

# **Florida Department Of Education**

## **LONG-RANGE PROGRAM PLAN FY 2006/07 – FY 2011/12**



**Draft  
September 30, 2006**



## Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Agency Mission and Goals .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Strategic Planning .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Agency Goals and Objectives .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Outcomes with Performance Projection Tables .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Linkages to Governor’s Priorities .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Trends and Conditions .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Exhibit I: Agency Workforce Plan.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Exhibit II: Performance Measures and Standards .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Exhibit III: Performance Measure Assessment.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Exhibit IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability.....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Division of Blind Services .....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>Private Colleges and Universities.....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>Student Financial Aid .....</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>Public Schools, Non-FEFP .....</b>	<b>133</b>
<b>Workforce Development .....</b>	<b>138</b>
<b>Community Colleges .....</b>	<b>149</b>
<b>State Board of Education.....</b>	<b>176</b>
<b>Exhibit V .....</b>	<b>182</b>
<b>Exhibit VI .....</b>	<b>194</b>
<b>Glossary of Terms.....</b>	<b>195</b>
<b>Explanation of Acronyms.....</b>	<b>203</b>

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

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

As stated in s. 1008.31(3), F.S., “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. . . .”

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

The four statutory goals for Florida’s K-20 education system [s. 1008.31(3), F.S.] 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 post-secondary 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.

### **Strategic Planning**

As refined in May of 2006 by the State Board of Education, the Department of Education strategic plan includes the following major performance measures, called *Tier One* measures:

#### ***Strategic Imperative 1: Teachers***

- ***New Hires:*** Increase the number of teachers to meet instructional demands. (1.1.a.)
- ***Teacher Retention:*** Increase the retention of teachers in Florida. (1.2.a.)
- ***Differentiated Pay:*** Annually increase the total bonus earned by teachers based on student achievement. (1.3.a.)
- ***“Highly-Qualified” Teachers:*** Increase the percent of core courses taught by teachers who meet NCLB highly-qualified criteria. (1.1.b.)

- **High-Performing Teachers:** Increase the number of high-performing teachers in Florida. (1.3.b.)

### **Strategic Imperative 2: Standards**

- **Sunshine State Standards:** Revise Sunshine State Standards on an established cycle. (2.1.a.)
- **Science FCAT:** Include Science FCAT scores as a component of school grades. (2.1.b.)
- **Middle and High School Standards:** Improve student retention and progression rates through middle and high school. (2.2.a.)

### **Strategic Imperative 3: Students**

- **Student Proficiency:** Improve the proficiency of grade 3-10 students in reading, math and writing. (3.1.a.)
- **Closing the Gap:** Increase the progress of subgroups toward meeting proficiency at a rate faster than the overall state average. (3.1.b.)
- **High School Graduation:** Increase the percent of high school graduates. (3.2.a.)
- **College Path Success:** Increase the proportion of students in a cohort who have completed an Associate degree or have transferred to another institution in a program leading to a degree, tracked from the point at which they had completed one term of college-level work, reported at annual intervals out to six years. (3.2.c.)
- **Credential Attainment:** Improve credential attainment in adult and career education programs: (1) Adult General Education Programs (GED and Adult High School); and (2) Career-Technical Certificate Programs. (3.2.d)
- **Blind Services Customers:** Improve the success rates of Blind Services Customers. (3.5.a.)
- **Vocational Rehabilitation Customers:** Improve the number of Vocational Rehabilitation customers who achieve successful employment outcomes after developing a plan for employment. (3.5.b.)
- **VPK Participation:** Increase the VPK participation rates. (3.4.a.)
- **Kindergarten Readiness:** Increase the number and percent of children who are “ready for kindergarten” upon completion of VPK. (3.4.b.)

### **Strategic Imperative 4: Leaders**

- **K-12 School Leadership:** Increase the number of school administrator Leadership Training Opportunities. (4.1.a.)

### **Strategic Imperative 5: Choice**

- **Quality Choice Options:** Increase participation in choice options available to students through federal, state and district choice programs: (1) Students Using Options by Program; and (2) Students Using Options by District. (5.1.a.)
- **High Performing Charter Schools:** Increase the number and percentage of high performing charter schools and the students attending them: (1) “A” or “B” Charter School Institutions; and (2) Students in “A” or “B” Charter Schools. (5.2.a.)

***Strategic Imperative 6: Workforce***

- ***Workforce Education Program Placements:*** Increase the percent of placements from High Skill/High Wage and Targeted Occupations List programs. (6.1.a.)

***Strategic Imperative 7: Return on Investment***

- ***ROI Action Plan:*** Increase the ratio of student achievement relative to financial resources. (7.2.a.)
- ***Disaster Preparedness:*** Ensure all school districts, public schools, workforce centers, community colleges, and DOE have emergency operations plans compliant with National Incident Management System (NIMS). (7.3.a.)
- ***Postsecondary ROI Plans:*** Develop and present to the State Board a plan for collecting and reporting postsecondary ROI data, including baseline data for workforce, community colleges and state universities. (7.2.b.)

***Strategic Imperative 8: Access***

- ***Postsecondary Continuation Rate:*** Increase postsecondary continuation rate of high school standard graduates (within 1 year following high school graduation). (8.1.a.)
- ***Student Transitions in Adult General and Career Education:*** Increase the percentage of Adult General Education and Career Education students who transition to high level educational programs and/or who improve their economic self-sufficiency as measured by employment. (8.1.b.)

**Mission Statements by Activity**

As stated in s. 1008.31(3), F.S., “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. . . .”

**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.

**Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Education**

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."



## Agency Goals and Objectives

### *Goal 1: Highest Student Achievement*

#### *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 1E:**

To increase the proportion of A.A. degree transfers to state universities who successfully complete upper-division coursework

**OBJECTIVE 1F:**

To monitor the number/percent of A.A. partial completers transferring to a state university

**OBJECTIVE 1G:**

To monitor students' preparation upon entrance into the community college

**OBJECTIVE 1H**

To increase the percent of A.A. degree transfers to the State University System who started in College Prep and who successfully complete upper-division coursework

**OBJECTIVE 1I**

To monitor the number/percent/FTEs of A.A. students who do not complete a given proportion of credit hours within 200 percent of time

### *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 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 provide access to postsecondary education through the Florida Community College System

**OBJECTIVE 2H:**

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

**OBJECTIVE 2J:**

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

**OBJECTIVE 2L:**

To monitor the proportion of college preparatory students who continue on to college-level coursework

**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 proportion of non-transfer A.A. graduates who are employed in high wage jobs rather than continuing their education

**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 monitor the proportion of the A.A. students graduating within four years

**OBJECTIVE 4F:**

To increase the number 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 number 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 number 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 number 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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
42.5%	45%	47%	49%	50%	51%

**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 2001-02	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2001-02	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2001-02	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
61%	62%	62%	62%	62%	62%

**OBJECTIVE 1E:** To increase the proportion of A.A. degree transfers to state universities who successfully complete upper-division coursework

**OUTCOME 1E.1:** Increase the percentage of students who earn a 2.5 GPA or above within 2 years after transfer to the SUS

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
74%	74%	75%	75%	75%	75%

**OBJECTIVE 1F:** To monitor the number/percent of A.A. partial completers transferring to a state university

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

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
17,796 61.5%	61%	61%	61%	61%	61%

**OBJECTIVE 1G:** To monitor students' preparation upon entrance into the community college

**OUTCOME 1G.1:** Stabilize or decrease the number of students receiving college preparatory instruction

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 successfully complete upper-division coursework

**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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
71%	73%	75%	75%	75%	75%

**OBJECTIVE 1I** The monitor the number/percent/FTEs of A.A. students who do not complete a given proportion of credit hours within 200 percent of time

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

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
924	973	980	985	990	995

McKay Scholarship Program for Students with Disabilities

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
673	700	705	710	715	720

Opportunity Scholarship Program

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
59%	62%	64%	66%	68%	70%

**OBJECTIVE 2D:** Annually improve the transfer rate of associate in arts degree students into state universities

**OUTCOME 2D.1:** Increase the Associate in Arts continuation rate into the SUS

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
61%	64%	66%	68%	70%	72%

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

Baseline FY 2001-02	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
149,825 FTEs	5.27%	4.13%	3.66%	3.27%	3.27%

**OBJECTIVE 2G:** To provide access to postsecondary education through the Florida Community College System

**OUTCOME 2G.1:** The percentage of prior year high school graduates enrolled in community colleges

Baseline Fall 2003	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
34%	34%	35%	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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
19,000	20,000	20,500	21,000	21,500	22,000

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

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

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
61%	70%	80%	90%	100%	100%

**OBJECTIVE 2J:** To monitor the proportion of college preparatory students who continue on to college-level coursework

**OUTCOME 2 J.1** Increase 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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
75.5%	75%	76%	77%	78%	79%

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

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

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
71	70	70	70	70	70

**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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
27.9%	28%	29%	30%	32%	34%

**OUTCOME 3B.2:** Technical center completions\*

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
29.1%	30%	32%	32%	34%	34%

**OUTCOME 3B.3:** Technical center placements\*

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
32.5%	33%	34%	35%	36%	37%

**OUTCOME 3B.4:** Community college enrollments\*

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
45.7%	47%	49%	50%	52%	52%

**OUTCOME 3B.5:** Community college completions\*

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
35.98%	37%	39%	40%	42%	43%

**OUTCOME 3B.6:** Community college placements\*

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
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 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
12,893	14,000	14,500	15,000	15,500	16,000

**OBJECTIVE 3D:** To monitor the proportion of non-transfer A.A. graduates who are employed in high wage jobs rather than continuing their education**OUTCOME 3D.1:** Decrease the percentage of non-transfer A.A. graduates who are not continuing their education and who are employed full-time in jobs earning at least \$10.74 an hour

Baseline FY 2003-04	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
57%	58%	58%	58%	58%	58%

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

Baseline FY 2000-01	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
64%	75%	85%	90%	95%	95%

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

Below the Governor's priorities are linked to the objectives adopted in the strategic planning process of the Department of Education:

### 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 1E | • To increase the proportion of A.A. degree transfers to state universities who successfully complete upper-division coursework.   |
| OBJECTIVE 1F | • To monitor the number/percent of A.A. partial completers transferring to a state university.   |
| OBJECTIVE 1G | • To monitor students' preparation upon entrance into the community college.   |
| OBJECTIVE 1H | • To increase the percent of A.A. degree transfers to the State University System who started in College Prep and who successfully complete upper-division coursework.                       |
| 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 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 provide access to postsecondary education through the Florida Community College System.   |
| OBJECTIVE 2L | • To monitor the proportion of college preparatory students who continue on to college-level coursework.   |
| 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 3F | • To improve services and employment opportunities for all customers of the Vocational Rehabilitation Program by closing the gaps in performance and service capacity |
| OBJECTIVE 4F | • To increase the number 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 number 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 number 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 number 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 proportion of non-transfer A.A. graduates who are employed in high wage jobs rather than continuing their education
- OBJECTIVE 3E • To provide Food Service Vending training, work experience, and licensing.
- OBJECTIVE 3F • To improve services and employment opportunities for all customers of the Vocational Rehabilitation Program by closing the gaps in performance and service capacity
- OBJECTIVE 3H • 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 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 3F • To improve services and employment opportunities for all customers of the Vocational Rehabilitation Program by closing the gaps in performance and service capacity
- OBJECTIVE 3G • To improve services and reemployment opportunities for injured workers of the Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services Program
- 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 monitor the proportion of A.A. students graduating within four years.

#### **6. Enhance Florida's Environment and Quality of Life**

- 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 3F • To improve services and employment opportunities for all customers of the Vocational Rehabilitation Program by closing the gaps in performance and service capacity
- OBJECTIVE 3G • To improve services and reemployment opportunities for injured workers of the Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services Program
- OBJECTIVE 4C • To promote service to the public.
- OBJECTIVE 4J • To provide Braille and recorded publications services.

## Trends and Conditions

### K-12 Education System

#### **Florida is ensuring all students are learning**

Florida's uses the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test to measure student learning. Based on scores for the 2006 test administration, students at the elementary, middle and high school levels all showed improvement compared to scores in 2001.

#### **Reading and Math Gains for All Levels**

The FCAT scores show Florida's students continue to make learning gains in both reading and math. This year's scores show the largest year to year increases in reading since 2001. Overall, 57 percent of students in grades 3 through 10 are reading at or above grade level (Level 3 and above) compared to 47 percent in 2001. This represents 223,000 more students. In mathematics, 61 percent of Florida students are demonstrating mathematics skills at or above grade level (Level 3 and above) compared to 50 percent in 2001. This represents 234,000 more students. Below are scores for each level compared to scores in 2001:

#### **Elementary School**

- 70 percent of elementary school students are reading at or above grade level (Level 3 and above), up from 54 percent.
- 14 percent of elementary students scored in the lowest level (Level 1) in reading, down more than half from 30 percent.
- 66 percent of elementary school students are demonstrating mathematics skills at or above grade level (Level 3 and above), up from 52 percent.
- 14 percent of elementary students scored in the lowest level (Level 1) in mathematics, down almost half from 27 percent

#### **Middle School**

- 57 percent of middle school students are reading at or above grade level (Level 3 and above), up from 48 percent. This is also single year record increase, moving from 51 percent to 57 percent reading at or above grade level from 2005 to 2006.
- 20 percent of middle school students scored in the lowest level (Level 1) in reading, down from 30 percent.
- 56 percent of middle school students are demonstrating mathematics skills at or above grade level (Level 3 and above), up from 47 percent.
- 23 percent of middle school students scored in the lowest level (Level 1) in mathematics skills, down from 32 percent.

#### **High School**

- 37 percent of high school students are reading at or above grade level (Level 3 and above), up from 32 percent.
- 33 percent of high school students scored in the lowest level (Level 1) in reading, down from 39 percent.
- 62 percent of high school students are demonstrating mathematics skills at or above grade level (Level 3 and above), up from 52 percent.
- 16 percent of high school students scored in the lowest level (Level 1) in mathematics, down from 25 percent.

**Florida Continues to Close the Achievement Gap**

Florida has made great strides in closing the achievement gap. African-American and Hispanic students in grades 3 through 10 again made progress this year, continuing gains in both reading and mathematics.

- 39 percent of African-American students are reading at or above grade level (Level 3 and above), up from 26 percent.
- 50 percent of Hispanic students are reading at or above grade level (Level 3 and above), up from 35 percent.
- 41 percent of African-American students are demonstrating mathematics skills at or above grade level (Level 3 and above), up from 26 percent.
- 56 percent of Hispanic students are demonstrating mathematics skills at or above grade level (Level 3 and above), up from 41 percent.

