization and improve its key processes to effectively and efficiently provide rehabilitation services to eligible individuals with disabilities who reside in the State. To help guide the transition and organizational improvement initiative, the Division completed a comprehensive needs assessment in December 2002. The purpose of the needs assessment was to identify the gaps in service capacity and program performance.

The needs assessment describes the vocational rehabilitation environment as follows. Approximately 55% of Florida's population of 15,982,378 residents are working age; approximately 71% of this group reported being employed. Additionally, approximately 22% of Florida's residents reported a work disability and this is almost 3% higher than the national figures of 19.2% and higher than the other four comparable states (CA, NY, PA, TX). In Florida, a larger percentage of males (78.7%) than females (64.9%) reported employment. Nationally, 56.6% of the individuals with a work disability reported employment; 61.5% of males with a disability and 51.7% of females with a disability were employed.

At the macro level, preliminary findings from the needs assessment suggest that solutions center around five topics: (1) clients, (2) employers, (3) DVR staff, (4) the rehabilitation process, and (5) vendors and providers. Also fourteen (14) issues emerged during the analysis phase and were prepared for presentation to Stakeholder Groups. Stakeholder Groups were established in each of DVR's six (6) regional areas to address the issues identified from the analysis phase of the needs assessment for their specific regional areas. Area Stakeholder Groups consistently identified six of the fourteen issues as most important:

- ❖ Eligibility determinations for some Persons with a Disability (PWDs) are taking too much time
- ❖ Individualized Plans for Employment (IPEs) need to be written for more PWDs

- ❖ The number and percentage of PWDs who get a job is too low
- ❖ The number and percentage of severely and most severely disabled PWDs who get a job is too low
- ❖ The number and percentage of other PWDs who get a job is too low
- ❖ A smaller proportion than expected of PWDs aged 15-19 and 20-24 who apply to VR get jobs

During SFY 2003-2004, Florida DVR had an average of 35, 885 persons with a disability in active status involved in the rehabilitation process each month. Under both federal and state regulations, the vocational rehabilitation program must give priority to serving clients with significant and most significant disabilities. Of the 9,413 individuals placed into gainful employment, and almost 74% (7,210) were either significantly or most significantly disabled. The average annual earnings of VR customers at placement during this period was \$17, 344 compared to the approved standard of \$14,463.

Assessing customer satisfaction is one method often used for determining how well a program is addressing the needs of its clientele. The Florida Rehabilitation Council continues to conduct customer satisfaction survey research to this end. Recently, the FRC expanded its customer satisfaction research efforts. Two separate client satisfaction surveys are conducted of DVR's customers. The first is of closed client cases and a second more recent survey is of active clients who participate in the program. Results from the long-standing survey of closed clients show satisfaction levels between 84-88 percent. Although satisfaction does not assure quality, these results do indicate that the majority of DVR's clients are very satisfied to mostly satisfied with the services they received from the VR program and with their treatment by DVR staff.

The results of the needs assessment study guided the development of a five-year strategic plan to increase the employment outcomes of eligible individuals with disabilities. During the strategic planning process, DVR staff met with strategic partner, the Florida Rehabilitation Council, to review the causes and solutions identified in the six identified gap areas listed above to develop strategies to close the gaps in performance and service capacity. The issues and the identified solutions are the basis for the Division's strategic objectives and goals in the Five-year Strategic Plan, as well as those described in the Department's Long-Range Program Plan. In addition, these goals and strategic objectives are aligned with the goals and priorities presented in the Division's federal/state plan submitted to the United States Department of Education, Rehabilitation Services Administration. DVR's priorities and activities align with Strategic Imperative 6 of the State Board of Education. Additionally, these priorities and activities align with the Governor's Priorities # 2, 3, 5 and 6.

The Bureau of Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services (BRRS) was transferred to DVR during the 2002 Legislative Session. BRRS's main function is to provide a safety net for injured workers who are unable to return to work and for those who are having difficulty returning to work by providing reemployment services at no cost. This includes



the provision of crisis prevention/intervention and referral to appropriate agencies that assist the injured worker with issues not related to their workers' compensation case. The Bureau of Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services has, as a priority, the improvement of its return-to-work rates and has determined to make some strategic changes that are needed to help improve the State's return-to-work rate.

Given the conditions, without these changes the impact would be adverse. Also, without some sort of statutory change concerning return to work efforts on the part of insurance carriers (either penalties or incentives, such as tax reductions, or other financial benefit), it may be difficult to encourage the industry to recognize the importance of its role in assisting injured workers in getting back to work, thus removing them and the expense of their continued financial maintenance from the workers' compensation system.

### **Impact of Desired Strategy Changes and Obstacles to their Implementation:**

#### *Impact:*

- All parties in the system understand and actively participate in their roles regarding returning injured workers to work
- Gradual improvement in overall return-to-work-rate
- Reduced overall system costs for employers
- Through education and other marketing initiatives, increased numbers of injured workers that are provided bureau sponsored reemployment services.

The 2004 Florida Legislature transferred the Adults with Disabilities grant program to Vocational Rehabilitation. Prior to this transfer, this program was administered by Workforce Education. The mission of the program is to support and enhance the educational and recreational opportunities for Floridians with disabilities who may not have employment as a goal and/or senior citizens by providing programs that enhance the individual's quality of life, health and well being, or lifelong learning. To achieve this mission, grants are awarded to school districts and community colleges, may assist with the recruitment of persons with developmentally disabled who would like to work and help provide the transitional services that are necessary to work.

These grants include reading components to help improve individual's literacy. Benchmarks for each individual are established based on the individual's needs and goals. During the program year, each student is expected to enhance his quality of life, health and well being, or lifelong learning skills by achieving at least two identified benchmarks. Last year, 16,274 Floridians with disabilities were successfully integrated into their community allowing them to live, work, and recreate more independently.

Also, the Department of Education/Division of Vocational Rehabilitation is the recipient of funds from the United States Department of Education earmarked for the Florida Assistive Services and Technology, Inc. (FAAST). FAAST is authorized by Chapter 94-324, Laws of Florida and is charged with ensuring consumer involvement in the creation, application and distribution of technology-related assistance to and for persons with disabilities. To achieve its mission, FAAST administers two programs, the access to

Telework Loan Program and the Alternative Financing Program. As the administrative entity receiving the discretionary grant funds, DVR is responsible for contract administration and monitoring of the FFAST programs.

**Exhibit I: Agency Workforce Plan**

<b>Fiscal Years</b>	<b>Total FTE Reductions</b>	<b>Description of Reduction Issue</b>	<b>Positions per Issue</b>	<b>Impact of Reduction</b>
FY 2005-2006		Because of multiple changes to the organization of education during the time period, this data will be submitted at a later date.		
FY 2006-2007				
<b>Total</b>	<b>TBD</b>			

### Exhibit II - Performance Measures and Standards

<b>Department: Education</b>	<b>Department No.: 48</b>
------------------------------	---------------------------

Program: Vocational Rehabilitation	Code: 48160000
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2004-05 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2003-04 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2003-04 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2005-06 Standard (Numbers)
Number/percent of customers gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days	11,500 / 65%	9,413 (54.2%)	11,500 / 65%	11,500 / 65%
Number/percent of VR significantly disabled gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days	9,775 / 58.5%	7,210 (50.5%)	9,775 / 58.5%	9,775 / 58.5%
Number/percent of all other VR disabled gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days	1,725 / 77%	2,203 (71.3%)	1,725 / 77.0%	1,725 / 77.0%
Number/percent of VR customers placed in competitive employment	11,213 / 97.5%	9,381 (99.7%)	11,213 / 97.5%	11,213 / 97.5%
Number/percent of VR customers retained in employment after 1 year	6,300 / 67.5%	Not available	6,300 / 67.5%	6,300 / 67.5%
Average annual earning of VR customers at placement	\$14,463	\$17,344	\$14,463	\$14,463
Average annual earning of VR customers after 1 year	\$15,999	Not available	\$15,999	\$15,999
Percent of case costs covered by third-party payers	23%	5.4%	23%	23%
Average cost of case life (to division) for significantly disabled VR customers	\$3,350	\$3,517	\$3,350	\$3,350
Average cost of case life (to division) for all other disabled VR customers	\$400	\$387	\$400	\$400
Number of customers reviewed for eligibility	29,000	24,333	29,000	29,000
Number of individualized written plans for services	24,500	17,356	24,500	24,500
Number of active cases	37,500	35,885	37,500	37,500
Customer caseload per counselor	125	100	125	125

Percent of eligibility determinations completed in compliance with federal law	95%	87%	95%	95%
Number of program applicants provided Reemployment Services	2,500	2,738	2,525	2,525
Percent of eligible injured workers receiving reemployment services with closed cases during the fiscal year and returned to suitable gainful employment.	74%	87%	76%	76%

Program: Division of Blind Services	Code: 48180000
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2004-05 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2003-04 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2003-04 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2005-06 Standard (Numbers)
Number/percent of rehabilitation customers gainfully employed at least 90 days.	747 / 68.3%	672 / 57%	747 / 68.3%	TBD
Number/percent rehabilitation customers placed in competitive employment.	654 / 64.3%	670 / 99.7%	654 / 64.3%	TBD
Projected average annual earnings of rehabilitation customers at placement.	\$13,500	\$16,816	\$13,500	TBD
Number/percent successfully rehabilitated older persons, non-vocational rehabilitation.	1,500 / 55.2%	2,027 / 71%	1,500 / 55.2%	TBD
Number/percent of customers (children) successfully rehabilitated/transitioned from pre-school to school.	36 / 67.3%	72 / 75.7%	36 / 67.3%	TBD
Number/percent of customers (children) successfully rehabilitated/transitioned from school to work.	47 / 26.5%	69 / 57%	47 / 26.5%	TBD
Number of customers reviewed for eligibility	2,035	2,377	2,035	TBD
Number of written plans for services	1,425	2,397	1,425	TBD
Number of customers served	13,100	12,255	13,100	TBD
Average time lapse (days) between application and eligibility determination for rehabilitation customers	60	27	60	TBD

Customer caseload per counseling/case management team member	114	115	114	TBD
Cost per Library customer served	\$19.65	\$27.76	\$19.65	TBD
Number of blind vending food service facilities supported	153	153	153	TBD
Number of existing food service facilities renovated	5	2	5	TBD
Number of new food service facilities constructed	5	5	5	TBD
Number of Library customers served	44,290	41,702	44,290	TBD
Number of Library items (Braille and recorded) loaned	1.25 m.	1,330,131	1.35 m.	TBD

Program: Private Colleges and Universities	Code: 48190000
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2004-05 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2003-04 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2003- 04 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2005-06 Standard (Numbers)
Retention rate of First Time in College (FTIC) award recipients, using a 6-year rate (Florida Resident Access Grant - FRAG)	TBD	N/A	53.0%	53.0%
Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, using a 6-year rate (Florida Resident Access Grant - FRAG)	TBD	N/A	50.0%	50.0%
Number of degrees granted by level for FRAG recipients and contract program recipients (Florida Resident Access Grant - FRAG)	TBD	N/A	9,987	9,987
Retention rate of award recipients (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	TBD	N/A	53.0%	53.0%
Graduation rate of award recipients (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	TBD	N/A	50.0%	50.0%

Of those graduates remaining in Florida, the percent employed at \$22,000 or more 1 year following graduation (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A
Of those graduates remaining in Florida, the percent employed at \$22,000 or more 5 years following graduation (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A
Licensure/certification rates of award recipients, (where applicable), (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number/percent of baccalaureate degree recipients who are found placed in an occupation identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list (This measure would be for each Academic Contract and for the Florida Resident Access Grant)	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of prior year's graduates (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of prior year's graduates remaining in Florida (Academic Contracts)	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of FTIC students, disaggregated by in-state and out-of-state (Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A

Program: <b>Student Financial Aid Program—State</b>	Code: 48200200
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

*NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.*

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2004-05 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2004-05</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2005-06</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of high school graduates who successfully completed the 19 core credits (Bright Futures)	63%	N/A	63%	63%
Retention rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system, using a 4-year rate for community colleges and a 6-year rate for universities (Bright Futures)	TBD	N/A	TBD	TBD
Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system (Bright Futures)	TBD	N/A	TBD	TBD
Percent of high school graduates attending Florida postsecondary institutions (Bright Futures)	52%	N/A	52%	52%
Number of Bright Futures recipients	114,315	N/A	125,101	125,101
Retention rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system, using a 4-year rate for community colleges and a 6-year rate for universities (Florida Student Assistance Grant)	TBD	N/A	TBD	TBD
Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system (Florida Student Assistance Grant)	TBD	N/A	TBD	TBD
Percent of recipients who, upon completion of the program, work in fields in which there are shortages (Critical Teacher Shortage Forgivable Loan Program)	TBD	N/A	TBD	TBD



Program: <b>State Grants/K-12 Program—FEFP</b>	Code: 48250300
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

*NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.*

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2004-05 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2004-05</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2005-06</b> Standard (Numbers)
Number/percent of teachers with National Teacher's Certification, reported by district	3,369 / 2.4%	4,438	4,853 / 3%	TBD
Number/percent of "A" schools, reported by district	600 / 25%	1,259	600 / 25%	TBD
Number/percent of "D" or "F" schools, reported by district	300 / 12%	233	300 / 12%	TBD
Number/percent of schools declining one or more letter grades, reported by district	193 / 8%	555	193 / 8%	TBD
Number/percent of schools improving one or more letter grades, reported by district	966 / 40%	393	966 / 4%	TBD

Program: <b>State Grants/K-12 Program – Non FEFP</b>	Code: 48250400
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

*NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.*

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2004-05 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2004-05</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2005-06</b> Standard (Numbers)
Funding per K-12 student	\$75.54	\$162.79	\$171.56	TBD

Program: <b>Federal Grants/K-12 Program</b>	Code: 48250500
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

*NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.*

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2004-05 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2004-05</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2005-06</b> Standard (Numbers)
Funding per K-12 student	\$498.35	\$636.40	\$637.31	TBD

Program: <b>Education Media and Technology Services</b>	Code: 48250600
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

*NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.*

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2004-05 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2004-05</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2005-06</b> Standard (Numbers)
Expenditure per Florida resident	\$1.14	N/A	\$1.14	TBD

Program: <b>Workforce Education</b>	Code: 48250800
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

*NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.*

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2004-05 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2004-05</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2005-06</b> Standard (Numbers)
Number/percent of vocational certificate occupational completion point completers who completed an occupational completion point within a program identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list and are found employed at \$4,680 or more per quarter. (Level III)	13,910 / TBD	N/A	13,910 / TBD	TBD
Number/percent of vocational certificate occupational completion point completers who completed an occupational completion point within a program identified for new entrants on the Workforce Estimating Conference list and are found employed at \$3,900 or more per quarter, or are found continuing education in a college credit program. (Level II)	5,282 / TBD	N/A	5,282 / TBD	TBD
Number/percent of vocational certificate occupational completion point completers who completed any occupational completion point within a program not included in Levels II or III and are found employed, enlisted in the military, or continuing their education at the vocational certificate level. (Level I)	16,451 / TBD	N/A	16,451 / TBD	TBD
Number/percent of associate in science degree and college-credit certificate program completers who completed a program identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list and are found employed at \$4,680 or more per quarter. (Level III)	7,519 / TBD	N/A	7,519 / TBD	TBD
Number/percent of associate in science degree and college-credit certificate program completers who completed a program identified for new entrants on the Workforce Estimating Conference list and are found employed at \$3,900 or more per quarter, or are found continuing education in a college-credit program. (Level II)	1,472 / TBD	N/A	1,472 / TBD	TBD

