

Florida Department Of Education

**LONG-RANGE PROGRAM PLAN
FY 2006/07 – FY 2010/11**



FINAL
September 30, 2005

Table of Contents

	Page
Agency Mission and Goals	1
Agency Goals and Objectives.....	4
Outcomes with Performance Projection Tables	7
Linkages to Governor’s Priorities	19
Trends and Conditions.....	22
K-12 Education System.....	22
Strategic Planning	27
Current Funding and Budget Priorities	30
Community Colleges and Workforce Education.....	32
State Universities	36
Blind Services	41
Vocational Rehabilitation	44
Exhibit I: Agency Workforce Plan.....	48
Exhibit II: Performance Measures and Standards.....	49
Exhibit III: Performance Measure Assessment	62
Exhibit IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability	115
Glossary of Terms	150
Explanation of Acronyms.....	157

Agency Mission and Goals ***“Raising 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 Florida Board of Governors 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 State 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 programs and functional goals for individuals of all ages who are blind or visually impaired are:

- Obtain employment outcomes;
- Maximize independence; and,
- Integrate into the community.

The scope of the Division's programs and its major activities are designed 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; and,
- 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 customers.
- ❖ 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 customers of 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.

Agency Goals and Objectives

Goal 1: Highest Student Achievement

OBJECTIVE 1A:

To improve student rates of learning

OBJECTIVE 1B:

To improve graduation rates

OBJECTIVE 1C:

To ensure readiness of high school graduates

OBJECTIVE 1D:

To increase the proportion of A.A. degree transfers granted annually

OBJECTIVE 1E:

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

OBJECTIVE 1F:

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

OBJECTIVE 1G:

To stabilize or decrease the number of students receiving college preparatory instruction

OBJECTIVE 1H

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

OBJECTIVE 1I

To decrease 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 quantity and improve the quality of education options

OBJECTIVE 2B:

To measure the quality of private school options

OBJECTIVE 2C:

Annually increase the proportion of prior year high school standard diploma earners who continue into a Florida postsecondary education institution in the fall following their graduation

OBJECTIVE 2D:

Annually improve the transfer rate of associate in arts and associate in science degree students into state universities in the academic year following the year of earning their degree

OBJECTIVE 2E:

To increase the proportion of students seeking postsecondary education in the Florida Community College System

OBJECTIVE 2F:

To provide adequate access to undergraduate and graduate education

OBJECTIVE 2G:

To increase the percent of prior year graduates enrolled in community colleges

OBJECTIVE 2H:

To promote the offering of upper-level courses through concurrent-use agreements with universities on the community college campus

OBJECTIVE 2I:

To increase collaboration with K-20 partners in reducing the need for remediation at the postsecondary level

OBJECTIVE 2J:

To increase mentoring/tutoring programs including adoption of critically low-performing schools

OBJECTIVE 2K:

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

OBJECTIVE 2L:

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

OBJECTIVE 2M:

To facilitate the provision of developmental services to blind and visually impaired children

Goal 3: Skilled Workforce and Economic Development**OBJECTIVE 3A:**

To expand the number of quality workforce education programs

OBJECTIVE 3B:

Annually expand the percentage of students who enroll in and complete workforce education programs and are placed as a result

OBJECTIVE 3C:

Increase the literacy rates and employability skills of adult Floridians

OBJECTIVE 3D:

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

OBJECTIVE 3E:

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

OBJECTIVE 3F:

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 3G:

To provide Food Service Vending training, work experience, and licensing

OBJECTIVE 3H:

To provide services and employment opportunities for all clients for the Vocational Rehabilitation Program by closing the gaps in performance and service capacity

OBJECTIVE 3I:

To provide services and reemployment opportunities for injured workers of the Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services

Goal 4: Quality Efficient Services**OBJECTIVE 4A:**

Annually increase the number of high-performing teachers as evidenced by certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

OBJECTIVE 4B:

To solve critical state problems through research

OBJECTIVE 4C:

To promote service to the public

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

OBJECTIVE 4E:

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

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

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

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

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

OBJECTIVE 4J:

To provide Braille and recorded publications services

Outcomes with Performance Projection Tables

GOAL #1: Highest Student Achievement

OBJECTIVE 1A: To improve student rates of learning

OUTCOME 1A.1: Percentage of grade 3-10 students scoring at Level 3 or above on the FCAT in reading

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
48%	53%				

OUTCOME 1A.2: Percentage of grade 3-10 students scoring at Level 3 or above on the FCAT in mathematics

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
51%	59%				

OUTCOME 1A.3: Percentage of grade 3-10 students scoring 3.5 or above on the FCAT in writing

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
67%	76%				

OUTCOME 1A.4: Percentage of postsecondary career education students earning Occupational Completion Points in community colleges within one year

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
37.5%	58%	68%	75%	85%	90%

OUTCOME 1A.5: Percentage of postsecondary career education students earning Occupational Completion Points in school districts within one year

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
59%	62%	65%	68%	70%	72%

OUTCOME 1A.6: Percentage of Adult General Education students earning Literacy Completion Points at community colleges within one year

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
37.5%	38%	38%	38%	40%	40%

OUTCOME 1A.7: Percentage of Adult General Education students earning Literacy Completion Points in school districts within one year

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
44.6%	47%	48%	49%	50%	51%

OBJECTIVE 1B: To improve graduation rates

OUTCOME 1B.1: No Child Left Behind four-year public high school graduation rate

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
64.7%	72%	74%	76%	78%	80%

OUTCOME 1B.2: Percentage of workforce education students who become full program completers within 2 years of enrollment at community colleges

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
45.4%	50%	52%	54%	56%	58%

OUTCOME 1B.3: Percentage of workforce education students who become full program completers within 2 years of enrollment in school districts

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
35.1%	41%	43%	44%	45%	46%

OUTCOME 1B.4: Percentage of associate in arts degree students who earn their degrees on time

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
42.5%	45%	47%	49%	50%	51%

OUTCOME 1B.5: Percentage of associate in science degree students who earn their degrees on time

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
47.5%	48%	48%	49%	49%	50%

OBJECTIVE 1C: To ensure readiness of high school graduates

OUTCOME 1C.1: Percentage of Florida public high school seniors who earn a college assessment test score at or above the minimum level required by the Medallion Bright Futures Scholarship Program

Baseline FY 2002-03	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
35.5%	46%	48%	50%	52%	54%

OUTCOME 1C.2: Average number of high school credit hours earned through acceleration credits by all high school students

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
2.7	3.2	3.5	3.7	3.9	4.0

OUTCOME 1C.3: Average number of high school credit hours earned through acceleration credits by students traditionally underrepresented in higher education

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
2.4	2.8	3.0	3.3	3.7	4.0

OBJECTIVE 1D: To increase the proportion of A.A. degree transfers granted annually

OUTCOME 1D.1: The number of A.A. degrees granted annually

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
30,809	31,880	32,500	33,500	34,500	35,500

OUTCOME 1D.2: The percentage of A.A. degree transfers granted annually

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
61%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%

OBJECTIVE 1E: 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 1E.1: The percent of students who earn a 2.5 g.p.a. or above one year after transfer

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
74%	74%	74%	75%	75%	75%

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

OUTCOME 1F.1: The number and percent of students who annually transfer to a state university with at least 40 credit hours

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
17,796 61.5%	17,800 61%	61%	61%	61%	61%

OBJECTIVE 1G: To stabilize or decrease the number of students receiving college preparatory instruction

OUTCOME 1G.1: The number of students receiving college preparatory instruction

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
123,527	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000

OBJECTIVE 1H 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 1H.1: 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 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
71%	73%	75%	75%	75%	75%

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

OUTCOME 1I.1: The number/percent/FTEs of A.A. students who do not complete 18 credit hours within four years

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
12,234/ 37%/2,020	12,234/ 37%/2,020	12,234/ 37%/ 2,020	12,234/ 37%/2,020	12,234/ 37%/2,020	12,234/ 37%/2,020

GOAL #2: Seamless Articulation and Maximum Access

OBJECTIVE 2A: To increase the quantity and improve the quality of education options

OUTCOME 2A.1: Number of private schools participating in and meeting requirements of the following state scholarship programs:

Corporate Tax Credit Scholarship Program

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
924	973	980	985	990	995

McKay Scholarship Program for Students with Disabilities

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
673	700	705	710	715	720

Opportunity Scholarship Program

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
35	40	40	40	40	40

OBJECTIVE 2B: To measure the quality of private school options

OUTCOME 2B.1: Number and percentage of all private schools with confirmed evidence of fraud or abuse that were prevented from participation in any of the above scholarship programs

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
5/100%	TBD/100%	TBD/100%	TBD/100%	TBD/100%	TBD/100%

OUTCOME 2B.2: Percentage of private schools renewing compliance requirements by deadline in order to remain eligible to participate in state scholarship programs

Baseline FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
82	90	95	100	100	100

OBJECTIVE 2C: Annually increase the proportion of prior year high school standard diploma earners who continue into a Florida postsecondary education institution in the fall following their graduation

OUTCOME 2C.1: Continuation rate

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
59%	62%	64%	66%	68%	70%

OBJECTIVE 2D: Annually improve the transfer rate of associate in arts and associate in science degree students into state universities in the academic year following the year of earning their degree

OUTCOME 2D.1: Associate in arts continuation rate

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
61%	62%	64%	66%	68%	70%

OUTCOME 2D.2: Associate in science continuation rate (does not include associate in applied science degree)

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
8%	10%	12%	14%	16%	18%

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

OUTCOME 2E.1: The number of students enrolled

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
816,290	820,000	825,000	830,000	835,000	840,000

OBJECTIVE 2F: To provide adequate access to undergraduate and graduate education

OUTCOME 2F.1: Annual percentage increase in student full-time equivalents (FTEs) in state universities

Baseline 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
149,825 FTEs	5.27%	4.13%	3.66%	3.27%	3.27%

OBJECTIVE 2G: To increase the percent of prior year graduates enrolled in community colleges

OUTCOME 2G.1: The percent of prior year graduates enrolled in community colleges

Baseline Fall, 2003	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
34%	34%	34%	35%	35%	35%

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

OUTCOME 2H.1: The number of students enrolled in baccalaureate programs offered on community college campuses

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
19,000	20,000	20,500	21,000	21,500	22,000

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

OUTCOME 2I.1: The percentage of community colleges that have formal articulation agreements addressing readiness with their local K-12 partners

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

OUTCOME 2J.1: The percentage of colleges engaged in mentoring/tutoring programs

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
61%	70%	80%	90%	100%	100%

OBJECTIVE 2K: 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 2K.1: The number of programs offered through concurrent-use arrangements with public/private colleges and universities

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
395	400	415	430	445	460

OBJECTIVE 2L: 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 2L.1 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 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
75.5%	75%	75%	76%	77%	78%

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

OUTCOME 2M.1: Number/percent of customers (children) successfully rehabilitated/transitioned from pre-school to school

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
36 (67.3%)	38 (70%)	41 (75%)	44 (80%)	44 (80%)	44 (80%)

GOAL #3: Skilled Workforce and Economic Development

OBJECTIVE 3A: To expand the number of quality workforce education programs

OUTCOME 3A.1: Annually increase the number of high-skill/high-wage programs at technical centers

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
71	70	70	70	70	70

OUTCOME 3A.2: Annually increase the number of high-skill/high-wage programs at community colleges

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
200	200	200	200	200	200

OBJECTIVE 3B: Annually expand the percentage of students who enroll in and complete workforce education programs and are placed as a result

OUTCOME 3B.1: Technical center enrollments*

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
27.9%	28%	29%	30%	32%	34%

OUTCOME 3B.2: Technical center completions*

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
29.1%	30%	32%	32%	34%	34%

OUTCOME 3B.3: Technical center placements*

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
32.5%	33%	34%	35%	36%	37%

OUTCOME 3B.4: Community college enrollments*

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
45.7%	47%	49%	50%	52%	52%

OUTCOME 3B.5: Community college completions*

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
35.98%	37%	39%	40%	42%	43%

OUTCOME 3B.6: Community college placements*

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
49.07%	50%	52%	52%	53%	54%

* High-skill/high-wage enrollment, completion, and placement data are as a percentage of post-secondary adult vocational enrollments, completions, and placements.

OBJECTIVE 3C: Increase the literacy rates and employability skills of adult Floridians

OUTCOME 3C.1: Number of adult basic education and adult secondary education completion point completers who are found employed or continuing their education

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
12,893	14,000	14,500	15,000	15,500	16,000

OBJECTIVE 3D: 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 3D.1: 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 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
57%	58%	58%	58%	58%	58%

OBJECTIVE 3E: 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 3E.1: The number of A.A. graduates found placed in occupations identified as high skill/high wage on the Workforce Estimating Conference list

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
2,754	2,800	2,850	2,900	2,900	2,900

OBJECTIVE 3F: 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 3F.1: The percent of rehabilitation customers placed in competitive employment

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
64%	75%	85%	90%	95%	95%

OBJECTIVE 3G: To provide Food Service Vending training, work experience, and licensing

OUTCOME 3G.1: Number of blind vending food service facilities supported

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
151	153	153	153	153	153

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

OUTCOME 3H.1: Number/percent of all VR customers gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
8,746 (53.9%)	10,000 (60%)	10,000 (60%)	10,000 (60%)	10,000 (60%)	10,000 (60%)

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

OUTCOME 3I.1: Number of program applicants provided reemployment services

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
2,500	2,525	2,525	2,550	2,575	2,575

OUTCOME 3J.1: 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 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
66%	78%	80%	82%	84%	84%

GOAL #4: Quality Efficient Services

OBJECTIVE 4A: Annually increase the number of high-performing teachers as evidenced by certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

OUTCOME 4A.1: Number of teachers with National Board Certification

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
992	1,448	1,500	1,600	1,700	1,800

OBJECTIVE 4B: To solve critical state problems through research

OUTCOME 4B.1: Annual percentage increase in research expenditures (state and sponsored research)¹

Baseline	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
\$1.006 billion	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%

¹ 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 4C.1: Annual percentage increase of public service funds expended for public service to Pre-K-12 schools

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
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 4D.1: The percent of students graduating with credit hours at or under 120 percent of degree requirement

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
37%	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 4E.1: The percent of students graduating within four years, disaggregated by category

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
35%	35%	35%	35%	35%	35%

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 4F.1: The number and percent of economically disadvantaged students who graduate with an A.A. degree in four years

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
2,956 (32%)	3,000 (32%)	32%	32%	32%	32%

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 4G.1: The number and percent of disabled A.A. degree students who graduate within four years

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
177 (29%)	180 (29%)	29%	29%	29%	29%

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 4H.1: The number and percent of black male students who graduate with an A.A. degree in four years

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
219 (20%)	220 (20%)	20%	20%	20%	20%

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 4I.1: The number and percent of English as a Second Language students who graduate with an A.A. degree in four years

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
187 (16%)	187 (16%)	16%	16%	16%	16%

OBJECTIVE 4J: To provide Braille and recorded publications services

OUTCOME 4J.1: Cost per library customer served

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11
\$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

- OBJECTIVE 1A: To improve student rates of learning
- OBJECTIVE 1B: To improve graduation rates
- OBJECTIVE 1C: To ensure readiness of high school graduates
- OBJECTIVE 1D: To increase the proportion of A.A. degree transfers granted annually
- OBJECTIVE 1E: 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.
- OBJECTIVE 1F: To monitor the number/percent of A.A. partial completers transferring to a state university with at least 40 credit hours.
- OBJECTIVE 1G: To stabilize or decrease the number of students receiving college preparatory instruction.
- OBJECTIVE 1H: 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.
- OBJECTIVE 2A: To increase the quantity and improve the quality of education options
- OBJECTIVE 2B: To measure the quality of private school options
- OBJECTIVE 2C: Annually increase the proportion of prior year high school standard diploma earners who continue into a Florida postsecondary education institution in the fall following their graduation
- OBJECTIVE 2D: Annually improve the transfer rate of associate in arts and associate in science degree students into state universities in the academic year following the year of earning their degree
- OBJECTIVE 2F: To provide adequate access to undergraduate and graduate education.
- OBJECTIVE 2G: To increase the percent of prior year graduates enrolled in community colleges.
- OBJECTIVE 2L: 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.
- OBJECTIVE 4A: Annually increase the number of high-performing teachers as evidenced by certification by the National Board for Professional teaching Standards

2. Strengthen Families

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

3. Promote Economic Diversity

- OBJECTIVE 3A: To expand the number of quality workforce education programs
- OBJECTIVE 3B: Annually expand the percentage of students who enroll in and complete workforce education programs and are placed as a result
- OBJECTIVE 3C: Increase the literacy rates and employability skills of adult Floridians.
- OBJECTIVE 3D: 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.
- OBJECTIVE 3E: 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.
- OBJECTIVE 3G: To provide Food Service Vending training, work experience, and licensing.
- OBJECTIVE 3H: To provide services and employment opportunities for all clients for the Vocational Rehabilitation Program by closing the gaps in performance and service capacity.
- OBJECTIVE 3I: To provide services and reemployment opportunities for injured workers of the Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services.