**Florida Is Holding the Education System Accountable**

The information summarized on the following table indicates education gains across education sectors:

<p><b><i>School Grades</i></b>                  Florida has seen a dramatic increase in school grades, even after raising the bar in 2001 and again in 2004</p>	<p><b>2006</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1,466 As</li> <li>• 610 Bs</li> <li>• 570 Cs</li> <li>• 121 Ds</li> <li>• 21 Fs</li> </ul>	<p><b>1999</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 202 As</li> <li>• 313 Bs</li> <li>• 1230 Cs</li> <li>• 601 Ds</li> <li>• 76 Fs</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>School Recognition</i></b>                  Florida has seen a dramatic increase in number of schools receiving school recognition funds, a program that requires schools to earn a grade of A or increase the school grade by at least one letter grade</p>	<p><b>2006</b></p> <p>1,799 schools shared                  \$157,587,811</p>	<p><b>1999</b></p> <p>319 schools shared                  \$27,603,881</p>
<p><b><i>Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)</i></b>                  More students are reading on grade level and Florida is closing the achievement gap</p>	<p><b><i>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Students Reading on or Above Grade Level</i></b>  <b>2006</b></p> <p>66% of all students                  60% of Hispanics                  49% of African-Americans</p>	<p><b><i>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Students Reading on or Above Grade Level</i></b>  <b>1999</b></p> <p>51% of all students                  37% of Hispanics                  23% of African-Americans</p>



***National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP – “the nation’s report card”)***

The percent of Florida 4<sup>th</sup> grade students scoring at proficient and above in reading has increased 8 percentage points since 1998 – from 22 percent to 30 percent. The percent of Florida 4<sup>th</sup> grade students scoring proficient and above in mathematics has increased by 22 percentage points since 1996 – from 15 percent to 37 percent. (Math was not assessed in 1998.)

***4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading: 2005 Assessment\****

- Average scale score: 219
- Average scale score for Hispanic students: 215
- Average scale score for African-American students: 203

***4<sup>th</sup> Grade Writing: 2002 Administration\****

- Florida 4<sup>th</sup> graders ranked 8<sup>th</sup> in the nation
- Hispanic 4<sup>th</sup> graders ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> in the nation

\* Represents latest data available at publication date

***4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading: 1998 Assessment***

- Average scale score: 206
- Average scale score for Hispanic students: 198
- Average scale score for African-American students: 186

***4<sup>th</sup> Grade Writing***

- Florida did not participate in 1998

***Number of High School Students taking Advanced Placement (AP) courses***

In Florida, the increase in number of test takers since 1998 is more than twice the national increase

***Spring 2006***

- 90,661 AP test takers (*up 162%*)
- 20,421 Hispanic AP test takers (*up 230%*)
- 8,788 African-American AP test takers (*up 239%*)

***Spring 1999***

- 34,607 AP test takers
- 6,181 Hispanic AP test takers
- 2,595 African-American AP test takers

***Graduation Rate***

Florida counts every student, and the graduation rate is increasing

***2005***

- 71.9% of all students
- 64.5% of Hispanic students
- 57.1% of African-American students

***1999***

- 60.2% of all students
- 52.8% of Hispanic students
- 48.7% of African-American students

***Dropout Rate***

Fewer students dropping out, and the decline is led by minority students

***2005***

- 3.0% among all students
- 3.6% among Hispanic students
- 3.9% among African-American students

***1999***

- 5.4% among all students
- 8.3% among Hispanic students
- 6.6% among African-American students

**Choice Programs**

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida's choice options include three K-12 scholarship programs that are the largest in the nation, a charter school enrollment that is the second highest in the nation, and the nation's first statewide public virtual school that is a nationally-recognized e-learning model</li> </ul> | <b>2006</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity Scholarships: 734</li> <li>• McKay Scholarships: 17,300</li> <li>• Corporate Tax Credit Scholarships: 14,061</li> </ul> <b>1999</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charter school students: 92,214</li> <li>• Virtual school half-credit course enrollments: 68,000</li> </ul> | <b>2001</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity Scholarships: 51</li> <li>• McKay Scholarships: 970</li> <li>• Corporate Tax Credit Scholarships: 15,585 (2002-2003)</li> </ul> <b>1999</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charter school students: 9,135</li> <li>• Virtual school half-credit course enrollments: 9,135 (1998-99)</li> </ul> |
|--|---|---|

**Bright Futures Funding**

Dramatic increase in funding and number of awards for Bright Futures scholarships since inception in 1997

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>2006</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$346,342,906 FY 2006-07</li> <li>• 149,389 (estimated) awards in 2006-07</li> </ul> | <b>1999</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$93,332,570 FY 1998-99</li> <li>• 56,065 awards in 1998-99</li> </ul> |
|---|---|

**Community Colleges**

- Nearly half rank in the nation's top 100 (based on the number of associate degrees awarded)
- Four are in the top 10

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2006</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 749,690 students enrolled (up 5%)</li> <li>• 25,720 earned Associate in Arts (AA) degrees (up 30 %)</li> <li>• 20,407 community college students in 2004 were found in the state university system (<i>up 17%</i>)</li> </ul> | <b>1999</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 716,228 students enrolled</li> <li>• 25,720 earned Associate in Arts (AA) degrees</li> <li>• 15,783 community college students in 1998 were found in the state university system in 1999</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

**Florida is improving the quality of 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.

*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.

## **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 (Rehabilitation Act of 1973 As Amended & Chapter 413, FL Statutes). Both federal and state guidelines are followed in administering the vocational program. Federal guidelines are used in deciding a person's eligibility to participate in the program. Specifically, the three eligibility criteria are that an individual (1) must have a physical or mental impairment to employment, (2) can benefit in terms of an employment outcome from receiving VR services, and (3) requires VR services to prepare for, retain, or regain employment.

After the passage of House Bill 1825 (now Chapter 2002-2, Laws of Florida), which changed the governance structure of the rehabilitation program in Florida, the Division selected its priorities using a participatory process that involved stakeholders from many levels. 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 July 1, 2010 the population will increase 21.4% over the year 2000 to 19,397,414 (conference held 2/17/2006). 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. By 2010, this group is expected to decrease 1.5% to 45.2% from the 2000 census of 46.7%.

The Division continues to address the five topic priorities developed using findings from the 2002 needs assessment. These topic priorities being addressed include: (1) clients, (2) employers, (3) DVR staff, (4) the rehabilitation process, and (5) vendors and providers. In the intervening four years, some of the gaps have closed. DVR continues to assess its progress in addressing the findings from its 2002 needs assessment. The findings

below show the Division's efforts in closing the gaps in service capacity and program performance.

- Finding: Eligibility determinations for some Persons with a Disability (PWDs) are taking too much time  
Progress: The average time has decreased by more than 8 days (8.66 days).
- Finding: Individualized Plans for Employment (IPEs) need to be written for more PWDs.  
Progress: The Gap has closed 11% from the previous fiscal year.
- Finding: The number and percentage of PWDs who get a job is too low.  
Progress: The number and percentage have increased since the 2002 needs assessment. The number is more than 2,200 greater than the 2002 level and 1,442 higher than the previous fiscal year. The percentage is more than 6% higher than the 2002 value and 3.5% higher than the 2004-05 fiscal year.
- Finding: The number and percentage of severely and most severely disabled PWDs who get a job is too low.  
Progress: Both have increased. The number is 1,072 higher and the rate is 3.2% higher than the previous fiscal year.
- Finding: The number and percentage of other PWDs who get a job is too low.  
Progress: Both have increased. The number is 370 higher and the rate is 4.8% higher than the previous state fiscal year.
- Finding: A smaller proportion than expected of PWDs aged 15-19 and 20-24 who apply to VR get jobs.  
Progress: The proportion of PWDs placed in employment who are 14-22 years old is 18% above last fiscal year.

During SFY 2004-2005, Florida DVR had an average of 33,401 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 10,796 individuals placed into gainful employment 76% (8,181) were significantly or most significantly disabled. The projected average annual earnings of VR customers at placement during this period was \$19,162 exceeding the legislative standard of \$17,500. The SFY2005-06 projected earnings increased approximately 7% 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 (FRC) continues to conduct customer satisfaction survey research to this end. Two separate client satisfaction surveys are conducted of DVR's customers. The first is of closed client cases and the second is of active clients who participate in the program. Customer satisfaction results of closed cases showed that overall, 81% are very or mostly satisfied with the services received from the VR Program, while results for active cases

showed overall satisfaction of 80%. Additionally, 81% of respondents from both closed and active cases agreed that VR services made their lives better. On the other hand, 84% of respondents surveyed in closed status and 86% active status agreed that VR services are either highly appropriate or appropriate. Ninety-three (93%) responding in both groups reported that VR staff were respectful and courteous.

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 its 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 Priority 1, Strategic Imperatives 3 and 7, and Priority 7 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 as 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 timely voluntary services as required by statute. 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 fully 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. This is because education and re-training for injuries with dates of accidents of October 1, 2003 and after is inclusive in the injured workers overall indemnity benefit period. Insurance carriers must do their 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 continue to work closely with health care providers, attorneys, 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:

- Continue to ensure that all parties in the system understand and actively carryout their roles regarding returning injured workers to suitable gainful employment.
- Make gradual improvement in the overall return to work rate.
- Reduce overall system costs for employers.
- Increase the numbers of injured workers that are provided bureau sponsored reemployment services through education and other marketing initiatives.
- Work collaboratively with system partners to increase the number of injured worker referrals to the program.

VR also administers the Adults with Disabilities program that was previously administered by the Division of 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 the 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 or her quality of life, health, well being, and/or lifelong learning skills by achieving at least two identified benchmarks. During 2005-2006, 16,595 Floridians with disabilities were successfully served in these education-related activities.

## Division of 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"> <li>a. Aid individuals who are blind in gaining employment including the provision of job training s. 413.011(d), F.S.;</li> <li>b. Provide independent living training so individuals who are blind can benefit from their community in the same manner as their sighted peers s. 413.011(f), F.S.;</li> <li>c. Provide library service to the blind and other physically disabled persons as defined in federal law and regulations in carrying out any or all of the provisions of this law s. 413.011 (h), F.S.; and,</li> <li>d. Promote the employment of eligible blind persons, including the training and licensing of such persons as operators of vending facilities on public property s. 413.041, F.S.</li> </ul>	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.

<b>Function</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>06/07</b>	<b>07/08</b>	<b>08/09</b>	<b>09/10</b>	<b>10/11</b>
Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, and independent living services, and provide job placement assistance to Blind Services' customers. Provide consultation, training, and rehabilitation engineering services to employers of Blind Services' customers	Annual # of customers provided these services	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.

### Private Colleges and Universities

The independent colleges and universities that have academic contracts and student grant programs funded in the General Appropriations Act are under the purview of the Office of Articulation within the Department of Education. The 28 colleges and universities that are included in the Department of Education's Long Range Program Plan are identified by having their students eligible for the William L. Boyd, IV, Florida Resident Access Grant (FRAG), a tuition equalization program available to eligible Florida residents who attend a college that meets the following criteria:

- Private
- Not-for-profit
- Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges & Schools (SACS) to award baccalaureate degrees
- Located and chartered in Florida
- Has a secular purpose

Until the School Code Revision of 2002, these colleges and universities were exempt from licensure but under the purview of the State Board of Independent Colleges and Universities for certain purposes related to fair consumer practices and reporting requirements. In 2002, the Legislature created the Commission for Independent Education to license private postsecondary educational institutions; the colleges and universities included in the Long Range Program Plan were removed from the jurisdiction or purview of the board (s. 1005.06, F.S.). Governmental liaison was provided first by the Division of Colleges and Universities and, in 2006, transferred to the Office of Articulation.

These colleges and universities are members of the Independent Colleges & Universities of Florida (ICUF). The colleges and universities serve more than 120,000 students at over 180 sites around Florida. They offer programs at the main campuses, at satellite sites in communities, on-line and at community colleges. In addition to FRAG, these institutions receive state funds for various academic contracts including tuition assistance for specified medical education programs and equipment. In addition, specific appropriations are made to three Historically Black Colleges and Universities for student access, retention and graduation assistance, and for library resources.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Academic contracts include the following:

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barry University/Bachelor of Science – Nursing and Master of Social Work</li> <li>• University of Miami Medical Training and Simulation Laboratory</li> <li>• Florida Institute of Technology – Bachelor of Science—Engineering and Bachelor of Science -- Science Education</li> <li>• University of Miami First Accredited Medical School – Cancer Research PhD Program in Biomedical Science, College of Medicine, and Sylvester Cancer Center</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nova Southeastern University / Osteopathic Medicine</li> <li>• Nova Southeastern University / Pharmacy</li> <li>• Nova Southeastern University / Optometry</li> <li>• Nova Southeastern University/ Nursing Nova Southeastern University / Rural and Unmet Needs</li> <li>• University of Miami / Regional Diabetes Center</li> <li>• University of Miami /Rosentiel Marine Science and Bachelor of Science, and Master of Fine Arts / Motion Pictures</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nova Southeastern University / Master of Science - Speech Pathology</li> <li>• 2+2 Partnership Baccalaureate Incentive</li> <li>• LECOM (Lake Erie College of Osteopathic Medicine / Health Programs</li> <li>• University of Tampa / Critical Training Needs Equipment</li> </ul> <p>Historically Black Colleges and Universities include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bethune Cookman</li> <li>• Edward Waters College</li> <li>• Florida Memorial College</li> <li>• Library Resources</li> </ul> |
|---|--|--|

## Community Colleges and Workforce Education

### **Community Colleges**

The Division of Community Colleges (DCC) is committed to increasing access and student success. DCC has eight priority goals in its strategic plan that align with DOE's Strategic Imperatives. The goals are:

- 1 - Ensure Open-Door Access and Student Success**
- 2 - Vitalize Communities Through Workforce Development**
- 3 - Align Baccalaureate Growth with Unmet Needs**
- 4 - Advocate for Funding Which Meets Growth/Capacity Needs**
- 5 - Maintain Affordability**
- 6 - Strengthen Facilities Planning and Capital Improvement**
- 7 - Expand Learning Via Emerging Technologies**
- 8 - Enhance Learning Through Leadership Development**

Several projects have been undertaken to further DCC in its commitment and to promote these priority goals.

One such project is Achieving the Dream, a multi-year initiative funded by the Lumina Foundation and partnered with the American Association of Community Colleges. Achieving the Dream is designed to enhance the academic success of low-income and minority students. Four of Florida's community colleges (Broward Community College, Hillsborough Community College, Tallahassee Community College, and Valencia Community College) are among the fifty-eight institutions in nine states that were selected to participate. 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. Each of Florida's colleges receives \$100,000 annually to implement their plans for addressing the academic success of low-income and minority students.