Number/percent of associate in science degree and college-credit certificate program completers who completed any program not included in Levels II or III and are found employed, enlisted in the military, or continuing their education at the vocational certificate level. (Level I)	2,086 / TBD	N/A	2,086 / TBD	TBD
Number/percent of workforce development programs which meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards for those programs which teach a subject matter for which there is a nationally recognized accrediting body.	TBD	N/A	TBD	TBD
Number/percent of students attending workforce development programs which meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards.	TBD	N/A	TBD	TBD
Number/percent of students completing workforce development programs which meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards.	TBD	N/A	TBD	TBD
Number of adult basic education, including English as a Second Language, and adult secondary education completion point completers who are found employed or continuing their education	57,344	N/A	42461	TBD

Program: <b>Community College Programs</b>	Code: 48400600
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

*NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.*

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2004-05 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2004-05</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2005-06</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of Associate in Arts (AA) degree graduates who transfer to a state university within 2 years	69%	N/A	70%	62%
Percent of AA degree transfers to the State University System who earn a 2.5 or above in the SUS after 1 year	75%	N/A	73%	75%
Of the AA students who complete 18 credit hours, the percent of whom graduate in 4 years.	36%	N/A	33%	33%

Percent of students graduating with total accumulated credit hours that are less than or equal to 120 percent of the degree requirement	36%	N/A	36%	38%
Percent of students exiting the college-preparatory program who enter college-level course work associated with the AA, Associate in Science (AS), Postsecondary Vocational Certificate, and Postsecondary Adult Vocational programs	74%	N/A	74%	74%
Percent of AA degree transfers to the State University System who started in College Prep and who earn a 2.5 in the SUS after 1 year	75%	N/A	75%	75%
Number/Percent of AA partial completers transferring to the State University System with at least 40 credit hours	16,821 / 72%	N/A	16,855/56%	12,672/74%
Number/Percent/FTEs of AA students who do not complete 18 credit hours within 4 years	5,346 / 23.3% FTE: 2,275	N/A	5,346/23.3%/2,275	5,346/23.3%/2,275
Of the economically disadvantaged AA students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an AA degree within 4 years	2,138 / 34%	N/A	2,138/34%	2,138/34%
Of the disabled AA students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an AA degree within 4 years	153 / 31%	N/A	153 / 31%	153 / 31%
Of the black male AA students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an AA degree within 4 years	126 / 18%	N/A	126/18%	126/18%
Of the English as Second Language (college prep) or English for Non-Speaker (college credit) students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an AA degree within 4 years	105 / 31%	N/A	105/31%	105/31%
Of the AA graduates who have not transferred to the State University System or an independent college or university, the number/percent who are found placed in an occupation identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list	2,931	N/A	2,900	2,900
Percent of prior year Florida high school graduates enrolled in community colleges	30%	N/A	31%	31%
Number of AA degrees granted	29,000	N/A	29,880	29,880
Number of students receiving college preparatory instruction	100,000	N/A	118,471	118,471

Number of students enrolled in baccalaureate programs offered on community college campuses	13,000	N/A	13,500	22,000
---	--------	-----	--------	--------

Program: <b>State Board of Education</b>	Code: 48800000
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

*NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.*

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2004-05 (Words)	Approved <b>Prior</b> Year Standard <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	<b>Prior</b> Year Actual <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	<b>Approved</b> Standards for <b>FY 2004-05</b> (Numbers)	<b>Requested</b> <b>FY 2005-06</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of program administration and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions - Division of Public Schools	0.09% / 7.89%	N/A	0.09% / 7.89%	TBD
Percent of teacher certificates issued within 30 days after receipt of complete application and the mandatory fingerprint clearance notification	90%	N/A	90%	TBD
Number of districts that have implemented a high-quality professional development system, as determined by the Department of Education, based on its review of student performance data and the success of districts in defining and meeting the training needs of teachers.	12	N/A	12	TBD
Percent of current fiscal year competitive grants initial disbursement made by August 15 of current fiscal year, or as provided in the General Appropriations Act	100%	N/A	100%	TBD
Number of certification applications processed	87,663	N/A	109,275	TBD
Percent of program administration and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions	0.10% / 4.15%	N/A	0.10% / 4.15%	TBD
Percent of Division of Colleges & Universities Administration and Support Costs and Positions Compared to Total State University System Costs and Positions (SUS Positions are not appropriated).	0.39%	N/A	0.39%	TBD

Program: <b>Educational and General Activities</b>	Code: 48900100
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

*NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.*

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2004-05 (Words)	Approved <b>Prior</b> Year Standard <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	<b>Prior</b> Year Actual <b>FY 2003-04</b> (Numbers)	<b>Approved</b> Standards for <b>FY 2004-05</b> (Numbers)	<b>Requested</b> <b>FY 2005-06</b> Standard (Numbers)
Graduation rate for First Time in College (FTIC) students, using a 6-year rate	61%	N/A	61%	TBD
Retention rate for FTIC students, using a 6-year rate	71.0%	N/A	71.0%	TBD
Graduation rate for AA transfer students, using a 4-year rate	69%	N/A	69%	TBD
Retention rate for AA transfer students, using a 4-year rate	80%	N/A	80%	TBD
Percent of students graduating with total accumulated credit hours that are less than or equal to 115% of the degree requirement, disaggregating the data by FTIC and AA transfers	69%	N/A	69%	TBD
Pass rate on licensure/certification exams, for the first sitting	TBD	N/A	TBD	TBD
Of the prior year graduates remaining in Florida, the percent employed at \$22,000 or more 1 year following graduation	64%	N/A	64%	TBD
Of those graduates remaining in Florida, the percent employed at \$22,000 or more 5 years following graduation	90%	N/A	90%	TBD
Percent of undergraduate students enrolled in graduate school upon completion of the baccalaureate degree	12%	N/A	12%	TBD
Externally generated research and training grant funds (federal, state, local, business, and industry) per state-funded ranked faculty full-time equivalent	\$97,196	N/A	\$97,196	TBD
Average number of articles in Institute for Scientific Information Publication Count per ranked faculty	0.7	N/A	0.7	TBD
For IFAS only, the percent of public service projects where the beneficiary is satisfied or highly satisfied with the extension assistance	92%	N/A	92%	TBD

Of the total instructional effort by level, the percent of effort provided by faculty:				
(I) Lower level	45%	N/A	45%	TBD
(II) Upper level	66%	N/A	66%	TBD
(III) Graduate	73%	N/A	73%	TBD
Percent of qualified Florida students, those applicants meeting admission standards, admitted as FTIC students	95%	N/A	95%	TBD
Percent of undergraduate students at each university classified as out-of-state	10%	N/A	10%	TBD
Number of undergraduate out-of-state students above 10% of all undergraduate students	0	N/A	0	TBD
Percent of out-of -state students admitted who are do not meet FBE admission standards	0	N/A	0	TBD
Percent of FTIC students admitted as student profile assessments	10%	N/A	10%	TBD
Number/percent of student profile assessments who are out-of-state students	363 / 10%	N/A	363 / 10%	TBD
Of total faculty effort allocated for public service, the percent devoted to public schools	25%	N/A	25%	TBD
Number/percent of baccalaureate degree recipients who are found placed in an occupation identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list	TBD	N/A	TBD	TBD
Number of degrees granted, baccalaureate	37,982	N/A	37,982	TBD
Number of degrees granted, masters	11,008	N/A	11,008	TBD
Number of degrees granted, doctoral	1,255	N/A	1,255	TBD
Number of degrees granted, professional	1,170	N/A	1,170	TBD



**Exhibit III: Performance Measure Assessment**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Retention rate of First Time in College (FTIC) award recipients, using a 6-year rate. (Florida Resident Access Grant—FRAG)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>TBD</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

“Retention rate of annual cohorts of first time Florida Resident Access Grant recipients.” (See *Long-Range Program Plan, 2003-08*, p. J-55). Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, using a 6-year rate. (Florida Resident Access Grant—FRAG)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
TBD	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The inclusion of FRAG in this measure duplicates a previous measure. (See *Long-Range Program Plan, 2003-08*, p. J-56.) Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2003. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of degrees granted by level for FRAG recipients and contract program recipients. (Florida Resident Access Grant – FRAG)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>TBD</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The measure is complex and data are not readily available to establish appropriate standards. The inclusion of FRAG in this measure duplicates a previous measure. Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Retention rate of award recipients (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>TBD</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The measure is complex and data are not readily available to establish appropriate standards. The inclusion of FRAG in this measure duplicates a previous measure. Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Graduation Rate of award recipients (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>TBD</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The measure is complex and data are not readily available to establish appropriate standards. The inclusion of FRAG in this measure duplicates a previous measure. Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Of those graduates remaining in Florida, the percent employed at \$22,000 or more 1 year following graduation. (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>TBD</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The measure is complex and data are not readily available to establish appropriate standards. Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Of those graduates remaining in Florida, the percent employed at \$22,000 or more 5 years following graduation. (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>TBD</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The measure is complex and data are not readily available to establish appropriate standards. Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Licensure/certification rates of award recipients (where applicable), (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>TBD</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The measure is complex and data are not readily available to establish appropriate standards. Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of baccalaureate degree recipients who are found placed in an occupation identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list. (This measure would be for each Academic Contract and for the Florida Resident Access Grant)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
TBD	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The measure is complex and data are not readily available to establish appropriate standards. Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of prior year's graduates (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
TBD	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The measure is complex and data are not readily available to establish appropriate standards. Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of prior year's graduates remaining in Florida. (Academic Contracts)

**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure                       Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure                       Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>TBD</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The measure is complex and data are not readily available to establish appropriate standards. Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of FTIC students, disaggregated by in-state and out-of-state. (Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
TBD	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The measure is complex and data are not readily available to establish appropriate standards. Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Percent of high school graduates who successfully completed the 19 core credits. (Bright Futures)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
63%	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Retention rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system, using a 4-year rate for community colleges and a 6-year rate for universities. (Bright Futures)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
TBD	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system (Bright Futures)

**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure                       Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure                       Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>TBD</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Percent of high school graduates attending Florida postsecondary institutions. (Bright Futures)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
52%	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of Bright Futures recipients

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>114,315</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

Number of awards contingent on legislative appropriations

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Retention rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system, using a 4-year rate for community colleges and a 6-year rate for universities. (Florida Student Assistance Grant)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>TBD</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system (Florida Student Assistance Grant)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>TBD</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Percent of recipients who, upon completion of the program, work in fields in which there are shortages. (Critical Teacher Shortage Forgivable Loan Program)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>TBD</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Grants/K-12 FEFP  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of teachers with National Teacher’s Certification, reported by district.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
3,369 (2.4%)	4,438 (3%)	1,069	32%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Grants/K-12 FEFP  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of "A" schools, reported by district.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>600 (25%)</b>	<b>1,259 (48%)</b>	<b>659</b>	<b>110%</b>

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Grants/K-12 FEFP  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of "D" or "F" schools, reported by district.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>300 (12%)</b>	<b>233 (9%)</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>22%</b>

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Grants/K-12 FEFP  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of schools declining one or more letter grades, reported by district.

- Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure                       Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure                       Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>193 (8%)</b>	<b>555 (21%)</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>187%</b>

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors           | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities        | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)            |  |

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem         |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission |   |

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- |                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training  | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Grants/K-12 FEFP  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of schools improving one ore more letter grades, reported by district.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>966 (40%)</b>	<b>393 (15%)</b>	<b>573</b>	<b>59%</b>

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent who completed an occupational completion point within a program identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list and are found employed at \$4,680 or more per quarter. (Level III)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>13,910 (TBD)</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent who completed an occupational point within a program identified for new entrants on the Workforce Estimating Conference list and are found employed at \$3,900 or more per quarter, or are found continuing education in a college-credit-level program. (Level II)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5,282 (TBD)	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent who completed an occupational completion point within a program not included in Levels II or III and are found employed, enlisted in the military, or are continuing their education at the vocational certificate level. (Level I)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>16,451 (TBD)</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent who completed a program identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list and are found employed at \$4,680 or more per quarter. (Level III)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
7,519 (TBD)	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent who completed a program identified for new entrants on the Workforce Estimating Conference list and are found employed at \$3,900 or more per quarter, or are found continuing education in a college-credit-level program. (Level II)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1,472 (TBD)	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent who completed any program not included in Levels II or III and are found employed, enlisted in the military, or continuing their education at the vocational certificate level. (Level I)

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>2,086 (TBD)</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of workforce development programs which meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards for those programs which teach a subject matter for which there is a nationally recognized accrediting body.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>TBD</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of students attending workforce development programs which meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
TBD	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of students completing workforce development programs which meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
TBD	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of adult basic education, including English as a Second Language, and adult secondary education completion point completers who are found employed or continuing their education.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>57,344</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Education—Administered Funds  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of adult basic education and adult secondary education completion point completers who are found employed or continuing their educations.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>42,461</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Board of Education  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Percent of teacher certificates issued within 30 days after receipt of complete application and the mandatory fingerprint clearance notification.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
90%	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Board of Education  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of districts that have implemented a high-quality professional development system, as determined by the Department of Education, based on its review of student performance data and the success of districts in defining and meeting the training needs of teachers.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>12</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Board of Education  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Percent of current year competitive grants initial disbursement made by August 15 of current fiscal year, or as provided in the General Appropriations Act.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
100%	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Board of Education  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of certification applications processed.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
<b>87,663</b>	<b>106,093</b>	<b>18,430</b>	<b>21%</b>

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommended performance measures and standards will be submitted to the Legislature on December 1, 2004. Those that are approved should be substituted for existing K-20 education measures.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers.  
**Measure:** Number/percent of rehabilitation customers gainfully employed at least 90 days  
**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure                      NA  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure                      NA  Deletion of Measure  
 NA  Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
747/68.3%	672/57%	75 under	10%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference: NA**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:** The difference is not significant. Outcomes can vary over or under by 5 or so percent every year.

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply): NA

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers.  
**Measure:** Number/percent rehabilitation customers placed in competitive employment.  
**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure                      NA  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure                      NA  Deletion of Measure  
 NA  Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
654/64.3%	670/99.7%	16	2%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:** The Division has been focusing on individuals with the most significant disabilities. This focus included staff training. This increase in competitive employment been increasing due to the training and focus.

**External Factors** (check all that apply): NA

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply): NA

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers.  
**Measure:** Projected average annual earnings of rehabilitation customers at placement.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
\$13,500	\$16,816	\$3,316	25%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors  Staff Capacity
- Competing Priorities  Level of Training
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable  Technological Problems
- Legal/Legislative Change  Natural Disaster
- Target Population Change  Other (Identify)
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training  Technology
- Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Request that standard be raised to \$16,500. Since 99/00 the Division has exceeded this measure.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers.  
**Measure:** Number/Percent successfully rehabilitated older persons, non-vocational rehabilitation.

**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure      NA  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure      NA  Deletion of Measure  
 NA  Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1500/55.2%	2,027/71%	527	35%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:** Larger older population applied for services.