4. Reduce Violent Crime and Illegal Drug Use

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

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

- OBJECTIVE 2H: To promote the offering of upper-level courses through concurrent-use agreements with universities on the community college campus.
- OBJECTIVE 2I: To increase collaboration with K-20 partners in reducing the need for remediation at the postsecondary level.

- OBJECTIVE 2K: 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.
- OBJECTIVE 2M: To facilitate the provision of developmental services to blind and visually impaired children.
- 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.
- OBJECTIVE 4E: To increase the proportion of the A.A. students with 18 credit hours who graduate in four years.

6. Enhance Florida's Environment and Quality of Life

- OBJECTIVE 2E: To increase the proportion of students seeking postsecondary education in the Florida Community College System.
- OBJECTIVE 2J: To increase mentoring/tutoring programs including adoption of critically low- performing schools.
- OBJECTIVE 3F: 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 4C: To promote service to the public.
- OBJECTIVE 4J: To provide Braille and recorded publications services.

Trends and Conditions

K-12 Education System

On April 7, 2005, U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings announced a new approach to implementing the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law. In her remarks she said, “States that show results and follow the principles of No Child Left Behind will be eligible for new tools to help them meet the law’s goal of getting every child to grade level by 2013-14.” Some of the tools will come in the form of new flexibilities awarded to states that are able to demonstrate success under the four guiding principles of NCLB: ensuring students are learning; making the school system accountable, ensuring information is accessible and options are available; and improving the quality of teachers. All measures of academic achievement are showing that Florida is moving in the right direction.

Florida is ensuring all students are learning

The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) results released in 2004 continued the trend of rising student achievement in Florida. The greatest improvements over 2003 continued to be in reading among elementary grades, with 68 percent of third and fourth grade students reading at or above grade level, compared to 55 percent in 2001. From 2001 to 2004, Florida students have shown significant progress in both reading and mathematics. Last year, minority students continued to narrow the achievement gap, with both Hispanic and African American students improving nearly twice as fast in reading and three times as fast in mathematics as their white counterparts. Florida’s focus on improving reading skills among elementary students is reflected in increases in FCAT Reading scores, especially at the 4th grade level. These results are corroborated by Florida’s impressive gains in 4th grade reading scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). In 2004, every grade except 6th and 8th grade showed improvement in mathematics. As with the reading results, Florida has made significant progress in reducing the percentage of students scoring Level 1 and increasing the percentage of students scoring Level 3 and above.

Florida is holding the school system accountable

The FCAT has been administered each spring (February for writing and March for reading and mathematics) since 1998 to assess students in selected grade levels in reading, writing, and mathematics. A science component was added to the program in 2003. FCAT is a program that includes both state-developed criterion-referenced assessments and a commercially-available national norm-referenced test. The FCAT is an assessment of student achievement of the *Sunshine State Standards* for reading, writing, mathematics, and science. For each administration, Florida reports additional summary statistics for each school and district and the state by disaggregated characteristics such as racial/ethnic group, gender and other demographic information. Specifically, on the FCAT demographic report, student performance is reported by the following categories: White, Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan, Multiracial/Ethnic, Unreported Race/Ethnicity, Female, Male, Unreported Gender, Standard Curriculum, LEP, Migrant, Section 504, Free/Reduced

Lunch, Not Free/Reduced Lunch, All ESE Other Than Gifted, Not ESE Plus Gifted, and various disability categories.

Florida ensures information is accessible and options are available

Florida's A+ Plan and the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirements of NCLB have complementary objectives, ensuring that all of Florida's students have the opportunity to benefit from school improvement. Both the state and federal laws evaluate how well students have mastered the Sunshine State Standards—the skills Florida's teachers determined our children must learn at each grade level—which are measured by the FCAT. School grades, assigned under the A+ Plan, are based on: how well students are doing, how much progress they are making (learning gains), and how much progress struggling readers are making (since reading is essential to success in all subject areas). NCLB requires each student subgroup (all ethnic groups, students with disabilities, students learning English, and economically disadvantaged students) in schools, districts, and the state as a whole to make adequate yearly progress in reading, mathematics, writing, and graduation rate. Schools that do not make enough progress in each area for two years in a row are in need of improvement, and must use those funds to provide alternatives to parents--such as transferring to another school or participating in a different program within the school. Schools that need improvement two years in a row (do not make AYP for three consecutive years) must provide tutoring to their low income students through Supplemental Educational Services.

Although both elements share the same goal of high achievement for all students, the rules by which the two laws measure progress toward the goal differ somewhat. The A+ Plan evaluates schools by taking a moving picture of student achievement, using a combination of current student performance along with the amount of improvement in learning from one year to another. NCLB uses a one-time snapshot of student achievement, which produces a different, and, in some ways, less complete picture of school performance.

Florida is improving the quality of our teachers

Florida requires that teacher candidates pass a series of rigorous examinations prior to the issuance of certificates. They must not only demonstrate their general knowledge in reading, English/language arts (including a written essay), and mathematics, they also must pass an exam of pedagogy (professional education exam) and an exam in the area of their expertise and desired certification. In addition, the teacher certification exams are aligned to the State's curriculum standards for students, the Sunshine State Standards.

In 2000, the Florida Legislature enacted legislation to improve the quality of the professional development system for public education. The School Community Professional Development Act (Section 1012.98, F.S.) requires the Department of Education to design methods by which school districts may evaluate and improve professional development systems. This evaluation must include annual assessment of data indicating progress or lack of progress of students and will result in identification of "best practices" and provision of targeted technical assistance. The legislation is in alignment with the definition of high quality professional development outlined in NCLB and links professional development with student and instructional personnel needs as

determined by school improvement plans, annual school reports, student achievement data, and performance appraisal data of teachers and administrators. Professional development activities focus primarily on subject content (especially reading) and teaching methods, classroom management, assessment and data analysis, family involvement and school safety.

Florida's education policies go beyond the principles of NCLB

Florida has moved beyond a status model of accountability to one that is capable of setting individual proficiency goals for each student, tracking and reporting progress, and using this information to drive instruction at the classroom level. The two guiding principles of the A+ Plan establish the framework for all other policies and programs that are implemented. Several examples can be cited to illustrate Florida's commitment to going above and beyond the policies of NCLB for the purpose of raising student achievement:

Assistance Plus--Florida's A+ School Accountability system rewards schools for improved student achievement and sanctions schools with grade F performance. Schools that earn a letter grade of A or improve at least one letter grade receive funds in the amount of \$100 per pupil. Since 1999, approximately \$561 million dollars have been provided to schools through the School Recognition Program. Districts that have schools that earn a letter grade of F are sanctioned by the State Board of Education and must agree to put into place improvement strategies that are defined annually in the State Board approved Assistance Plus Plan. Funding is provided for professional development to support the Continuous Improvement Model, mathematics and reading coaches, Comprehensive School Reform, Title I School Improvement, research-based reading programs, 21st Century Learning Community Projects, and School Improvement staff and support.

Scholarship Programs--The A+ Plan places great emphasis on providing support and resources to schools that are not performing satisfactorily. However, when schools do not improve or when students are in need of special assistance, Florida provides families and children with additional opportunities. Currently, Florida has three options: the Opportunity Scholarship Program, the John M. McKay Scholarships for Students with Disabilities Program, and the Corporate Tax Credit Scholarship Program. All three options provide Florida's private schools with an opportunity to partner with the state to serve Florida's students. Florida's private schools have seized this opportunity—with over half of the 2,231 active private schools in 2003-04 participating in one or more of these scholarship programs.

Just Read, Florida!--Just Read, Florida! received national attention last year when the results of the National Assessment for Educational Progress (NAEP), also known as the "Nation's Report Card" proved Florida to be the only state in the nation to show significant improvement in 4th grade reading. Also, the recently released Education Trust report shows Florida's 15-point gain in reading at 4th grade is more than twice that of the closest state.

Middle School Reform--The 2004 Legislature passed the Middle Schools Reform Act, which was the first step to better posture Florida's middle schools to leave no child behind. The purpose of the Act was to provide focus and rigor to academics in the middle grades. It was the intent of the Legislature that students promoted from the eighth grade would be ready for success in high school. The Department conducted a study on how the overall academic performance of middle grade students and schools could be improved and submitted recommendations for increasing the academic performance of middle grade students and schools. These recommendations may result in proposed 2006 legislation.

High School Reform--High school reform in Florida provides added focus and rigor to academics for students in ninth through twelfth grade. Using reading as the foundation, all high school students should receive rigorous academic instruction through challenging curricula, provision of appropriate and effective remediation and academic intervention, and access to effective academic advisement to ensure that all students perform at high levels of academic achievement. To achieve these goals and sustain progress, schools must require students to complete a solid academic core, teach in ways that engage students in learning challenging content, and provide support and extra help for all students who have difficulty mastering the content.

Return on Investment--One of Florida's goals is to deliver quality efficient services within the education system. The State Board of Education adopted the strategic imperative of aligning financial resources with performance expectations as the method for accomplishing the delivery of quality efficient services. Within this framework, the Return on Investment (ROI) website was created, which displays many indicators of school, district, and state performance. The sources for these measures are the comprehensive student, staff, and finance data systems maintained by the Department. This ROI website allows users to evaluate measures of performance in relation to the resources allocated to the individual schools and districts. An ROI index for each Florida public school was developed in order to relate financial resources expended at the school level with measures of student performance at that school.

Sunshine Connections--Florida has entered into a five-year partnership with Microsoft to improve the availability of performance information and create access to learning objects and opportunities within the state. There are two major products envisaged by the partnership: a web-based product that will drive improvements in student performance by creating a new level of access to student-level data, curricula information, classroom planning tools, and professional development opportunities. This product is called "Sunshine Connections" and will be made available to every public school teacher in Florida by the end of 2006. The second product, also web-based, will provide a new gateway for professional education interests and the general public to access and better understand education performance data throughout the state.

Alternate Teaching Certification Programs--Designed to develop quality teachers, this research-based program offers professional education preparation to newly hired teachers who already possess subject area expertise and who qualify for an initial Florida Certificate. Each Florida school district offers a competency-based, on-the-job alternative certification program--either a district-developed program that has been approved by the Florida Department of Education or Florida's Alternative Certification Program. Florida's program has been featured as a model "emerging program" by the National Center for Alternative Certification. Over 800 participants have completed alternative programs since the statewide implementation in 2002 and over 2,300 are currently "in the pipeline."

Postsecondary Educator Preparation Institutes—Florida law was amended last year to authorize accredited and/or state board approved postsecondary institutions to seek approval from the Department of Education to create educator preparation institutes for the following purposes:

- Provide professional development instruction to assist teachers in improving classroom instruction and in meeting certification or re-certification requirements.
- Provide instruction to assist potential and existing substitute teachers in performing their duties.
- Provide instruction to assist paraprofessionals in meeting education and training requirements.
- Provide instruction for baccalaureate degree holders to become certified teachers in order to increase routes to the classroom for mid-career professionals and college graduates who were not education majors.

Removing Barriers to Teacher Certification—Realizing the great demand for highly effective teachers and the competition nationwide, the State of Florida through the adoption of new statutes or statutory revisions has continuously removed unnecessary barriers for certification while offering pathways that ensure that quality standards are met. The Florida certification system continues to require, as a minimum, a bachelor's degree, a full state certificate, and subject area competency as now established in NCLB. However, the Florida system offers more options to qualify for a full-time certificate than most other states while not compromising quality by not issuing waivers or emergency credentials.

Voluntary Pre-kindergarten Program (VPK)--Through an amendment to the State Constitution in 2002, Florida voters mandated that "Every four-year old child in Florida shall be provided by the State a high quality pre-kindergarten learning opportunity in the form of an early childhood development and education program which shall be voluntary, high quality, free and delivered according to professionally accepted standards." The Legislature enacted during the Special Session, and Governor Bush subsequently signed into law, legislation to implement the Voluntary Pre-kindergarten (VPK) Education Program.

This legislation assigns responsibilities for the day-to-day management of the program to the Agency for Workforce Innovation (AWI); licensing and credentialing to the Department of Children and Families (DCF); and the creation of standards, curriculum, and accountability to the Department of Education (DOE). All three agencies are working closely together to provide leadership and support to the local early learning coalitions, school districts, and public and private providers to ensure the successful implementation of effective pre-kindergarten education programs for Florida's four-year-old children.

Data Infrastructure Capabilities--Florida is recognized as having the most robust information system of any state in the US. It is based upon unit records collected at the state level and retained in a data warehouse with capabilities which are unparalleled. Over six years of matched data sets are available for making informed decisions. In another part of Florida's comprehensive information system, the class of 1991 has been tracked from graduation through employment.

In addition to collecting items which support the operation of the state's educational system, the data system is capable of and has been used for longitudinal studies about student progression and supports the extensive accountability and public reporting of information about the public schools. The system tracks course offerings, student attendance, and dropouts and is one of the few systems which is completely auditable by replications outside the system. It has allowed Florida to produce a graduation rate calculation which follows students from original entry in grade 9 through their final classification within the four-year cohort.

Strategic Planning

In support of the overarching mission of the Department of Education—"Raising Student Achievement"—the State Board of Education on February 15, 2005 approved updates to its eight strategic imperatives, as follows:

1. Increase the Supply of Highly Effective Teachers
2. Set, Align, and Apply Academic Curricular and Testing Standards
3. Improve Student Rates of Learning
4. Improve the Quality of Instructional Leadership
5. Increase the Quantity and Improve the Quality of Education Options
6. Align Workforce Education Programs with Skill Requirements of the New Economy
7. Align Financial Resources with Performance
8. Coordinate Efforts to Improve Higher Student Learning.

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. A summary of each imperative and its associated performance measure(s) is presented below

Strategic Imperative 1: Increase the Supply of Highly Effective Teachers

Measure 1. Adopt and implement an action plan to secure a sufficient number of effective classroom teachers to meet the demands of the Class Size Amendment for 2006-07 and beyond.