College Goal Sunday (CGS) is a grant program, funded through the Lumina Foundation, that provides traditionally underrepresented students and their families with information about the availability of financial aid and assistance in completing the paperwork required to qualify for that aid. It is generally held on a Sunday closely preceding or following Super Bowl Sunday, typically in February. According to survey data released by the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators and the Institute for Higher Education Policy, 89 percent of our 2006 participants were in the target audience (e.g., low income, first generation in college, or minority). In fact, Florida ranked in the top three participating states in the nation for percentage of target audience members attending the event. At our 2006 event, we served approximately 1,000 students who were encouraged and supported with one-on-one advice to seek postsecondary education and financial aid opportunities.

Additionally, all 28 of Florida's community colleges will be participating in the 2007 statewide Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). In 2004, all 28 participated 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. 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 developed workshops to assist institutions in interpreting and using the results of the survey.

Florida has multiple pathways to teacher certification. Serving as one of these pathways, Educator Preparation Institutes (EPIs) meet the need for increased access for baccalaureate degree holders to become certified teachers. Community colleges 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 authorized to create Educator Preparation Institutes with Department of Education approval. These institutes address Florida's pressing needs in professional development for teachers, substitute teacher preparation, paraprofessional training, and alternative teacher certification. They also enhance the ability of community colleges to assist the state in meeting federal No Child Left Behind requirements. Within the past year, all 28 of Florida's community colleges received approval to begin EPI operations. In 2005-06, approximately 1,500 students were enrolled in alternative teacher certification programs within the EPIs.

The Florida Distance Learning Consortium (FDLC) provides valuable services and information to institutions, students, and faculty members. The FDLC hosts multiple web-based tools in use by the faculty, students, members, and the Florida Department of Education that include online delivery of courses and programs, webconferencing software, and a digital repository for a single point of access to content owned by the state of Florida. FDLC hosts an online electronic catalog of courses and programs at [www.distancelearn.org](http://www.distancelearn.org) which listed over 10,000 unique courses in 2005-06. Moreover, the FDLC hosts quarterly meetings which offer access to state, regional, national and international leaders in e-learning. A bi-weekly newsletter, keeps the state informed regarding the latest information in technology delivered learning. State level agreements for software products offer significant cost savings to the institutions based on the aggregated buying power of the educational community. All contracts reflect an identified need of the FDLC membership.

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 that supports library operational functions and a content-rich eResources collection that is available to all community college students in Florida regardless of time of day or their location. By acquiring core eResources for statewide access, significant cost savings are achieved through major discounts due to the economies of scale involved.

Finally, to continually monitor student access and student success, DCC 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 2003-04, the Florida Community College System (FCCS) served 79% of all minority students enrolled in public lower division classes. The FCCS also served 80% of all Pell Grant recipients. FCCS enrolled one-fourth as many Bright Futures recipients as SUS during 2002-03. In 2004-05, FCCS tuition and fee charges as a percentage of median household income was 4%, the lowest of all institution types.

DCC 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, DCC 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.



### Exhibit I: Agency Workforce Plan

Fiscal Years	Total FTE Reductions	Description of Reduction Issue	Positions per Issue	Impact of Reduction
FY 2005-06		The department will maintain its existing vacancy rate during FY 2006-07 by realigning personnel in accordance with the department's core mission.		
State Board of Education				
FY 2006-2007		The department will continue to reduce its workforce through attrition and by realigning personnel in accordance with the department's core mission.		
State Board of Education				
<b>Total*</b>				

\*The department has adjusted its workforce adjustment target to neutralize the effect of legislative policy changes. Since the target was based on employees in 1998-99, the Department of Education has undergone major shifts in governance. Because of Legislative amendments in the 2002 School Code and the Constitutional creation of the Board of Governors, it is difficult to trace reductions in the number of employees attributed to the State Board of Education. Since the target was established, Legislative changes also placed the Divisions of Vocational Rehabilitation and Blind Services in the Department of Education.

**Exhibit II: Performance Measures and Standards**

<b>Department: Education</b>		<b>Department No.: 48</b>	
Program: Vocational Rehabilitation		Code: 48160000	
Service/Budget Entity:		Code:	
NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.			

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard (Numbers)
Number/percent of customers gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days	11,500 / 65%	10,796 / 60.4%	11,500 / 65%	
Number/percent of VR significantly disabled gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days	9,775 / 58.5%	8,181 / 56.3%	9,775 / 58.5%	
Number/percent of all other VR disabled gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days	1,725 / 77%	2,615 / 78.1%	2,000 / 77% <sup>0</sup>	
Number/percent of VR customers placed in competitive employment	11,213 / 97.5%	10,767 / 99.7%	11,213 / 97.5%	
Number/percent of VR customers retained in employment after 1 year	6,300 / 67.5%	5,684 / 64.7%	6,300 / 67.5%	
Average annual earning of VR customers at placement	\$17,500	\$19,162	\$17,500	
Average annual earning of VR customers after 1 year	\$18,500	\$19,227	\$18,500	
Percent of case costs covered by third-party payers	23%	2.6%	23%	
Average cost of case life (to division) for significantly disabled VR customers	\$3,350	\$3,396	\$3,350	
Average cost of case life (to division) for all other disabled VR customers	\$400	\$463	\$400	
Number of customers reviewed for eligibility	29,000	26,287	29,000	
Number of individualized written plans for services	24,500	19,810	24,500	
Number of active cases	37,500	33,401	37,500	
Customer caseload per counselor	125	95	125	
Percent of eligibility determinations completed in compliance with federal law	95%	93.1%	95%	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Approved <b>Prior</b> Year Standard <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Prior</b> Year Actual <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Approved</b> Standards for <b>FY 2006-07</b> (Numbers)	<b>Requested</b> <b>FY 2007-08</b> Standard (Numbers)
Number of program applicants provided Reemployment Services	2,525	2,611	2,525	
Percent of eligible injured workers receiving reemployment services with closed cases during the fiscal year and returned to suitable gainful employment.	76%	92%	76%	

**Exhibit II: Performance Measures and Standards**

<b>Department: Education</b>		<b>Department No.: 48</b>	
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 2006-07 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard (Numbers)
Number/percent of rehabilitation customers gainfully employed at least 90 days.	747 / 68.3%	652 / 64.4%	747 / 68.3%	
Number/percent rehabilitation customers placed in competitive employment.	654 / 64.3%	650 / 99.54	654 / 64.3%	
Projected average annual earnings of rehabilitation customers at placement.	\$13,500	\$18,985	\$16,500	
Number/percent successfully rehabilitated older persons, non-vocational rehabilitation.	1,500 / 55.2%	1,827 / 73.9%	1,700 / 55.2%	
Number/percent of customers (children) successfully rehabilitated/transitioned from pre-school to school.	36 / 67.3%	160 / 86%	100 / 67.3%	
Number/percent of customers (children) successfully rehabilitated/transitioned from school to work.	47 / 26.5%	74 / 66.1%	70 / 26.5%	
Number of customers reviewed for eligibility	2,035	5,398	4,000	
Number of written plans for services	1,425	2,737	1,425	
Number of customers served	13,100	12,141	13,100	
Average time lapse (days) between application and eligibility determination for rehabilitation customers	60	45	60	
Customer caseload per counseling/case management team member	114	79	114	
Cost per library customer served	\$19.65	\$30.76	\$19.65	
Number of blind vending food service facilities supported	153	152	153	
Number of existing food service facilities renovated	5	12	5	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Approved <b>Prior</b> Year Standard <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Prior</b> Year Actual <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Approved</b> Standards for <b>FY 2006-07</b> (Numbers)	<b>Requested</b> <b>FY 2007-08</b> Standard (Numbers)
Number of new food service facilities constructed	5	2	5	
Number of library customers served	44,290	39,126	44,290	
Number of library items (Braille and recorded) loaned	1.25 m.	1,627,173	1.35 m.	

**Exhibit II: Performance Measures and Standards**

**Department: Education**

**Department No.: 48**

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 2006-07 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2007-08 Standard (Numbers)
Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, using a 6-year rate (Florida Resident Access Grant - FRAG)	TBD	TBD	50%	
Number of degrees granted for FRAG recipients and contract program recipients (Florida Resident Access Grant - FRAG)	TBD	8,578	9,987	
Retention rate of award recipients (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	TBD	See spreadsheet below	53.0%	
Graduation rate of award recipients (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	TBD	TBD	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	<b>ICUF</b> 5,847 / 70% <b>FRAG</b> 4,283 / 70% <b>HBCUs</b> 343 / 66%	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	<b>ICUF</b> 5,234 / 87% <b>FRAG</b> 3,529 / 86% <b>HBCUs</b> 250 or 83%	TBD	

<p>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)</p>	<p>Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2005-06 (Numbers)</p>	<p>Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06 (Numbers)</p>	<p>Approved Standards for FY 2006-07 (Numbers)</p>	<p>Requested FY 2007-08 Standard (Numbers)</p>
<p>Licensure/certification rates of award recipients, (where applicable), (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>See spreadsheet below</p>	<p>TBD</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>TBD</p>	
<p>Number of prior year's graduates (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>See spreadsheet below</p>	<p>TBD</p>	
<p>Number of prior year's graduates remaining in Florida (Academic Contracts)</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>See spreadsheet below</p>	<p>TBD</p>	
<p>Number of FTIC students, disaggregated by in-state and out-of-state (Historically Black Colleges and Universities)</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>See spreadsheet below</p>	<p>TBD</p>	

Performance Measures and Standards Approved by the Legislature for Private Colleges and Universities

Actual FY 2003-04

Measure	University of Miami/Medical Training and Simulation Laboratory	Bethune-Cookman College	Edward Waters College	Florida Memorial University	University of Miami/First Accredited Medical School	University of Miami/ BS and MFA in Motion Pictures	Barry University/BS Nursing	Barry University/ MSW Social Work	Florida Institute of Technology/BS Engineering	Florida Institute of Technology/BS Math/Science Education	Nova Southeastern University/MS Speech Pathology	University of Miami/ Regional Diabetes Center	Nova Southeastern University/ Health Programs
Retention rate of award recipients (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)		85%	74%	79%		100%	95%	100%	84%	100%	89%		
Graduation rate of award recipients (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)		39%	11.7%	22%		100%	100%	Under review.	100%	100%	100%		
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; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)		58% <sup>2</sup>	Info. not readily available.	28%		100%	100%	96%	47%	0% <sup>1</sup>	100%		
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; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)		84.2% <sup>4</sup>	Info. not readily available.	Data not available.		100%	100%	No response.	100%	Unknown <sup>3</sup>	100%		
Licensure/certification rates of award recipients, (where applicable), (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)		100%	Majority of students graduate in majors that do not require licensure immediately upon graduation.	97.4%		Not applicable as licensure is not required.	85%	Students who choose to be licensed have to have a minimum of two years full-time post Masters work experience. Therefore, the 2002-03 graduates would not be eligible for licensure until 2005.	Not applicable for this degree.	No graduates for the reported year.	80%		
Number/percent of baccalaureate degree recipients who are found placed in an occupation identified as high wage/high skill on Workforce Estimating Conference list (This measure would be for each Academic Contract and for the Florida Resident Access Grant)						5/100%	19/100%	N/A Master's Degree only.	12/55%	No graduates for the reported year.	N/A Master's Degree only.		



Number of prior year's graduates (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	274	126	197	5	19	9	22	0	39
Number of prior year's graduates remaining in Florida (Academic Contracts)				3	19	N/A	16	0	33
Number of FTIC students disaggregated by in-state and out-of-state (Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	519/296 <sup>5</sup>	260/75 <sup>5</sup>	448/112						

**Note:**

This report reflects 2003-04 data that was reported by the Regina Sofer, Florida Board of Governors to Link Jarett on March 18, 2005.  
 The cells left blank reflect the contract programs that are not student-specific and/or for which data is not collected.  
 The measures that are specific to only FRAG are not included in this report.

<sup>1</sup>There were no award recipient graduates in 2002-03. Therefore, there were no graduates remaining in Florida.

<sup>2</sup>Based on data from 2002-03.

<sup>3</sup>Two students graduated in 1998-99. One resides in Florida but her employment is unknown.

<sup>4</sup>Based on 1995-96 graduates.

<sup>5</sup>IPEDS was the source of this information.