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers.  
**Measure:** Number/percent of customers (children) successfully rehabilitated/transitioned from pre-school to school.  
**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure                      NA  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure                      NA  Deletion of Measure  
 NA  Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
36/67.3%	72/75.7%	36	100%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:** The number of pre-school students transitioning is based on the target population.

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers.  
**Measure:** Number/percent of customers(children)successfully rehabilitated from school to work.

**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure                      NA  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure                      NA  Deletion of Measure  
 NA  Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
47/26.5%	69/57%	22	47%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:** The target population fluctuates.

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers.  
**Measure:** Number of customers reviewed for eligibility.

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
2035	2,377	342	17%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:** Since FY 99/00 the Division has exceed this measure.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Recommend standard adjusted to 3000.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers.  
**Measure:** Number of written plans for services

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1425	2,397	972	68%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:** Since FY 99/00 the Division has exceed this measure. Original estimate too low.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:** Request standard be changed to 2800.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers.  
**Measure:** Number of customers served  
**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure                      NA  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure                      NA  Deletion of Measure  
 NA  Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
13,100	12,255	845	6%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:** Customers served is based on number applying for services. The 5.5 % difference is not significant enough to request any changes.

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers.  
**Measure:** Average time laps (days)between application and eligibility determination for rehabilitation customers  
**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure                      NA  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure                      NA  Deletion of Measure  
 NA  Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
60	27	33 under (less is better)	55%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:** Federal guidelines indicate that eligibility must be completed within 60 days. Anything 60 days or less is meeting the standard.

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:** None standard is met.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers.  
**Measure:** Customer caseload per counseling/case management team member.  
**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure                      NA  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure                      NA  Deletion of Measure  
 NA  Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
114	115	1	0.9%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:** Not significant difference.

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Provide Braille and recorded publications  
**Measure:** Cost per Library customer served

**Action:**

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure      NA  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure      NA  Deletion of Measure  
 NA  Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
\$19.65	\$27.76	\$8.11	41.3%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply): NA

- Personnel Factors       Staff Capacity  
 Competing Priorities       Level of Training  
 Previous Estimate Incorrect  
 Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable       Technological Problems  
 Legal/Legislative Change       Natural Disaster  
 Target Population Change       Other (Identify)  
 This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem  
 Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:** This measure will fluctuate based on increases or decreases in the General Revenue budget of the Library and increases or decreases in the number of customers served by the Library each fiscal year.

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training       Technology  
 Personnel       Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Provide food service vending training, work experience, and licensing  
**Measure:** Number of blind vending food service facilities supported

**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure                      NA  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure                      NA  Deletion of Measure  
 NA  Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
153	153	0	0

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**    **Difference is not significant. Only over by 2 %**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors           | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities        | <input type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)            |  |

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem         |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission |   |

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- |                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training  | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Provide food service vending training, work experience, and licensing  
**Measure:** Number of existing food service facilities renovated

**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5	2	3	60%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors  Staff Capacity
- Competing Priorities  Level of Training
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:** The Division has two related measures, one is construction of facilities and one is renovation. The Division attained the construction standard.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable  Technological Problems
- Legal/Legislative Change  Natural Disaster
- Target Population Change  Other (Identify)
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training  Technology
- Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:** The Division is renovating less and constructing new facilities more. Recommend that the standard be adjusted from 5 to 2.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Provide food service vending training, work experience, and licensing  
**Measure:** Number of new food service facilities constructed.  
**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure      NA  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure      NA  Deletion of Measure  
 NA  Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5	5	0	0

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:** The Division is renovating less and constructing more. Funds that would have been used to renovate were used to construct a new vending facility.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:** Recommended that renovation standard be reduced.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Provide Braille and recorded publications  
**Measure:** Number of Library customers served

**Action:**

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
- Revision of Measure
- Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
44,290	41,702	2570 under	5.8%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:** Original estimate too high. This recommended standard was made using three year trend data of number of customers served, plus allowing for estimated growth. The estimation for growth was higher than what has actually happened.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:** Recommend that the standard be changed to 41,702.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Provide Braille and recorded publications  
**Measure:** Number of Library items (Braille and recorded) loaned

**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
1.25 million	1.33 million	.08 million over	6.4%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:** increased need

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:** The Library' increasing demand for items in Braille and talking book formats has exceeded 1.3 million for the third year. Recommend standard changed to 1.35 million.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Percent of Associate in Arts (AA) degree graduates who transfer to a state university within two years

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
69%	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Percent of AA degree transfers to the state university system who earn a 2.5 or above in the SUS after one year

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
75%	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Of the AA graduates who are employed full time rather than continuing their education, the percent which are in jobs earning at least \$9 an hour

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
59%	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

N/A

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

N/A

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Of the AA students who complete 18 credit hours, the percent of whom graduate in four years

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
36%	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

Individual student circumstances

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Percent of students graduating with total accumulated credit hours that are less than or equal to 120 percent of the degree requirement

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
36%	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

N/A

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

N/A

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Percent of students exiting the college-preparatory program who enter college-level course work associated with the AA, Associate in Science (AS), Postsecondary Vocational Certificate, and Postsecondary Adult Vocational programs

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
74%	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

Student effort

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Percent of AA degree transfers to the State University System who started in College Prep and who earn a 2.5 in the SUS after one year

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
75%	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Number/Percent of AA partial completers transferring to the State University System with at least 40 credit hours

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
16,821 (72%)	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

Student choice

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Number/Percent/FTEs of AA students who do not complete 18 credit hours within four years

**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
5,346 (23%) 2,275	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors  Staff Capacity
- Competing Priorities  Level of Training
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

N/A

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable  Technological Problems
- Legal/Legislative Change  Natural Disaster
- Target Population Change  Other (Identify)
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

N/A

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training  Technology
- Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Of the economically disadvantaged AA students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an AA degree within four years

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
2,138 (34%)	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors  Staff Capacity
- Competing Priorities  Level of Training
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

N/A

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable  Technological Problems
- Legal/Legislative Change  Natural Disaster
- Target Population Change  Other (Identify)
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

N/A

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training  Technology
- Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Of disabled AA who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an AA degree within four years

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
153 (31%)	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

N/A

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

N/A

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Of the black male AA students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an AA degree within four years

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
126 (18%)	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

N/A

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

N/A

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Of the English as Second Language (college prep) or English for Non-Speaker (college credit) students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an AA degree within four years

**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
105 (31%)	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors  Staff Capacity
- Competing Priorities  Level of Training
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

N/A

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable  Technological Problems
- Legal/Legislative Change  Natural Disaster
- Target Population Change  Other (Identify)
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

N/A

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training  Technology
- Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Of the AA graduates who have not transferred to the State University System or an independent college or university, the number/percent who are found placed in an occupation identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
2,931	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

Inability to determine student intent

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Percent of prior year Florida high school graduates enrolled in community colleges

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
30%	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Number of AA degrees granted

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
29,000	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

Enrollment increase

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Number of students receiving college preparatory instruction

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
100,000	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

Enrollment increase

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Work closely with K-12 on college-level skills needed for success

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Program Fund  
**Service:** Postsecondary Education Services  
**Measure:** Number of students enrolled in baccalaureate programs offered on community college campuses

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
13,000	N/A		

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

Increase in concurrent-use arrangements among community colleges and public/private universities

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of customers gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days

- Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
Rate 65.0%	54.2%	-10.8%	-16.6%
Number 11,500	9,413	-2,087	-18.1%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect     |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)                |   |

**Explanation:**

DVR continues to experience staff turnover in direct service positions, in large part because salaries are not competitive with the private sector. Turnover affects the client- counselor relationship, and some clients find it difficult to begin again with a new counselor. Other factors affecting this measure are the extensive orientation and training ---up to 18 months--- required by new counselors before they can work independently or carry a full caseload. Finally, staff turnover requires some supervisors to carry a substantial caseload, reducing their ability to provide supervision and monitor performance.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem         |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission |  |

**Explanation:**

Changing economic conditions in Florida---the increasing unemployment rate coupled with the reduced demand for employment in "service" occupations---is a contributory factor to underperformance on this measure. Examination of the relationship between the rehabilitation rate and the unemployment rate for a four year period showed a relatively strong negative correlation (-.65) between the two variables. Across the 48 months approximately 43% of the variance in the rehabilitation rate was accounted for by the unemployment rate.

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technology |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)      |

**Recommendations:**

The provision of faster computers to a large number of front line staff has reduced the time for data input and the "cycle time" for clients being served. Additional improvements to hardware will be made when this is possible.

Improvements were implemented for the contracting process in SFY2003 and changes will continue to be made.

The training program for counselors is being re-designed. Quarterly training for supervisory personnel has been implemented and will continue.

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of VR significantly disabled customers gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days

- Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
Rate 58.5%	50.5%	-8.0%	-13.7%
Number 9,775	7,210	-2,565	-26.2%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors  Staff Capacity  
 Competing Priorities  Level of Training  
 Previous Estimate Incorrect  
 Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

This is a subset of the first outcome measure, and is affected by the same factors.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable  Technological Problems  
 Legal/Legislative Change  Natural Disaster  
 Target Population Change  Other (Identify)  
 This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem  
 Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

This is a subset of the first outcome measure, and is affected by the same factors.

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training  Technology  
 Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

This is a subset of the first outcome measure; the same recommendations are applicable.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of all other VR disabled customers gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days

**Action:**

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
Rate 77.0%	71.3%	-5.7%	-7.4%
Number 1,725	2,203	478	27.7%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors  Staff Capacity
- Competing Priorities  Level of Training
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

This is a subset of the first outcome measure, and is affected by the same factors.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable  Technological Problems
- Legal/Legislative Change  Natural Disaster
- Target Population Change  Other (Identify)
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

This is a subset of the first outcome measure, and is affected by the same factors.

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training  Technology
- Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

This is a subset of the first outcome measure; the same recommendations are applicable.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of VR customers placed in competitive employment

- Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
Rate 97.5%	99.7%	2.2%	2.3%
Number 11,213	9,381	(1,832)	-16.3%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors  Staff Capacity  
 Competing Priorities  Level of Training  
 Previous Estimate Incorrect  
 Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

This is a variation of the first outcome measure, and is affected by the same factors. This standard cannot be met unless the standard for the first measure (number of customers gainfully employed) is met. Note that the rate exceeds the performance standard.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable  Technological Problems  
 Legal/Legislative Change  Natural Disaster  
 Target Population Change  Other (Identify)  
 This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem  
 Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

This is a variation of the first outcome measure, and is affected by the same factors.

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training  Technology  
 Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

This is a variation of the first outcome measure; the same recommendations are applicable.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of VR customers retained in employment after 1 year  
**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
67.5%			
6,300			

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors  Staff Capacity
- Competing Priorities  Level of Training
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

Performance is a probable consequence of lower numbers of clients placed in gainful employment in prior state fiscal years. When this number is low the number and percent retained after one year is also expected to be low.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable  Technological Problems
- Legal/Legislative Change  Natural Disaster
- Target Population Change  Other (Identify)
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training  Technology
- Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Performance improvement is expected here as a consequence of implementation of the activities described for the first measure---number of customers placed in gainful employment.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**SCHEDULE XIV-A: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
**Service/Budget Entity:** General Program  
**Measure:** Average annual earnings of VR customers at placement

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved GAA Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
\$14,463	\$17,344	\$ 2,881	19.9%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**SCHEDULE XIV-A: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
**Service/Budget Entity:** General Program  
**Measure:** Average annual earnings of VR customers after 1 year  
**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

**Projected from three (3) quarters of data**

Approved GAA Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
\$15,999			

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**  
**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):  
 Personnel Factors  Staff Capacity  
 Competing Priorities  Level of Training  
 Previous Estimate Incorrect  
 Other (Identify)  
**Explanation:**  
**External Factors** (check all that apply):  
 Resources Unavailable  Technological Problems  
 Legal/Legislative Change  Natural Disaster  
 Target Population Change  Other (Identify)  
 This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem  
 Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission  
**Explanation:**  
**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):  
 Training  Technology  
 Personnel  Other (Identify)  
**Recommendations:**

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Percent of case costs covered by third-party payors

**Action:**

- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure
- Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure
- Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
23.0%	5.4%	17.6%	-76.5%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors  Staff Capacity
- Competing Priorities  Level of Training
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

In SFY2004 monies recovered decreased from the previous fiscal year, causing a decrease of about 0.5% in performance on the measure. The estimated standard is too high. Approximately \$19,000,000 would be needed from third party payors to meet the standard of 23%.

In addition, attention to recovery of monies competes with DVR's mission of assisting persons with disabilities to gain or retain employment and increased independence. Recovery of the monies is a specialized task apart from service delivery; loss of key personnel has affected performance on this measure.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable  Technological Problems
- Legal/Legislative Change  Natural Disaster
- Target Population Change  Other (Identify)
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

DVR has only partial control of performance on this measure. The agency cannot select for clients whose costs are likely to be recoverable from a third party payor, although the agency can emphasize the need to recover such monies, where possible.

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training  Technology
- Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

Management has improved training for personnel about the value of and process for recovery of monies from third party payors. In addition, management has increased the number of personnel focused on this task and emphasized the use of technology for such recovery efforts.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Average cost of case life (to Division) for significantly disabled VR customers

- Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
\$3,350	\$3,517	\$ 167	5.0%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors               | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect     |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)                |   |

**Explanation:**

Reduction of direct costs for services to customers competes with the State and Federal mandates to provide services to persons with the most significant disabilities, who are likely to require more services, and more costly services, over a longer period of time than are less severely disabled persons.

It is also probable that not all counselors are aware of the processes for selecting services in the most cost efficient manner and using comparable benefits for services when possible, or cognizant of the importance of doing so.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem         |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission |  |

**Explanation:**

Availability of resources from other community agencies has been reduced or eliminated due to changes in their policies or as a result of increased demand.

The Division has reduced the average cost from the previous fiscal year by about \$350 but cannot reasonably expect to continue to do so in view of the rising costs of all goods and services.

In addition, heavy workloads for experienced personnel has decreased both the time they have available to seek alternative sources for services and the time for training new staff in methods for using community resources.

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel           | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

**Recommendations:**

More efficient use of resources, and use of comparable services and benefits, is being addressed from the viewpoints of improving staff knowledge of and access to resources within their communities and increasing the emphasis on use of such resources as fully as possible.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**SCHEDULE XIV-A: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
**Service/Budget Entity:** General Program  
**Measure:** **Average cost of case life (to Division) for other disabled VR customers**  
**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved GAA Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
\$400	\$387	\$ (13)	-3.3%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors  Staff Capacity
- Competing Priorities  Level of Training
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

Reduction of direct costs for services to customers competes with the State and Federal mandates to provide services to persons with the most significant disabilities, who are likely to require more services, and more costly services, over a longer period of time than are less severely disabled persons.

It is also probable that not all counselors are aware of the processes for selecting services in the most cost efficient manner and using comparable benefits for services when possible, or cognizant of the importance of doing so.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable  Technological Problems
- Legal/Legislative Change  Natural Disaster
- Target Population Change  Other (Identify)
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

Availability of resources from other community agencies has been reduced or eliminated due to changes in their policies or as a result of increased demand.

The Division has reduced the average cost from the previous fiscal year by about \$100 but cannot reasonably expect to continue to do so in view of the rising costs of all goods and services.

In addition, heavy workloads for experienced personnel has decreased both the time they have available to seek alternative sources for services and the time for training new staff in methods for using community resources.