Measure 2. Annually increase the quantity of high-performing teachers as evidenced by the number who earn National Board Certification and who produce significant student learning gains.

Measure 3. Ensure that every school district has a provision in its teacher contract proposal that fully implements statutory performance pay requirement.

Measure 4. Recommend to the Legislature and school boards policies and practices that increase retention of high performing teachers in the classroom.

Strategic Imperative 2: Set, Align, and Apply Academic Curricular and Testing Standards

Measure 1. Adopt revisions to the Sunshine State Standards to better align the standards to increased rigor requirements.

Measure 2. Develop specifications for a more robust measure of postsecondary proficiency expectations.

Measure 3. Adopt VPK standards for student performance and program curricula, including readiness rates.

Strategic Imperative 3: Improve Student Rates of Learning

Measure 1. Annually increase the percentage of grade 3-10 students that meet or exceed proficiency levels on the FCAT.

Measure 2. Annually increase the percentage of postsecondary career education students demonstrating job-specific learning gains within one year.

Measure 3. Annually increase the percentage of Adult General Education students whose reading or math skills improve at least one grade level within one year.

Measure 4. Annually increase the percentage of 4-year public high school graduates.

Measure 5. Annually increase the percentage of workforce education students who become full program completers within 2 years of enrollment.

Measure 6. Annually increase the percentage of associate degree students who earn their degree on time.

Measure 7. Annually increase the percentage of Florida public high school seniors who earn a college assessment test score at or above the minimum level required by the Medallion Bright Futures Scholarship Program.

Measure 8. Annually increase the average number of high school credit hours earned through acceleration credits by students traditionally underrepresented in higher education.

Strategic Imperative 4: Improve the Quality of Instructional Leadership

Measure 1. Promote a statutory change to authorize the SBE to implement the four critical components of DELTA (Instructional Leadership Development for Principals) and an evaluation system related to student achievement.

Measure 2. Annually ensure a minimum number of Community College and Workforce Education Chancellor's Leadership Seminar completers and placements into senior management or higher positions.

Measure 3. Establish a new instructional leadership training program for workforce education administrators.

Strategic Imperative 5: Increase the Quantity and Improve the Quality of Education Options

Measure 1. Annually increase the number of private schools participating in and meeting requirements of a state scholarship program.

Measure 2. Support the establishment of new, norm-referenced testing requirements for Corporate Tax Credit scholarship program students.

Measure 3. Annually identify and eliminate all private schools with confirmed evidence of fraud or abuse from participation in any scholarship programs.

Measure 4. Annually increase the percentage of private schools renewing compliance requirements by deadline in order to remain eligible to participate in state scholarship programs.

Measure 5. Adopt and implement a comprehensive plan for identifying monitoring and expanding the percent of parents who have been given meaningful choices and who have taken advantage of choices among public schools in Florida.

Strategic Imperative 6: Align Workforce Education Programs with Skill Requirements of the New Economy

Measure 1. Annually increase the number of High Skill/High Wage postsecondary programs.

Measure 2. Annually increase the percentage of students who enroll in and complete High Skill/High Wage programs and who are placed as a result.

Measure 3. Secure annual legislative appropriation of funds to support the start-up and expansion of new High Skill/High Wage workforce education programs.

Measure 4. Annually improve the satisfaction rate of businesses and industries that employ previous-year workforce program graduates as having the industry-standard competencies necessary to succeed in the job.

Strategic Imperative 7: Align Financial Resources with Performance

Measure 1. Support statutory changes to adopt, in law, the K-20 performance measures adopted by the State Board of Education.

Measure 2. Implement and action plan for providing technical assistance to less efficient public K-12 schools as determined by the Return on Investment index.

Measure 3. Develop and present to the SBE a plan for collecting and reporting postsecondary Return on Investment data, including baseline data, for workforce, community colleges, and state universities.

Strategic Imperative 8: Coordinate Efforts to Improve Higher Student Learning

Measure 1. Adopt a comprehensive system that addresses articulation and access, student success, accountability and performance, resource and facility

capacity, emerging policies, and workforce education, consistent with the State Board's Strategic Plan.

Measure 2. Annually increase the proportion of prior year high school standard diploma earners who continue into a Florida postsecondary education institution in the fall following their graduation.

Measure 3. Annually improve the transfer rate of Associate of Arts and Associate in Science degree students into state universities in the academic year following the year of earning their degree.

Measure 4. Annually increase the number of community college/university concurrent-use partnerships to offer bachelor degrees.

Measure 5. Ensure State Board of Education and Board of Governors collaboration in linking priority issues of student achievement, access, articulation, workforce and economic development, and quality efficient services in strategic planning efforts, activities, and priorities.

Current Funding and Budget Priorities

The eight strategic imperatives above comprise the top priority for the department's 2006-07 Legislative Budget Request (LBR). Subsequent priorities in rank order are listed below:

- Improve student achievement, especially in reading
- Student enrollment for Grades Pre K-12
- Improve access to higher education, including student financial aid
- Annual review of non-recurring and recurring line item appropriations
- Construct, restore, and renovate education facilities
- Provide client services for Vocational Rehabilitation and Blind Services
- Align funding with community needs and unique institutional missions.

Each budget issue and line item appropriation detailed in the agency's LBR is linked directly to one or more of these priorities. Highlights from the 2006-07 LBR are discussed below.

Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK) Education Program

In 2005-06, the VPK program is projected to serve 147,235 children (67% of the total population of four-year-old children) to better prepare them for successful entry into kindergarten. A requested increase of 4.6% to \$404,920,028 will accommodate an estimated 226,959 children in 2006-07. The Base Student Allocation (BSA) is increased by 1.8% from \$2,500 in 2005-06 to \$2,545 in 2006-07.

K-12 Program/FEFP

The Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) guarantees to each student in the Florida public education system the availability of programs and services appropriate to his or her educational needs which are substantially equal to those available to any similar student, notwithstanding geographic differences and varying local economic factors. Requested state and local funding for this program is \$17.694 billion, a 7.83% increase over 2005-06 appropriations. The increase is predicated upon an enrollment growth of 56,629 full-time equivalent students. A 2.0% price level adjustment was made to the BSA for 2005-06 resulting in a 2006-07 BSA of \$3,817.27, an increase of \$74.85.

Included in this appropriation is funding for implementation of Article IX, Section 1 of the Florida Constitution, the "Class Size Amendment." During 2004-05, the second year of implementation, 18 school districts did not meet the class size goals based on reported district average data. After the appeal process provided in law was completed, nine districts had \$1,076,719 in funds transferred from the operating budget to the fixed capital outlay budget. In 2005-06, district averages are to be reduced by a total of six students from the base year or to the designated target level for each grade grouping. The allocation factors provided to attain these goals are \$539.94 for grades pre-k through 3, \$515.45 for grades 4-8, and \$516.90 for grades 9-12. If the total class size reduction allocation is greater than the appropriation of \$1.528 billion, funds shall be prorated to the level of the appropriation based on each district's calculated amount. In 2006-07, year four of implementation, the calculation of averages shifts from the district to the school level. The total requested appropriation of \$2.126 billion for 2006-07 is an increase of \$597.5 million (39%) over the current year. These funds are to be used to reduce classroom averages by an additional two students (or to the specified caps). If the district has met the specified maximums, priority in spending the allocation shall be given to increasing the salaries of classroom teachers, as defined in s. 1012.01(2)(a), F.S., and to implementing the salary career ladder, as defined in s. 1012.231, F.S.

K-12 Program/Non-FEFP

Key components of this budget item are funding for excellent teaching, new teacher recruitment, and professional development activities. The Dale Hickam Excellent Teaching Program provides funds for fees for teachers to become nationally certified and pays some costs of portfolio preparation through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Additionally, payments are made to teachers upon completion of the certification process and completion of 12 mentoring days. The 19.6% increase to just under \$100 million is based on a projected 3,400 new applicants in 2006-07 and continuing support for those who currently hold NBPTS certification. Teacher recruitment and professional development activities include support for the on-line web portal (www.teachinflorida.com), the statewide job fair (The Great Florida Teach-In), and statewide conferences of Florida Future Educators of America chapters. A wide range of collaborations and conferences as well as research projects related to teacher professional development is also included. The total amount requested to support these activities in 2006-07 is \$134.6 million.

To achieve Florida's goal for all students to be reading on grade level or higher by 2012, a combination of state and federal funds are requested to support the initiatives of the Just Read, Florida! Office. Funding will allow the state to provide the following, at no cost, to the districts: Diagnostic assessments for Level 1 students in grades K-12, professional development for each competency of the Reading Endorsement, continuation funding for the Florida Reading Initiative through the North East Florida Education Consortium, training for principals and reading coaches, training for parents of children in grades K-8, and sustainability grants for the Governor's Family Literacy Initiative.

Assistance to low performing schools is targeted to receive just over \$10 million in 2006-07, an increase of 42% over the current level. The increase will support the

implementation of Florida's system of school improvement and education accountability through Assistance Plus. The purpose of this program is to increase student achievement and, particularly, to close the achievement gap that has led low income and minority students to be underrepresented in college preparatory and advanced placement courses in middle and high schools.

Strategic imperatives 2 and 3 are addressed in a requested \$10 million to implement secondary school reforms. Of the total, \$6 million is earmarked for Ninth Grade Academies, \$2 million for integrating mathematics, science, and technology in the classroom, and \$2 million for mathematics and science reform.

An additional \$1.5 million is requested to increase the supply of highly effective teachers (Strategic Imperative 1), and \$4 million will be used primarily to implement the Developing Educational Leaders for Tomorrow's Achievers (DELTA) program, a component of Strategic Imperative 4.

Student Financial Aid Program—State

Funded by the Florida Lottery, the Bright Futures Scholarship Program rewards Florida high school students for their academic achievement and encourages them to continue their postsecondary education at a Florida institution of higher education. The request for 2006-07 totals almost \$347.5 million, an increase of 11.4% to fully fund all projected eligible students (148,886). The increase also allows for projected increases in tuition and fees of 5% at four-year institutions and 1.8% at two-year colleges.

The Florida Prepaid College Foundation has awarded close to 20,000 scholarships statewide to improve access to higher education for economically disadvantaged youth who are at risk of dropping out of school. Dubbed Project STARS (Scholarship Tuition for At-Risk Students), the program requires a 50:50 match of funds from private sector sources. The requested \$7 million will enable the Florida Prepaid College Foundation to make an additional 1,362 awards during the 2006-07 academic year.

The three Florida Student Assistance Grants programs comprise Florida's primary need-based awards enabling students to attend public universities and community colleges, independent non-profit colleges or universities accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, or private colleges and universities licensed by the Commission on Independent Education. The requested appropriation for 2006-07 is based on a per student increase of \$100 over the average award in 2004-05. The increase will accommodate a projected growth of 10,000 students in these programs.

K-20 Education

Overall, the Department of Education is requesting a budget of \$19.3 billion for 2006-07. This is an increase of \$1.5 billion or 8.5% over the current year.

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 (Section 1004.85, F.S.), 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 Section 1004.85, F.S. 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 have received additional focus due to the Career Education Task Force chaired by Lt. Governor Toni Jennings and the resulting recommendations. The recommendations centered on six topics: Increasing rigor and relevance in career education; improving career guidance and counseling; maximizing the use of existing resources to support career education using funding to improve capacity;

increasing marketing and public awareness of career education and its positive impact on Florida's economy; and increasing accountability in career education.

In response to these recommendations, the Commissioner of Education has announced a four point plan to step up efforts to better prepare students for success. The four point plan includes:

- Better prepare high school students by integrating academic rigor with real world career relevance by increasing the number of quality career education options through a blending of high school and college coursework.
- Better prepare students by ensuring that career education programs meet industry standards and workforce demands by increasing program offerings in high demand, high wage, and high skill careers.
- Better prepare students by enhancing CHOICES and FACTS.org, the statewide advising and planning tools that help them continue their education and climb a progressive career ladder and by supporting students' attainment of the highest level of workforce skills.
- Better prepare students by strengthening Florida's public and private investments that build capacity and modernize the image of career education by redirecting Department of Education resources to the Office of Workforce Education with responsibility to develop private sector partnerships and increase marketing and public awareness campaigns related to all the strategies in the four point plan.

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 have placed a major focus on articulation and the development of statewide articulation agreements and models of local agreements that will facilitate the ease of transfer among and between secondary and postsecondary institutions.

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

Commission for Independent Education

The Commission for Independent Education (CIE) has been administratively placed under the Chancellor for Community Colleges and Workforce Education. CIE has statutory responsibilities in matters relating to nonpublic postsecondary educational institutions. In keeping with the Florida Department of Education's goal of producing a seamless educational system, some of these functions include consumer protection, program improvement, institutional policies and administration, data management, and the licensure of independent schools, colleges and universities.

The CIE was created by SB 1162 in 2001 with the merger of the State Board of Independent Colleges and Universities and the State Board of Nonpublic Career Education. The Commission is made up of seven members appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate for a term of three years.

The Commission has more than 868 non-degree schools and degree-granting institutions which fall under their jurisdiction. There are more than 4,500 licensed programs of study at these institutions, which boast an enrollment in excess of 207,000 students and over 72,500 graduates. Some of the projects they have in progress include updating licensure standards, developing online services, sharing data with FETPIP, CHOICES, AWI, OSFA, and Workforce Florida, Inc., and acting as the liaison with workforce development training providers.

State Universities

Article IX, Section 7, subsection (d) of the Florida Constitution establishes a statewide Board of Governors with a mandate to operate, regulate, control, and be fully responsible for the management of the whole university system. These responsibilities shall include,

but not be limited to, defining the distinctive mission of each constituent university and its articulation with free public schools and community colleges, ensuring the well-planned coordination and operation of the system, and avoiding wasteful duplication of facilities or programs.

In July 2003, the Board began the process of developing a strategic plan, centered around clearly-articulated goals, that would fulfill its constitutional responsibilities and ensure that Florida's universities form a coordinated system. After reviewing national and state data, studies by the Council of 100 and the Council for Education Policy Research and Improvement, research studies commissioned by the Board, and input from universities, the Board of Governors established a set of goals for the State University System. These goals focus on providing access, meeting the workforce needs of the state, and building world-class academic programs and research capacity. The Board will work with universities to establish parallel goals that reflect each institution's appropriate level of participation in the statewide plan. While the goals are specific, the Board's intention is to provide broad flexibility in developing plans to achieve them. The Board will support universities' efforts and provide leadership when progress toward goals requires funding, state-level policies, or collaboration with other agencies.

In addition to the statewide goals, each institution will adopt additional, measurable goals consistent with its distinctive mission. Once these are approved by the Board of Governors, the Board will provide support to universities in their efforts to make progress toward important institutional as well as statewide goals.

The Board has established specific, measurable goals related to: access to and production of degrees, meeting statewide professional and workforce needs, and building world-class academic programs and research capacity, while defining and approving university missions that meet community needs and fulfill unique institutional responsibilities. The role of each university in achieving the system goals is determined by the distinctive mission of each institution. The strategic guidance provided by the Board of Governors will determine how those missions evolve over time.

The Board will continue to study ways to create the optimum structure for the university system, including number and location of universities, number and location of branches, and number and location of subsystems, reflecting the geographic needs of the state. In establishing the optimum structure, the following questions must be answered:

A. With attention to quality, cost and access, what is the optimal mix of campus models to serve the state, both in satisfying demand and in minimizing cost?