**Source for approved performance measures:**

[http://www.oppage.state.fl.us/monitor/reports/pdf/2004-05\\_Measures.pdf](http://www.oppage.state.fl.us/monitor/reports/pdf/2004-05_Measures.pdf)

**Exhibit II: Performance Measures and Standards**

**Department: Education**

**Department No.: 48**

Program: <b>Student Financial Aid Program—State</b>	Code: 48200200
Service/Budget Entity:	Code:
NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Approved <b>Prior</b> Year Standard <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Prior</b> Year Actual <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Approved</b> Standards for <b>FY 2006-07</b> (Numbers)	<b>Requested</b> <b>FY 2007-08</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of high school graduates who successfully completed the 19 core credits (Bright Futures)	63%	37.4 % (Std diploma eligible for Bright Futures)	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	Graduated or still enrolled: 65% CC 79% SUS (Note: 79% CC graduated, still enrolled, or transferred to SUS)	4.0% CC 3.2% SUS	
Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system (Bright Futures)	TBD	48% CC 67% SUS	19.9% CC 48.1% SUS	
Percent of high school graduates attending Florida postsecondary institutions (Bright Futures)	52%	86.4% (Note: <i>Rigorous Academic Scholarship = 80%</i> )	52%	
Number of Bright Futures recipients	114,315	140,049	149,384	
Retention rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system,	TBD	Graduated or	2.4% CC	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Approved <b>Prior</b> Year Standard <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Prior Year</b> Actual <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Approved</b> Standards for <b>FY 2006-07</b> (Numbers)	<b>Requested</b> <b>FY 2007-08</b> Standard (Numbers)
using a 4-year rate for community colleges and a 6-year rate for universities (Florida Student Assistance Grant)		still enrolled: 68% SUS 55% CC <i>(Note: 60% CC graduated, still enrolled, or transferred to SUS)</i>	2.4% SUS	
Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system (Florida Student Assistance Grant)	TBD	59.8% SUS 33.3% CC	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	100%	100%	

<b>Exhibit II: Performance Measures and Standards</b>				
<b>Department: Education</b>			<b>Department No.: 48</b>	
Program: <b>State Grants/K-12 Program—FEFP</b>			Code: 48250300	
Service/Budget Entity:			Code:	
NOTE: Approved primary service outcomes must be listed first.				
Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Approved <b>Prior</b> Year Standard <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Prior</b> Year Actual <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2006-07</b> (Numbers)	<b>Requested</b> Standard <b>FY 2007-08</b> (Numbers)
Number/percent of teachers with National Teacher's Certification, reported by district	3,369 / 2.4%	7,782 / 4.42%	4,853 / 3%	7,782 / 4.42%
Number/percent of "A" schools, reported by district	600 / 25%	52.6%	600 / 25%	1,467 / 52.6%
Number/percent of "D" or "F" schools, reported by district	300 / 12%	5.1%	300 / 12%	142 / 5.1%
Number/percent of schools declining one or more letter grades, reported by district	193 / 8%	13.9%	193 / 8%	373 / 14%
Number/percent of schools improving one or more letter grades, reported by district	966 / 40%	50.3%	966 / 40%	729 / 50.3%

### Exhibit II: Performance Measures and Standards

**Department: Education**

**Department No.: 48**

**Program: Workforce Development**

Code: 48250800

Service/Budget Entity:

Code:

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2006-07</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2007-08</b> 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	6,792 / 50%	2,055 / 53%	
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	16,792 / 62%	4,700 / 60 %	
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	13,603 / 68%	21,115 / 70%	
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	TBD	TBD	
Number/percent of students attending workforce development programs which meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards.	TBD	TBD	TBD	

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Approved <b>Prior</b> Year Standard <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Prior</b> Year Actual <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Approved</b> Standards for <b>FY 2006-07</b> (Numbers)	<b>Requested</b> <b>FY 2007-08</b> Standard (Numbers)
Number/percent of students completing workforce development programs which meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards.	TBD	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	85,506	73,346 / TBD	

**Exhibit II: Performance Measures and Standards**

**Department: Education**

**Department No.: 48**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual FY 2005-06 (Numbers)	Approved Standards for FY 2006-07 (Numbers)	Requested FY 2007-08 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	6,920 / 63%	5,516 / 35%	
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)	4,721 / TBD	1,985 / 75%	4,721 / 30%	
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	1,239 / 76%	3,024 / 19%	
Percent of Associate in Arts (AA) degree graduates who transfer to a state university within 2 years	69%	65%	62%	64%
Percent of AA degree transfers to the State University System who earn a 2.5 or above in the SUS after 1 year	75%	75%	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	6,343/ 70%	59%	58%
Of the AA students who complete 18 credit hours, the	36%	34.47%	33%	35%

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Approved <b>Prior</b> Year Standard <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Prior</b> Year Actual <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Approved</b> Standards for <b>FY 2006-07</b> (Numbers)	<b>Requested</b> <b>FY 2007-08</b> Standard (Numbers)
percent of whom graduate in 4 years.				
Percent of students graduating with total accumulated credit hours that are less than or equal to 120 percent of the degree requirement	36%	40%	38%	47%
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%	75.6%	74%	75%
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%	72%	75%	75%
Number/Percent of AA partial completers transferring to the State University System with at least 40 credit hours	16,821 / 72%	17,596 / 83%	17,796 / 61.5%	17,800 / 61%
Number/Percent/FTEs of AA students who do not complete 18 credit hours within 4 years	5,346 / 23.3% FTE: 2,275	13,837 / 37%/ 3,044 FTE	5,346 / 23.3% 2,275 FTE	12,234 / 37% / 2,020 FTE
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%	3,408 / 30.84%	2,138 / 34%	3,000 / 32%
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 / 24.86%	153 / 31%	180 / 29%
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%	277 / 22.62%	126 / 18%	220 / 20%
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%	143 / 29.55%	105 / 31%	187 / 16%



Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Approved <b>Prior</b> Year Standard <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Prior</b> Year Actual <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	<b>Approved</b> Standards for <b>FY 2006-07</b> (Numbers)	<b>Requested</b> <b>FY 2007-08</b> Standard (Numbers)
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	5,501/ 61%	2,900	
Percent of prior year Florida high school graduates enrolled in community colleges	30%	31%	31%	34%
Number of AA degrees granted	29,000	33,398	29,880	32,500
Number of students receiving college preparatory instruction	100,000	118,058	118,471	120,000
Number of students enrolled in baccalaureate programs offered on community college campuses	13,000	21,613	22,000	20,500

### Exhibit II: Performance Measures and Standards

**Department: Education**

**Department No.: 48**

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

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

Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Approved Prior Year Standard <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	Prior Year Actual <b>FY 2005-06</b> (Numbers)	Approved Standards for <b>FY 2006-07</b> (Numbers)	Requested <b>FY 2007-08</b> Standard (Numbers)
Percent of program administration and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions - Division of Public Schools	0.09% / 7.89%	15.4% Costs 14.3% Positions	0.09% / 7.89%	
Percent of teacher certificates issued within 30 days after receipt of complete application and the mandatory fingerprint clearance notification	90%	99.42%	90%	95%
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	67	67	
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%	0	100%	
Number of certification applications processed	87,663	138,758	109,275	120,000
Percent of program administration and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions	0.10% / 4.15%	1.0% Costs 4.0% Positions	0.10% / 4.15%	

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

**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:**  
 Previous estimate included all schools in the denominator, not just all graded schools. Previous estimate did not control for schools that were graded F in the prior year, which cannot decline and so should be deleted from the numerator and the denominator.

**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:**  
 Florida's schools are performing better than expected, so fewer schools are declining in grade.

**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

**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:**

Previous estimate included all schools in the denominator, not just all graded schools. Previous estimate did not control for schools that were graded A in the prior year, which cannot decline and so should be deleted from the numerator and the denominator.

**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:**

Florida's schools are improving in numbers greater than expected.

**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
- 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
747/68.3%	653/64.4%	94 under	14.4%

**Factors Accounting for the Difference: NA**

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

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

**Explanation:**

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 six 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 Vacant	Avg # of Days Vacant – VR	Total # of Vacancies	Avg # of Days
05/06	12	86	28	105
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:

VR Performance Based Budget Measures	Fiscal Years				
	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06
Number of Customers Served:	4,915	4,966	4,694	4,468	4,529
Eligibility Determinations:	2,269	2,076	1,813	1,945	1,911
Number of Customers Competitively Employed:	728	717	715	622	650

**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:**

Other agencies are luring experienced VR counselors away by offering higher pay.

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

- Training
- Personnel
- Technology
- Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

The Division submitted a joint Legislative Budget Request issue with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation identifying the VR counselor retention and recruitment issue. The Legislature provided some funding that will alleviate some of the problems. The Division's intent is to submit another Legislative Budget Request issue this fiscal year identifying the problem again and requesting additional funding to resolve this problem.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2004*

**LRPP EXHIBIT III: PERFORMANCE MEASURE ASSESSMENT**

**Department:** Department of Education  
**Program:** Division of Blind Services  
**Service:** Determine eligibility for services, provide counseling, facilitate the provision of rehabilitative treatment, job training, independent living services, and job placement assistance to Blind Service customers.  
**Measure:** Number/percent rehabilitation customers placed in competitive employment.  
**Action:**  
 Performance Assessment of Outcome Measure  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%	650/99.54%	4 Under	.01%

**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): NA

- 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 .01 % difference is not significant enough to request any changes.

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

- Training  Technology
- Personnel  Other (Identify)

**Recommendations:**

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

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The Rehabilitation Information Management System (RIMS) data are used. The information is entered into the system for every customer by field associates. "Edits" have been added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) audits the data regularly.

The data are downloaded from the mainframe monthly and a SAS program is used to aggregate the data using well-established operational definitions for gainful employment from the Federal regulations for vocational rehabilitation. The rate is computed as a percentage of all customers who exit the program within the designated time frame after completing an individualized plan for employment (IPE) and receiving services. The numerator is the number of customers who do enter employment; the denominator is all those who completed an IPE, those who do enter employment and those who do not.

**Validity:**

The methodology used was simply to examine the relationship between the measure and the mission of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) and to look for potential threats to validity. The percent and number of customers placed in gainful employment is a logical measure of the effectiveness of the rehabilitation process that has been used at the Federal and state levels since inception of the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) program. This measure, with its subsets, is directly linked to the mission of the program: Employment and increased independence for persons with disabilities.

One potential threat to validity is selection, e.g., are the customers who are determined eligible for the VR program, compared to all those who apply or are referred, appropriate for services? This threat is largely mitigated by the use of well-developed criteria for selection, assessment of the customer's needs and his/her employment potential. Information from external sources as well as from the customer, coupled with the VR associate's experience and skills, are all used to decide eligibility for services.

Assessment of the customer's incentive to go to work is always difficult; these decisions are subject to the counselor's interpretation to some degree, based on their experience and the evaluations done.

**Reliability:**

This is a reliable measure of the vocational rehabilitation program. Data for this measure are entered into RIMS by associates as cases are closed for individual customers; data entry is likely to be highly reliable because of the edits in the RIMS system. Redefinition of this measure, in 1999, to align it with the definition used by the Federal Rehabilitation Service Administration (RSA) improved the reliability and allows comparison of Florida's performance with that of other states.



Overall consistency and reproducibility would be affected by the fact that RIMS is a “live” database that changes constantly as customers progress through the rehabilitation process. This potential threat is controlled by using a “static” database of data downloaded monthly from RIMS for the performance-based program budgeting measures, and maintained on a server.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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: 2** 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 and calculations are used. 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. A team of Division associates recently addressed the criteria with the goal of simplifying the criteria and standardizing 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

### 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: 3** 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 and calculations are used. 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:**

Comments on the validity of the measure above are also applicable to this measure. The same steps to address and control those threats are applied here.

**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 same steps are taken to address possible subjectivity in assessing significance.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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: 4** 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. The numerator is customers placed in competitive employment; the denominator is customers placed in gainful employment.

**Validity:**

This is a valid measure of vocational rehabilitation. Its validity may be compromised somewhat by the fact that not all individuals who are placed in competitive employment are working full time ( $\geq 36$  hours per week). Validity has been improved by redefining this measure to make it consistent with the definition used by RSA.

As a variant of the first measure---number and percent placed in gainful employment---the same potential threats to validity were considered, and mitigated to the extent possible.

**Reliability:**

Data entry is done by each counselor at the time the customer's case is closed. Results can be duplicated within the current definition of competitive employment.

As for other measures, the potential threat to reliability of a "live" database is controlled by using a "static" database of data downloaded monthly from RIMS for the performance-based program budgeting measures and maintained on a server.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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: 5** 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" in RIMS assure the accuracy of data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. 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 (numerator) by the total number of participants found in the four quarters (denominator).

**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 units located along Florida's borders.

**Reliability:**

This measure has been tracked since 1996. The RIMS data used for the match, and the database from the Division of Unemployment Compensation, is well established and well documented. The reliability of this measure is good.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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: 6** 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" in RIMS prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. 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. These total earnings for all customers, the numerator, is then divided 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 return 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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: 7** 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" in RIMS prevent erroneous data entries as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. 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 RSA is exploring its use. RSA has conducted a pilot test to determine whether agencies in all states 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 are well established and well documented. The reliability of this measure is good.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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: 8** 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"), reimbursements from Social Security Insurance / Social Security Disability Insurance (SSI/SSDI) 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 protect the accuracy of the data and RSA audits the RIMS data regularly.

The measure is computed by summing the dollars obtained from third party payors, the numerator. This is divided by the total client service dollars to obtain the percentage of direct costs of services recovered.

This measure should be deleted. The Division has little control because both State and Federal law prohibit deliberately seeking customers most likely to contribute to high performance.

**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.

**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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*



**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: 9** 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 RIMS data are used; the information is entered into the system by field associates for every customer. "Edits" control accuracy of the data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly and RSA regularly audits the data.

The average cost is computed by first summing the direct costs to the Division of services to all significantly and most significantly disabled customers closed during the time period. This figure is divided 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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: 10** 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 RIMS data are used as for other measures; the information is entered into the system by field associates for every customer. "Edits" control accuracy of the data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly and RSA regularly audits the data.

The average cost is computed by first summing the direct costs to the Division of services to all other disabled customers closed during the time period. This figure is divided by the number of other disabled customers closed to obtain the average cost of case life.

**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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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: 11** 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 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. 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 eligibility 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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: 12** 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:**

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 vocational rehabilitation 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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: 13** 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 vocational rehabilitation program. Use of the monthly average represents unique customers for the interval measured and reflects the workload of VR personnel. The proposed measure is equally valid, based on well-defined criteria for each of the four closure statuses to be included.

**Reliability:**

The criteria for assigning the status codes for active customers are well defined and the results represent unique individuals. These data have been tracked in RIMS and by RSA over many years. These data are highly reliable; results are reproducible when they are computed from a static database.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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: 14** 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 vocational rehabilitation 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2005*

**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: 15** 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:**

RIMS data are used; the information is entered into the system by field associates for every customer. These data are protected, as for other measures, by “edits” added to RIMS to prevent the entry of invalid or erroneous data as much as possible without constricting the system unduly. These data are also audited regularly by RSA.

“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 trial work, or the customer’s agreement to an extension of the eligibility period must be documented in the customer’s file. The numerator for the measure is the number of eligibility determinations for the timeframe that meet the Federal mandate. The denominator is the total number of eligibility determinations made within the time frame.

**Validity:**

The discussion of validity for the number of eligibility determinations also applies to this measure. 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 within Federal regulations and incorporated into the Division’s training and policies.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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: 16** 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 using the same data sources and applying the same methodology. Analyses can be duplicated to achieve the same results regardless of the time of query.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*



**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: 17** 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 using the same data sources and applying the same methodology. Analyses can be duplicated to achieve the same results regardless of the time of query.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 18:** 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 19:** 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 Worker	5 – Homemaker	6 – Unpaid Family

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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 20:** 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 Worker	5 – Homemaker	6 – Unpaid Family

**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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 21:** 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 22:** 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 23:** 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 24:** 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 25:** 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 26:** 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*



**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 27:** 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 28:** Customer caseload per counseling/case management team member

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting Revision to Approved Measure  
 Change in Data Sources or Measurement Methodologies  
 Requesting New Measure  
 Backup for Performance Outcome and Output Measure

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

The definition and methodology for this measure conforms to that of DVR.

Data from the Client Rehabilitation Information System (CRIS) will be used. Data for the measures will be produced directly from CRIS using a programmed reporting process to extract data entered on clients at the field office level.