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training  Technology
- Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

More efficient use of resources, and use of comparable services and benefits, is being addressed from the viewpoints of improving staff knowledge of and access to resources within their communities and increasing the emphasis on use of such resources as fully as possible.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of customers reviewed for eligibility

- Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
29,000	24,333	(4,667)	-16.1%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel Factors           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff Capacity    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Competing Priorities        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level of Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)            |   |

**Explanation:**

Turnover in direct service positions has affected this measure, reducing productivity and efficiency because newly hired counselors required extensive orientation and training. Newly hired counselors require approximately 18 months after they join the organization before they can be expected to work independently or carry a full caseload.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Disaster       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Target Population Change                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem         |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission |   |

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Technology       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel           | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

**Recommendations:**

More efficient use of staff time is being examined, to provide counselors with more time to focus on the determination of eligibility. This effort also targets increasing the availability of the evaluation services critical to timely and reliable determination of the eligibility of a person with a disability for vocational rehabilitation services.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of Individualized Plans for Employment written

- Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
24,500	17,356	(7,144)	-29.2%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors  Staff Capacity  
 Competing Priorities  Level of Training  
 Previous Estimate Incorrect  
 Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

Prior remarks concerning staff experience and staff training apply to this measure as well. Development of the Individualized Plan for Employment is contingent upon the availability of a pool of customers eligible for services.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable  Technological Problems  
 Legal/Legislative Change  Natural Disaster  
 Target Population Change  Other (Identify)  
 This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem  
 Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training  Technology  
 Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The measures designed to increase the number of eligibility determinations will also affect this performance measure.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**SCHEDULE XIV-A: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
**Service/Budget Entity:** General Program  
**Measure:** Average Number of Active Cases per Month

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved GAA Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
37,500	35,885	(1,615)	-4.3%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

One of the key determinants of the number of active cases is the length of time a customer spends in each stage of the vocational rehabilitation process. Concerted efforts to streamline the process has reduced the average time spent in critical steps. This seems the most likely cause of the lower average for the number of active cases per month.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

If the count for this measure continues to decline it may be necessary to adjust the standard for this performance measure.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Customer caseload per counselor  
**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  Revision of Measure  
 Performance Assessment of Output Measure  Deletion of Measure  
 Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
125	100	(25)	-20.0%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors  Staff Capacity
- Competing Priorities  Level of Training
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

This measure reports the median caseload for all counselors within a given time period based on an operational definition that does not include a status that has become an increasing element of the counselors' workloads—new referrals to the program. The observed workload over time is not accurately captured by the existing definition of the measure.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable  Technological Problems
- Legal/Legislative Change  Natural Disaster
- Target Population Change  Other (Identify)
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training  Technology
- Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The operational definition for this measure should be modified to include referrals, to provide an accurate reflection of counselor workload.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation \_\_\_\_\_  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Percent of eligibility determinations completed in compliance with the Federal mandate

- Action:**
- Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure
  - Performance Assessment of Output Measure
  - Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards
  - Revision of Measure
  - Deletion of Measure

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
95.0%	87.0%	-8.0%	-8.4%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference:**

**Internal Factors** (check all that apply):

- Personnel Factors
- Competing Priorities
- Previous Estimate Incorrect
- Other (Identify)
- Staff Capacity
- Level of Training

**Explanation:**

The internal factors discussed concerning the number of eligibility determinations are equally relevant here.

**External Factors** (check all that apply):

- Resources Unavailable
- Legal/Legislative Change
- Target Population Change
- This Program/Service Cannot Fix The Problem
- Current Laws Are Working Against The Agency Mission
- Technological Problems
- Natural Disaster
- Other (Identify)

**Explanation:**

**Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems** (check all that apply):

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

It should be noted that performance improved approximately 4% over SFY2001-2002 on this measure in the 2002-03 state fiscal year. The efforts discussed for addressing the number of eligibility determinations will also affect this measure, with continued performance improvement.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**Exhibit IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability**

<p><b>Department:</b> <u>Education</u></p> <p><b>Program:</b> <u>Private Colleges and Universities</u></p> <p><b>Service:</b> _____</p> <p><b>Activity:</b> _____</p> <p><b>Measure:</b> <u>Retention rate of First Time in College (FTIC) award recipients, using a 6-year rate. (Florida Resident Access Grant—FRAG)</u></p> <p><b>Action</b> (check one):</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting Revision to Approved Measure</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Requesting New Measure</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure</p>
<p><b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FRAG Database – State Student Financial Aid database containing all student and Postsecondary FRAG data for the academic year.</li> <li>Postsecondary institutions report students who have received disbursements to OSFA. OSFA plans to collect graduation data from institutions in the future. Query the FRAG database for the number of first-time students who received a disbursement in 1999-2000 to create a cohort file. Match those students who graduate during or at the end of the academic year to the cohort file. This group of students will be tracked over the next six years.</li> <li>Divide the number of matched cohort students by the number of original students in cohort file for 1999-2000.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Validity:</b> Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established.</p> <p><b>Reliability:</b> Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established</p>

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, using a 6-year rate. (Florida Resident Access Grant—FRAG)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

1. FRAG Database – State Student Financial Aid database containing all student and Postsecondary FRAG data for the academic year.
2. Postsecondary institutions report students who have received disbursements to OSFA. OSFA plans to collect graduation data from institutions in the future. Query the FRAG database for the number of first-time students who received a disbursement in 1999-2000 to create a cohort file. Match those students who graduate during or at the end of the academic year to the cohort file. This group of students will be tracked over the next six years.
3. Divide the number of matched cohort students by the number of original students in cohort file for 1999-2000.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established.

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of degrees granted by level for FRAG recipients and contract program recipients. (Florida Resident Access Grant – FRAG)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Note: Funding is provided via specific line item appropriations; therefore, tracking aggregate data is misleading. We recommend reporting graduation rates for individual programs

Program administrators' track and report graduation rates for these programs. Contracts may support individual students or the program as a whole; therefore program graduation rates will be reported beginning in 2001.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established.

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Retention rate of award recipients (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

This measure is outdated. In many cases contract payments are made to support programs rather than individual students. An aggregation of performance data would be misleading. We recommend deleting this measure and replace it with disaggregated graduation rates.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Graduation Rate of award recipients (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Of those graduates remaining in Florida, the percent employed at \$22,000 or more 1 year following graduation. (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Education**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_**Measure:** Of those graduates remaining in Florida, the percent employed at \$22,000 or more 5 years following graduation. (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Licensure/certification rates of award recipients (where applicable), (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Education**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_**Measure:** Number/percent of baccalaureate degree recipients who are found placed in an occupation identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list. (This measure would be for each Academic Contract and for the Florida Resident Access Grant)**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of prior year's graduates (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of prior year's graduates remaining in Florida. (Academic Contracts)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of FTIC students, disaggregated by in-state and out-of-state. (Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Percent of high school graduates who successfully completed the 19 core credits. (Bright Futures)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Retention rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system, using a 4-year rate for community colleges and a 6-year rate for universities. (Bright Futures)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system (Bright Futures)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Percent of high school graduates attending Florida postsecondary institutions. (Bright Futures)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of Bright Futures recipients

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

1. Bright Futures (H4) Database – State Student Financial Aid database containing all student and postsecondary Bright Futures data for the academic year.
2. Postsecondary institutions report students who have received disbursements to OSFA. Query the Bright Futures database for the number of public high school initial eligible students who receive a disbursement.
3. Divide the number of public high school initial eligible students who receive a disbursement by the number of initial eligible students.

**Validity:**

This is a valid output measure.

**Reliability:**

This is a reliable output measure.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Retention rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system, using a 4-year rate for community colleges and a 6-year rate for universities. (Florida Student Assistance Grant)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system (Florida Student Assistance Grant)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Student Financial Aid—State  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Percent of recipients who, upon completion of the program, work in fields in which there are shortages. (Critical Teacher Shortage Forgivable Loan Program)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Grants/K-12 FEFP  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of teachers with National Teacher's Certification, reported by district.

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Annually, in November, the NBPTS notifies the Division of Professional Educators of the number of teachers who successfully completed this voluntary certification program. A running total is maintained of Florida teachers holding NBPTS certification.

**Validity:**

This is a valid output measure.

**Reliability:**

This is a reliable output measure.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Grants/K-12 FEFP  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of "A" schools, reported by district.

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:****Validity:**

This is a valid outcome measure.

**Reliability:**

This is a reliable outcome measure.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Grants/K-12 FEFP  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of "D" of "F" schools, reported by district.

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:****Validity:**

This is a valid outcome measure.

**Reliability:**

This is a reliable outcome measure.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Grants/K-12 FEFP  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of schools declining one or more letter grades, reported by district.

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:****Validity:**

This is a valid outcome measure.

**Reliability:**

This is a reliable outcome measure.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Grants/K-12 FEFP  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of schools improving one ore more letter grades, reported by district.

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:****Validity:**

This is a valid outcome measure.

**Reliability:**

This is a reliable outcome measure.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Education**Program:** Workforce Development**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_**Measure:** Number/percent who completed an occupational completion point within a program identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list and are found employed at \$4,680 or more per quarter. (Level III)**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Education**Program:** Workforce Development**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_**Measure:** Number/percent who completed an occupational point within a program identified for new entrants on the Workforce Estimating Conference list and are found employed at \$3,900 or more per quarter, or are found continuing education in a college-credit-level program. (Level II)**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent who completed an occupational completion point within a program not included in Levels II or III and are found employed, enlisted in the military, or are continuing their education at the vocational certificate level. (Level I)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent who completed a program identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list and are found employed at \$4,680 or more per quarter. (Level III)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent who completed a program identified for new entrants on the Workforce Estimating Conference list and are found employed at \$3,900 or more per quarter, or are found continuing education in a college-credit-level program. (Level II)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent who completed any program not included in Levels II or III and are found employed, enlisted in the military, or continuing their education at the vocational certificate level. (Level I)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Education**Program:** Workforce Development**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_**Measure:** Number/percent of workforce development programs which meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards for those programs which teach a subject matter for which there is a nationally recognized accrediting body.**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of students attending workforce development programs which meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards.

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Workforce Development  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number/percent of students completing workforce development programs which meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards.

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Education**Program:** Workforce Development**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_**Measure:** Number of adult basic education, including English as a Second Language, and adult secondary education completion point completers who are found employed or continuing their education.**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Education**Program:** Workforce Education—Administered Funds**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_**Measure:** Number of adult basic education and adult secondary education completion point completers who are found employed or continuing their educations.**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Board of Education  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Percent of teacher certificates issued within 30 days after receipt of complete application and the mandatory fingerprint clearance notification.

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Bureau reports the percentage of certificates that were issued within 30 days of receiving the mandatory fingerprint clearance notification and not 30 days from receiving the initial application. This measure most accurately reflects the workload and efficiency of the Bureau in completing this phase of the certification process where it has control.

**Validity:**

This is a valid output measure.

**Reliability:**

This is a reliable output measure.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Education**Program:** State Board of Education**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_**Measure:** Number of districts that have implemented a high-quality professional development system, as determined by the Department of Education, based on its review of student performance data and the success of districts in defining and meeting the training needs of teachers.**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Board of Education  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Percent of current year competitive grants initial disbursement made by August 15 of current fiscal year, or as provided in the General Appropriations Act.

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** State Board of Education  
**Service:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Measure:** Number of certification applications processed.

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Department is scheduled to present recommended K-20 education performance measures and standards to the legislature by December 1, 2004.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not established

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not established

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Programs  
**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services  
**Activity:** Community College Program Fund  
**Measure:** Percent of Associate in Arts (AA) degree graduates who transfer to a state university within two years.

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Date Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Division of Community College Student Data Base (SDB). The SDB is built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to [http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctemis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary\\_main.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctemis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm). A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.

As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.

**Validity:**

Performance Based Budgeting component 1 is run consistently using the following data elements from FCCS Data Elements – Social Security Number, Degree Earned, Year Reported and the State University System Data Elements – Social Security Number, Year of File. The Social Security Numbers of students receiving an A.A. degree in year 1 are matched with the Social Security Numbers of students reported as being enrolled in the State University System in year 1 and year 1+1 using the SUS Student Data Course File. The results are reported as counts.

**Reliability:**

The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP. The same programs are used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Programs  
**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services  
**Activity:** Community College Program Fund  
**Measure:** Percent of Associate in Arts (A.A.) degree transfers to the State University System who earn a 2.5 or above in the SUS after one year

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Date Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Division of Community College Student Data Base (SDB). The SDB is built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to [http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary\\_main.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm). A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.

As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.

**Validity:**

This measure indicates the performance of associate in arts degree completers for Year 1 who transferred to state universities in Year 1 + 1. The report is displayed by community college and by ethnic category. The data reports present the number of students that are enrolled at a state university by the community college from which they graduated. A.A. students who started at one community college, transferred to another and then transferred to the State University System are not accounted for in this report. The report focuses solely on the performance of students who received their complete education from one institution. This measure allows institutions to focus on the results of their own instructional strategies so that appropriate adjustments can be made in response to the results. Performance will be assessed by five methods: the percent below 2.0 GPA, the percent at or above 2.0 GPA and less than 2.5 percent, the percent at or above 2.5 GPA, the percent at or above 3.0 GPA, and the mean GPA. The report is also generated by ethnic classification and by former college preparatory/non-college preparatory status. However, the goal for this measure focuses on the percent at or above 2.5 GPA.

GPA is calculated from the SUS data as: (Total Grade Point + Term Grade Points) divided by (Total Hours + Term Hours). The SUS data are extracted from the SUS Student Data Course File.

**Reliability:**

The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP. The same programs are used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education**Program:** Community College Programs**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services**Activity:** Community College Program Fund**Measure:** Of the Associate in Arts (A.A.) graduates who are employed full time rather than continuing their education, the percent who are in jobs earning at least \$9 an hour (Performance- Based Budgeting is now using \$10 per hour.)**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The information is obtained through the Florida Education Training and Placement Information Program FETPIP database in the Department of Education.

**Validity:**

The information is supplied to the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education by the Florida Education Training and Placement Information Program (FETPIP) of the DOE. Students are tracked by social security number through the Agency for Workforce Innovation (formerly the Department of Labor) and other national employment tracking systems to assist in supplying job placement and earnings information. The use of social security numbers and state and national employment databases provides a consistent framework for gathering employability data. FETPIP employability information is recognized as one the best sources of tracking workforce placements and earnings in the educational realm.

**Reliability:**

The reliability of their information increases with access to national and census data combined with state information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education**Program:** Community College Programs**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services**Activity:** Community College Program Fund**Measure:** Of the Associate in Arts (A.A.) students who complete 18 credit hours, the percent of whom graduate in four years**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Date Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Division of Community College Student Data Base (SDB). The SDB is built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to [http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary\\_main.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm). A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.

As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.

**Validity:**

This measure shows the status of first-time-in college A.A., A.S. and Applied Associate in Science (A.A.S.)-degree-seeking students and Postsecondary Vocational Certificate (PVC) and Advanced Technical Certificate (ATD)-seeking students from the Fall of Year 1. The A.A., A.S. and A.A.S. students must have completed at least 18 college credits during the tracking period. (Fall Year 1 through Winter/Spring Year 1 + 3). The PVC and ATD- seeking students completed at least 9 credit hours during the tracking period (Fall Year 1 through Summer Year 1 + 2). The data is displayed by college and system wide, segmented by ethnicity and full-time/part-time status. Student tracking is done by using social security numbers.