- Stand-alone
- Branch
- Distributive
- Joint-use
- Additional universities
- Other models

B. What is the fixed, variable and marginal cost differential to meet growth challenges of each model?

C. How will this growth be financed?

The Board has developed and will continue to refine a system that holds universities accountable for:

- A. Each institution's contribution to the statewide goals and fulfillment of its individual mission;
- B. The efficiency of each institution's operation; and
- C. The financial health of each constituent university and the system.

According to an analysis presented by MGT of America at the November 2004 Board meeting, \$694 million (in 2004 dollars) in additional annual operating costs by 2012-13 would be required to attain the Board of Governors degree production goals. The additional costs are related both to growth in degrees and to a shift toward more necessary but expensive targeted programs. Capital costs associated with the increase in capacity would total \$1.4 billion in constant (2004) dollars. Through its legislative budget request process, the Board has begun linking its strategic goals to funding requests, and will work to further reinforce this connection in future requests.

Challenges the system will face as it works to achieve its goals include:

I. BALANCING INSTITUTIONAL SUPPLY AND STUDENT AND EMPLOYER DEMANDS

The Board has begun evaluating supply and demand in programs such as nursing, in which student demand currently outstrips the supply of seats in the system's programs, and teaching, in which low student demand is leaving unused capacity. The level of preparation of incoming students is another factor that may limit growth of programs in certain high-skill fields. Over the next year, additional program areas will be evaluated in consultation with universities and strategies developed to increase supply and/or demand as the situation warrants.

II. ENSURING GEOGRAPHIC ACCESS

A report by a business geographer for the Board of Governors recently identified areas of the state in which demographics may make the demand for higher education particularly acute. The outlying parts of metropolitan areas in central and south Florida in particular will face rapid growth in the traditional college-aged population, generating pressure both on the urban institutions in those areas and on the institutions in the north of the state with a statewide service mission. While students in some fields may be relatively mobile and able to attend programs in another region of the state, others will by choice or necessity create demand for programs close to home.

III. COMPETING INTERNATIONALLY WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS AND SYSTEMS

Florida's universities compete for research funding and for faculty and students not just with other public institutions in the United States, but with private universities and with public higher education systems around the world.

IV. RECRUITING FACULTY AND STUDENTS

Faculty recruitment will be needed to support growth, especially in targeted areas, and to replace large numbers of retiring faculty. In order to attract and retain world-class faculty and students, Florida will need to provide state-of-the-art facilities and competitive financial packages for faculty, graduate students, and post-doctorates. A small wave of retirements, as baby boomer faculty reach retirement age, will further increase hiring needs over the next ten years. In addition to competitive salaries, start-up costs in the sciences and engineering are likely to be considerable. A 2002 survey of Research I institutions by the Cornell Higher Education Research Institute found that average assistant professor start up costs in these fields ranged from \$390,000 in engineering to \$490,000 in chemistry. Costs for senior faculty were considerably higher.

The Board of Governors will work with institutions, through their institutional strategic plans and through coordinated statewide initiatives, to address these and other challenges facing the system.

Florida also has many advantages, or “opportunities,” to support ambitious goals for the State University System.

I. DEMOGRAPHICS

While many states are experiencing population and enrollment stagnation or decline, Florida is a growing state with an increasing number of potential students in the pipeline. The Legislature’s Office of Economic and Demographic Research projects that the state’s 18-24 year-old population will increase by 13% between 2004 and 2010 before it begins to level off.

II. RISING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND INTEREST IN FLORIDA PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

In the 1990s, a number of initiatives intended to get more Florida students into college were created, including programs aimed at academics, such as the A+ plan and the College Board Partnership, and programs that targeted finances, such as Bright Futures and the Florida Prepaid Tuition plan. At the same time, Florida maintained one of the lowest average in-state tuition rates in the country, while public and private colleges outside of Florida rapidly increased the cost of leaving the state. As a result, the percentage of Florida high school seniors taking the SAT test, a major step toward attending college, has increased from 50% in 1995 to 61% in 2004. Often, expanding the pool of students taking the test means declining scores, but in Florida the average combined score has actually risen slightly, from 993 to 998. The percentage of Florida residents attending college out-of-state has also declined, from 9% in 1994 to 6% in 2002 (IPEDS residency and migration data). Improving students’ preparation for higher education remains an important goal of the K-12 system, and higher education institutions in the state should plan for the improvement to continue.

III. STATE QUALITY OF LIFE AND GROWING ECONOMY

Florida offers an attractive environment for prospective faculty and students, with sunshine, vibrant cities, a variety of cultural attractions, and a reasonable cost of living compared to some cities in the Northeast and on the West Coast, where faculty salaries may not go as far. Internal migration within the United States and from outside the country, at all age levels, has contributed to the state's population growth and is projected to continue.

IV. EFFICIENT AND IMPROVING UNIVERSITIES

Strong graduation rates and low costs relative to other public universities will make growth more affordable. While there remains room for improvement, Florida's average public university graduation rate is the tenth highest in the nation, while our educational expenditures per credit hour are the tenth lowest.

Continued attention to cost and performance will ensure that the system is efficient in reaching the Board's goals.

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
<p>Ensure the greatest possible efficiency and effectiveness of services to individuals who are blind:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Aid individuals who are blind in gaining employment including the provision of job training s. 413.011(d), F.S.; 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.; 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, 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. 	Chapter 413, Florida Statutes
Expand the specialized early intervention services for visually impaired children, birth through 5, and their families on a statewide basis, s. 413.092, F.S.	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)
Serve children who are blind from 6 years through transition to the Vocational Rehabilitation Program s. 413.011(5), F.S.	Chapter 413, Florida Statutes
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.

Function	Measure	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11
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	11,700	11,700	11,700	11,700	11,700
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	Annual # of customers provided these services	38,290	38,673 (+1%)	39,060 (+1%)	39,451 (+1%)	39,846 (+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 Program (CP): 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.
- Blind Babies (BB) Program: Provides community-based early-intervention education to children from birth to 5 years of age who are blind or visually impaired, and to their parents, families, and through community-based provider organizations.

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 rehabilitation (VR) program. Federal legislation is used in deciding whether a person is eligible to participate in the program. Specifically, the Division must determine that an individual is eligible for VR services based only on the following requirements whereby a VR Counselor determines: (1) if an individual has a physical or mental impairment, (2) whether the individual's physical or mental impairment constitutes or results in a substantial impediment to employment, (3) that presumably the applicant can benefit in terms of an employment outcome from the provision of VR services, (4) that the applicant requires VR services to prepare for, enter into, engage in, or retain gainful employment consistent with the applicants strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, abilities, capabilities, and informed choice.

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 2002 needs assessment described the vocational rehabilitation environment based on 2000 census data. It found that approximately 55% of Florida's populations 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. The Florida Legislature estimates that, by April 1, 2004, (the latest date for which data are available), the population had increased 9.6% to 17,516,732. Information was not found for the percentage of individuals employed. The same press release identified concern regarding the decreasing number of individuals aged 25-59, "the prime labor force age group", in the workforce.

Findings from the 2002 needs assessment suggested that five topics should be addressed: (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. In the intervening 30 months some of the gaps have closed.

- ❖ Eligibility determinations for some Persons with a Disability (PWDs) are taking too much time---the average time has decreased by two days
- ❖ Individualized Plans for Employment (IPEs) need to be written for more PWDs---gap has not closed
- ❖ The number and percentage of PWDs who get a job is too low---the number and percentage have increased since the 2002 needs assessment. The number is 775 higher and the percentage is 3.3% higher.
- ❖ The number and percentage of severely and most severely disabled PWDs who get a job is too low---both have increased. The number is 516 higher and the rate is 3.4% higher.
- ❖ The number and percentage of other PWDs who get a job is too low---both have increased. The number is 259 higher and the rate is 1.7% higher.
- ❖ A smaller proportion than expected of PWDs aged 15-19 and 20-24 who apply to VR get jobs---the proportion of PWDs placed in employment who are 15-24 years old has increased 2% since SFY2001-02.

During SFY 2004-2005, Florida DVR had an average of 34,784 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 9,354 individuals placed into gainful employment, 76% (7,109) were significantly or most significantly disabled; this is an increase of slightly more than 2% over the previous fiscal year. The projected average annual earnings of VR customers at placement during this period was \$17,855, exceeding the legislative standard of \$14,463. The SFY2004-05 projected earnings increased approximately 4% from the previous fiscal year.

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. For federal fiscal year (FFY) 2004, survey results of closed clients show overall satisfaction is 80%. Survey results for active cases during FFY 2004 show overall satisfaction is 77%. 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 mission of the Bureau of Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services (BRRS) is to act a safety net in assisting eligible individuals who are injured on the job in returning to suitable gainful employment when their work injury prevents them from returning to their pre-injury occupation. To achieve this mission, the bureau's services are designed to assist the injured worker in returning to suitable work through job placement and/or re-training and education activities. The BRRS has as strategic priorities, improvements in the number of injured workers served by the program and improvements in the return to work rates.

In order to accomplish these strategic initiatives, changes are necessary in the overall workers' compensation system. First, workers' compensation insurance carriers must actively assist in returning injured workers to suitable employment through the provision of voluntary services. However, without some statutory mandate or change concerning return to work efforts on the part of the workers' compensation insurance carriers (either penalties or incentives, such as premium reductions and/or tax incentives or other financial benefits), it may be difficult to encourage the workers' compensation insurance industry to recognize and support the importance of its role in assisting injured workers in returning to suitable gainful employment. In addition, the BRRS must focus on getting more injured workers in the door in order to increase the number of eligible persons provided reemployment services. Insurance carriers must do its part by referring injured workers to the BRRS when it is determined that their work injuries will not allow them to return to their pre-injury occupation, particularly when they have been unemployed over 180 days and exhausted their indemnity benefits. In addition, the BRRS staff will work to increase its partnership initiatives with employers and other agencies in order to increase the number of eligible persons served by the program. This includes collaboration with municipal governments, state agencies such as Workforce and Unemployment Compensation and major employers in Florida. The BRRS will also work closely with health care providers and rehabilitation providers in an effort to get them to increase referrals to the program.

Impact of Desired Strategy Changes and Obstacles to their Implementation:

Impact:

- All parties in the system understand and actively carry out their roles regarding returning injured workers to suitable gainful employment.
- Gradual improvement in the overall return to work rate.
- Reduce overall system cost for employers.
- Through education and other marketing initiatives, increased numbers of injured workers that are provided bureau sponsored reemployment services.
- System partners will work collaboratively in increasing the number of injured worker referrals to the program.

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.

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, well being, and/or lifelong learning skills by achieving at least two identified benchmarks. During 2004-2005, 16,028 Floridians with disabilities were successfully served in these education-related activities.

Exhibit I: Agency Workforce Plan

Fiscal Years	Total FTE Reductions	Description of Reduction Issue	Positions per Issue	Impact of Reduction
FY 2006-2007	99.5	Currently there are 99.5 vacant positions within Budget Entity 48210000 (Projects, Contracts, and Grants) and Budget Entity 48800000 (Florida Board of Education). The department will maintain this vacancy rate during FY 2006-07 by realigning personnel in accordance with the department's core mission.		
State Board of Education				
FY 2007-2008	62.0	The department will reduce its workforce by 62 FTE through attrition and by realigning personnel in accordance with the department's core mission.		
State Board of Education				
Total*	161.5			

*The department has adjusted its workforce adjustment target to neutralize the effect of legislative policy changes. This reflects more appropriately the reductions to education specific programs and services that have occurred and that will be made through FY 2007-08.

Exhibit II: Performance Measures and Standards				
Department: Education		Department No.: 48		
Program: Vocational Rehabilitation	Code: 48160000			
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:			
NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.				
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2005-06 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2006-07 Standard (Numbers)
Number/percent of customers gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days	11,500 / 65%	9,354 / 56.9%	11,500 / 65%	10,000 / 59.5%
Number/percent of VR significantly disabled gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days	9,775 / 58.5%	7,109 / 53.1%	9,775 / 58.5%	8,000 / 56%
Number/percent of all other VR disabled gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days	1,725 / 77%	2,245 / 73.3%	1,725 / 77%	2,000 / 76%
Number/percent of VR customers placed in competitive employment	11,213 / 97.5%	9,347 / 99.9%	11,213 / 97.5%	9,750 / 97.5%
Number/percent of VR customers retained in employment after 1 year	6,300 / 67.5%	6,028 / 64.2%	6,300 / 67.5%	6,300 / 67.5%
Average annual earning of VR customers at placement	\$17,500	\$17,855	\$17,500	\$17,500
Average annual earning of VR customers after 1 year	\$18,500	\$19,245	\$18,500	\$18,500
Percent of case costs covered by third-party payers	23%	6.00%	23%	7%
Average cost of case life (to division) for significantly disabled VR customers	\$3,350	\$3,491	\$3,350	\$4,250
Average cost of case life (to division) for all other disabled VR customers	\$400	\$402	\$400	\$475
Number of customers reviewed for eligibility	29,000	23,424	29,000	25,000
Number of individualized written plans for services	24,500	17,120	24,500	19,000
Number of active cases	37,500	34,784	37,500	31,500
Customer caseload per counselor	125	94	125	100

Percent of eligibility determinations completed in compliance with federal law	95%	88%	95%	95%
Number of program applicants provided Reemployment Services	2,525	2,636	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.	76%	91%	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 2005-06 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2006-07 Standard (Numbers)
Number/percent of rehabilitation customers gainfully employed at least 90 days.	747 / 68.3%	626 / 64.60%	747 / 68.3%	747 / 68.3%
Number/percent rehabilitation customers placed in competitive employment.	654 / 64.3%	622 / 99.36%	654 / 64.3%	654 / 64.3%
Projected average annual earnings of rehabilitation customers at placement.	\$13,500	\$17,918	\$13,500	\$16,500
Number/percent successfully rehabilitated older persons, non-vocational rehabilitation.	1,500 / 55.2%	1,873 / 73.36%	1,500 / 55.2%	1,700 / 55.2%
Number/percent of customers (children) successfully rehabilitated/transitioned from pre-school to school.	36 / 67.3%	112 / 81.16%	36 / 67.3%	100 / 67.3%
Number/percent of customers (children) successfully rehabilitated/transitioned from school to work.	47 / 26.5%	71 / 68.27%	47 / 26.5%	70 / 26.5%
Number of customers reviewed for eligibility	2,035	5,379	2,035	4,000
Number of written plans for services	1,425	2,645	1,425	2,500
Number of customers served	13,100	11,854	13,100	11,700
Average time lapse (days) between application and eligibility determination for rehabilitation customers	60	44	60	60

Customer caseload per counseling/case management team member	114	78	114	114
Cost per Library customer served	\$19.65	\$29.82	\$19.65	\$19.65
Number of blind vending food service facilities supported	153	154	153	153
Number of existing food service facilities renovated	5	3	5	2
Number of new food service facilities constructed	5	7	5	6
Number of Library customers served	44,290	39,040	44,290	38,290
Number of Library items (Braille and recorded) loaned	1.25 m.	1,483,709	1.35 m.	1,350,000
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 2005-06 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2006-07 Standard (Numbers)
Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, using a 6-year rate (Florida Resident Access Grant - FRAG)	TBD	N/A	51.7% @ private 4 year	50.0%
Number of degrees granted for FRAG recipients and contract program recipients (Florida Resident Access Grant - FRAG)	TBD	N/A	8,871	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	TBD	TBD