This measure is 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 15<sup>th</sup> of every month and dividing this total by 12. (*The Average Daily Caseload from the 15<sup>th</sup> 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 29:** 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 30:** 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 31:** 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 32:** 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*



**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 33:** 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**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 34:** 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.

*Office of Policy and Budget – June, 2006*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service/Budget Entity:** ACT1962  
**Measures:** 35 - 43

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.
- Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.
- Requesting new measure.
- Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

We recommend reporting Florida Resident Access Grant (FRAG) data under Student Financial Assistance budget entity.

Data Source: Office of Student Financial Assistance (OSFA).

Methodology: To be implemented by OSFA.

**Validity:**

To be established by OSFA.

**Reliability:**

To be established by OSFA.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service/Budget Entity:** ACT1962  
**Measure 35:** Graduation rate of FTIC (first time in college) award recipients, using a 6-year rate (Florida Resident Access Grant – FRAG)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  
 Requesting new measure.  
 Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data are not available to report this measure. Data on Independent Colleges and Universities residing in the PK20 Education Data Warehouse do not include a first-time in college indicator.

We recommend reporting Florida Resident Access Grant (FRAG) data under Student Financial Assistance budget entity.

Data Source: Office of Student Financial Assistance (OSFA).

Methodology: To be implemented by OSFA.

**Validity:**

To be established by OSFA.

**Reliability:**

To be established by OSFA.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service/Budget Entity:**  
**Measure 36:** Number of degrees granted for FRAG recipients and contract program recipients (Florida Resident Access Grant – FRAG)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  
 Requesting new measure.  
 Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

**Data Source:** Data are reported by Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program through a data-sharing agreement with the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida.

**Methodology:**

Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program linked student records of bachelor degree recipients (2004-05) from ICUF institutions to the last 6 years of Florida Resident Access Grant.

**Calculation 2005-06:** Of 2004-05 bachelor-degree graduates of private colleges that are members of ICUF, 8,578 were recipients of FRAG at some time during the past 6 years.

Graduates are reported only for FRAG recipients; contract program graduates are not included.

**Validity:**

As an indicator of the effectiveness of the Florida Resident Access Grant in increasing the number of college graduates, this measure has validity.

This measure requires clarity.

In general, the contract program funds are program-specific and not student-specific. However, in some cases, funds are provided to institutions for research and purchase of equipment.

Additionally, Historically Black Colleges and Universities should also report this measure.

We recommend revising this measure to 'Number of degrees granted for contract program recipients (where applicable) and students enrolled in Historically Black Colleges and Universities' [Delineate by baccalaureate, masters, doctoral, and professional degree].

**Reliability:**

This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free.

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service/Budget Entity:** ACT1901, ACT1906, ACT1946, ACT1956, ACT1936, ACT1938, ACT1940, and ACT1960

**Measure 37:** Retention rate of award recipients (Delineate by Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  
 Requesting new measure.  
 Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

This measure requires clarity.

In general, the contract program funds are program-specific. There is also a wide variability in the levels of degree programs funded under Academic Contract (Degrees include B.S. M.S., MSW, Ph.D., and M.D.). As a result, data cannot be generalized for all students. Additionally, in some cases, funds are provided to institutions for research and purchase of equipments. Further, only a limited number of private colleges and universities receive contract program funds. An aggregation of performance data would thus be misleading.

Students in the three Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities are not the direct recipients of the state funds. Funds for Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities are provided to the institutions to enhance access, retention and graduation efforts. Consequently, it is important that we track the retention rate of students enrolled in the three Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities.

We recommend deleting this measure for contract programs and revising it to 'Retention rate of students enrolled in Historically Black Colleges and Universities' [Delineate by First Time in College (FTIC) students using a 2-year rate].

**Data Source:**

The Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities should report this measure directly to the Office of Articulation. The measure for recipients of the Florida Resident Access Grant should be reported by the Office of Student Financial Assistance.

Current databases do not contain the information needed to calculate this measure. As reported, the data do not identify the year (freshman, sophomore, etc.) in which the student received the Florida Resident Access Grant. Also, the data do not include an identifier for first-time-in-college recipients.

The private Historically Black Colleges and Universities also do not report data at this level to the Department of Education.

**Methodology:**

**Denominator** = Number of degree-seeking FTIC students who enrolled in Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities in Fall 2005.

**Numerator** = Of those enrolled, the number found re-enrolled in Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities in Fall 2006.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not yet established.

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not yet established. Last performance measures data was compiled in March, 2005. At the time, 2003-04 data was reported. State-level data for private colleges and universities has not be updated due to organizational restructuring leading to transfer of responsibility from the Division of Colleges and Universities to the Office of Articulation in January 2006.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service/Budget Entity:** ACT1901, ACT1906, ACT1946, ACT1956, ACT1936, ACT1938, ACT1940, and ACT1960  
**Measure 38:** Graduation rate of award recipients (Delineate by Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  
 Requesting new measure.  
 Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

This measure requires clarity.

In general, the contract program funds are program-specific. There is also a wide variability in the levels of degree programs funded under Academic Contract (Degrees include B.S. M.S., MSW, Ph.D., and M.D.). As a result, data cannot be generalized for all graduates. Additionally, in some cases, funds are provided to institutions for research and purchase of equipment. Further, only a limited number of private colleges and universities receive contract program funds. An aggregation of performance data would thus be misleading.

Students in the three Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities are not the direct recipients of the state funds. Funds for Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities are provided to the institutions to enhance access, retention and graduation efforts. Consequently, it is important that we track the graduation rate of students enrolled in the three Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities.

We recommend deleting this measure for contract programs and revising it to 'Graduation rate of students enrolled in Historically Black Colleges and Universities' [Delineate by First Time in College (FTIC) students using a 4- and 6-year rate].

**Data Source:**

Current databases do not contain the information needed to calculate this measure. As reported, the data do not identify the year (freshman, sophomore, etc.) in which the student received the Florida Resident Access Grant. Also, the data do not include an identifier for first-time-in-college recipients.

The private Historically Black Colleges and Universities also do not report data at this level to the Department of Education.

Graduation rates of recipients of the Florida Resident Access Grant should be reported by the Office of Student Financial Assistance. The Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities should report this measure directly to the Office of Articulation.

**Methodology:**

- Denominator = Number of degree-seeking FTIC students enrolled in Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities in academic year 2000-01.
- Numerator = Of those enrolled, the number who graduated within 4 years and 6 years following enrollment at Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities.



**Validity:**

The standard measure for graduation rates is based on the number of students completing a program within 150% of the normal time. Thus, for a 4-year baccalaureate degree program, the standard is the number graduating in 6 years.

[The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) defines normal time as the amount of time necessary for a student to complete all requirements for a degree or certificate according to the institution's catalog. This is typically 4 years for a bachelor's degree in a standard term-based institution].

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not yet established. Last performance measures data was compiled in March, 2005. At the time, 2003-04 data was reported. State-level data for private colleges and universities has not be updated due to organizational restructuring leading to transfer of responsibility from the Division of Colleges and Universities to the Office of Articulation in January 2006.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability****Department: Education****Program: Private Colleges and Universities****Service/Budget Entity: ACT1901, ACT1906, ACT1946, ACT1956, ACT1936, ACT1938, ACT1940, and ACT1960****Measure 39: 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; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)****Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  
 Requesting new measure.  
 Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Student records on graduates are obtained from database of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida as part of the PK20 Education Data Warehouse. Data are available through an agreement with the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program.

Follow-up information on those students was provided by the Florida Education Training and Placement Information Program databases. Data on employment and earnings are available for employers who report to the Florida unemployment insurance wage report.

Data are reported in the aggregate for ICUF colleges and cannot be delineated as required in the measure. In general, the contract program funds are program-specific. There is also a wide variability in the levels of degree programs funded under Academic Contract (Degrees include B.S. M.S., MSW, Ph.D., and M.D.). As a result, data cannot be generalized for all graduates. Additionally, in some cases, funds are provided to institutions for research and purchase of equipments. Further, only a limited number of private colleges and universities receive contract program funds. An aggregation of performance data would thus be misleading.

We recommend deleting this measure for contract programs and revising it to 'Of those graduates remaining in Florida, the percent employed at \$22,000 or more 1 year following graduation (Historically Black Colleges and Universities).'

**Methodology:**

Three calculations were made, for all ICUF institutions, for FRAG recipients only, and for graduates of Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

**Denominator:** Total number of 2004-05 graduates who were found employed in Florida in fourth quarter of 2005.

**Numerator:** Of those, the number whose reported earnings were \$22,000 or more (annual earnings are derived by multiplying quarterly earnings by 4).

**Separate calculation for:**

ICUF graduates

ICUF graduates who had received a FRAG award at any time in the past 6 years

Graduates of the four private Historically Black Colleges and Universities

**Calculation 2006:**

ICUF, 5,847 / 70%

FRAG, 4,283 / 70%

HBCUs, 343 / 66%

**Validity:**

Earning thresholds of graduates are a valid indicator of the contribution of private colleges and universities to the workforce (statutory goal 3). However, the threshold of \$22,000 was established some time ago and may need to be increased.

**Reliability:**

This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. Information collected on employment and earnings is the best available at this time. However, there are some gaps in the data. For instance, self-employed workers are not included in the Florida unemployment insurance wage report.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability**

**Department:** Education  
**Program:** Private Colleges and Universities  
**Service/Budget Entity:** ACT1901, ACT1906, ACT1946, ACT1956, ACT1936, ACT1938, ACT1940, and ACT1960  
**Measure:** 40 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; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)

**Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  
 Requesting new measure.  
 Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Student records on graduates are obtained from database of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida as part of the PK20 Education Data Warehouse. Data are available through an agreement with the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program.

Follow-up information on those students was provided by the Florida Education Training and Placement Information Program databases. Data on employment and earnings are available for employers who report to the Florida unemployment insurance wage report.

Data are reported in the aggregate for ICUF colleges and cannot be delineated as required in the measure. In general, the contract program funds are program-specific. There is also a wide variability in the levels of degree programs funded under Academic Contract (Degrees include B.S. M.S., MSW, Ph.D., and M.D.). As a result, data cannot be generalized for all graduates. Additionally, in some cases, funds are provided to institutions for research and purchase of equipments. Further, only a limited number of private colleges and universities receive contract program funds. An aggregation of performance data would thus be misleading.

We recommend deleting this measure for contract programs and revising it to 'Of those graduates remaining in Florida, the percent employed at \$22,000 or more 1 year following graduation (Historically Black Colleges and Universities).'

**Methodology:**

Three calculations were made, for all ICUF institutions, for FRAG recipients only, and for graduates of Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

**Denominator:** Total number of 2000-01 graduates who were found employed in Florida in fourth quarter of 2005.

**Numerator:** Of those, the number whose reported earnings were \$22,000 or more (annual earnings are derived by multiplying quarterly earnings by 4).

**Separate calculation for:**

ICUF graduates

Recipients of a FRAG award at any time in 6 years prior to graduation

Graduates of the four private Historically Black Colleges and Universities

**Calculation 2006:**

ICUF5, 234 / 87%

FRAG, 3,529 / 86%

HBCUs, 250 or 83%

**Validity:**

Graduates who remain in Florida to work and who earning at a certain threshold are a valid indicator of the contribution of private colleges and universities to the workforce (statutory goal 3). However, the threshold of \$22,000 was established some time ago and may need to be increased.

**Reliability:**

This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. Information collected on employment and earnings is the best available at this time. However, there are some gaps in the data. For instance, self-employed workers are not included in the Florida unemployment insurance wage report.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability****Department: Education****Program: Private Colleges and Universities****Service/Budget Entity: ACT1901, ACT1906, ACT1946, ACT1956, ACT1936, ACT1938, ACT1940, and ACT1960****Measure 41: Licensure/certification rates of award recipients, (where applicable), (Delineate by Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)****Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  
 Requesting new measure.  
 Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data bases on licensure and certification shared with the Department of Education are not sufficiently complete to report data on this measure.

This measure requires clarity.

We recommend revising this measure to 'Pass rate on licensure/certification exams (where applicable), for the first sitting (Delineate by Academic Contract; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities)'.

Data Source: Historically Black Colleges and Universities and institutions that receive contract program funds shall report this measure directly to the Office of Articulation.

Methodology: Not yet established.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not yet established.

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not yet established.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability****Department: Education****Program: Private Colleges and Universities****Service/Budget Entity: ACT1901, ACT1906, ACT1946, and ACT1956****Measure 42: Number/percent of baccalaureate degree recipients who are employed in an occupation identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list (This measure would be for each Academic Contract and for the Florida Resident Access Grant)****Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  
 Requesting new measure.  
 Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

This measure requires clarity.

Only a few of the contract program funds are baccalaureate degree-specific. As a result, data cannot be generalized for all students. An aggregation of performance data would thus be misleading.

A baccalaureate degree does not qualify a person to obtain employment in an occupation identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference Targeted Occupations list. Those occupations all require a technical education at the certificate- or degree-level.

We recommend deleting this measure.

Data Source: N/A

Methodology: N/A

**Validity:**

Not valid. If any ICUF graduates were found employed in an occupation requiring a technical certificate or AS degree, that employment would not be related to the baccalaureate degree.

**Reliability:**

N/A

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability****Department: Education****Program: Private Colleges and Universities****Service/Budget Entity: ACT1901, ACT1906, ACT1946, ACT1956, ACT1936, ACT1938, ACT1940, and ACT1960****Measure 43: Number of prior year's graduates (Delineate by Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)****Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  
 Requesting new measure.  
 Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Note: This is the same as measure # 36 for the Florida Resident Access Grant

**Data Source:** Data are reported by Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program through a data-sharing agreement with the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida.**Methodology:**

Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program linked student records of bachelor degree recipients (2004-05) from ICUF institutions to the last 6 years of Florida Resident Access Grant.

**Calculation 2005-06:** Of 2004-05 bachelor-degree graduates of private colleges that are members of ICUF, 8,578 were recipients of FRAG at some time during the past 6 years.

Graduates are reported only for FRAG recipients; contract program graduates are not included.

**Validity:**As an indicator of the effectiveness of the Florida Resident Access Grant in increasing the number of college graduates, this measure has validity.  
This measure requires clarity.

Not a valid measure for the contract program grants. In general, the contract program funds are program-specific. There is also a wide variability in the levels of degree programs funded under Academic Contract (Degrees include B.S. M.S., MSW, Ph.D., and M.D.). As a result, data cannot be generalized for all graduates. Additionally, in some cases, funds are provided to institutions for research and purchase of equipments. Further, only a limited number of private colleges and universities receive contract program funds. An aggregation of performance data would thus be misleading.