**Reliability:**

The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP. The same programs are used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Programs  
**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services  
**Activity:** Community College Program Fund  
**Measure:** Percent of students graduating with total accumulated credit hours that are less than or equal to 120 percent of degree requirement

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Date Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Division of Community College Student Data Base (SDB). The SDB is built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to [http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary\\_main.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm). A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.

As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.

**Validity:**

The Performance-Based Budgeting measure above is reported by the institutions on a special file developed for this purpose. The colleges provide information on hours attempted for each AA granted during a given year. The process has been in place for several years and is verified by comparing the percentages from one year to the next. Any large changes are reported back to the colleges with an accompanying request for an explanation.

**Reliability:**

The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP. The same programs are used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Programs  
**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services  
**Activity:** Community College Program Fund  
**Measure:** Percent of students exiting the college-preparatory program who enter college-level course work associated with the Associates in Arts (A.A.), Associate in Science (A.S.), Postsecondary Vocational Certificate (PVC), and Postsecondary Adult Vocational programs

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Date Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Division of Community College Student Data Base (SDB). The SDB is built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to [http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary\\_main.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm). A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.

As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.

**Validity:**

This measure shows the number of degree seeking students who are first time in college or previous year high school graduates who took an entry-level test during the Fall of Year 1 and who failed a portion of the test. The report then shows how many of those students enrolled in a college preparatory course (for the area needed), with the number and percentage of those who passed the highest-level college preparatory course for that area at that particular college, between Fall Year 1 and Summer Year 1 + 2.

**Reliability:**

The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP. The same programs are used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Programs  
**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services  
**Activity:** Community College Program Fund  
**Measure:** Percent of Associate in Arts (A.A.) degree transfers to the State University System (SUS) who started in College Prep and who earn a 2.5 in the SUS after one year

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Date Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Division of Community College Student Data Base (SDB). The SDB is built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to [http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary\\_main.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm). A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.

As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.

**Validity:**

This measure indicates the performance of associate in arts degree (A.A.) completers for Year 1 who transferred to state universities in Year 1 + 1. The report is displayed by community college and by ethnic category. The data reports present the number of students that are enrolled at a state university by the community college from which they graduated. A.A. students who started at one community college, transferred to another and then transferred to the State University System are not accounted for in this report. The report focuses solely on the performance of students who received their complete education from one institution. This measure allows institutions to focus on the results of their own instructional strategies so that appropriate adjustments can be made in response to the results. Performance will be assessed by five methods: the percent below 2.0 GPA, the percent at or above 2.0 GPA and less than 2.5 percent, the percent at or above 2.5 GPA, the percent at or above 3.0 GPA, and the mean GPA. The report is also generated by ethnic classification and by former college preparatory/non-college preparatory status. However, the goal for this measure focuses on the percent at or above 2.5 GPA.

GPA is calculated from the SUS data as: (Total Grade Point + Term Grade Points) divided by (Total Hours + Term Hours). These data are extracted from the SUS Student Data Course File.

**Reliability:**

The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP. The same programs are used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Programs  
**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services  
**Activity:** Community College Program Fund  
**Measure:** Number/Percent of Associate in Arts (A.A.) partial completers transferring to the State University System (SUS) with at least 40 credit hours

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Date Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Division of Community College Student Data Base (SDB). The SDB is built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to [http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary\\_main.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm). A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.

As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.

**Validity:**

This measure is based upon the match of elements from the FCCS and the State University System. The students are matched with information from the State University System related to social security number, university and hours accepted for transfer. Students found to have transferred to the SUS are then checked for the number of hours the SUS accepted for transfer. If the number is 40 or more, the student is counted. These students have been previously selected as non-degree earners via the Performance-Based Budgeting process.

**Reliability:**

The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP. The same programs are used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education**Program:** Community College Programs**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services**Activity:** Community College Program Fund**Measure:** Number/Percent FTEs of Associate in Arts (A.A.) students who do not complete 18 credit hours within four years**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Date Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Division of Community College Student Data Base (SDB). The SDB is built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to [http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary\\_main.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm). A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.

As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.

**Validity:**

This is a special run based on a cohort of accountability Measure 1, Part 2. It is a very difficult measure to track due to the tendency of students in the community colleges to drop in and out of classes. For that reason, we have recommended that this measure be eliminated.

**Reliability:**

The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP. The same programs are used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education**Program:** Community College Programs**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services**Activity:** Community College Program Fund**Measure:** Of the economically disadvantaged Associate in Arts (A.A.) students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an A.A. degree within four years**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Date Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Division of Community College Student Data Base (SDB). The SDB is built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to [http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary\\_main.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm). A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.

As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.

**Validity:**

This measure shows the status of first-time-in college A.A. degree seeking student from the Fall of Year 1 for four special populations: 1. Economically Disadvantaged, 2. Disabled, 3. English as a Second Language and Black Males. The A.A. students must have completed at least 18 college credits during the tracking period (Fall Year 1 through Winter/Spring Year 1 + 3). The data is displayed by college and system-wide, segmented by ethnicity and full-time/part-time status and special populations.

**Reliability:**

The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP. The same programs are used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Programs  
**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services  
**Activity:** Community College Program Fund  
**Measure:** Of the disabled Associate in Arts (A.A.) students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an A.A. degree within four years

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Date Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Division of Community College Student Data Base (SDB). The SDB is built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to [http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary\\_main.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm). A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.

As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.

**Validity:**

This measure shows the status of first-time-in college A.A. degree seeking student from the Fall of Year 1 for four special populations: 1. Economically Disadvantaged, 2. Disabled, 3. English as a Second Language and Black Males. The A.A. students must have completed at least 18 college credits during the tracking period (Fall Year 1 through Winter/Spring Year 1 + 3). The data is displayed by college and system-wide, segmented by ethnicity and full-time/part-time status and special populations.

**Reliability:**

The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP. The same programs are used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Programs  
**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services  
**Activity:** Community College Program Fund  
**Measure:** Of the black male Associate in Arts (A.A.) students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an A.A. degree within 4 years

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Date Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Division of Community College Student Data Base (SDB). The SDB is built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to [http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary\\_main.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm). A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.

As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.

**Validity:**

This measure shows the status of first-time-in college A.A. degree seeking student from the Fall of Year 1 for four special populations: 1. Economically Disadvantaged, 2. Disabled, 3. English as a Second Language and Black Males. The A.A. students must have completed at least 18 college credits during the tracking period (Fall Year 1 through Winter/Spring Year 1 + 3). The data is displayed by college and system-wide, segmented by ethnicity and full-time/part-time status and special populations.

**Reliability:**

The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP. The same programs are used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Programs  
**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services  
**Activity:** Community College Program Fund  
**Measure:** Of the English as Second Language (college prep) or English for Non-Speaker (college credit) students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an A.A. degree within 4 years

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Date Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Division of Community College Student Data Base (SDB). The SDB is built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to [http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctemis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary\\_main.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctemis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm). A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.

As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.

**Validity:**

This measure shows the status of first-time-in college A.A. degree seeking student from the Fall of Year 1 for four special populations: 1. Economically Disadvantaged, 2. Disabled, 3. English as a Second Language and Black Males. The A.A. students must have completed at least 18 college credits during the tracking period (Fall Year 1 through Winter/Spring Year 1 + 3). The data is displayed by college and system-wide and segmented by ethnicity, full-time/part-time status and special populations.

**Reliability:**

The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP. The same programs are used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education

**Program:** Community College Programs

**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services

**Activity:** Community College Program Fund

**Measure:** Of the Associate in Arts (A.A.) graduates who have not transferred to the State University System or an independent college or university, the number/percent who are found placed in an occupation identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Information is provided from the Florida Education Training and Placement Information Program (FETPIP) database.

**Validity:**

The information is supplied to the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education by the Florida Education Training and Placement Information Program (FETPIP) of the DOE. Students are tracked by social security number through the Agency for Workforce Innovation (formerly the Department of Labor) and other national employment tracking systems to assist in supplying job placement and earnings information. The use of social security numbers and state and national employment data bases provides a consistent framework for gathering employability data. FETPIP employability information is recognized as one the best sources of tracking workforce placements and earnings in the educational realm.

**Reliability:**

The reliability of their information increases with access to national and census data combined with state information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education

**Program:** Community College Programs

**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services

**Activity:** Community College Program Fund

**Measure:** Percent of prior year Florida high school graduates enrolled in community colleges

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

This information is taken from the *Performance on the Common Placement Test* report generated by the K-16 Articulation Office of the DOE (<http://info.doe.state.fl.us/perf.CPT/>).

**Validity:**

This information, taken from the *Performance on the Common Placement Test* report, is based upon the results of matching social security numbers provided by the K-16 Articulation Office with the student data base for a given year. The LRPP element is a simple count.

**Reliability:**

NA

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education**Program:** Community College Programs**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services**Activity:** Community College Program Fund**Measure:** Number of Associate in Arts (A.A.) degrees granted**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Division of Community College Student Data Base (SDB). The SDB is built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to [http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary\\_main.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm). A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.

As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.

**Validity:**

The measure is based upon the results of a frequency table from the Student Data Base (SDB) giving the number of A.A. degrees awarded in a given reporting year. The results are unduplicated at the college level.

**Reliability:**

The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP. The same programs are used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education  
**Program:** Community College Programs  
**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services  
**Activity:** Community College Program Fund  
**Measure:** Number of students receiving college preparatory instruction

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Division of Community College Student Data Base (SDB). The SDB is built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to [http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary\\_main.htm](http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm). A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.

As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.

Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.

**Validity:**

The information on this measure is taken from the Student Data Base. Through the use of social security numbers, an unduplicated count of students enrolled in college preparatory courses is compiled.

**Reliability:**

The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP. The same programs are used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education

**Program:** Community College Programs

**Service:** Postsecondary Educational Services

**Activity:** Community College Program Fund

**Measure:** Number of students enrolled in baccalaureate programs offered on community college campuses

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

This measure cannot be drawn from the Student Data Base. The report must be generated by survey data from the colleges.

**Validity:**

The results are based upon a survey of both the State University System and the independent institutions. This is clearly one of the weakest measures since it is not collected as part of normal institutional reporting requirements.

**Reliability:**

NA

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education**Program:** Division of Blind Services**Service:** Blind Services**Activity:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.**Measure:** Rate/no. of rehabilitation customers gainfully employed at least 90 days**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The definition and methodology for this measure conforms to that of DVR.

Data from the Client Rehabilitation Information System (CRIS) will be used. Data and calculations for the measures will be produced directly from CRIS using a programmed reporting process to extract data entered on clients at the field office level.

Status 26 is a successful rehabilitation, which is defined by federal regulations (34 CFR Part 361 et al) as maintenance in an acceptable employment outcome for at least 90 days. Status 28 is an unsuccessful rehabilitation after plan development.

This measure is derived by dividing the total number of cases closed status 26 (successful rehabilitation) by the total number of cases closed status 26 (successful rehabilitation) plus cases closed status 28 (unsuccessful rehabilitation).

**Validity:**

The CRIS System was developed to extract the data necessary for measuring performance on established PBPB measures. Testing has been conducted during the past fiscal year to insure that appropriate data elements are being selected for reports related to specific measures.

**Reliability:**

Client information is entered into the CRIS system by associates in the district offices. Edits were designed into the CRIS system to ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. Reliability of report data is checked on a quarterly basis.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department: Department of Education****Program: Division of Blind Services****Service: Blind Services****Activity: Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.****Measure: Rate/no. rehabilitation customers placed in competitive employment.****Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The definition and methodology for this measure conforms to that of DVR.

Data from the Client Rehabilitation Information System (CRIS) will be used. Data and calculations for the measures will be produced directly from CRIS using a programmed reporting process to extract data entered on clients at the field office level.

This measure is the report of all cases closed status 26 (successful rehabilitation). There is an associated work status which indicates type of employment. The following are definitions of the work statuses:

- Work Status 1 – Competitive Employment
- Work Status 2 – Sheltered Employment
- Work Status 3 – Self Employment
- Work Status 4 – Business Enterprises
- Work Status 5 – Homemaker
- Work Status 6 – Unpaid Family Worker

This measure is calculated by dividing Work Statuses 1, 3, and 4, by Work Statuses 1-6.

**Validity:**

The CRIS System was developed to extract the data necessary for measuring performance on established PBPB measures. Testing has been conducted during the past fiscal year to insure that appropriate data elements are being selected for reports related to specific measures.

**Reliability:**

Client information is entered into the CRIS system by associates in the district offices. Edits were designed into the CRIS system to ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. Reliability of report data is checked on a quarterly basis.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education**Program:** Division of Blind Services**Service:** Blind Services**Activity:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.**Measure:** Projected avg. annual earnings of rehabilitation customers at placement.**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The definition and methodology for this measure conforms to that of DVR.

Data from the Client Rehabilitation Information System (CRIS) will be used. Data and calculations for the measures will be produced directly from CRIS using a programmed reporting process to extract data entered on clients at the field office level.

Client weekly earnings are reported at the time of case closure. Weekly earnings pertain to VR cases closed STATUS 26 with an associated WORK STATUS AT CLOSURE = 1-4. These work statuses represent successful employment outcomes with earnings.

To calculate annual earnings, weekly earnings are multiplied by 52. To calculate the average, this figure is divided by the total number of clients closed STATUS 26 and WORK STATUS=1-4. This entire process is automated by the CRIS reporting system.

**Validity:**

The CRIS System was developed to extract the data necessary for measuring performance on established PBPB measures. Testing has been conducted during the past fiscal year to insure that appropriate data elements are being selected for reports related to specific measures.

**Reliability:**

Client information is entered into the CRIS system by associates in the district offices. Edits were designed into the CRIS system to ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. Reliability of report data is checked on a quarterly basis.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education**Program:** Division of Blind Services**Service:** Blind Services**Activity:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.**Measure:** Ratio/no. successfully rehabilitated older persons, non-vocational rehabilitation.**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data from the Client Rehabilitation Information System (CRIS) will be used. Data for the measures is produced directly from CRIS using a programmed reporting process to extract data entered on clients at the field office level.

This measure is calculated by determining the total number of cases closed status 25 (successfully rehabilitated). This figure is divided by the total number of cases closed (status 25) plus the total number of cases closed unsuccessfully.

The rate is calculated by dividing the number of successfully rehabilitated older persons by the number plus the total persons unsuccessfully rehabilitated (status 29). These calculations are performed by the CRIS reporting system.

**Validity:**

The CRIS System was developed to extract the data necessary for measuring performance on established PBPB measures. Testing has been conducted during the past fiscal year to insure that appropriate data elements are being selected for reports related to specific measures.

**Reliability:**

Client information is entered into the CRIS system by associates in the district offices. Edits were designed into the CRIS system to ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. Reliability of report data is checked on a quarterly basis.



**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education**Program:** Division of Blind Services**Service:** Blind Services**Activity:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.**Measure:** Ratio/no. of customers (children) successfully rehabilitated/transitioned from pre-school to school.**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data from the Client Rehabilitation Information System (CRIS) will be used. Data and calculations for the measures will be produced directly from CRIS using a programmed reporting process to extract data entered on clients at the field office level.