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	TBD	TBD
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	TBD	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 (This measure would be for each Academic Contract and for the Florida Resident Access Grant)	TBD	N/A	TBD	TBD
Number of prior year's graduates (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	TBD	N/A	TBD	TBD
Number of prior year's graduates remaining in Florida (Academic Contracts)	TBD	N/A	TBD	TBD
Number of FTIC students, disaggregated by in-state and out-of-state (Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	TBD	N/A	TBD	TBD

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2005-06 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2006-07 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	19.9% CC 48.1% SUS	19.9% CC 48.1% SUS
Percent of high school graduates attending Florida postsecondary institutions (Bright Futures)	52%	N/A	52%	52%
Number of Bright Futures recipients	114,315	130,597	139,553	148,886
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	27.4% CC 31.6% SUS	
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: State Grants/K-12 Program—FEFP	Code: 48250300
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2005-06 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2006-07 Standard (Numbers)
Number/percent of teachers with National Teacher's Certification, reported by district	3,369 / 2.4%	6,402 / 4.3%	4,853 / 3%	4,853 / 3%
Number/percent of "A" schools, reported by district	600 / 25%	1,254 / 45%	600 / 25%	600 / 25%
Number/percent of "D" or "F" schools, reported by district	300 / 12%	308 / 11%	300 / 12%	300 / 12%
Number/percent of schools declining one or more letter grades, reported by district	193 / 8%	503 / 18%	193 / 8%	193 / 8%
Number/percent of schools improving one or more letter grades, reported by district	966 / 40%	249 / 9%	966 / 40%	966 / 40%

Program: Workforce Development	Code: 48250800
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2005-06 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2006-07 Standard (Numbers)
Number/percent persons earning vocational certificate occupational completion points, at least one of which is 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	2,055/TBD	13,910 / TBD	2,055 / TBD

Number/percent of persons earning vocational certificate occupational completion points, at least one of which is 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	4,700/TBD	9,850 / TBD	4,700/ TBD
Number/percent of persons earning vocational certificate occupational completion points, at least one of which is 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	19,329/TBD	21,115 / TBD	21,115 / 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	75,672	73,346	73,346

Program: Community College Programs	Code: 48400600
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2005-06 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2006-07 Standard (Numbers)
--	--	--	--	--

Number/percent of associate in science degree and college-credit certificate program completers who finished 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	5,516 / 35%	5,516 / TBD	5,516 / TBD
Number/percent of associate in science degree and college-credit certificate program completers who finished 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	4,721 / 30%	4,721 / TBD	4,721 / TBD
Number/percent of associate in science degree and college-credit certificate program completers who finished 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	3,024 / 19%	3,024 / TBD	3,024 / TBD
Percent of Associate in Arts (AA) degree graduates who transfer to a state university within 2 years	69%	61%	62%	61%
Percent of AA degree transfers to the State University System who earn a 2.5 or above in the SUS after 1 year	75%	74%	75%	74%
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.	N/A	57%	59%	59%
Of the AA students who complete 18 credit hours, the percent of whom graduate in 4 years.	36%	35%	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%	37%	38%	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%	75.5%	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%	74%	75%	75%
Number/Percent of AA partial completers transferring to the State University System with at least 40 credit hours	16,821 / 72%	17,796 / 61.5%	12,672/74%	17,796 / 61.5%

Number/Percent/FTEs of AA students who do not complete 18 credit hours within 4 years	5,346 / 23.3% FTE: 2,275	12,234 / 37% 2,020	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%	2,956 / 32%	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%	177 / 29%	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%	219 / 20%	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%	187 / 16%	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	2,754	2,900	2,900
Percent of prior year Florida high school graduates enrolled in community colleges	30%	34%	31%	31%
Number of AA degrees granted	29,000	30,809	29,880	29,880
Number of students receiving college preparatory instruction	100,000	123,527	118,471	118,471
Number of students enrolled in baccalaureate programs offered on community college campuses	13,000	19,077	22,000	22,000

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

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2005-06 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2006-07 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%	98.3%	90%	90%
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		15	
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%		100%	
Number of certification applications processed	87,663	138,406	109,275	109,275
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%	
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	TBD	

Program: Universities, Education / General Activities	Code: 48900100
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:

NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2005-06 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2004-05 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2006-07 Standard (Numbers)
Graduation rate for First Time in College (FTIC) students, using a 6-year rate	61%	Cohort Yr. 1998 – 61.8%	61%	61%
Retention rate for FTIC students, using a 6-year rate	71.0%	Cohort Yr. 1998 – 70.7%	71%	71%
Graduation rate for AA transfer students, using a 4-year rate	69%	Cohort Yr. 2000 – 70.4%	69%	69%
Retention rate for AA transfer students, using a 4-year rate	80%	Cohort Yr. 2000 – 80.9%	80%	80%
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%	Academic Year (AY) 2003-04 All – 66.9% FTIC – 55.6% AA Transfer – 78.5%	69%	69%
Pass rate on licensure/certification exams, for the first sitting	TBD	AY 2002-03 - Pass Rate for Teacher Certification – 96.9%	96.90%	96.90%
Of the prior year graduates remaining in Florida, the percent employed at \$22,000 or more 1 year following graduation	64%	Fall 2003 – 61.9%	64%	64%
Of those graduates remaining in Florida, the percent employed at \$22,000 or more 5 years following graduation	90%	Fall 2003 – 84.9%	90%	90%
Percent of undergraduate students enrolled in graduate school upon completion of the baccalaureate degree	12%	AY 2003-04 – 12.3%	12%	12%
Externally generated research and training grant funds (federal, state, local, business, and industry) per state-funded ranked faculty full-time equivalent	\$97,196	AY 2003-04 - \$149,299	\$97,196	\$97,196

Average number of articles in Institute for Scientific Information Publication Count per ranked faculty	0.7	AY 2003-04 - .86	0.7	0.7
For IFAS only, the percent of public service projects where the beneficiary is satisfied or highly satisfied with the extension assistance	92%	AY 2003-04 – 96.8%	92%	92%
Of the total instructional effort by level, the percent of effort provided by faculty:				
(I) Lower level	45%	AY 2003-04 – 41.9%	45%	45%
(II) Upper level	66%	AY 2003-04 – 65.5%	66%	66%
(III) Graduate	73%	AY 2003-04 – 76.8%	73%	73%
Percent of qualified Florida students, those applicants meeting admission standards, admitted as FTIC students	95%	AY 2003-04 91.9%	95%	95%
Percent of undergraduate students at each university classified as out-of-state	10%	AY 2003-04 – 7.5%	10%	10%
Number of undergraduate out-of-state students above 10% of all undergraduate students	0	AY 2003-04 - 0	0	0
Percent of out-of -state students admitted who are do not meet FBE admission standards	0	AY 2003-04 – 2.1%	0	0
Percent of FTIC students admitted as student profile assessments	10%	AY 2003-04 – 5.3%	10%	10%
Number/percent of student profile assessments who are out-of-state students	363 / 10%	AY 2003-04 – 301/14.1%	363 / 10%	363 / 10%
Of total faculty effort allocated for public service, the percent devoted to public schools	25%	AY 2003-04 – 10.3%	25%	25%
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	TBD	TBD	TBD
Number of degrees granted, baccalaureate	37,982	AY 2003-04 – 42,680	37,982	37,982
Number of degrees granted, masters	11,008	AY 2003-04 – 13,040	11,008	11,008

Number of degrees granted, doctoral	1,255	AY 2003-04 – 1,464	1,255	1,255
Number of degrees granted, professional	1,170	AY 2003-04 – 1,370	1,170	1,170

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
193 (8%)	503 (18%)	310	161%

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:

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
966 (40%)	249 (9%)	717	74%

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:

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 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
747/68.3%	626/64.6%	121 under	16.2%

Factors Accounting for the Difference: NA

Internal Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

The VR counselor is the key professional in the system and is responsible for interacting with individuals with disabilities who are seeking or receiving VR services to assist them in entering the workforce and becoming economically independent. Congress mandated, in a previous reauthorization of the Rehabilitation Act, that in order to be qualified to serve persons with disabilities under the Public VR Program, rehabilitation counselors must obtain a Master’s Degree or meet the highest state standard for persons in that or similar professions. A review of starting VR counselor salaries for the top five most populated states indicates Florida has the lowest starting salary. The table below supports this premise.

State	Starting Annual Salary	Census 2004 Population
California	\$36,048	35,893,799
Texas	\$36,800	22,490,022
New York	\$45,394	19,227,088
Florida	\$29,785	17,397,161
Illinois	\$33,564	12,713,634

The number of VR counselor FTE positions is 174. The table below identifies a disturbing trend for the past five fiscal years in FTE attrition and the number of days to fill these vacancies. A recurring response during exit interviews indicates non-competitive salaries as the major reason for the employee separating. Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) counselors comprise the major turnover totals as indicated in the table below.

FY	# of VR Vacancies	Avg # of Days Vacant – VR	Total # of Vacancies	Avg # of Days Vacant
04/05	26	60	33	94
03/04	6	25	15	189
02/03	13	93	17	214
01/02	9	145	14	271
00/01	10	72	25	175

The attrition or turnover rates of FTEs have adversely impacted productivity and have affected the attainment of the specified Goals and Objectives indicated in the previous section. A review of VR Performance Based Budget Measures listed below supports this conclusion:

	Fiscal Years			
	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05
VR Performance Based Budget Measures				
Number of Customers Served:	4,915	4,966	4,694	4,468
Eligibility Determinations:	2,269	2,076	1,813	1,945
Number of Customers Competitively Employed:	728	717	715	622
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:				
Other agencies are luring experienced VR counselors away by offering higher pay.				
Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply): NA				
<input type="checkbox"/> Training			<input type="checkbox"/> Technology	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Personnel			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)	
Recommendations:				
The Division is currently studying the VR counselor retention and recruitment issue with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. The intent is to submit a Legislative Budget Request issue this fiscal year identifying the problem and requesting funding to resolve this problem.				

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 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
654/64.3%	622/99.36%	32 Under	4.89%

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 VR counselor is the key professional in the system and is responsible for interacting with individuals with disabilities who are seeking or receiving VR services to assist them in entering the workforce and becoming economically independent. Congress mandated, in a previous reauthorization of the Rehabilitation Act, that in order to be qualified to serve persons with disabilities under the Public VR Program, rehabilitation counselors must obtain a Master’s Degree or meet the highest state standard for persons in that or similar professions. A review of starting VR counselor salaries for the top five most populated states indicates Florida has the lowest starting salary. The table below supports this premise.

State	Starting Annual Salary	Census 2004 Population
California	\$36,048	35,893,799
Texas	\$36,800	22,490,022
New York	\$45,394	19,227,088
Florida	\$29,785	17,397,161
Illinois	\$33,564	12,713,634

The number of VR counselor FTE positions is 174. The table below identifies a disturbing trend for the past five fiscal years in FTE attrition and the number of days to fill these vacancies. A recurring response during exit interviews indicates non-competitive salaries as the major reason for the employee separating. Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) counselors comprise the major turnover totals as indicated in the table below.

FY	# of VR Vacancies	Avg # of Days Vacant – VR	Total # of Vacancies	Avg # of Days Vacant
04/05	26	60	33	94
03/04	6	25	15	189
02/03	13	93	17	214
01/02	9	145	14	271
00/01	10	72	25	175

The attrition or turnover rates of FTEs have adversely impacted productivity and have affected the attainment of the specified Goals and Objectives indicated in the previous section. A review of VR Performance Based Budget Measures listed below supports this conclusion:

	Fiscal Years			
	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05
VR Performance Based Budget Measures				
Number of Customers Served:	4,915	4,966	4,694	4,468
Eligibility Determinations:	2,269	2,076	1,813	1,945
Number of Customers Competitively Employed:	728	717	715	622
External Factors (check all that apply): NA				
<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:				
Other agencies are luring experienced VR counselors away by offering higher pay.				
Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply):				
<input type="checkbox"/> Training			<input type="checkbox"/> Technology	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Personnel			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)	
Recommendations:				
The Division is currently studying the VR counselor retention and recruitment issue with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. The intent is to submit a Legislative Budget Request issue this fiscal year identifying the problem and requesting funding to resolve this problem.				

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	\$17,918	\$4,418 Over	32.73%

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 previous estimate was projected incorrectly.

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 has exceeded this measure since Fiscal Year 99/00. Request that the Approved Standard be raised to \$16,500.

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 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
1,500/55.2%	1,873/73.36%	373 Over	24.86%

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 previous estimate was projected incorrectly.

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:

Larger older population applied for services.

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

- Training Technology
- Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

The Division has exceeded this measure since Fiscal Year 99/00. Request that the Approved Standard be raised to 1,700.

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 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
36/67.3%	112/81.16%	76 Over	211.11%

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:

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

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

- Training Technology
- Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Request that the Approved Standard be raised to 100.

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 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
47/26.5%	71/68.27%	24 Over	51.06%

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:

The target population has increased and will continue to do so.

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

- Training Technology
- Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

Request that the Approved Standard be raised to 70.

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
2,035	5,379	3,344 Over	164.32%

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:

The previous projected estimates were inaccurate. The demographics and results support this conclusion.

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 Division has exceeded this measure since Fiscal Year 99/00. Request that the Approved Standard be raised to 4,000.

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 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
1,425	2,645	1,220 Over	85.61%

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 previous projected estimates were inaccurate. The demographics and results support this conclusion.

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 has exceeded this measure since Fiscal Year 99/00. Request that the Approved Standard be raised to 2,500.

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 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
13,100	11,854	1,246 Under	9.51%

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 not met this Standard since FY 01/02. It was projected inaccurately.

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 Approved Standard should be decreased to 11,700.

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 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
60	44	16 Under (less is better)	26.66%

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:

Federal guidelines mandate eligibility must be completed within 60 days. Since the Actual Performance Results is less than 60 days the results have exceeded the Federal 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:

There are no management efforts to address this difference because the results exceed the Standard.

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
- 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
114	78	36 Under	31.58%

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 results are directly related to the VR counselor retention and recruiting problem identified in the explanation of low production for the ‘**Measure: Number/percent of rehabilitation customers gainfully employed at least 90 days**’.

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 Division is currently studying the VR counselor retention and recruitment issue with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. The intent is to submit a Legislative Budget Request issue this fiscal year identifying the problem and requesting funding to resolve this problem.

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
 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
\$19.65	\$29.82	\$10.17 Over	51.76%

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:

Actual Performance Results will fluctuate based on the number of customers served and increases or decreases in the Library's General Revenue budget.

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

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

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 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
153	154	1 Over	.7%

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:

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
 - 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	3	2 Under	40.0%

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 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
- 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 Approved Standard be adjusted from 5 to 2.

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
- 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	7	2 Over	40.0%

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:

Recommend that the Approved Standard be increased from 5 to 6.

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 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
44,290	39,040	5,250	11.85%

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 original estimate was too high. The Approved Standard was calculated using three year trend data based on the number of customers served with an adjustment for estimated growth. The estimation for growth was higher than what has actually happened.

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:

Recommend that the Approved Standard be reduced to 38,290.

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
1,250,000	1,483,709	233,709 Over	18.696%

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:

Increasing demand for items in Braille and talking book formats have exceeded 1.3 million for the fourth year. Recommend that the Approved Standard be increased to 1,350,000.

LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education
Program: Workforce Development
Service: Postsecondary Education Services
Measure: Number/Percent persons earning occupational completion points, at least one of which is 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 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
13,910	2,055	11,855	85%

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 Workforce Estimating Conference tightened the criteria for occupations on their high wage/high skill list, resulting in many occupations dropping off the list, beginning is 2004-05.

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:

The difference is largely a result of changing definitions for high wage/high skill occupations. Many programs not on the high wage/high skill list are still important to the community and should be maintained. The resources have not been available to district technical programs to expand into more high wage/high skill offerings.

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

- Training Technology
- Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education
Program: Workforce Development
Service: Postsecondary Education Services
Measure: Number/percent of persons earning vocational certificate occupational completion points, at least one of which is 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)

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
5,282	4,700	582	11%

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 Workforce Estimating Conference tightened the criteria for occupations on their new entrants' list, resulting in many occupations dropping off the list, beginning is 2004-05.

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:

The difference is largely a result of changing definitions for new entrants' list occupations. Many programs not on the list are still important to the community and should be maintained. The resources have not been available to district technical programs to expand programs.

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

- Training Technology
- Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

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%	61%	8	12%

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 difference is at least partly due to the increase in private concurrent use sites on community college campuses. Community college students often feel more at ease on a community college campus rather than in a large university.

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

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

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 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
75%	74%	1	1.3%

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:

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 FCCS will continue to track this measure as one component of our accountability process. This information is then shared with all 28 colleges.

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 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
59%	57%	2	3.4%

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:

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%	35%	1	2.8%

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:

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:

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 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
75%	74%	1	1.3%

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:

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:

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
- 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
5,346 (23%) 2,275	12,234 (37%) 2,020	255 FTE	11%

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:

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
 - 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
2,138 (34%)	2,956 (32%)	818	38%

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:

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 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
153 (31%)	177 (29%)	24	16%

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:

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%)	187 (16%)	82	78%

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:

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	2,754	177	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:

The list of high-skill/high-wage occupations is not consistent over time thereby making it extremely difficult to accurately compare these results with those of previous years.

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

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

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 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
100,000	123,527	23,527	23.5%

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:

Enrollment increase

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:

Work closely with K-12 on college-level skills needed for success

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:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
Rate 65.0%	56.9%	-8.1%	-12.5%
Number 11,500	9,354	-2,146	-18.7%

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:

Although the rate of turnover has declined somewhat in recent months, DVR continues to experience staff turnover in direct service positions largely because salaries are not competitive with those in 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 each new counselor before s/he can work independently or carry a full caseload. Finally, staff turnover requires some supervisors to carry a substantial caseload, reducing their ability to coach, provide supervision and monitor performance. The emphasis on serving the most significantly disabled individuals competes with this high performance goal of 11,500 (65.0%) of customers gainfully employed because these individuals typically require a greater investment of resources, more involvement with their counselors and take longer to complete the rehabilitation process.

The Division has tracked this measure since SFY1999 using the methodology described in the Validity & Reliability Report. Review of performance for seven years shows that the best performance number was 9,987 (SFY2003) and the highest rate was 59.8% (SFY1999), with the same number of field staff positions as at present. The respective seven year averages are 9,381 and 56.2%. The SFY2006-2007 standard for the number should be reduced to 10,000 and the standard for the rate should be reduced to 60.0%.

External Factors (check all that apply):

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

Explanation:

Both the rate and number gainfully employed are substantially below standard. The number is slightly below SFY2003-04 performance, primarily because 68 DVR units and subunits across the state were closed for almost 2000 hours due to the hurricanes. The immediate result was the loss of more than 13,000 client service hours---the equivalent of 6 full-time counseling positions. The impact continues with offices that remain closed or are inadequate so that field staff must share space and other resources. The rate for the current fiscal year exceeds the Federal standard of 55.8% and is 2.7% above performance in the prior year. This improvement in efficiency reflects process improvements that have been made.

Management Efforts to Address Differences/Problems (check all that apply): Training Personnel Technology 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. Process improvements have been initiated to reduce the time for processes and eliminate repetition. Recruitment of front line staff is being addressed and the hiring process is being examined for ways to improve efficiency. In addition, a plan to reward high performing counseling teams is being developed.

The training program for counselors is being re-designed. Triannual training for supervisory personnel was implemented in SFY2003-04 and continues.

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 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%	53.1%	-5.4%	-9.2%
Number 9,775	7,109	-2,666	-27.3%

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 subset of the first outcome measure, and is affected by the same factors. Although both the number and rate are below standard, the rate is 2.6% higher than in the 2003-2004 fiscal year.

The Division has tracked this measure since SFY1999 using the methodology described in the Validity & Reliability Report. Review of performance for seven years shows that the best performance number for this measure was 7,929 (SFY2000) and the highest rate was 56.8% (SFY1999), with the same number of field staff positions as at present. The respective seven year averages are 7,317 and 52.9%. The seven year average for the percentage of customers gainfully employed who are significantly disabled is 78%.

If the standards for the first outcome performance measure are changed, the numeric standard for the number should be reset to 8,000 to maintain the emphasis on serving the most severely disabled. The SFY2006-2007 standard for the rate should be reduced to 56.5%, slightly higher than the Federal standard (55.8%) for the rehabilitation rate for all customers.

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.

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 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%	73.3%	-3.7%	-4.8%
Number 1,725	2,245	520	30.1%

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. Although both the number and rate are below standard, the rate is 2.0% higher than in the 2003-2004 fiscal year.

The Division has tracked this measure since SFY1999 using the methodology described in the Validity & Reliability Report. Review of performance for seven years shows that the best performance number for this measure was 2,346 (SFY2003) and the highest rate was 74.1% (SFY2001), with the same number of field staff positions as at present. The respective seven year averages are 2,080 and 72.6%. The seven year average for the percentage of customers gainfully employed who are significantly disabled is 78%.

If the standards for the first outcome performance measure are changed, the numeric standard for the number should be reset to 2,000 to maintain the emphasis on serving the most severely disabled. The SFY2006-2007 standard for the rate should be reduced to 76.0%, reflecting the fact that these individuals typically require fewer services and less time, and are more likely to enter gainful employment than are more severely disabled persons.

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.

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:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
Rate 97.5%	99.9%	2.4%	2.5%
Number 11,213	9,347	-1,866	-16.6%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) | |

Explanation:

This is a variation of the first outcome measure, and is affected by the same factors. This standard for numbers cannot be met unless the standard for the first measure (number of customers gainfully employed) is met. The rate exceeds the performance standard and is 0.2% higher than for SFY2003-2004.

The Division has tracked this measure since SFY1999 using the methodology described in the Validity & Reliability Report. The seven-year numeric average for the measure is 9,261; for the rate the seven year average is 98.7%.

If the numeric standard for the first outcome performance measure is changed, the SFY2006-2007 numeric standard for this measure should be changed to 9,750 to be consistent with the standard for number gainfully employed. The rate should not be changed. The rationale for this is based on the expected increase in referrals from the Agency for Persons with Disabilities who may be more difficult to place in competitive employment.

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:

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):

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

Recommendations:

This is a variation of the first outcome measure; the same recommendations are applicable.

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%	64.2%	-3.3%	-4.9%
6,300	6,028	-272	-4.3%

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:

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.

LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Education
Program: Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Service/Budget Entity: General Program
Measure: Average annual earning 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
\$17,500	\$17,855	\$355	2.0%

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:

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:

LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Education
Program: Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Service/Budget Entity: General Program
Measure: Average annual earning 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

Approved GAA Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
\$18,500	\$19,245	+\$745	+4.0%

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:

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:

Individuals with a disability typically cannot perform the kinds of jobs that developed in response to the hurricanes. Damage to businesses reduced the availability of other positions or the hours available.

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

- Training Technology
- Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

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 payers

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
7.5%	6.0%	-1.5%	-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:

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. A cadre of employees in headquarters now have primary responsibility for the recovery process. This, plus increased use of technology, has resulted in a slight increase over SFY2003-2004 performance.

The Division has tracked this measure since SFY1999 using the methodology described in the Validity & Reliability Report. The eight-year average is 7.8%. The average for the last five fiscal years has varied from 4.85% to 6.03%. The 2006-2007 standard for this measure should be reset to 7%.

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 continues to educate field staff about the value of and process for recovery of monies from third party payors and has improved the use of technology for such recovery efforts.

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	\$3,491	\$141	4.2%

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:

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.

Learning about community resources that can provide comparable benefits is one of the most time-consuming elements in the education of newly hired counseling staff.

The Division has tracked performance on this measure since it entered performance-based budgeting, using the methodology described in the Validity and Reliability Report. This standard should be increased to \$4,250 to reflect the rising cost of living and increasing costs of medical care and other goods and 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:

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 approximately \$25 but cannot reasonably expect to continue to do so in view of the rising costs of all goods and services.

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.

LRPP EXHIBIT III: 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 all 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	\$402	\$ 2	0.4%

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 on the previous measure addressing a different set of customers, those who are not significantly disabled, and is affected by the same set of internal factors.

The Division has tracked performance on this measure since it entered performance-based budgeting, using the methodology described in the Validity and Reliability Report. This standard should be increased to \$475 to reflect the rising cost of living and increasing costs of medical care and other goods and 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:

This is a variation on the previous measure addressing a different set of customers, those who are not significantly disabled, and is affected by the same set of external factors.

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

- Training Technology
- Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

This is a variation on the previous measure addressing a different set of customers, those who are not significantly disabled, and is addressed by the same recommendations.

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	23,424	-5,576	-19.2%

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 affects this measure, reducing productivity and efficiency, because newly hired counselors need 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.

The Division has tracked this measure since it entered performance based budgeting, using the methodology described in the Validity & Reliability Report. Review of performance for seven years shows that the best performance number was 26,262 (SFY2002), with the same number of field staff positions as at present. The seven year average is 24,719. The SFY2006-2007 standard should be changed to 25,000.

External Factors (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Unavailable | <input type="checkbox"/> Technological Problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal/Legislative Change | <input checked="" 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:

Performance here was also affected by the closure of 68 offices for approximately 2000 hours, resulting in the loss of more than 13,000 hours in which clients could otherwise have been served. Some areas continued to share computers, office space and other resources for an additional 60-70 days. A related factor is the damage to businesses and service providers who could not operate at full capacity until damages were repaired and utilities available.

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:

Process improvements have been identified and, in some instances, initiated, but it is too soon to determine their impact on downtime and rework.

LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Education
Program: Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Service: General Program
Measure: Number of written service plans

- 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
21,700	17,120	-4,580	-21.1%

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 for Output 1 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.

The Division has tracked this measure since it entered performance based budgeting, using the methodology described in the Validity & Reliability Report. Review of performance for seven years shows that the best performance number was 20,102 (SFY1999), with the same number of field staff positions as at present. The seven year average is 18,556.

The SFY2006-2007 standard should be changed to 19,000. The name should be changed to Number of Individualized Plans for Employment written to align the terminology with the Rehabilitation Services Administration terminology and simplify comparison with other state vocational rehabilitation agencies.

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 external factors discussed for Output 1 apply to this measure as well.

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

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

The recommendations designed to increase the number of eligibility determinations will also affect this performance measure.

LRPP Exhibit III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Education
Program: Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Service/Budget Entity: General Program
Measure: Number of active cases

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	34,784	-2,716	-7.2%

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 number of referrals to DVR dropped in SFY2004-05, reducing the number of applicants and thus the potential number of active customers. Another potential factor is that from March through June customers moved through the earlier stages of the rehabilitation process faster than in previous months, approaching their employment goal more rapidly and reducing the number of months they were in the system.

The name of this measure should be changed to Number of Customers Served. The method for computation of this measure should also be changed to align it with the method used by the Federal Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) and the standard adjusted appropriately. Both measures have been tracked internally since 1999. The methodologies are reliable and valid. The proposed standard for the modified measure is 31,500.

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:

Client service hours lost due to hurricanes and the following recovery periods may have prevented individuals with disabilities from entering the vocational rehabilitation program.

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.

LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Education
Program: Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Service: General Program
Measure: Customer caseload per counselor
Action:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Outcome</u> Measure | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revision of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment of <u>Output</u> Measure | <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Measure |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adjustment of GAA Performance Standards | |

Approved Standard	Actual Performance Results	Difference (Over/Under)	Percentage Difference
125	94	-31	-24.8%

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Estimate Incorrect | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) | |

Explanation:

An informal survey of other state vocational rehabilitation agencies established the desired caseload per counselor in the range of 90-100. Florida DVR has begun to streamline the rehabilitation process and will continue to do so to the extent possible. Smaller caseloads improve the quality of rehabilitation by allowing customers more time with the counseling staff and increase the likelihood of success, e.g., customers placed in gainful employment.

The SFY2006-2007 standard for this measure should be reset to 100 to improve the quality of the rehabilitation process and increase the likelihood of successful outcomes.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify) |

Recommendations:

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 federal law
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
95.0%	88.0%	-7.0%	-7.4%

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 internal factors discussed concerning the number of eligibility determinations are equally relevant here.

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:

Performance for the last four months of the fiscal year ranged from 89% to 93% but was lower in the "hurricane" months because of closed offices and closed vendors and providers. This pulled the overall average down.

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

- Training Technology
- Personnel 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.

LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Education
Program: Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Service: Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services
Measure: **Percent of eligible injured workers receiving reemployment services sponsored by the Division with closed cases during the fiscal year and returned to suitable gainful 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
76.0%	91.0%	+15.0%	+19.7%

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:

The Bureau of Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services (BRRS) has continued to exceed its approved performance standard (+19.7%) although its experienced extensive staff vacancies in two of the district services delivery areas during the fiscal year. The BRRS increased its positive performance for this standard outcome by +4% over the Fiscal Year 2003-2004 outcome figure of 87%.

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:

The Bureau of Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services (BRRS) continues to implement process improvements by improving the turnover of cases and improving the timeframes by which injured workers are provided services. The delivery of services has been refocused through an early intervention mode where the injured worker is scheduled for services and provided job placement assistance as soon as possible. Vocational services provided by BRRS staff, such as employability skills training, job development and job placement, will continue to assist in expediting the process by which injured workers are returned to suitable work as soon as medically feasible.

Joint meetings and the sharing of individual performance data with private Vocational Evaluators contracted to provide vocational evaluations for injured workers has made a significant improvement in the quality of return-to-work programs being recommended during the evaluation process.

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

- Training Technology
- Personnel 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.

LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT

Department: Department of Education
Program: Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Service: Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services
Measure: Number of program applicants provided reemployment services.
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
2,525	2,636	+111	+4.4%

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 Bureau of Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services (BRRS) has continued to exceed its approved performance standard (+4.4%) although its experienced extensive staff vacancies in two of the district services delivery areas during the fiscal year. The impact of the aforementioned core vocational position vacancies caused the bureau to provide reemployment services for -102 or -4% less injured workers than during the previous fiscal year.

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:

The number of injured workers provided reemployment services are +4.4% above the approved standard. The BRRS continues to focus on implementing process improvements that will result in more injured workers provided services and returned to suitable, gainful employment. The BRRS also continues to focus on automating processes and developing web-based programs that will eliminate or reduce associated time consuming manual processes.

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

- Training Technology
- Personnel Other (Identify)

Recommendations:

The 2003 Workers' Compensation Law amendments, which became effective October 1, 2003, eliminated the additional 26 weeks of Rehabilitation Temporary Total Disability (RTTD) benefits injured workers received while enrolled in a training and education program. The amendments made the RTTD benefits inclusive in the 104 maximum weeks of allowable overall temporary total disability benefits. This law change has impacted the number of injured workers provided reemployment services since many do not return to the bureau after the initial orientation where they find out about the law impacts and the shorter duration of disability benefits for education and training.