We recommend deleting this measure for contract programs and Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

**Reliability:**

This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*



**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability****Department: Education****Program: Private Colleges and Universities****Service/Budget Entity: ACT1901, ACT1906, ACT1946, and ACT1956****Measure 44: Number of prior year's graduates remaining in Florida (Academic Contract)****Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  
 Requesting new measure.  
 Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

This measure requires clarity.

In general, the contract program funds are program-specific. However, in some cases, funds are provided to institutions for research and purchase of equipments.

Additionally, Historically Black Colleges and Universities should also report this measure.

We recommend revising this measure to Number of graduates remaining in Florida 1 year following graduation [Academic Contract (where applicable) and Historically Black Colleges and Universities].

Data Source: The institutions that receive contract program funds and Historically Black Colleges and Universities shall report this measure directly to the Office of Articulation.

Methodology: Not yet established.

**Validity:**

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not yet established.

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not yet established. Last performance measures data was compiled in March, 2005. At the time, 2003-04 data was reported. State-level data for private colleges and universities has not be updated due to organizational restructuring leading to transfer of responsibility from the Division of Colleges and Universities to the Office of Articulation in January 2006.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

**LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability****Department: Education****Program: Private Colleges and Universities****Service/Budget Entity: ACT1936, ACT1938, ACT1940, and ACT1960****Measure 45: Number of FTIC students disaggregated by in-state and out-of-state  
(Historically Black Colleges and Universities)****Action** (check one):

- Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  
 Requesting new measure.  
 Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

Data are not available to report this measure. The ICUF data residing in the PK20 Education Data Warehouse do not indicate in-state or out-of-state status.

**Data Source:** The Historically Black Colleges and Universities should report this measure directly to the Office of Articulation.

**Methodology:** The number of First Generation in College students and the number of First Time in College students enrolled in Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

**Validity:**

As an indicator of the extent to which HBCUs are providing access to Florida residents, this is a valid measure. However the measure should include First Generation in College students as well. Funds for Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities are provided to the institutions to enhance access in addition to retention and graduation efforts. Consequently, it is important that we track First Generation in College students enrolled in the three Historically Black Private Colleges and Universities.

We recommend revising this measure to 'Number of First Time in College (FTIC) students and First Generation in College students disaggregated by in-state and out-of-state and gender (Historically Black Colleges and Universities)'.

Methodology not yet implemented; validity not yet established.

**Reliability:**

Methodology not yet implemented; reliability not yet established. Last performance measures data was compiled in March, 2005. At the time, 2003-04 data was reported. State-level data for private colleges and universities has not be updated due to organizational restructuring leading to transfer of responsibility from the Division of Colleges and Universities to the Office of Articulation in January 2006.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department Program Service/Budget Entity Measure # 46</b>	<b>Education Student Financial Aid Program  Percent of high school graduates who successfully completed the 19 core credits (Bright Futures)</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
- Data Source: Florida Department of Education High School graduation report 2005-06 and State Student Financial Assistance Data base	
The number of public high school standard diploma graduates and projected private high school graduates comes from the DOE Office of Evaluation and Reporting, Martha Millers "Projected Florida High School Graduates 2005-06 through 2020-21 and a private school projection. OSFA uses this information to generate budget estimates	
<b>Methodology</b>	
- Denominator: Number of High School standard high school diploma graduates in academic year	
- Numerator: Number of High School students eligible for Bright Futures in following academic year	
<b>Calculation</b> (high school graduates in 03-04)	
<b>Numerator:</b> 53,704 (2005 standard-diploma high school graduates, initial eligibles, Bright Futures in academic year 2005-06)	
<b>Denominator:</b> 143,687 (Public high school graduates plus projected private high school graduates, 2004-05)	
<b>Result: 37.4 percent</b>	
<b>Validity:</b>	
The percent of high school graduates who are eligible for a merit-based scholarship is a valid indicator of progress toward the statutory goal of highest student achievement. Tracking this measure over time may demonstrate the impact of the Bright Futures program on high school students' selection of more challenging courses.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
Data in the student transcript database form the basis for evaluating a student's eligibility for a Bright Future award. Therefore, the data are carefully edited and reliable. However, the term used in the measure "19 credits" is not defined. Also, it is not clear what is intended by "successfully completed" the courses, because the student can earn high school credit in all fifteen courses but not be eligible for scholarship because of GPA in those courses. Therefore, the computation is not accurately described by the measure.	
The department calculated the percent of high school graduates who were eligible for a Bright Futures scholarship.	
<b>Recommendation:</b>	

Restate the measure:

- o Option 1: Annual percent of standard high school diploma recipients who were eligible for a Bright Futures Scholarship
- o Option 2: Annual percent of standard high school diploma recipients who earned high school credit for the 15 credits required to be eligible for a Bright Futures Medallion Scholarship.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department Program Service/Budget Entity Measure #47</b>	<b>Education Student Financial Aid Program  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)</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
- Data Sources: State Student Financial Aid Database (SSFAD) and Education Data Warehouse (EDW) - Data Availability: Annually in October - Methodology: Student records of all Bright Futures initial disbursements in a given academic year are linked to student enrollment records at community colleges and state universities during the most recent academic year for which enrollment records are available. The initial year is identified as 4 years prior to the current year for community colleges, and 6 years prior to the current year for state universities.	
<p>The term "retention rate" is not defined in the wording of the measure. For purposes of this calculation, retention is defined as graduation, remaining enrolled after the target date, or (for community colleges) having transferred to a state university prior to graduating from the community college.</p>	
<b>Calculation:</b>	
<b>State University System</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•39,626 Students had a status of Eligibility Initial for 2000-2001</li> <li>•32,215 of these students had a disbursement during 2000-2001</li> </ul>	
<b>Denominator</b>	
20,788 of the 32,215 receiving a disbursement in 2000-2001 were enrolled in the SUS during 2000-2001.	
<b>Numerator</b>	
13,959 received an award (Bachelors or Masters) from a State University sometime between 2001-2002 and 2005-2006, with an additional 2,502 still enrolled in 2005-2006 in the State University System for a total of 16,461.	
<b>Result</b>	
16,461 / 20,788 = 79%	
<b>Community College System</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>40,912 students had a status of Eligibility Initial for 2002-2003</li> <li>34,369 of these students had a disbursement during 2002-2003</li> </ul>	
<b>Denominator</b>	
10,802 of the 34,369 receiving a disbursement in 2002-2003 were enrolled in a CC during 2002-2003.	
<b>Numerator</b>	
5,161 received an award (AA, AS, BA, AAS, ASC) from a community college sometime between 2002-2003 and 2005-2006, with an additional 1,908 still enrolled in 2005-2006 in a community	

college for a total of 7,069. There are also 1,433 of these students enrolled in SUS in 2005-2006. These could be added to the 7,069 to get a total of 8,502.

**Result**

$7,069 / 10,802 = 65\%$  or  $8,502 / 10,802 = 79\%$

**Validity:**

As an indicator of progress toward the goal of increasing postsecondary continuation rates, the calculation of the retention of recipients of a state grant is a valid measure. However, the word "retention" includes those who have graduated as well as those who remain enrolled after 4 or 6 years. Enrollment after 4 or 6 years is not a measure of the effectiveness of the education sector (community college or state university system) or of the Bright Futures program. For instance, a student who is successful at a community college may have graduated or transferred to a 4-year program well before 4 years of initial enrollment. Likewise, continuing enrollment after 2 or 4 years does not indicate any degree of failure by the education institution or the FSAG program.

**Reliability:**

The data accurately reflect the percent of Bright Futures students who have graduated or continue in enrollment at a community college or state university after 4 or 6 years. The measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b> <b>Program</b> <b>Service/Budget Entity</b> <b>Measure #48</b>	<b>Education</b> <b>Student Financial Aid Program</b>  <b>Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system (Bright Futures)</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
- Data Sources: State Student Financial Aid Database (SSFAD) and Education Data Warehouse (EDW) - Data Availability: Annually in October - Methodology: Student records of all Bright Futures initial disbursements in a given academic year are linked to student enrollment records at community colleges and state universities during the most recent academic year for which enrollment records are available. The initial year is identified as 4 years prior to the current year for community colleges, and 6 years prior to the current year for state universities.	
<b>Calculation:</b>	
<b>State University System</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•39,626 Students had a status of Eligibility Initial for 2000-2001</li> <li>•32,215 of these students had a disbursement during 2000-2001</li> </ul>	
<b>Denominator</b>	
20,788 of the 32,215 receiving a disbursement in 2000-2001 were enrolled in the SUS during 2000-2001.	
<b>Numerator</b>	
13,959 received an award (Bachelors or Masters) from a State University sometime between 2001-2002 and 2005-2006	
<b>Result</b>	
13,959 / 20,788 = 67.1 percent	
<b>Community College System</b>	
40,912 students had a status of Eligibility Initial for 2002-2003	
34,369 of these students had a disbursement during 2002-2003	
<b>Denominator</b>	
10,802 of the 34,369 receiving a disbursement in 2002-2003 were enrolled in a CC during 2002-2003.	
<b>Numerator</b>	
5,161 received an award (AA, AS, BA, AAS, ASC) from a community college sometime between 2002-2003 and 2005-2006.	
<b>Result</b>	
5,161 / 10,802 = 47.7 percent	
<b>Validity:</b>	
As an indicator of progress toward the goal of increasing postsecondary continuation rates, the calculation of the graduation rate of recipients of a state grant is a valid measure. However, graduation is not the only positive outcome for recipients of a state grant who enroll in	

community colleges. A community college student who transfers to a university prior to graduation is a successful student.

**Reliability:**

The data accurately reflect the percent of Bright Futures students who have graduated after 4 or 6 years. The measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. However, the Legislature reviews a number of accountability reports, each having a different method of calculating the graduation rate. Although each method may be reliable according to its definitions, the fact that there are a number of different rates may be confusing.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*



<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Student Financial Aid Program</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	
<b>Measure #49</b>	<b>Percent of high school graduates attending Florida postsecondary institutions (Bright Futures)</b>

---

**Action** (check one):

Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  
 Requesting new measure.  
 Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

**Data Source:**  
**SSFAD**

**Methodology:**  
 Numerator: Bright Futures Initial students disbursed at Florida postsecondary eligible institutions 2005-06.  
 Denominator: Total number of Bright Futures initial eligible students.

**Calculation:**  
 There were 46,150 students with a status of Eligible Initial for Bright Futures in 04-05. Of these, 38,910 students received a disbursement in 04-05. An additional 982 received their first disbursement in 05-06.

$39,892 / 46,150 = 86.4\%$

The percent of students who accept an award for which they are eligible is higher for the Florida Medallion Scholarship than for the Florida Academic Scholarship:

	Percentage Accepting Award		
FAS	7838	9798	80.0%
FMS	30585	34668	88.2%
GSV	1469	1684	87.2%
Total	39892	46150	86.4%

**Validity:**  
 The established standard appears to mirror the percent of high school graduates who enroll in postsecondary education in Florida the fall following high school graduation (standard 52% and actual 61%). However, the calculation measures only the number of students who accept the Bright Futures Scholarship offered to them (88.6%). The measure is valid only if it is intended to evaluate whether the Bright Futures program decreases the "brain drain" to out of state institutions. In that case, it is meaningful only if displayed clearly as a trend line. One year of data is not meaningful. Also, the data would be more meaningful as a measure of the "brain drain" if broken down by the type of scholarship. The Florida Academic Scholarship has much more rigorous eligibility standards than the Florida Medallion Scholarship or the Florida Gold Seal Vocational Scholarship. The percent of students who accept their Florida Academic Scholarship is less than those who accept the less rigorous award. Presumably, these students could be receiving scholarships to attend out-of-state colleges.

**Reliability:**

The data reported are reliable as the number deemed eligible and accept their scholarship during a given window of time is documented through funds disbursed.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Student Financial Aid Program</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	
<b>Measure # 50</b>	<b>Number of Bright Futures recipients</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
- Data Source: SSFAD - Date Availability: Annually in September - Number of Bright Futures Recipients = 140,049	
<b>Validity:</b>	
An increase to the number of Bright Futures recipients indicates that more students are achieving the high school requirements for the program. One positive outcome of the Bright Futures program is increased high school achievement.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
The calculation is reliable because Bright Futures funding per educational institution is documented at the student record level.	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department Program Service/Budget Entity Measure #51</b>	<b>Education Student Financial Aid Program  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)</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
- Data Sources: State Student Financial Aid Database (SSFAD) and Education Data Warehouse (EDW) - Data Availability: Annually in October - Methodology: Student records of all FSAG initial disbursements in a given academic year are linked to student enrollment records at community colleges and state universities during the most recent academic year for which enrollment records are available. The initial year is identified as 4 years prior to the current year for community colleges, and 6 years prior to the current year for state universities.	
<p>The term "retention rate" is not defined in the wording of the measure. For purposes of this calculation, retention is defined as graduation, remaining enrolled after the target date, or (for community colleges) having transferred to a state university prior to graduating from the community college.</p>	
<b>Calculation:</b>	
<b>State University System</b>	
43,064 received an initial FSAG disbursement in 2000-2001.	
<b>Denominator</b>	
12,243 of the 43,064 receiving a disbursement in 2000-2001 were enrolled in the SUS during 2000-2001.	
<b>Numerator</b>	
Of those, 7,330 received an award (Bachelors or Masters) from a State University sometime between 2001-2002 and 2005-2006, with an additional 1,032 still enrolled in 2005-2006 in the State University System for a total of 8,362.	
<b>Result</b>	
8,362 / 12,243 = <b>68%</b>	
<b>Community College System</b>	
52,609 received an initial FSAG disbursement in 2002-2003.	
<b>Denominator</b>	
29,986 of the 52,609 receiving a disbursement in 2002-2003 were enrolled in a CC during 2002-2003.	
<b>Numerator</b>	
9,975 received an award (AA, AS, BA, AAS, ASC) from a community college sometime between 2002-2003 and 2005-2006, with an additional 6,626 still enrolled in 2005-2006 in a community college for a total of 16,601. There are also 1,370 of these students enrolled in SUS in 2005-2006. These could be added to the 16,601 to get a total of 17,971.	
<b>Result</b>	

16,601 / 29,986 = **55%** or 17,971 / 29,986 = **60%**

**Validity:**

As an indicator of progress toward the goal of increasing postsecondary continuation rates, the calculation of the retention of recipients of state grant is a valid measure. However, the word "retention" includes those who have graduated as well as those who remain enrolled after 4 or 6 years. Enrollment after 4 or 6 years is not a measure of the effectiveness of the education sector (community college or state university system) or of the FSAG program. For instance, a student who is successful at a community college may have graduated or transferred to a 4-year program well before 4 years of initial enrollment. Likewise, continuing enrollment after 2 or 4 years does not indicate any degree of failure by the education institution or the FSAG program.