Status 15 is the status for successful transition from pre-school to school. This measure is calculated by obtaining the sum total of all clients placed in Status 15 during the reporting period and then dividing this figure by the total of cases in Status 15 plus the total of all unsuccessful closures (Status 08) for a reporting period.

**Validity:**

The CRIS System was developed to extract the data necessary for measuring performance on established PBPB measures. Testing has been conducted during the development to insure that appropriate data elements are being selected for reports related to specific measures.

**Reliability:**

Client information is entered into the CRIS system by associates in the district offices. Edits were designed into the CRIS system to ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. Reliability of report data is checked on a quarterly basis.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education**Program:** Division of Blind Services**Service:** Blind Services**Activity:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.**Measure:** Ratio/no. of customers (children) successfully rehabilitated/transitioned from school to work.**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data from the Client Rehabilitation Information System (CRIS) will be used. Data and calculations for the measures will be produced directly from CRIS using a programmed reporting process to extract data entered on clients at the field office level.

Status 26 is the status for successful transition from school to work.

This measure is calculated by obtaining the sum total of all clients placed in Status 26 during the reporting period and then dividing this figure by the total of cases in Status 26 plus the total of all unsuccessful closures after plan implementation (Status 28) for that reporting period.

**Validity:**

The CRIS System was developed to extract the data necessary for measuring performance on established PBPB measures. Testing has been conducted during the past fiscal year to insure that appropriate data elements are being selected for reports related to specific measures.

**Reliability:**

Client information is entered into the CRIS system by associates in the district offices. Edits were designed into the CRIS system to ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. Reliability of report data is checked on a quarterly basis.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education**Program:** Division of Blind Services**Service:** Blind Services**Activity:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.**Measure:** No. of customers reviewed for eligibility**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The definition and methodology for this measure conforms to that of DVR.

Data from the Client Rehabilitation Information System (CRIS) will be used. Data for the measures will be produced directly from CRIS using a programmed reporting process to extract data entered on clients at the field office level.

To calculate this measure, a total of all cases that were placed in an "accepted," "closed from application," or in an "extended evaluation" status is determined. This total is defined as the number of customers reviewed for eligibility during the reporting period.

**Validity:**

The CRIS System was developed to extract the data necessary for measuring performance on established PBPB measures. Testing has been conducted during the development to insure that appropriate data elements are being selected for reports related to specific measures.

**Reliability:**

Client information is entered into the CRIS system by associates in the district offices. Edits were designed into the CRIS system to ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. Reliability of report data is checked on a quarterly basis.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education**Program:** Division of Blind Services**Service:** Blind Services**Activity:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.**Measure:** No. of written plans for services**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The definition and methodology for this measure conforms to that of DVR.

Data from the Client Rehabilitation Information System (CRIS) will be used. Data for the measures will be produced directly from CRIS using a programmed reporting process to extract data entered on clients at the field office level.

All Plans entered into the system are assigned a number. The first Plan for each client is assigned the number 1.00. This measure is calculated as the sum total of Plans 1.00, with an approval date falling within the reporting period.

**Validity:**

The CRIS System was developed to extract the data necessary for measuring performance on established PBPB measures. Testing has been conducted during the development to insure that appropriate data elements are being selected for reports related to specific measures.

**Reliability:**

Client information is entered into the CRIS system by associates in the district offices. Edits were designed into the CRIS system to ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. Reliability of report data is checked on a quarterly basis.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education**Program:** Division of Blind Services**Service:** Blind Services**Activity:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.**Measure:** No. of customers served**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The definition and methodology for this measure conforms to that of DVR.

Data from the Client Rehabilitation Information System (CRIS) will be used. Data for the measures will be produced directly from CRIS using a programmed reporting process to extract data entered on clients at the field office level.

This measure is calculated by taking the sum of all cases in an open status on the last day of the reporting period. This figure combined with all cases closed during the reporting period (statuses 08, 09, 25, 26, 28, and 30) is the total of cases served during the reporting period.

**Validity:**

The CRIS System was developed to extract the data necessary for measuring performance on established PBPB measures. Testing has been conducted during the development to insure that appropriate data elements are being selected for reports related to specific measures.

**Reliability:**

Client information is entered into the CRIS system by associates in the district offices. Edits were designed into the CRIS system to ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. Reliability of report data is checked on a quarterly basis.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education**Program:** Division of Blind Services**Service:** Blind Services**Activity:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.**Measure:** Avg. time lapse (days) between application and eligibility determination for rehabilitation customers**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The definition and methodology for this measure does not conform to that of DVR.

Data from the Client Rehabilitation Information System (CRIS) will be used. Data for the measures will be produced directly from CRIS using a programmed reporting process to extract data entered on clients at the field office level.

This measure is calculated by summing the total number of days between the date of application and the date of eligibility determination. This figure is then divided by the number of clients for whom eligibility was determined to produce the average.

**Validity:**

The CRIS System was developed to extract the data necessary for measuring performance on established PBPB measures. Testing has been conducted during the development to insure that appropriate data elements are being selected for reports related to specific measures.

**Reliability:**

Client information is entered into the CRIS system by associates in the district offices. Edits were designed into the CRIS system to ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. Reliability of report data is checked on a quarterly basis.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education**Program:** Division of Blind Services**Service:** Blind Services**Activity:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers.**Measure:** Customer caseload per counseling/case management team member**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The definition and methodology for this measure conforms to that of DVR.

Data from the Client Rehabilitation Information System (CRIS) will be used. Data for the measures will be produced directly from CRIS using a programmed reporting process to extract data entered on clients at the field office level.

This measure is derived by dividing the total number of customers served (defined in Output #3) by the total number of FTEs with caseload carrying responsibilities.

**Validity:**

The CRIS System was developed to extract the data necessary for measuring performance on established PBPB measures. Testing has been conducted during the past fiscal year process to insure that appropriate data elements are being selected for reports related to specific measures.

**Reliability:**

Client information is entered into the CRIS system by associates in the district offices. Edits were designed into the CRIS system to ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. Reliability of report data is checked on a quarterly basis.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Blind Services  
**Activity:** Provide Braille and recorded publications services.  
**Measure:** Cost per Library Customer served

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The annual cost per Library customer served is calculated by dividing the sum of the Library's General Revenue (State Funding) allocation for the fiscal year by the total number of customers served during the fiscal year.

**Validity:**

The calculations for this measure includes only General Revenue funds, because Trust funds provided to the Library consist of nonrecurring, competitive federal grants designated for special projects rather than operating expenses. However, in accordance with the recommendations of the DLES Office of Inspector General in Report Number 98/99-101 (June 23, 1999, p. 10), we propose the deletion of this measure because it does not reflect the total cost of Library operations.

**Reliability:**

This measure will fluctuate based on increases or decreases in the General Revenue budget of the Library and increases or decreases in the number of customers served by the Library each fiscal year.



**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education**Program:** Division of Blind Services**Service:** Blind Services**Activity:** Provide food service vending training, work experience, and licensing**Measure:** Total Number of Food Service Managers**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Source and Methodology:**

The data source is the RSVP (Randolph-Sheppard Vending Program) software program. Three linked data files are used to generate this output measure: a) "operators," consisting of a profile for each licensed vendor; b) "facilities," consisting of a profile for each facility of the Bureau; and c) "licensed operator facility agreement (LOFA), which, when linked with a manager and a facility, creates a status of "active" for the Food Service Facility Manager.

Previously, only Type I LOFAs were used. Now, Type I and some qualifying Type II.

There are two types of LOFAs: a) Type I is used with the primary facility operated under a five-year agreement with a food service manager; and b) Type II is used with a secondary facility under an agreement of twelve months or less. For this output measure, only Type I LOFAs are counted along with those operators having a Type II LOFA only. Some operators may have both a Type I and Type II at the same time.

**Validity:**

The current count of Type I LOFAs is a key indicator of whether the program is accomplishing its goal toward maximizing employment opportunities for the most eligible and licensed blind individuals. Type II LOFAs are included (since they indicate that a manager has at least temporary employment. The objective of the program is to increase Type I and decrease Type II.

**Reliability:**

Strict business rules are programmed into the RSVP which do not allow operator/facility linkages to occur without a valid LOFA. The system also does not allow operators to have more than one Type I LOFA, therefore, an attempt to link an operator with two Type I LOFAs would fail.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education**Program:** Division of Blind Services**Service:** Blind Services**Activity:** Provide food service vending training, work experience, and licensing**Measure:** No. of existing food service facilities renovated**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Source and Methodology:**

The Fiscal Budget provided by the Bureau of Business Enterprises is the source document. Only those projects completed within the reporting period are counted.

**Validity:**

The on site visit by the Regional Sales Manager verifies the project has been completed; the facility is open and providing service.

**Reliability:**

The BBE State Fiscal department provides a back up as to the amount of facilities renovated.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education**Program:** Division of Blind Services**Service:** Blind Services**Activity:** Provide food service vending training, work experience, and licensing**Measure:** No. of existing food service facilities constructed**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Source and Methodology:**

The Fiscal Budget provided by the Bureau of Business Enterprises is the source document. Only those projects completed within the reporting period are counted.

**Validity:**

The on site visit by the Regional Sales Manager verifies the project has been completed, the facility is open and providing service.

**Reliability:**

The BBE State Fiscal department provides a back up as to the amount of facilities renovated.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Blind Services  
**Activity:** Provide Braille and recorded publications services.  
**Measure:** Number of Library customers served

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All data relating to the number of Library customers and the Library's collections of materials is tracked by the Library's automated system for customer registration and bibliographic information.

Data for the reporting period is derived by dividing the total number of copies of books in the collection at the end of the reporting period by the total number of customers served during the reporting period. The total number of customers served is calculated by adding the total number of customer accounts closed during the reporting period to the total number of active customer accounts at the end of the reporting period.

**Validity:**

This data provides a direct measure of the selection of books available to each Library customer served.

**Reliability:**

The Library adjusts this data on a daily basis as new copies or titles are added to the collection and copies are deducted for loss or damage. On-going inventories of sections of the collection of more than 3 million copies are conducted to determine the need for additional copies of unavailable books.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education**Program:** Division of Blind Services**Service:** Blind Services**Activity:** Provide Braille and recorded publications services.**Measure:** Number of Library items (Braille and recorded) loaned**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

All data relating to the number of Library customers and the Library's collections of materials is tracked by the Library's automated system for customer registration and bibliographic information.

Data for the reporting period is derived by dividing the total number of copies of books in the collection at the end of the reporting period by the total number of customers served during the reporting period. The total number of customers served is calculated by adding the total number of customer accounts closed during the reporting period to the total number of active customer accounts at the end of the reporting period.

**Validity:**

This data provides a direct measure of the selection of books available to each Library customer served.

**Reliability:**

The Library adjusts this data on a daily basis as new copies or titles are added to the collection and copies are deducted for loss or damage. On-going inventories of sections of the collection of more than 3 million copies are conducted to determine the need for additional copies of unavailable books.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.

**Measure:** Number/percent of customers gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Rehabilitation Information Management System (RIMS) data are used. The information is entered into the system for every customer by field associates. "Edits" have been added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) audits the data regularly.

The data are downloaded from the mainframe monthly and a SAS program used to aggregate the data using well-established operational definitions for levels of severity of the disability and gainful employment. The rate is computed as a percentage of all customers who exit the program after completing an individualized plan for employment and receiving services---customers who do enter employment and those who do not.

**Validity:**

The methodology used was simply to examine the relationship between the measure and to look for potential threats to validity. The percent and number of customers placed in gainful employment is a logical measure of the effectiveness of the rehabilitation process that has been used at the Federal and state levels since inception of the vocational rehabilitation program. This measure, with its subsets, is directly linked to the mission of the program: Employment and increased independence for persons with disabilities.

One potential threat to validity is selection, e.g., are the customers who are determined eligible for the VR program, compared to all those who apply or are referred, appropriate for services? This threat is mitigated in large part by the use of well-developed criteria for selection, assessment of the customer's needs and his/her employment potential. Information obtained from external sources as well as information from the customer and the VR associate's experience and skill are all used in deciding the customer's eligibility for services.

Assessment of the severity of a customer's disability, and the customer's incentive to go to work, is always difficult; these decisions are subject to the counselor's interpretation to some degree. During SFY1996 the Division refined the criteria for assessing the severity of the disability, reducing this factor as a threat to validity.

**Reliability:**

Data for this measure are entered into RIMS by associates as cases are closed for individual customers; data entry is likely to be highly reliable because of the edits in the RIMS system. Redefinition of this measure, in 1999, to align it with the definition used by the federal Rehabilitation Service Administration (RSA) improved the reliability and allows comparison of Florida's performance with that of comparable states.

The subjectivity inevitably associated with assessing the severity of the disability may affect the reliability of this indicator. The threat to reliability results from the pressure to serve the most severely disabled, which must be balanced against evidence that rehabilitation is more demanding with this population and thus a lower incidence of success is likely.

Overall consistency would be affected by the fact that RIMS is a "live" database that changes constantly as customers progress through the rehabilitation process. This potential threat is controlled by

using a “static” database of data downloaded monthly from RIMS for the performance-based program budgeting measures, and maintained on a server.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Education\_\_\_\_\_

**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation

**Service:** General Program\_\_\_\_\_

**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.

**Measure:** Number/percent of VR significantly disabled customers gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

This addresses a subset of the population addressed in the first item. The same data sources and methodology are used.

**Validity:**

The validity for this measure, a subset of the measure above, was examined with the same methodology used for the first measure.

**Reliability:**

The reliability for this measure, a subset of the measure above, was examined with the same methodology used for the first measure.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.  
**Measure:** Number/percent of VR significantly disabled customers gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

This addresses a subset of the population addressed in the first item. The same data sources and methodology are used.

**Validity:**

The validity for this measure, a subset of the measure above, was examined with the same methodology used for the first measure.

**Reliability:**

The reliability for this measure, a subset of the measure above, was examined with the same methodology used for the first measure.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.  
**Measure:** Number/percent of VR customers placed in competitive employment

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Rehabilitation Information Management System (RIMS) data are used. The information is entered into the system for every customer by field associates. "Edits" have been added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) audits the data regularly.

The data are downloaded from the mainframe monthly and a SAS program used to aggregate the data using well-established operational definitions for competitive employment. The rate is computed as a percentage of all customers who exit the program in gainful employment.

**Validity:**

This is a valid measure of vocational rehabilitation. Its validity may be compromised somewhat by the fact that not all individuals who are placed in competitive employment are working full time ( $\geq 36$  hours per week). Validity has been improved by redefining this measure to make it consistent with the definition used by RSA.

As a variant of the first measure---number and percent placed in gainful employment---the same potential threats to validity were considered, and mitigated to the extent possible.

**Reliability:**

Data entry is done by each counselor at the time the customer's case is closed. Results can be duplicated within the current definition of competitive employment.

The potential threat to reliability of a "live" database is controlled by using a "static" database of data downloaded monthly from RIMS for the performance-based program budgeting measures, and maintained on a server.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
**Service: General Program** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.  
**Measure:** Number/percent of VR customers retained in employment after 1 year

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Rehabilitation Information Management System (RIMS) data are matched with data from the Division of Unemployment Compensation by an outside agency (Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP)). Results obtained from FETPIP are entered into an Excel spreadsheet to be reported for the year in which the “match” is made. “Edits” have been added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) audits the data regularly.

The number is computed by summing the individuals found employed for the four quarters. The rate is calculated by dividing the sum of the individuals found employed by the total number of participants, e.g., those exiting in employment, in the four quarters.