The 2003 Law amendments also eliminated the bureau's ability to enroll students in shorter term and less costly programs provided by private institutions. Injured workers with dates of accidents on October 1, 2003 and after are now required to receive training and education only at a community college as designated in s.100.21 (3) or at a career center established under s.1001.44. This restriction is negatively impacting injured workers with a limited number of temporary total disability benefits remaining who may want to enroll in short term training programs but cannot do so because of law restrictions.

The bureau has submitted a Legislative Proposals for 2005-2006 to change the restrictions for training and education programs for injured workers solely from community colleges and career centers. The proposed Legislative Proposals requests that for all dates of accidents, training programs may be approved at private educational facilities when the training is not offered at a public facility or provides an overall cost/time savings to the workers' compensation system, which can be justified.

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: Number / Percent 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:

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.

The Number portion of the measure is calculated as the sum of all Successfully Rehabilitated VR Cases during the reporting period.

The Percent portion of the measure is calculated by dividing the total Successfully Rehabilitated VR Cases by the sum of the Successfully Rehabilitated VR Cases and Unsuccessfully Rehabilitated VR Cases.

A Successfully Rehabilitated VR Case is defined as a Status 26 Closure. This is further defined by 34 CFR Part 361 et al, as maintenance in an acceptable employment outcome for at least 90 days.

An Unsuccessfully Rehabilitated VR Case is defined as a Status 28 Closure during the reporting period.

A Case is defined as services performed for a client to achieve their goals. A client may have more than one case during the reporting period.

Validity:

CRIS contains consistent status codes that indicate application, eligibility, plan development, services, case success or failure. The methodology used to calculate this measure aggregates totals based upon the status codes of the client during the reporting period.

Reliability:

CRIS was developed to track client cases and provided services. CRIS is the sole repository for this type of data. Client information is entered in CRIS by associates in the district offices. Edits in CRIS ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. CRIS Reports are reviewed at all management levels statewide. Therefore, the methodology appears to be reliable.

New procedures have been developed for validating the integrity of established Performance Based Program Budgeting Measures generated by CRIS. Detailed extract reports are created so that results can be independently validated by the DBS user community.

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: Number / Percent of 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:

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.

A Clients Work Status is stored when a VR case is successfully closed, indicating the type of employment:
 1 – Competitive Employment 2 – Sheltered Employment 3 – Self Employment
 4 – Business Enterprises 5 – Homemaker 6 – Unpaid Family Worker

The Number portion of the measure is calculated as the sum of all VR Cases Closed in Status 26 during the reporting period, with a Work Status of 1, 3, or 4.

The Percent portion of the measure is calculated by dividing the Number portion of the measure by total of all VR Cases Closed in Status 26 with Work Statuses 1-6.

A Case is defined as services performed for a client to achieve their goals. A client may have more than one case during the reporting period.

Validity:

CRIS contains consistent status codes that indicate application, eligibility, plan development, services, case success or failure. The methodology used to calculate this measure aggregates totals based upon the status codes of the client during the reporting period.

Reliability:

CRIS was developed to track client cases and provided services. CRIS is the sole repository for this type of data. Client information is entered in CRIS by associates in the district offices. Edits in CRIS ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. CRIS Reports are reviewed at all management levels statewide. Therefore, the methodology appears to be reliable.

New procedures have been developed for validating the integrity of established Performance Based Program Budgeting Measures generated by CRIS. Detailed extract reports are created so that results can be independently validated by the DBS user community.

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 average 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:

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.

To calculate this measure The Total Annual Earnings are divided by the Total Number of Specific VR Cases.

Total Annual Earnings is defined as the sum of the Weekly Earnings of Specific VR Cases multiplied by 52 weeks.

Specific VR Cases are defined as all Successfully Closed VR Cases with a Work Status equal to 1, 2, 3 or 4 in the reporting period.

A Clients Work Status is stored when a VR case is successfully closed, indicating the type of employment:

1 – Competitive Employment	2 – Sheltered Employment	3 – Self Employment
4 – Business Enterprises	5 – Homemaker	6 – Unpaid Family Worker

Validity:

CRIS contains consistent status codes that indicate application, eligibility, plan development, services, case success or failure. The methodology used to calculate this measure aggregates totals based upon the status codes of the client during the reporting period.

Reliability:

CRIS was developed to track client cases and provided services. CRIS is the sole repository for this type of data. Client information is entered in CRIS by associates in the district offices. Edits in CRIS ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. CRIS Reports are reviewed at all management levels statewide. Therefore, the methodology appears to be reliable.

New procedures have been developed for validating the integrity of established Performance Based Program Budgeting Measures generated by CRIS. Detailed extract reports are created so that results can be independently validated by the DBS user community.

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: Number/Percent of 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.

The Number portion of the measure is calculated as the sum of all Successfully Rehabilitated Independent Living Adult Cases during the reporting period.

The Percent portion of the measure is calculated by dividing the Successfully Rehabilitated Independent Living Adult Cases by the sum of the Successfully Rehabilitated Independent Living Adult Cases and Unsuccessfully Rehabilitated Independent Living Adult Cases.

Successfully Rehabilitated Independent Living Adult Cases are defined as the Total ILAP Cases who were closed in Status 7, 25, or 33 during the reporting period.

Unsuccessfully Rehabilitated Independent Living Adult Cases are defined as Total ILAP Cases who were closed in Status 29 during the reporting period.

An Independent Living Adult Case is defined as services performed for a client to achieve their goals. A client may have more than one case during the reporting period.

Validity:

CRIS contains consistent status codes that indicate application, eligibility, plan development, services, case success or failure. The methodology used to calculate this measure aggregates totals based upon the status codes of the client during the reporting period.

Reliability:

CRIS was developed to track client cases and provided services. CRIS is the sole repository for this type of data. Client information is entered in CRIS by associates in the district offices. Edits in CRIS ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. CRIS Reports are reviewed at all management levels statewide. Therefore, the methodology appears to be reliable.

New procedures have been developed for validating the integrity of established Performance Based Program Budgeting Measures generated by CRIS. Detailed extract reports are created so that results can be independently validated by the DBS user community.

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: Number / Percent 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.

The Number portion of the measure is calculated as the sum of all Successfully Transitioned Early Intervention Cases during the reporting period.

The Percent portion is calculated by dividing Successfully Transitioned Early Intervention Cases by the sum of Unsuccessful Early Intervention Closures and Successfully Transitioned Early Intervention Cases.

Successfully Transitioned Early Intervention Cases are defined as the total number of Status 15's which occurred during the reporting period.

Unsuccessful Early Intervention Closures are defined as Children's Program Clients between the ages of 0 and less than 6 years old that closed as Status 28 or 30 during the reporting period.

An Early Intervention Cases is defined as services performed for a client, between the ages of 0 and less than 6 years old, to achieve their goals. A client may have more than one case during the reporting period.

Validity:

CRIS contains consistent status codes that indicate application, eligibility, plan development, services, case success or failure. The methodology used to calculate this measure aggregates totals based upon the status codes of the client during the reporting period.

Reliability:

CRIS was developed to track client cases and provided services. CRIS is the sole repository for this type of data. Client information is entered in CRIS by associates in the district offices. Edits in CRIS ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. CRIS Reports are reviewed at all management levels statewide. Therefore, the methodology appears to be reliable.

New procedures have been developed for validating the integrity of established Performance Based Program Budgeting Measures generated by CRIS. Detailed extract reports are created so that results can be independently validated by the DBS user community.

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: Number / Percent 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.

The Number portion of the measure is calculated as the sum of all Successfully Rehabilitated Children's Cases during the reporting period.

The Percent portion of the measure is calculated by dividing Successfully Rehabilitated Children's Cases by the sum of Unsuccessfully Rehabilitated Children's Cases and Successfully Rehabilitated Children's Cases.

Successfully Rehabilitated Children's Cases are defined as Children's Program Clients Ages 6+ closed in Status 26 during the reporting period.

Unsuccessfully Rehabilitated Children's Cases are defined as Children's Program Clients Ages 6+ closed in Status 28 or Status 30 during the reporting period.

A Children's Program Case is defined as services performed for a child between the ages of 6 and 21 years old, to achieve their goals. A child may have more than one case during the reporting period.

Validity:

CRIS contains consistent status codes that indicate application, eligibility, plan development, services, case success or failure. The methodology used to calculate this measure aggregates totals based upon the status codes of the client during the reporting period.

Reliability:

CRIS was developed to track client cases and provided services. CRIS is the sole repository for this type of data. Client information is entered in CRIS by associates in the district offices. Edits in CRIS ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. CRIS Reports are reviewed at all management levels statewide. Therefore, the methodology appears to be reliable.

New procedures have been developed for validating the integrity of established Performance Based Program Budgeting Measures generated by CRIS. Detailed extract reports are created so that results can be independently validated by the DBS user community.

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: 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 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 total all cases for clients that applied for services during the reporting period.

This is done by totaling all cases in Status 2 for Vocational Rehab and the Children's Program and all cases in Status 5 for the Independent Living /Adult Program, that occurred during the reporting period.

A Case is defined as services performed for a client to achieve their goals. A client may have more than one case during the reporting period.

Validity:

CRIS contains consistent status codes that indicate application, eligibility, plan development, services, case success or failure. The methodology used to calculate this measure aggregates totals based upon the status codes of the client during the reporting period.

Reliability:

CRIS was developed to track client cases and provided services. CRIS is the sole repository for this type of data. Client information is entered in CRIS by associates in the district offices. Edits in CRIS ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. CRIS Reports are reviewed at all management levels statewide. Therefore, the methodology appears to be reliable.

New procedures have been developed for validating the integrity of established Performance Based Program Budgeting Measures generated by CRIS. Detailed extract reports are created so that results can be independently validated by the DBS user community.

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: Number 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:

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:

CRIS contains consistent status codes that indicate application, eligibility, plan development, services, case success or failure. The methodology used to calculate this measure aggregates totals based upon the status codes of the client during the reporting period.

Reliability:

CRIS was developed to track client cases and provided services. CRIS is the sole repository for this type of data. Client information is entered in CRIS by associates in the district offices. Edits in CRIS ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. CRIS Reports are reviewed at all management levels statewide. Therefore, the methodology appears to be reliable.

New procedures have been developed for validating the integrity of established Performance Based Program Budgeting Measures generated by CRIS. Detailed extract reports are created so that results can be independently validated by the DBS user community.

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: Number 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:

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 which were in any open status, at any time during the reporting period.

A Case is defined as services performed for a client to achieve their goals. A client may have more than one case during the reporting period.

Validity:

CRIS contains consistent status codes that indicate application, eligibility, plan development, services, case success or failure. The methodology used to calculate this measure aggregates totals based upon the status codes of the client during the reporting period.

Reliability:

CRIS was developed to track client cases and provided services. CRIS is the sole repository for this type of data. Client information is entered in CRIS by associates in the district offices. Edits in CRIS ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. CRIS Reports are reviewed at all management levels statewide. Therefore, the methodology appears to be reliable.

New procedures have been developed for validating the integrity of established Performance Based Program Budgeting Measures generated by CRIS. Detailed extract reports are created so that results can be independently validated by the DBS user community.

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: Average 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:

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 dividing the total number of Days Lapsed by the total number of Eligibility Determinations.

An Eligibility Determination is defined as a Case from any program which was determined "eligible for service" or closed as "ineligible for services" during the reporting period.

Days Lapsed is defined as the number of days between the Eligibility Determination Date that occurred during the reporting period and the Application Date for that specific Eligibility Determination.

The Application Date is the Status Start Date from ILAP Status 5 or VR/CP Status 2.

The Eligibility Determination Date is the Status Start Date from ILAP Status 7 and 9, and the first 11, 13, 15 or 17 that falls within the reporting period. For VR/CP, the Status Start Date from status 8 or 10 that falls within the reporting period.

A Case is defined as services performed for a client to achieve their goals. A client may have more than one case during the reporting period.

Validity:

CRIS contains consistent status codes that indicate application, eligibility, plan development, services, case success or failure. The methodology used to calculate this measure aggregates totals based upon the status codes of the client during the reporting period.

Reliability:

CRIS was developed to track client cases and provided services. CRIS is the sole repository for this type of data. Client information is entered in CRIS by associates in the district offices. Edits in CRIS ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. CRIS Reports are reviewed at all management levels statewide. Therefore, the methodology appears to be reliable.

New procedures have been developed for validating the integrity of established Performance Based Program Budgeting Measures generated by CRIS. Detailed extract reports are created so that results can be independently validated by the DBS user community.

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:

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 dividing the Average Daily Caseload by the Number of Counselors on Staff.

The Average Daily Caseload is determined by identifying the total number of cases in any open status, for all programs, on the 15th of every month and dividing this total by 12. (*The Average Daily Caseload from the 15th of every month is used because of seasonal considerations. There is not 1 day in the year which could have been used as the basis for identifying a normal day's caseload.*)

The Number of Counselors on Staff is identified by the DBS Personnel Department. The current breakdown is 14 VR Supervisors, 44 VR Counselors, 22 Independent Living Counselors, and 12 Children's Counselors, for a total of 92.

A Case is defined as services performed for a client to achieve their goals. A client may have more than one case during the reporting period.

Validity:

CRIS contains consistent status codes that indicate application, eligibility, plan development, services, case success or failure. The methodology used to calculate this measure aggregates totals based upon the status codes of the client during the reporting period.

Reliability:

CRIS was developed to track client cases and provided services. CRIS is the sole repository for this type of data. Client information is entered in CRIS by associates in the district offices. Edits in CRIS ensure greater reliability and accuracy of data entered at the field level. CRIS Reports are reviewed at all management levels statewide. Therefore, the methodology appears to be reliable.

New procedures have been developed for validating the integrity of established Performance Based Program Budgeting Measures generated by CRIS. Detailed extract reports are created so that results can be independently validated by the DBS user community.

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:

All data related to customer registration and the circulation of reading materials is tracked by the Keystone Library Automation System (KLAS).

This measure is calculated by dividing the Library's General Revenue (State Funding) allocation for the fiscal year by the Total Number of Library Customers Served.

The Total Number of Library Customers Served is derived by generating the Patron Status Summary report from KLAS which identifies the total number of individuals and institutions registered for service at any time during the past twelve months.

Validity:

The Fiscal data 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.

KLAS contains consistent data elements there were designed to track library services and usage.

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.

Reliability:

Under the federal regulations governing the Library's services, the Library must retain the original application for service for all registered customers. The service status for each customer reported as receiving service may be verified by examination of the application files.

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: Number of blind vending food service facilities supported

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 related to tracking blind vending food service facilities are maintained in the Randolph-Sheppard Vending Program (RSVP) software program.

This measure is derived by generating the Facility General Report. The total blind vending service facilities supported are the total of Licensed Operator Facility Agreements (LOFA) in place during the reporting period.

Validity:

All Blind Business Operators prior to opening a facility must have a signed LOFA with DBS. RSVP tracks this information by maintaining the current status of the Facility. Those statuses are: Available, Closed Temporarily, Development, LOFA in Place or Opened.

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.

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.

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: Number 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 Sources and Methodology:

All new food service facilities that are constructed during the reporting period have been planned for prior to actual construct by the Business Enterprise Program (BEP). The number of facilities renovated are tracked manually in a Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet.

Validity:

On site visits by Regional Sales Managers ensures the project has been completed, the facility is open and is providing service.