**Reliability:**

The data accurately reflect the percent of FSAG students who have graduated or continue in enrollment at a community college or state university after 4 or 6 years. The measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Student Financial Aid Program</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	
<b>Measure #52</b>	<b>Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system (Florida Student Assistance Grant)</b>

**Action** (check one):

Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  
 Requesting new measure.  
 Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

- Data Sources: State Student Financial Aid Database (SSFAD) and Education Data Warehouse (EDW)
- Data Availability: Annually in October
- Methodology: Student records of all FSAG initial disbursements in a given academic year are linked to student enrollment records at community colleges and state universities during the most recent academic year for which enrollment records are available. The initial year is identified as 4 years prior to the current year for community colleges, and 6 years prior to the current year for state universities.

**Calculation:**

**State University System**

43,064 received an initial FSAG disbursement in 2000-2001.

**Denominator**

12,243 of the 43,064 receiving a disbursement in 2000-2001 were enrolled in the SUS during 2000-2001.

**Numerator**

Of those, 7,330 received an award (Bachelors or Masters) from a State University sometime between 2001-2002 and 2005-2006

**Result**

$7,330 / 12,243 = 59.8$  percent

**Community College System**

52,609 received an initial FSAG disbursement in 2002-2003.

**Denominator**

29,986 of the 52,609 receiving a disbursement in 2002-2003 were enrolled in a CC during 2002-2003.

**Numerator**

9,975 received an award (AA, AS, BA, AAS, ASC) from a community college sometime between 2002-2003 and 2005-2006.

**Result**

$9,975 / 29,986 = 33.3$  percent

**Validity:**

As an indicator of progress toward the goal of increasing postsecondary continuation rates, the calculation of the graduation rate of recipients of a state grant is a valid measure. However, graduation is not the only positive outcome for recipients of a state grant who enroll in community colleges. A community college student who transfers to a university prior to graduation is a successful student.

**Reliability:**

The data accurately reflect the percent of recipients of the Florida Student Assistance Grant who have graduated after 4 or 6 years. The measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. However, the Legislature reviews a number of accountability reports, each having a different method of calculating the graduation rate. Although each method may be reliable according to its definitions, the fact that there are a number of different rates may be confusing.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Student Financial Aid Program</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	
<b>Measure #53</b>	<b>Percent of recipients who, upon completion of the program, work in fields in which there are shortages (Critical Teacher Shortage Forgivable Loan Program)</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
- Data Sources: State Student Financial Aid Database.	
- Numerator: Record of all Critical Teacher Program recipients who worked in the Critical Teaching Field	
- Denominator Records of all Critical Teacher Program recipients in a given academic year.	
<b>Validity:</b>	
Not valid. The measure cannot be other than 100 percent. The program requires a recipient of the Critical Teacher Program to work in the field of teaching as a prerequisite for the program.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
The data accurately reflect the percentage of participants working in the field of teaching, however, all participants in program must be teaching to receive program award.	
This measure should be deleted, as it is meaningless.	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*



<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Department of Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>State Grants/K-12 Program—FEFP Code: 48250300</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	
<b>Measure 54</b>	<b>Number/percent of teachers with National Teacher's Certification, reported by district</b>

**Action** (check one):

Requesting revision to approved performance measure.

Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.

Requesting new measure.

Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

**Data Source:**  
National Board of Professional Teaching Standards  
<http://www.nbpts.org/>

Funding is available through a Federal Subsidy grant from the United States Department of Education and the Dale Hickam Excellent Teacher Program. Data on the state funds distribution are maintained for accounting purposes. National data are used as teachers may relocate without notifying the Department of Education.

**Methodology:**  
Denominator: Number of teachers in Florida (2005 data) --  
Numerator: Number of teachers in Florida who hold National Board Certification – 7,782

Number = 7,782  
Percent = 4.42 percent

**Validity:**  
Validity of this measure cannot be determined because the Department of Education has not adopted an objective whose progress is measured by an increase in the number of teachers with national board certification. The department keeps track of the state funding provided but has no other program responsibilities related to national board certification of teachers.

**Reliability:** This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Department of Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Public Schools</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	<b>Curriculum and Instruction (ACT0565)</b> <b>School Improvement (ACT0605)</b> <b>Assessment and Evaluation (ACT0635)</b>
<b>Measure 55</b>	<b>Number/percent of "A" schools, reported by district</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<b>Data Sources:</b>	
Evaluation and Reporting data base. Available in Excel format (searchable) on the World Wide Web at:	
<a href="http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/xls/sg0506alldistricts.xls">http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/xls/sg0506alldistricts.xls</a>	
District level school grades are available at:	
<a href="http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/0506/schlGrds_pages_15_16.pdf">http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/0506/schlGrds_pages_15_16.pdf</a>	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
Denominator = Number of graded schools (A-F)	
Numerator = Of those, the number of schools with grade of A in 2005-06	
<b>Calculation 2005-06:</b>	
Number of graded schools – 2,789	
Number of schools with grade of A – 1,467	
Percent of A schools (state level) – 52.6 percent	
<b>Validity:</b>	
Tracked over time, this measure is valid as an indicator of progress toward achieving the statutory goal of <i>Highest Student Achievement</i> , Strategic Imperative 3, <i>Student proficiency: Improve the proficiency of Grade 3-10 students in reading, math, and writing.</i>	
Schools are assigned a grade based primarily upon student achievement data from the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). School grades communicate to the public how well a school is performing relative to state standards. School grades are calculated based on annual learning gains of each student toward achievement of Sunshine State Standards, the progress of the lowest quartile of students, and the meeting of proficiency standards.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free.	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Department of Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Public Schools</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	<b>Curriculum and Instruction (ACT0565)</b> <b>School Improvement (ACT0605)</b> <b>Assessment and Evaluation (ACT0635)</b>
<b>Measure 56</b>	<b>Number/percent of <i>D</i> or <i>F</i> schools, reported by district</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<b>Data Sources:</b>	
Evaluation and Reporting data base. Available in Excel format (searchable) on the World Wide Web at:	
<a href="http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/xls/sg0506alldistricts.xls">http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/xls/sg0506alldistricts.xls</a>	
District level school grades are available at:	
<a href="http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/0506/schlGrds_pages_15_16.pdf">http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/0506/schlGrds_pages_15_16.pdf</a>	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
Denominator = Number of graded schools (A-F)	
Numerator = Of those, the number of schools with grade of <i>D</i> , plus the number with a grade of <i>F</i> , in 2005-06	
<b>Calculation 2005-06:</b>	
Number of graded schools – 2,789	
Number of schools with grade of <i>D</i> or <i>F</i> – 142	
Percent of <i>D</i> or <i>F</i> schools (state level) – 5.1 percent	
<b>Validity:</b>	
Tracked over time, this measure is valid as an indicator of progress toward achieving the statutory goal of <i>Highest Student Achievement</i> , Strategic Imperative 3, <i>Student proficiency: Improve the proficiency of Grade 3-10 students in reading, math, and writing</i> . The measure is negative, in that low percentages of <i>D</i> or <i>F</i> schools is better than high percentages.	
Schools are assigned a grade based primarily upon student achievement data from the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). School grades communicate to the public how well a school is performing relative to state standards. School grades are calculated based on annual learning gains of each student toward achievement of Sunshine State Standards, the progress of the lowest quartile of students, and the meeting of proficiency standards.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free.	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Department of Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Public Schools</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	<b>Curriculum and Instruction (ACT0565)</b> <b>School Improvement (ACT0605)</b> <b>Assessment and Evaluation (ACT0635)</b>
<b>Measure 57</b>	<b>Number/percent of schools declining one or more letter grades, reported by district</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<b>Data Sources:</b>	
Evaluation and Reporting data base. Available in Excel format (searchable) on the World Wide Web at: <a href="http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/xls/sg0506alldistricts.xls">http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/xls/sg0506alldistricts.xls</a>	
District level school grades are available at: <a href="http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/0506/schlGrds_pages_15_16.pdf">http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/0506/schlGrds_pages_15_16.pdf</a>	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
Denominator = Number of schools that earned a grade of A-F in both 2005 and 2006, minus the schools graded F in 2005 that also earned a grade in 2006 (unable to decline one or more grades)	
Numerator = Of those, the number of schools that declined one or more grades	
<b>Calculation 2005-06:</b>	
Number of schools that earned a grade of A-F in both 2004-05 and 2005-06, minus schools graded F in 2005 that also received a grade in 2006– 2,672	
Number of schools declining one or more grades - 373	
Percent of schools declining one or more grades (state level) - 14 percent	
<b>Validity:</b>	
Tracked over time, this measure is valid as an indicator of progress toward achieving the statutory goal of <i>Highest Student Achievement</i> , Strategic Imperative 3, <i>Student proficiency: Improve the proficiency of Grade 3-10 students in reading, math, and writing.</i>	
Schools are assigned a grade based primarily upon student achievement data from the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). School grades communicate to the public how well a school is performing relative to state standards. School grades are calculated based on annual learning gains of each student toward achievement of Sunshine State Standards, the progress of the lowest quartile of students, and the meeting of proficiency standards.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free.	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Department of Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Public Schools</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	<b>Curriculum and Instruction (ACT0565)</b> <b>School Improvement (ACT0605)</b> <b>Assessment and Evaluation (ACT0635)</b>
<b>Measure 58</b>	<b>Number/percent of schools improving one or more letter grades, reported by district</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<b>Data Sources:</b>	
Evaluation and Reporting data base. Available in Excel format (searchable) on the World Wide Web at: <a href="http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/xls/sg0506alldistricts.xls">http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/xls/sg0506alldistricts.xls</a>	
District level school grades are available at: <a href="http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/0506/schlGrds_pages_15_16.pdf">http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/0506/schlGrds_pages_15_16.pdf</a>	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
<b>Denominator</b> = Number of schools that earned a grade of A-F in both 2005 and 2006, minus the schools graded A in 2005 that also earned a grade in 2006 (unable to improve because already at the top)	
<b>Numerator</b> = Of those, the number of schools that improved one or more grades	
<b>Calculation 2005-06:</b>	
<b>Denominator</b> - 2,703 graded schools in both 2005 and 2006, minus 1,253 schools graded A in 2005 = 1,450	
<b>Numerator</b> - Number of schools improving one or more grades - 729	
<b>Percent of schools improving one or more grades (state level) – 50.3 percent</b>	
<b>Validity:</b>	
Tracked over time, this measure is valid as an indicator of progress toward achieving the statutory goal of <i>Highest Student Achievement</i> , Strategic Imperative 3, <i>Student proficiency: Improve the proficiency of Grade 3-10 students in reading, math, and writing.</i>	
Schools are assigned a grade based primarily upon student achievement data from the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). School grades communicate to the public how well a school is performing relative to state standards. School grades are calculated based on annual learning gains of each student toward achievement of Sunshine State Standards, the progress of the lowest quartile of students, and the meeting of proficiency standards.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free.	

Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Department of Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Workforce Development</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	
<b>Measure #59</b>	<b>Number/percent of 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)</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<b>Data Sources:</b>	
The Community College and Technical Center Management Information System (CCTMIS) provided data on students who earned vocational certificates or occupational completion points.	
Follow-up information on those students was provided by the Florida Education Training and Placement Information Program databases on continuing education and earnings. Follow-up data on postsecondary enrollment are available for public postsecondary institutions and private postsecondary institutions that are members of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF). Data on employment and earnings are available for employers who report to the unemployment insurance wage report.	
The Workforce Estimating Conference Targeted Occupations List for 2004-05 identified the high wage/high skill occupations.	
The 2005 4 <sup>th</sup> quarter Unemployment Insurance Wage Report file identified employment and earnings for the targeted occupations. Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program linked student records with the UI wage report records to identify the former students who were employed and earning at the threshold established in the measure.	
The criteria for high wage/high skill occupations are set annually. In addition, the links between education programs and occupations were updated for the 2004-05 reporting year. These changes explain why a larger number of students were found in related occupations on the Targeted Occupations List than in previous years.	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
<b>Denominator:</b> In 2004-05, the number of persons earning an occupational completion point in a program on the targeted occupations list; data obtained by Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program from the 2004-05 CCTMIS file.	
<b>Numerator:</b> Of those, the number found employed at \$4,680 or more per quarter in the 4 <sup>th</sup> quarter of 2005.	
Note: Those found employed at Level II were subtracted from both the numerator and the denominator. Level II is reported in Measure 60 of the Long Range Program Plan.	
<b>Calculation 2006:</b> 6,792 / 50 percent	

**Validity:**

As a measure of progress toward the statutory goal of a skilled workforce and economic development, this measure provides a valid indicator of the contribution of public technical centers to the need for skilled workers in high wage/high skill areas.

**Reliability:**

This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. Information collected on continuing education and earnings is the best available at this time. However, there are some gaps in the data.

The criteria for high wage/high skill occupations are set annually. In addition, the links between education programs and occupations were updated for the 2004-05 reporting year. These changes explain why a larger number of students were found in related occupations on the Targeted Occupations List than in previous years.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Department of Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Workforce Development</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	
<b>Measure #60</b>	<b>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</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<b>Data Sources:</b>	
The Community College and Technical Center Management Information System (CCTMIS) provided data on students who earned vocational certificates or occupational completion points.	
Follow-up information on those students was provided by the Florida Education Training and Placement Information Program databases on continuing education and earnings. Follow-up data on postsecondary enrollment are available for public postsecondary institutions and private postsecondary institutions that are members of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF). Data on employment and earnings are available for employers who report to the unemployment insurance wage report.	
The Workforce Estimating Conference Targeted Occupations List for 2004-05 identified the high wage/high skill occupations.	
The 2005 4 <sup>th</sup> quarter Unemployment Insurance Wage Report file identified employment and earnings for the targeted occupations. Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program linked student records with the UI wage report records to identify the former students who were employed and earning at the threshold established in the measure.	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
<b>Denominator:</b> In 2004-05, the number of persons earning vocational certificates in a program on the targeted occupations list for 2004-05; data obtained by Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program from the 2004-05 CCTMIS file.	
<b>Numerator:</b> Of those, the number found employed at \$3,900 or more per quarter in the 4 <sup>th</sup> quarter of 2005, plus the number who were found enrolled in a program at a higher level.	
Note: Those found employed at Level III (\$4,680 or more per quarter) were subtracted from both the numerator and the denominator. Level III is reported in Measure 59 of the Long Range Program Plan.	
<b>Calculation 2006:</b> 16,213 / 62%	
<b>Validity:</b>	



As a measure of progress toward the statutory goal of a skilled workforce and economic development, this measure provides a valid indicator of the contribution of public technical centers to the need for skilled workers in high wage/high skill areas.