**Validity:**

Given the mission of the Division, this is a valid measure of the quality of outcomes in vocational rehabilitation. Validity is threatened by the lack of information about continuity of employment across the four quarters since closure, e.g., an individual could have been employed 1 week in each quarter, or 13 weeks in each quarter, and be reported as employed. Data on employment are obtained from 97% of Florida’s employers, but no data are obtained from employers in Georgia or Alabama; this may bias results for areas and units located along Florida’s borders.

**Reliability:**

This measure has been tracked since 1996. The RIMS data used for the match, and the database from the Division of Unemployment Compensation, is well established and well documented. The reliability of this measure is good.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.  
**Measure:** Average annual earnings of VR customers at placement

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Rehabilitation Information Management System (RIMS) data are used. The information is entered into the system for every customer by field associates. "Edits" have been added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) audits the data regularly.

The data are downloaded from the mainframe monthly and a SAS program used to aggregate the data using well-established operational definitions for levels of severity of the disability and gainful employment. Earnings are computed by multiplying the weekly earnings of each customer closed in gainful employment by 52 weeks, then dividing the total earnings for all customers by the number of customers closed in gainful employment.

**Validity:**

This is a valid measure of a quality outcome of vocational rehabilitation and is widely used in the rehabilitation community as an indicator of the benefit obtained for the cost of services delivered. Validity is threatened to some extent in that earnings of all customers are included without regard to the type or severity of the customers' disabilities, individual abilities, the number of hours worked per week or local economic conditions.

**Reliability:**

The lack of available documentation may compromise the reliability of this measure. Earnings are "self-reported" by customers to their counselors. They may be reported after the case is closed, and may be reported erroneously accidentally or by design. Research on income that is self-reported in situations not related to credit applications shows that self-reported income is usually inflated.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Education\_\_\_\_\_

**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation

**Service:** General Program\_\_\_\_\_

**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.

**Measure:** Average annual earnings of customers retained in employment after 1 year

**Action** (check one):

Requesting Revision to Approved Measure

Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies

Requesting New Measure

Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Rehabilitation Information Management System (RIMS) data are matched with data from the Division of Unemployment Compensation by an outside agency (Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP). Results obtained from FETPIP are entered into an Excel spreadsheet to be reported for the year in which the “match” is made. “Edits” have been added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) audits the RIMS data regularly.

The measure is computed by multiplying the quarterly results by 4 to obtain the annual projection.

**Validity:**

This is a potential measure of the quality of the outcomes of vocational rehabilitation. Follow-up data are wages reported by employers. Validity is threatened to some extent in that earnings of all customers are included without regard to the type or severity of the customers’ disabilities, individual abilities, the number of hours worked per week or local economic conditions.

**Reliability:**

This measure has been tracked since 1996. The RIMS data used for the match, and the database from the Division of Unemployment Compensation, is well established and well documented. The reliability of this measure is good.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education\_\_\_\_\_**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation**Service:** General Program\_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.**Measure:** Percent of case costs covered by third party payors**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Figures for expenditures for clients (“client service dollars”), SSI/SSDI reimbursements and monies recovered from insurers and legal settlements for VR customers are obtained from the appropriate administrative units. “Edits” have been added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) audits the RIMS data regularly.

The measure is computed by summing the dollars obtained from third party payors, and dividing this by the total client service dollars to obtain the percentage covered.

**Validity:**

This is a valid measure of VR’s efforts to coordinate its activities with other programs and agencies to maximize its resources. Reporting the percentage rather than the dollar amount improves validity of this measure by showing the amount obtained relative to the total cost of client services and allows comparison of performance over time. This is a good measure of program efficiency.

**Reliability:**

Data on SSI/SSDI reimbursements have been tracked many years and are highly reliable. Figures for other monies recovered, which are tracked by VR’s budget office, are also highly reliable.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education\_\_\_\_\_**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation**Service:** General Program\_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.**Measure:** Average cost of case life (to Division) for significantly disabled customers**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Rehabilitation Information Management System (RIMS) data are used; the information is entered into the system by field associates for every customer. "Edits" have been added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) audits the data regularly.

The average cost is computed by dividing the costs to the Division of services to all significantly disabled customers closed by the number of significantly disabled customers closed.

**Validity:**

This is a valid measure of the efficiency of the vocational rehabilitation process, although validity may be compromised somewhat by examining the costs according to the severity of the disability rather than using a combination of type and severity of the disability.

**Reliability:**

The life-of-case cost has been tracked by RSA for a number of years and is reproducible.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education\_\_\_\_\_**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation**Service:** General Program\_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.**Measure:** Average cost of case life (to Division) for other disabled VR customers**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Rehabilitation Information Management System (RIMS) data are used; the information is entered into the system by field associates for every customer. "Edits" have been added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) audits the data regularly.

The average cost is computed by dividing the costs to the Division of services to other disabled VR customers closed by the number of other disabled VR customers closed.

**Validity:**

This is a valid measure of the efficiency of the vocational rehabilitation process, although validity may be compromised somewhat by examining the costs according to the severity of the disability rather than using a combination of type and severity of the disability.

**Reliability:**

The life-of-case cost has been tracked by RSA for a number of years and is reproducible.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*



**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education\_\_\_\_\_**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation**Service:** General Program\_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.**Measure:** Number of customers reviewed for eligibility**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Rehabilitation Information Management System (RIMS) data are used; the information is entered into the system by field associates for every customer. "Edits" have been added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) audits the data regularly.

The measure is a simple sum, using the SAS program, of the number of eligibility determinations made within the time period.

**Validity:**

Determining whether an applicant is eligible for services in the VR programs is an important and often time-consuming portion of the rehabilitation process. This output measure is a valid indicator of productivity for both programs.

The current definition includes only those customers for whom an eligibility determination was made. Validity of this measure has been improved by limiting the measure to the specific statuses recognized by RSA as determination of eligibility or ineligibility rather than including customers who simply leave the program without a formal decision.

**Reliability:**

Determining eligibility may be difficult because of the unique elements associated with the customer's disability, knowledge, skills, etc., but the criteria for data entry are well defined. These data have been tracked in RIMS and by RSA for a number of years and are reproducible.

The Division is currently examining the process to improve standardization of the methodology statewide to the extent possible, given the complexity of the process and the variation in the customers.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education\_\_\_\_\_**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation**Service:** General Program\_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.**Measure:** Number of Individualized Plans for Employment written**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Rehabilitation Information Management System (RIMS) data are used; the information is entered into the system by field associates for every customer. "Edits" have been added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) audits the data regularly.

The measure is a simple sum, using the SAS program, of the number of plans written within the time period.

**Validity:**

This is a valid measure of productivity for the VR program. A plan is tailored for individual customers, incorporating specific services needed for the customer to be rehabilitated and prepared for employment.

**Reliability:**

The criteria for "a plan" are well defined. These data have been tracked in RIMS and by RSA over many years. These data are reproducible and highly reliable.

The Division is currently examining the process to improve standardization of the methodology statewide to the extent possible, given the complexity of the process and the variation in the customers.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education\_\_\_\_\_**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation**Service:** General Program\_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.**Measure:** Average number of active cases per month**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Rehabilitation Information Management System (RIMS) data are used; the information is entered into the system by field associates for every customer. "Edits" have been added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) audits the data regularly.

The measure is a simple sum, using the SAS program, of the number of clients in specific active statuses within the time period.

**Validity:**

This is a valid measure of productivity for the VR program. Use of the monthly average represents unique customers for the interval measured.

**Reliability:**

The criteria for assigning the status codes for active customers are well defined and the results represent unique individuals. These data have been tracked in RIMS and by RSA over many years. These data are highly reliable; results are reproducible when they are computed from a static database.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education\_\_\_\_\_**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation**Service:** General Program\_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.**Measure:** Customer caseload per counselor**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Rehabilitation Information Management System (RIMS) data are used; the information is entered into the system by field associates for every customer. "Edits" have been added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) audits the data regularly.

The measure is calculated by the SAS program as the median ("middle") value for all counselor caseloads during the timeframe. The existing definition of the measure does not include referral status, an element of vocational rehabilitation that is receiving increasing emphasis by the Division as part of the focus on process improvement.

**Validity:**

The median is a valid measure of the efficiency of the VR program because it is not affected by outliers. The computation also reflects the effect of vacant positions and the role of associates who carry partial caseloads, perhaps because of other responsibilities or to compensate when a position is vacant.

**Reliability:**

This is a reliable measure of the efficiency of the VR program and can be reproduced over time.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.  
**Measure:** Percent of eligibility determinations completed in compliance with the Federal mandate

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Rehabilitation Information Management System (RIMS) data are used; the information is entered into the system by field associates for every customer. "Edits" have been added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) audits the data regularly.

The measure is computed by dividing the number of eligibility determinations meeting the Federal mandate by the total number of eligibility determinations made within the time frame.

**Validity:**

The discussion of validity for the number of eligibility determinations also applies to this measure.

**Reliability:**

The reliability for this measure was examined with the same methodology used for the measure of the number of eligibility determinations.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY****Department:** Department of Education\_\_\_\_\_**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation**Service:** General Program\_\_\_\_\_**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.**Measure:** Number of program applicants provided reemployment services**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure
- Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies
- Requesting New Measure
- Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data are maintained with the bureau on a database accessed via ARAMIS. Fiscal year data consists of program participation activity based on closed cases regardless of the program type during the fiscal year.

The measure is the sum of all applicants to whom reemployment services are provided.

**Validity:**

Calculations of actual program activity are based on data reported on a District Monthly Operations Report to determine output for the fiscal year. Data are also reflected on a Monthly Feedback Report to District for the fiscal year.

The Bureau is charged to facilitate the gainful reemployment of injured workers a reasonable cost. Data must be maintained to reflect the percent of eligible workers receiving reemployment services sponsored by the division with closed cases during the fiscal year and returned to suitable gainful employment.

**Reliability:**

Data are collected in a consistent manner, compiled on an annualized basis, use the same data sources, apply the same methodology, and can be duplicated to achieve the same results regardless of the time of query.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

**Department:** Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_  
**Program:** Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
**Service:** General Program \_\_\_\_\_  
**Activity:** Provide assistance to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize their employment, economic self-sufficiency and independence.  
**Measure:** Percent of eligible injured workers receiving reemployment services with closed cases during the fiscal year and returned to suitable employment

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data are maintained with the bureau on a database accessed via ARAMIS. Fiscal year data consists of program participation activity based on closed cases regardless of the program type during the fiscal year.

The measure is computed by dividing the total number of injured employees returned to work by the sum of the number of injured employees eligible with cases closed.

**Validity:**

Calculations of actual program activity are based on data reported on a District Monthly Operations Report to determine output for the fiscal year. Data are also reflected on a Monthly Feedback Report to District for the fiscal year.

The Bureau is charged to facilitate the gainful reemployment of injured workers a reasonable cost. Data must be maintained to reflect the percent of eligible workers receiving reemployment services sponsored by the division with closed cases during the fiscal year and returned to suitable gainful employment.

**Reliability:**

Data are collected in a consistent manner, compiled on an annualized basis, use the same data sources, apply the same methodology, and can be duplicated to achieve the same results regardless of the time of query.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Academic Year: The time period containing the academic sessions held during consecutive Summer, Fall, and Spring semesters.

Accreditation: Certification by an official review board that specific requirements have been met, such as institutional accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

Activity: A set of transactions within a budget entity that translates inputs into outputs using resources in response to a business requirement. Sequences of activities in logical combinations form services. Unit cost information is determined using the outputs of activities.

Actual Expenditures: Includes prior year actual disbursements, payables and encumbrances. The payables and encumbrances are certified forward at the end of the fiscal year. They may be disbursed between July 1 and December 31 of the subsequent fiscal year. Certified forward amounts are included in the year in which the funds are committed and not shown in the year the funds are disbursed.

Adult Basic Education (ABE): Education for adults whose inability to speak, read, or write the English language constitutes a substantial impairment of their ability to procure or retain employment commensurate with their ability. Courses at or below a fifth grade level in the language arts, including English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), mathematics, natural and social sciences, consumer education, and other courses that enable an adult to attain basic or functional literacy.

Adult Literacy: The level at which an adult must be able to read, write, compute, and otherwise use the skills of schooling in order to operate successfully in the workplace and society.

Advanced Graduate: A graduate student who has been formally admitted to a recognized Doctoral or Post-Master's degree program who has accumulated 36 or more semester credit hours toward his or her degree program or has a Master's degree.

Apprenticeship Training: Structured vocational skill training in a given job through a combination of on-the-job training and classroom instruction.

Appropriation Category: The lowest level line item of funding in the General Appropriations Act which represents a major expenditure classification of the budget entity. Within budget entities, these categories may include: salaries and benefits, other personal services (OPS), expenses, operating capital outlay, data processing services, fixed capital outlay, etc. These categories are defined within this glossary under individual listings. For a complete listing of all appropriation categories, please refer to the ACTR section in the *LAS/PBS User's Manual* for instructions on ordering a report.

Area Vocational Education School: A vocational school operated by a community college.

Area Vocational-Technical Center: A vocational school operated by a public school system.

Articulation: The bringing together of the various parts (levels) of the educational system to facilitate the smooth transition of students through the system.



At-Risk Student: Any identifiable student who is at risk of not meeting the goals of an educational program, completing a high school education, or becoming a productive worker.

Auxiliaries: Budget entities which are primarily self-supported ventures in support of the university community (students, faculty and university departments).

Baseline Data: Indicators of a state agency's current performance level, pursuant to guidelines established by the Executive Office of the Governor in consultation with legislative appropriations and appropriate substantive committees.

Basic Skills: Skills in reading, writing, math, speaking, listening, and problem solving that are necessary for individuals to succeed in vocational and applied training programs.

Base Funding: The product of Component A, FTE; times Component B, Program Cost Factors as adjusted by capping; times Component C, Base Student Allocation; times Component D, District Cost Differential.

Beginning Graduate: A graduate student who has been formally admitted to a graduate program but who is not an advanced graduate student.

Board of Trustees: The corporate body of persons appointed by the governor as the operating board for a community college or university.

Budget Entity: A unit or function at the lowest level to which funds are specifically appropriated in the appropriations act. "Budget entity" and "service" have the same meaning.

College Preparatory Instruction: Courses through which vocational and academic education are integrated and which directly relate to both academic and occupational competencies. The term includes competency-based education and adult training or retraining that meets these requirements.

Competency-Based Education: An educational approach based on a predetermined set of knowledge, skills, and abilities that the student is expected to accomplish.

Contracts and Grants: Budget entities which deal primarily with sponsored research activities and federally funded educational grants.

Corridor Funding: A university is funded to generate specific numbers of annual FTEs at each level: Lower, Upper, Graduate Classroom, and Thesis/Dissertation. Florida statutes provide that if the actual enrollment for any university is less than the funded enrollment by from zero to five percent for a fiscal year, the university shall receive full funding as allocated. If the actual enrollment for a university is less than the planned enrollment by more than five percent for any two consecutive fiscal years, the university's plan for the next year shall be reduced. If actual enrollment exceeds planned enrollment by more than five percent, an explanation of the excess shall be provided with the next year's enrollment plan.

D3-A: A legislative budget request (LBR) exhibit which presents a narrative explanation and justification for each issue for the requested years.