Reliability:

These totals are derived from documents approving the renovation of the facilities, and from on site progress reports from Regional Sales Managers.

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: Number of new 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 Sources and Methodology:

All new food service facilities that are constructed during the reporting period have been planned for prior to actual construct by the Business Enterprise Program (BEP). The number of facilities constructed are tracked manually in a Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet.

Validity:

On site visits by Regional Sales Managers ensures the project has been completed, the facility is open and is providing service.

Reliability:

These totals are derived from documents approving the construction of the facilities, and from on site progress reports from Regional Sales Managers.

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 related to customer registration and the circulation of reading materials is tracked by the Keystone Library Automation System (KLAS).

This measure is derived by generating the Patron Status Summary report from KLAS which identifies the annual number of library customers served. This is defined as the total number of individuals and institutions registered for service at any time during the past twelve months.

Validity:

KLAS contains consistent data elements there were designed to track library services and usage.

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.

Reliability:

Under the federal regulations governing the Library's services, the Library must retain the original application for service for all registered customers. The service status for each customer reported as receiving service may be verified by examination of the application files.

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 related to customer registration and the circulation of reading materials is tracked by the Keystone Library Automation System (KLAS).

Items loaned by the Library include reading materials in Braille, cassette, disk, large type, and descriptive video formats.

This measure is calculated by adding the Total Number of Monographs (Books) and the Totals Number of Serials (Magazines) loaned during the reporting period. The two Totals are extracted by generating Circulation Reports from KLAS.

Validity:

KLAS contains consistent data elements there were designed to track library services and usage.

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.

Reliability:

Under the federal regulations governing the Library's services, the Library must retain the original application for service for all registered customers. The service status for each customer reported as receiving service may be verified by examination of the application files.

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 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--customers who are significantly or most significantly disabled; the same protocols are used for the analysis. Data are selected according to the same criteria for gainful employment. The criteria for assigning the significance of the disability are also well established.

Validity:

As for the first measure, this is a logical measure of the effectiveness of the rehabilitation process that has been used at the Federal and state levels for many years. Comments on the validity of the measure above are also applicable to this measure.

A second potential threat to validity is the accuracy of the assessment of the significance of a disability. These decisions are subject to the counselor's interpretation to some degree and influenced by the state and Federal mandate to provide services to the most severely disabled. This threat is mitigated to the extent possible by the use of well-established criteria for the levels of significance that are incorporated into policy and frequently discussed in training sessions. During SFY1996 the Division refined the criteria for assessing the severity of the disability, reducing this factor as a threat to validity. These criteria are again being addressed by a team whose goal is to simplify the criteria and standardize their application as much as possible.

Reliability:

Comments on the reliability for this measure, a subset of the first measure above, are equally applicable here. The measure is reliable, e.g., reproducible.

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. Consistent and continuing training for staff, coupled with the use of assessment instruments and the counselor's training and experience, assure the reliability of this measure to the extent possible.

Proposed Changes to Standards:

The Division has tracked this measure since SFY1999 using the methodology described above. Review of performance for seven years shows that the best performance number for this measure was 7,929 (SFY2000) and the highest rate was 56.8% (SFY1999), with the same number of field staff positions as at present. The respective seven year averages are 7,317 and 52.9%. The seven year average for the percentage of customers gainfully employed who are significantly disabled is 78%.

If the standards for the first outcome performance measure are changed, the SFY2006-2007 numeric standard should be reset to 8,000 to maintain the emphasis on serving the most severely disabled. The SFY2006-2007 standard for the rate should be reduced to 56.5%, slightly higher than the Federal standard (55.8%) for the rehabilitation rate for all customers.

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 all other VR disabled 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---customers who are not significantly disabled; the same protocols are used for the analysis. Data are selected according to the same criteria for gainful employment. The criteria for assigning the significance of the disability are also well established.

Validity:

As for the first measure, this is a logical measure of the effectiveness of the rehabilitation process that has been used at the Federal and state levels for many years. Comments on the validity of the measure above are also applicable to this measure.

A second potential threat to validity is the accuracy of the assessment of significance of a disability. These decisions are somewhat subject to the counselor's interpretation and influenced by the state and Federal mandate to serve the most severely disabled. This threat is mitigated to the extent possible by the use of well-established criteria for the levels of significance that are incorporated into policy and frequently discussed in training sessions. During SFY1996, the Division refined the criteria for assessing the severity of the disability, reducing this factor as a threat to validity. These criteria are again being addressed by a team whose goal is to simplify the criteria and standardize their application as much as possible.

Reliability:

Comments on the reliability for this measure, a subset of the first measure above, are equally applicable here. The measure is reliable, e.g., reproducible.

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 of "all other disabled", e.g., those who are not significantly disabled, is usually less demanding and thus a higher incidence of success is likely. Consistent and continuing training for staff coupled with the use of assessment instruments and the counselor's training and experience assure the reliability to the extent possible.

Proposed Changes to Standards:

The Division has tracked this measure since SFY1999 using the methodology described above. Review of performance for seven years shows that the best performance number for this measure was 2,346 (SFY2003) and the highest rate was 74.1% (SFY2001), with the same number of field staff positions as at present. The respective seven year averages are 2,080 and 72.6%. The seven year average for the percentage of customers gainfully employed who are significantly disabled is 78%.

If the standards for the first outcome performance measure are changed, the SFY2006-2007 numeric standard for this measure should be reset to 2,000 to maintain the emphasis on serving the most severely disabled. The SFY2006-2007 standard for the rate should be changed to 76.0%, reflecting the fact that these individuals typically require fewer services and less time, and are more likely to enter gainful employment than are more severely disabled persons.

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 is used to aggregate the data using well-established operational definitions for competitive employment based on the customer's work status at placement. This is a subset of the first measure, "gainfully employed". 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 (≥ 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.

Proposed Changes to Standards:

The Division has tracked this measure since SFY1999 using the methodology described above. The seven-year numeric average for the measure is 9,261; for the rate the seven year average is 98.7%. If the numeric standard for the first outcome performance measure is changed, the SFY2006-2007 numeric standard for this measure should be changed to 9,750 to be consistent with the standard for number gainfully employed. The rate should not be changed. The rationale for this is based on the expected increase in referrals from the Agency for Persons with Disabilities who may be more difficult to place in competitive employment.

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 another entity within the Florida Department of Education, the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP). Results 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 of customers retained in employment one year after placement is found for each quarter of the state fiscal year. The rate for each quarter is calculated by dividing the sum of the individuals found employed by the total number of participants found. For the fiscal year the number is computed by summing the individuals found employed for each of the four quarters. The rate is calculated by dividing the sum of the individuals found employed in each of the four quarters by the total number of participants found 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 since closure, e.g., an individual is recorded as employed whether s/he worked 1 week in a quarter, or 13 weeks in the quarter.

Data on employment are obtained from 97% of Florida’s employers, but no data are obtained from employers in Georgia or Alabama nor are data collected on those who are self-employed. 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.

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 earning 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 is used to aggregate the data using well-established operational definitions for 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.

The validity of this as a measure of the quality of the outcome is supported in principle by the use of multiple Federal measures that assess earnings as hourly wages.

Reliability:

The lack of available documentation may compromise the reliability of this measure. Earnings are "self-reported" by customers to their counselors. Initial entries for the week prior to the closure of the case may later be corrected in the RIMS data; these changes are not made to the static database. Additionally, earnings may be reported erroneously by the customer, either 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.

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 earning of VR customers 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 another entity within the Florida Department of Education, the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP). Results 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 earnings of customers retained in employment one year after placement is found for each quarter of the state fiscal year. Earnings for each quarter are multiplied by four to project annual earnings for the customers found employed in the quarter. Earnings for the fiscal year are obtained by summing the average earnings for each of the four quarters to obtain the annual projection.

Validity:

This is a good 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.

The value of this measure of the outcomes of vocational rehabilitation is supported by the fact that the Federal Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) is exploring its use. RSA is conducting a pilot test to determine whether all agencies will be able to conduct the match adequately and report findings in a timely manner.

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.

LRPP EXHIBIT: 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 payers

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 of direct costs of services recovered.

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 direct costs 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 by VR’s legal unit and tracked by VR’s budget office are also highly reliable.

Proposed Change to Standard:

The Division has tracked this measure since SFY1998 using the methodology described above. The eight-year average is 7.8%. The average for the last five fiscal years has varied from 4.85% to 6.03%. The SFY2006-2007 standard for this measure should be reset to 7%.

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 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 direct costs to the Division of services to all significantly and most significantly disabled customers closed by the number of significantly and most 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.

Proposed Change to Standard:

The Division has tracked performance on this measure since it entered performance-based budgeting, using the methodology described above. Trend analysis based on the last seven years of costs shows the SFY2006-2007 standard should be increased to \$4,250 to reflect changes in the cost of living and the markedly increased costs of medical care.

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 all 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 direct 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 program, 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.

Proposed Change to Standard:

The Division has tracked performance on this measure since it entered performance-based budgeting, using the methodology described above. Trend analysis based on the last seven years of costs shows the SFY2006-2007 standard should be increased to \$475 to reflect the rising cost of living and the markedly increased costs of medical care and other goods and services.

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. An "eligibility determination" includes all persons determined to be eligible for services as well as a limited number of persons determined to be ineligible. Inclusion of a determination of ineligibility is related to established definitions of the reason for ineligibility.

Validity:

Determining whether an applicant is eligible for services in the VR program is an important and often time-consuming portion of the rehabilitation process. This output measure is a valid indicator of productivity.

Validity of this measure has been improved by limiting the measure to the specific statuses recognized by RSA as determination of eligibility or ineligibility by counseling staff 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. Periodic case reviews by supervisory staff and by RSA contribute to the reliability of eligibility determination.

In 2003-2004 the Division convened a team to improve standardization of the methodology statewide to the extent possible, given the complexity of the process and the variation in the customers.

Proposed Changes to Standard:

The Division has tracked this measure since it entered performance based budgeting, using the methodology described above. Review of performance for seven years shows that the best performance number was 26,262 (SFY2002), with the same number of field staff positions as at present. The seven year average is 24,719. The SFY2006-2007 standard should be changed to 25,000.

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 Written Service Plans

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. Preparation of a good Individualized Plan for Employment (IPE) is critical to the customer's successful achievement of employment.

Reliability:

The criteria for development of 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.

In 2003-04 the Division convened a team to examine the process and improve standardization of the methodology statewide to the extent possible, given the complexity of the process and the variation in the customers' needs, knowledge, skills and abilities.

Proposed Changes to Standard:

The Division has tracked this measure since it entered performance based budgeting, using the methodology described above. Review of performance for seven years shows that the best performance number was 20,102 (SFY1999), with the same number of field staff positions as at present. The seven year average is 18,556.

The SFY2006-2007 standard should be changed to 18,500. The name should be changed to Number of Individualized Plans for Employment written to align this number with the Rehabilitation Services Administration terminology and simplify comparison with other state vocational rehabilitation agencies.

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 active cases

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. An "active" case is any case that applied in a prior time period and remains open.

The proposed new methodology is also a simple sum that uses the SAS program to count persons exiting the program in one of four closure statuses. Changing the methodology will align the measure of customers served with that of the Federal Rehabilitation Services Administration, making easier to compare Florida's performance to other state vocational rehabilitation agencies.

Validity:

This is a valid measure of productivity for the VR program. Use of the monthly average represents unique customers for the interval measured and reflects the workload of VR personnel.

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.

Proposed Changes to Measure and Standard:

The name of this measure should be changed to Number of Customers Served. The method for computation of this measure should also be changed to align it with the method used by the Federal Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) and the standard adjusted appropriately. Both measures have been tracked internally since 1999. The methodologies are reliable and valid. The proposed standard for the modified measure is 31,500.

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.

"Caseload" is all active customers and those closed in specified statuses who are affiliated with a counselor. The measure is calculated by the SAS program as the median ("middle") value for all counselor caseloads during the timeframe. The median is computed for each month, then recomputed for quarterly reports and for the fiscal year.

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. Reliability is contingent upon recalculation of a true median as time frames shift rather than mathematical computation of the caseload as an arithmetic average.

Proposed Changes to Standard:

The Division has tracked this measure since it entered performance based budgeting, using the methodology described above. The SFY2006-2007 standard should be changed to 100 to improve the quality of the rehabilitation process and increase the likelihood of successful outcomes.

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 federal law

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 for the timeframe that meet the Federal mandate by the total number of eligibility determinations made within the time frame. "Eligibility determination" is defined in Measure 11. To meet the Federal mandate, the determination must have occurred within 60 days of application, or the customer must have been placed in extended evaluation, or the customer's agreement to an extension of the eligibility period must be documented in the customer's file.

Validity:

The discussion of validity for the number of eligibility determinations also applies to this measure. The timeliness of the eligibility determination has been validated as an important factor in the likelihood of a customer's successful completion of the rehabilitation program.

Reliability:

The reliability for this measure was examined with the same methodology used for the measure of the number of eligibility determinations. Criteria for each of the three categories that meet the mandate are also well established with Federal regulations and incorporated into the Division's training and policies.

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 (Automated Reemployment and Medical Information System). 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 at 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.

Proposed Change:

This measure should be included in the listing of official approved measures for the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

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 returning to suitable gainful 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 (Automated Reemployment and Medical Information System). 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 at 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.

Proposed Change:

This measure should be included in the listing of official approved measures for the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Department: Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education
Program: Workforce Development
Service: Postsecondary Education Services
Measure: Number/Percent persons earning occupational completion points, at least one of which is 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:

Data on program completers is tracked through the Florida Education Training and Placement Information Program databases on continuing education and earnings. Data is only available on public postsecondary institutions and for employers who are part of the unemployment insurance wage database. The Workforce Estimating Conference criteria for high wage/high skill occupations are set on an annual basis. Recent changes in the criteria have resulted in fewer occupations appearing on the list used for this measure.

Validity:

This is a valid measure of public technical centers contribution to the need for skill workers in high wage/high skill areas.

Reliability:

Data collected on continuing education and earnings is the best available at this time. However, there are some gaps in the data. In addition, the Workforce Estimating Conference high wage/high skill list changes every year and is therefore, a moving target.

Proposed Change to Standard:

Because of changes to the methodology for the high wage/high skill list, the Division requests an approved standard that more accurately reflects the potential enrollment in the programs on the list. The 2006-07 measure should be adjusted to 2,055 to reflect recent changes.

LRPP EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Department: Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education
Program: Workforce Development
Service: Postsecondary Education Services
Measure: Number/percent of persons earning vocational certificate occupational completion points, at least one of which is 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)

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 on program completers is tracked through the Florida Education Training and Placement Information Program databases on continuing education and earnings. Data is only available on public postsecondary institutions and for employers who are part of the unemployment insurance wage database. The Workforce Estimating Conference criteria for new entrants' list occupations are set on an annual basis. Recent changes in the criteria have resulted in many fewer occupations appearing on the high wage/high skill list used for this measure.

Validity:

This is a valid measure of public technical centers contribution to the need for skill workers in high wage/high skill areas.

Reliability:

Data collected on continuing education and earnings is the best available at this time. However, there are some gaps in the data. In addition, the Workforce Estimating Conference new entrants' list changes every year and is therefore, a moving target.

Proposed Change to Standard:

Because of changes to the methodology for the new entrants' list, the Division requests an approved standard that more accurately reflects the potential enrollment in the programs on the list. The 2006-07 measure should be adjusted to 4,700 to reflect recent changes.

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