Demand: The number of output units which are eligible to benefit from a service or activity.

Designated State Agency: The sole State Agency designated in accordance with federal regulations (CFR 361.13 (a) to administer, or supervise the local administration of, the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services.

Designated State Unit: In the case of the State of Florida, the division that is primarily concerned with vocational rehabilitation or vocational and other rehabilitation of individuals with disabilities and that is responsible for the administration of the vocational rehabilitation program of the State Agency (CFR 361.13 (b)).

Dual Enrollment: Enrollment in two institutions at the same time, such as a college and a high school, whereby a student can earn both high school and college credit simultaneously.

Early Admission: Enrollment full-time in a college before graduating from high school.

Educational and General: Budget entities which provide instructional programs leading to formal degrees, research for solving problems, and for public service programs.

Estimated Expenditures: Includes the amount estimated to be expended during the current fiscal year. These amounts will be computer generated based on the current year appropriations and adjusted for vetoes and special appropriations bills.

First-Time-in-College (FTIC): A student enrolled for the first time in any post secondary institution.

Fixed Capital Outlay: Real property (land, buildings including appurtenances, fixtures and fixed equipment, structures, etc.), including additions, replacements, major repairs, and renovations to real property which materially extend its useful life or materially improve or change its functional use, and including furniture and equipment necessary to furnish and operate a new or improved facility.

Full-Time-Equivalent (FTE) Faculty: A budgetary term that represents one full-time faculty position. (Note that two people each serving in half-time faculty positions would together equal one F.T.E. faculty.)

Full-Time-Equivalent (FTE) Student: A graduate student enrolled for 9 or more credit hours in a term, or an undergraduate student enrolled for 12 or more hours in a term in either the Fall or Spring Semester. Defined differently for the Summer Semester.

Full-Time Student: A graduate student enrolled for 9 or more semester credit hours in a term, or an undergraduate student enrolled for 12 or more semester credit hours in a term.

General Education: Basic liberal education in communications, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.

Grants and Aids: Contributions to units of governments or nonprofit organizations to be used for one or more specified purposes, activities, or facilities. Funds appropriated under this category may be advanced.

Indicator: A single quantitative or qualitative statement that reports information about the nature of a condition, entity or activity. This term is used commonly as a synonym for the word "measure."

Information Technology Resources: Includes data processing-related hardware, software, services, telecommunications, supplies, personnel, facility resources, maintenance, and training.

Input: See Performance Measure.

Instruction and Research: A program component which contains the objective of transmitting knowledge, skills, and competencies that allow eligible individuals to become practicing professionals or to pursue further academic endeavors and to enhance the store of knowledge and technology.

Judicial Branch: All officers, employees, and offices of the Supreme Court, district courts of appeal, circuit courts, county courts, and the Judicial Qualifications Commission.

LAS/PBS: Legislative Appropriation System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem. The statewide appropriations and budgeting system owned and maintained by the Executive Office of the Governor.

Legislative Budget Commission: A standing joint committee of the Legislature. The Commission was created to: review and approve/disapprove agency requests to amend original approved budgets; review agency spending plans; issue instructions and reports concerning zero-based budgeting; and take other actions related to the fiscal matters of the state, as authorized in statute. It is composed of 14 members appointed by the President of the Senate and by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to two-year terms, running from the organization of one Legislature to the organization of the next Legislature.

Legislative Budget Request: A request to the Legislature, filed pursuant to s. 216.023, Florida Statutes, or supplemental detailed requests filed with the Legislature, for the amounts of money an agency or branch of government believes will be needed to perform the functions that it is authorized, or which it is requesting authorization by law, to perform.

Level of Student: The student's level of progress toward a degree. Freshmen and Sophomore students are categorized in the Lower Level; Junior and Senior students are categorized in the Upper Level; Graduate students are categorized in the Graduate Level.

Limited Access Program: A community college vocational program or university upper-division program in which enrollment is limited due to space, equipment, or faculty limitations, or other limitations.

Long-Range Program Plan: A plan developed on an annual basis by each state agency that is policy-based, priority-driven, accountable, and developed through careful examination and justification of all programs and their associated costs. Each plan is developed by examining the needs of agency customers and clients and proposing programs and associated costs to address those needs based on state priorities as established by law, the agency mission, and legislative authorization. The plan provides the framework and context for preparing the legislative budget request and includes performance indicators for evaluating the impact of programs and agency performance.

Lower-Division Student: A student who has earned less than 60 semester credit hours.

**Matriculation Fee:** The instructional fee paid by both resident and non-resident students per credit or credit equivalent.

**Narrative:** Justification for each service and activity is required at the program component detail level. Explanation, in many instances, will be required to provide a full understanding of how the dollar requirements were computed.

**Nonrecurring:** Expenditure or revenue which is not expected to be needed or available after the current fiscal year.

**Occupational Completion Point:** A group of competencies/skills that are needed in order to obtain proficiency in a specific occupation.

**Outcome:** See Performance Measure.

**Output:** See Performance Measure.

**Outsourcing:** Describes situations where the state retains responsibility for the service but contracts outside of state government for its delivery. Outsourcing includes everything from contracting for minor administration tasks to contracting for major portions of activities or services which support the agency mission.

**Part-Time Student:** A graduate student enrolled for less than 9 semester credit hours in a term or an undergraduate student enrolled for less than 12 semester credit hours in a term.

**Pass Through:** Funds the state distributes directly to other entities, e.g., local governments, without being managed by the agency distributing the funds. These funds flow through the agency's budget; however, the agency has no discretion regarding how the funds are spent and the activities (outputs) associated with the expenditure of funds are not measured at the state level. **NOTE: This definition of "pass through" applies ONLY for the purposes of long-range program planning.**

**Performance Ledger:** The official compilation of information about state agency performance-based programs and measures, including approved programs, approved outputs and outcomes, baseline data, approved standards for each performance measure and any approved adjustments thereto, as well as actual agency performance for each measure.

**Performance Measure:** A quantitative or qualitative indicator used to assess state agency performance.

- Input means the quantities of resources used to produce goods or services and the demand for those goods and services.
- Outcome means an indicator of the actual impact or public benefit of a service.
- Output means the actual service or product delivered by a state agency.

**Perkins Act:** The federal vocational education funding act.

**Policy Area:** A grouping of related activities to meet the needs of customers or clients which reflects major statewide priorities. Policy areas summarize data at a statewide level by using the

first two digits of the ten-digit LAS/PBS program component code. Data collection will sum across state agencies when using this statewide code.

Privatization: Occurs when the state relinquishes its responsibility or maintains some partnership type of role in the delivery of an activity or service.

Program: A set of activities undertaken in accordance with a plan of action organized to realize identifiable goals based on legislative authorization (a program can consist of single or multiple services). For purposes of budget development, programs are identified in the General Appropriations Act for FY 2001-2002 by a title that begins with the word "Program." In some instances a program consists of several services, and in other cases the program has no services delineated within it; the service is the program in these cases. The LAS/PBS code is used for purposes of both program identification and service identification. "Service" is a "budget entity" for purposes of the LRPP.

Program Purpose Statement: A brief description of approved program responsibility and policy goals. The purpose statement relates directly to the agency mission and reflects essential services of the program needed to accomplish the agency's mission.

Program Component: An aggregation of generally related objectives which, because of their special character, related workload and interrelated output, can logically be considered an entity for purposes of organization, management, accounting, reporting, and budgeting.

Reliability: The extent to which the measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials and data are complete and sufficiently error free for the intended use.

Service: See Budget Entity.

Standard: The level of performance of an outcome or output.

Student Financial Aid: Appropriations by the Legislature for student financial aid are used to support need- and merit-based student grants, scholarships, and loans to provide access and attract high achieving and talented students.

Transfer Student: A student who attended one or more colleges as a regular student in addition to the one in which currently enrolled, as opposed to a native student.

Tuition Fee: The instructional fee paid by non-resident students per credit or credit equivalent in addition to the matriculation fee.

Type I: A category or group within the classification system used by the American Association of University Professors. These institutions are characterized by a significant level and breadth of activity in and commitment to doctoral-level education as measured by the number of doctorate recipients and the diversity in doctoral-level program offerings. Included in this category are those institutions which grant a minimum of 30 doctorate level degrees annually. These degrees must be granted in 3 or more doctoral-level programs.

Type II: A category or group within the classification system used by the American Association of University Professors. These institutions are characterized by diverse post-baccalaureate programs (including first professional), but do not engage in significant doctoral-level education. Specifically, this category includes institutions not considered specialized schools in which the

number of doctoral-level degrees granted annually is fewer than 30 or in which fewer than 3 doctoral-level programs are offered. In addition, these institutions must grant a minimum of 30 post-baccalaureate degrees annually and either grant degrees in 3 or more post-baccalaureate programs or, alternatively, have an interdisciplinary program at the post-baccalaureate level.

Unclassified Student: A student not admitted to a degree program.

Unit Cost: The average total cost of producing a single unit of output – goods and services for a specific agency activity.

Upper Division: Baccalaureate junior and senior levels.

Upper-Division Student: A student who has earned 60 or more semester credit hours or has an Associate in Arts degree or is working toward an additional baccalaureate degree.

Unweighted Full-Time Equivalent Student Membership (UFTE): Membership in the regular school term. The regular term for Department of Juvenile Justice schools is 240 to 250 days; the regular term for all other schools is 180 days.

Validity: The appropriateness of the measuring instrument in relation to the purpose for which it is being used.

Weighted Full-Time Equivalent Student Membership (WFTE): Unweighted FTE times program cost factors.

## Explanation of Acronyms

**A&P** - Administrative and Professional

**A.A.** – Associate in Arts degree

**A.A.S.** – Associate in Applied Science

**AAUP** - American Association of University Professors

**ABE** – Adult Basic Education

**ACE** - Arts for a Complete Education

**ACT** - American College Testing Assessment

**ADA** – Americans with Disabilities Act

**AHS** – Adult High School

**AITF** – Academic Improvement Trust Fund

**AP** – Advanced Placement

**AS** – Associate in Science degree

**ATC** – Advanced Technical Certificate

**ATD** – Advanced Technical Diploma

**BA** – Bachelor of Arts

**BOG** – Board of Governor's

**BRRS** – Bureau of Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services

**BSA** – Base Student Allocation

**CBO** – Community-Based Organization

**CCLA** – College Center for Library Automation

**CCPF** – Community College Program Fund

**CIL** – Center for Independent Living

**CIO** - Chief Information Officer

**CIP** - Capital Improvements Program Plan

**CIS** – Communities in Schools

**CLAST** – College-Level Academic Skills Test

**CLEP** – College-Level Examination Program

**CPT** – College Placement Test

**CROP** – College Reach-Out Program

**CTO** – Chief Technology Officer

**CWE** – Continuing Workforce Education

**DCCWE** – Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education

**DCD** – District Cost Differential

**DCU** – Division of Colleges and Universities

**DSA** – Designated State Agency

**DSO** – Direct Support Organization

**DSU** – Designated State Unit

**DVR** – Division of Vocational Rehabilitation

**DWD** – Division of Workforce Development

**ECS** – Education Commission of the States

**EDC** Education Data Center

**EH** – Emotionally Handicapped

**EOG** - Executive Office of the Governor

**EPC** – Education Practices Commission

**ESC** – Education Standards Commission

**ESE** – Exceptional Student Education

**ESEA** – Elementary and Secondary Education Act

**ESOL** – English for Speakers of Other Languages

**FAAST** – Florida Alliance for Assistive Services and Technology, Inc.

**FAC** – Florida Administrative Code



**FACTS** – Florida Academic Counseling and Tracking for Students

**FASTER** – Florida Automated System/Transfer Education Records

**FBOE** – Florida Board of Education

**FCAT** – Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

**FCO** - Fixed Capital Outlay

**FDLN** – Florida Distance Learning Network

**FDLRS** – Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resource System

**FEFP** – Florida Education Finance Program

**FETC** – Florida Educational Technology Corporation

**FETPIP** – Florida Education Training and Placement Information Program

**FFMIS** - Florida Financial Management Information System

**FFY** – Federal Fiscal Year

**FIRN** – Florida Information Resource Network

**FISH** – Florida Inventory of School Houses

**FLAIR** - Florida Accounting Information Resource Subsystem

**FPMS** – Florida Performance Measurement System

**FRAG** – Florida Resident Access Grant

**FRC** – Florida Rehabilitation Council

**F.S.** - Florida Statutes

**FTCE** – Florida Teacher Certification Examination

**FTE** – Full-Time Equivalent

**FTIC** – First-Time-in-College

**GAA** - General Appropriations Act

**GED** – General Education Development test

**GPA** – Grade Point Average

**GR** - General Revenue Fund

**GTAT** – Grade Ten Assessment Test

**HSCT** – High School Competency Test

**ICUF** – Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida

**IFAS** - Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences

**IL** – Independent Living

**IOE** - Itemization of Expenditure

**IPE** – Individualized Plan for Employment

**IPEDS** – Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System

**IT** - Information Technology

**LAN** - Local Area Network

**LAS/PBS** - Legislative Appropriations System/Planning and Budgeting Subsystem

**LBC** - Legislative Budget Commission

**LBR** - Legislative Budget Request

**LCP** – Literacy Completion Point

**LD** – Learning Disabled

**LEA** – Local Education Agency

**LEP** – Limited English Proficiency

**L.O.F.** - Laws of Florida

**LRPP** - Long-Range Program Plan

**MAN** - Metropolitan Area Network (information technology)

**MIS** – Management Information Systems

**MSFW** – Migrant and Seasonal Farm Worker

**NAEP** – National Assessment of Education Progress

**NASBO** - National Association of State Budget Officers

**OCO** – Operating Capital Outlay

**OCP** – Occupational Completion Point

**OJT** – On-the-Job Training

**OPB** - Office of Policy and Budget, Executive Office of the Governor

**OPPAGA** – Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability

**OPS** – Other Personnel Services

**OSFA** – Office of Student Financial Assistance

**PAEC** – Panhandle Area Educational Consortium

**PBPB/PB2** - Performance-Based Program Budgeting

**PECO** – Public Education Capital Outlay

**PSAV** – Postsecondary Adult Vocational Program

**PSAVC** – Postsecondary Adult Vocational Certificate

**PSV** – Postsecondary Vocational Program

**PSVC** – Postsecondary Vocational Certificate

**PWDs** – Persons with Disabilities

**RSA** – Rehabilitation Services Administration

**SAT** – Scholastic Assessment Test

**SAC** – School Advisory Council

**SBCC** – State Board of Community Colleges

**SBE** – State Board of Education

**SCNS** – Statewide Course Numbering System

**SDA** – Service Delivery Area

**SGE** – Suitable Gainful Employment

**SOLAR** – Student On-Line Advisement and Articulation System

**SPD** – Staff and Program Development

**STO** - State Technology Office

**SUS** – State University System

**SWOT** - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

**TANF** – Temporary Assistance to Needy Families

**TCS** - Trends and Conditions Statement

**TF** - Trust Fund

**TRW** - Technology Review Workgroup

**USPS** - University Support Personnel System

**VR** – Vocational Rehabilitation

**WAGES** - Work and Gain Economic Self-Sufficiency (Agency for Workforce Innovation)

**WAN** - Wide Area Network (information technology)

**WC** – Worker’s Compensation

**WD** – Workforce Development

**ZBB** - Zero-Based Budgeting