**Reliability:**

This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. Data collected on continuing education and earnings is the best available at this time. However, there are some gaps in the data.

The criteria for high wage/high skill occupations are established annually. In addition, the links between education programs and occupations were updated for the 2004-05 reporting year. These changes explain why a larger number of students were found in related occupations on the Targeted Occupations List than in previous years.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Department of Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Workforce Development</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	
<b>Measure #61</b>	<b>Number/percent of persons earning vocational certificate 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 are continuing their education at the vocational certificate level (Level I)</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources:</b>	
The Community College and Technical Center Management Information System (CCTMIS) provided data on students who earned occupational completion points.	
Follow-up information on those students was provided by the Florida Education Training and Placement Information Program databases on continuing education and earnings. Follow-up data on postsecondary enrollment are available for public postsecondary institutions and private postsecondary institutions that are members of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF). Data on employment and earnings are available for employers who report to the unemployment insurance wage report. Data on military enlistment are obtained from federal reports.	
The 2005 4 <sup>th</sup> quarter Unemployment Insurance Wage Report file identified employment. Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program linked student records with the UI wage report records to identify the former students who were employed and earning at the threshold established in the measure.	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
<b>Denominator:</b> In 2004-05, the number of persons earning an occupational completion point in any career and technical education; data obtained by Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program from the 2004-05 CCTMIS file. Note: This calculation excludes former students who earned completion points in a program identified as level II or II on the Targeted Occupations List; they are included in the calculation for measures 59 and 60 in the Long Range Program Plan.	
<b>Numerator:</b> Of those, the number found employed at any level of earnings, plus the number who were found enrolled in a program at a level higher than the vocational certificate level, and the number found enlisted in the United States Armed Forces.	
<b>Calculation 2006:</b> 13,603 / 68%	
<b>Validity:</b>	
As a measure of progress toward the statutory goal of a skilled workforce and economic development, this measure provides a valid indicator of the contribution of public technical centers to the need for trained workers and for continuing education of those at the entry level.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	

This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. Data collected on continuing education, earnings, and military enlistment is the best available at this time. However, there are some gaps in the data.

**Request for change:** As the measure is stated, continuing education must be at the vocational certificate level; the calculation should be changed to include continuing education only if it is at a higher level. That calculation is used for all other reporting measures for state and federal purposes. Excluding vocational certificate-level education accounts for the lower number reported in the 2006 Long Range Program Plan compared to previous years.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Department of Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Workforce Development</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	
<b>Measure #62</b>	<b>Number/percent of workforce development programs which meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards for those programs that teach a subject matter for which there is a nationally recognized accrediting body</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
Data Source: No database is currently available.	
Methodology: N/A	
<b>Validity:</b> This is a valid measure of the quality of career-technical technical programs for which national accreditation or certification standards are available. If technical centers offer programs that meet the industry standards required by employees, students who complete those programs will be able to meet or exceed the requirements of local business and industry. However, some career and technical programs may not have standards established by a nationally recognized accrediting body.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
For reliability, it is necessary to update annually the information on all career and technical education programs. Data are not available. Collection of data on this measure requires collection of self-reported information on program accreditation or certifications for all career and technical programs.	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Department of Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Workforce Development</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	
<b>Measure #63</b>	<b>Number/percent of students attending workforce development programs that meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
Data Source: No database is currently available.	
Methodology: N/A	
<p><b>Validity:</b> This is a valid measure of the quality of career-technical technical programs for which national accreditation or certification standards are available. Students enrolled in accredited or certified programs should be the most prepared for the current requirements of local business and industry. However, some career and technical programs may not have standards established by a nationally recognized accrediting body.</p>	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
N/A	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Department of Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Workforce Development</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	
<b>Measure #64</b>	<b>Number/percent of students completing workforce development programs that meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
Data Source: No database is currently available.	
Methodology: N/A	
<b>Validity:</b> This is a valid measure of the quality of career-technical technical programs for which national accreditation and/or certification standards are available. Students enrolled in accredited or certified programs should be the most prepared for the current requirements of local business and industry. However, some career and technical education programs may not have standards established by a nationally recognized accrediting body.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
N/A	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department Program</b>	<b>Department of Education Workforce Development</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity Measure #65</b>	<b>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</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
The Community College and Technical Center Management Information System (CCTMIS) provided data on students who earned literacy completion points.	
Follow-up information on those students was provided by the Florida Education Training and Placement Information Program databases on continuing education and earnings. Follow-up data on postsecondary enrollment are available for public postsecondary institutions and private postsecondary institutions that are members of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF). Data on employment and earnings are available for employers who report to the unemployment insurance wage report.	
The 2005 4 <sup>th</sup> quarter Unemployment Insurance Wage Report file identified employment. Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program linked student records with the UI wage report records to identify the former students who were employed at any level. Linkages with postsecondary education files identified those who were found continuing their education at any level.	
<b>Calculation 2006:</b>	
<b>Denominator:</b> All students who earned any literacy completion point during the reporting year (2003-2004).	
<b>Numerator:</b> Of those, the number who were found employed at any level or who were found enrolled in any level of education, including those who were enrolled in adult basic education.	
<b>Validity:</b>	
This measure is not a valid indicator of the effect of education on employability. The number who earn a completion point does not reflect the quality of the education program, and the employment prospects are likely to improve only if a student completes an entire program and earns a GED or adult high school diploma. The denominator includes all types of Literacy Completion Points, from a two-year learning gain to completion of the GED. Not all LCPs have the same impact on employability and continuing education. The lowest level of learning gain will likely have a much less significant impact on employability than a higher level learning gain.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
The measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free.	

**Request for change:** The measure should include only those students who earn a GED or adult high school diploma. It should include the percent as well as the number.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*



<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Division of Community Colleges</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Community College Programs</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	<b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b>
<b>Measure #66</b>	<b>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)</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p> <p>Information on the students in programs identified as high wage/high skill is from Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program's (FETPIP) databases.</p>	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
<p><b>Denominator</b> = Number of AS and college-credit certificate program completers who finished programs identified as high wage/ high skill</p> <p><b>Numerator</b> = Number of those found by FETPIP to be employed for at least \$4,680 per quarter</p>	
<b>Validity:</b>	
<p>The objective seeks to annually expand the percentage of students who enroll in and complete workforce education programs and are placed as a result. This measure identifies students who complete the programs and are currently working. Therefore, this is a valid measure of the objective.</p>	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
<p>This measure is not a reliable measure because the occupations on the Workforce Estimating Conference list as high wage/high skill may change from year to year. The data, therefore, cannot be tracked longitudinally.</p>	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b> <b>Program</b> <b>Service/Budget Entity</b> <b>Measure #67</b>	<b>Division of Community Colleges</b> <b>Community College Programs</b> <b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b> <b>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 level program (Level II)</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p> <p>Information on the students in programs identified as high wage/high skill is from Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program's (FETPIP) databases.</p>	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Denominator = Number of AS and college-credit certificate program completers who finished programs identified for new entrants</li> <li>• Numerator = Number of those found by FETPIP to be employed for at least \$3,900 per quarter and number of those found continuing education in a college-credit level program</li> </ul>	
<b>Validity:</b> The objectives do not address college continuation for AS or college-credit certificate students. Therefore, this is not a valid measure of the objective.	
<b>Reliability:</b> This measure is not a reliable measure because the occupations on the Workforce Estimating Conference list as new entrants may change from year to year. The data, therefore, cannot be tracked longitudinally.	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department Program Service/Budget Entity Measure #68</b>	<b>Division of Community Colleges Community College Programs Postsecondary Educational Services 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)</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firm.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firm.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p> <p>Information on the students in programs identified as high wage/high skill is from Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program's (FETPIP) databases.</p>	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Denominator = Number of AS and college-credit certificate program completers who finished programs not identified as high wage/high skill and not identified as new entrants</li> <li>• Numerator = Number of those found by FETPIP to be employed and number of those found to be enlisted in the military and number of those found continuing their education at the vocational certificate level</li> </ul>	
<b>Validity:</b>	
The objective only addresses the placement portion of this measure. Therefore, this is not a valid measure of the objective.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
This measure is not a reliable measure because the occupations on the Workforce Estimating Conference (WEC) list as high wage/high skill may change from year to year. Since this measure	

looks at programs not on the WEC list, those programs will change as the WEC list changes.  
The data, therefore, cannot be tracked longitudinally.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>Department</b> <b>Program</b> <b>Service/Budget Entity</b> <b>Measure #69</b>	<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b> <b>Division of Community Colleges</b> <b>Community College Programs</b> <b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b> <b>Percent of Associate in Arts (AA) degree graduates who transfer to a state university within two years.</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one): <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b> Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a> . A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.  As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.  Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted. <b>Methodology:</b> • <b>Denominator</b> = Number of students enrolled in a Florida Community College who earned the AA degree in an academic year • <b>Numerator</b> = Of those, the number found enrolled in the State University System in the year of graduation or the year following.  <b>Validity:</b> The objective seeks to increase the transfer rate of AA degree students into state universities. Research shows that most AA degree student transfers occur within the first two years of earning the degree. Therefore, this is a valid measure of the transfer of AA degree students.  <b>Reliability:</b> This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. The same program is used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information. The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP.	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>Department</b> <b>Program</b> <b>Service/Budget Entity</b> <b>Measure #70</b>	<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b> <b>Division of Community Colleges</b> <b>Community College Programs</b> <b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b> <b>Percent of Associate in Arts (A.A.) degree transfers to the State University System who earn a 2.5 or above in the SUS after one year</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one): <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b> <p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p> <p>Methodology:  <b>Denominator</b> = Number of students who earned the AA degree in one academic year and transferred to the State University System in the next year  <b>Numerator</b> = Of those, the number who earned a 2.5 or above GPA in the SUS</p> <p><b>Validity:</b>  The objective seeks to increase the proportion of AA degree transfers to state universities who successfully complete upper-division coursework. A GPA of 2.5 or above is used to define "successful completion of coursework". Therefore, this is a valid measure of the successful completion of coursework by AA transfer students.</p> <p><b>Reliability:</b>  This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. The same program is used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information. The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP.</p>	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department Program Service/Budget Entity Measure #71</b>	<b>Division of Community Colleges Community College Programs Postsecondary Educational Services Of the Associate in Arts (A.A.) graduates who are employed full time rather than continuing their education, the percent who are in jobs earning at least \$9 an hour</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p> <p>Information on students' employment is from Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program's (FETPIP) databases.</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•<b>Denominator</b> = Number of students enrolled in a Florida Community College who earned the AA degree</li> <li>•<b>Numerator</b> = Of those, the number found by FETPIP to be employed and earning at least \$9/hour.</li> </ul> <p><b>Validity:</b> The objective seeks to monitor the percentage of non-transfer AA graduates employed in high skill/high wage jobs. This measure defines high wage jobs as those earning \$9/hour or more. Therefore, this is a valid measure.</p> <p><b>Reliability:</b> This measure currently uses \$9/hour, while the Performance Based Program Budgeting and the objective linked to this measure both use \$10/hour. This measure is not currently reliable because this is creating an inconsistency in reporting. However, if this correction is made, this measuring procedure will yield the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free.</p>	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>Department</b> <b>Program</b> <b>Service/Budget Entity</b> <b>Measure #72</b>	<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b> <b>Division of Community Colleges</b> <b>Community College Programs</b> <b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b> <b>Of the Associate in Arts (A.A.) students who complete 18 credit hours, the percent of whom graduate in four years</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one): <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b> <p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p> <p>Methodology:  <b>•Denominator</b> = Number of students enrolled in a Florida Community College AA program who earned at least 18 credit hours  <b>•Numerator</b> = Of those, the number who earned an AA within four years of entering the program</p> <p><b>Validity:</b>  The objective seeks to increase the proportion of AA students with 18 credit hours who graduate in four years. However, graduation is only one goal of students who attend the community college. This measure should be changed to include the retention of students in the community college system. Measure 1, Part 2 of the Community College Accountability Reports currently calculates a retention rate as the percentage of students who graduated or are still enrolled after 4 years. This calculation should be used for Measure #72 to provide consistency among reporting mechanisms.</p> <p><b>Reliability:</b>  Reliability of the current measure - While 18 hours has been used for more than a decade in the Florida Community College System's accountability system, recent work with the Achieving the Dream states has indicated a need to change to 12 hours in order to compare across the states. We have incorporated the 12 hour cutoff in our latest Strategic Imperative measure. Therefore, changing this measure to 12 hours would promote consistency between the LRPP and Strategic Imperative measures.</p>	



Reliability of the proposed measure – This is a reliable measure because the Accountability Reports have been calculated from the Community College Student Data Base and are reported annually.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>Department</b> <b>Program</b> <b>Service/Budget Entity</b> <b>Measure #73</b>	<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b> <b>Division of Community Colleges</b> <b>Community College Programs</b> <b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b> <b>Percent of students graduating with total accumulated credit hours that are less than or equal to 120 percent of degree requirement</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one): <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b> <p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Denominator = Number of students enrolled in a Florida Community College who earned the AA degree in an academic year</li> <li>•Numerator = Of those, the number who earned 72 credit hours or less</li> </ul> <p><b>Validity:</b></p> <p>The objective seeks to improve graduation rates. An Associate in Arts degree is 60 credit hours. Students who are able to complete their degree with 12 or fewer additional hours are able to do so in a more time efficient manner and thereby save themselves and the State monies that can be used to finance upper-division work. Therefore, analyzing this measure annually is a valid method of determining the improvement of the graduation rate.</p> <p><b>Reliability:</b></p> <p>This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. The same program is used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information. The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP.</p>	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>Department</b> <b>Program</b> <b>Service/Budget Entity</b> <b>Measure #74</b>	<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b> <b>Division of Community Colleges</b> <b>Community College Programs</b> <b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b> <b>Percent of students exiting the college-preparatory program who enter college-level course work associated with the Associate in Arts (A.A.), Associate in Science (A.S.), Postsecondary Vocational Certificate (PVC), and Postsecondary Adult Vocational programs</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one): <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b> Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firm.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firm.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a> . A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.  As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.  Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted. <b>Methodology:</b> • <b>Denominator</b> = Number of students enrolled in a Florida Community College who exited the College Preparatory program • <b>Numerator</b> = Of those, the number found who enrolled in college-level coursework associated with the AA, AS, PSVC, or PSAV programs  <b>Validity:</b> The objective seeks to increase the proportion of college preparatory students who continue on to college-level coursework. Once students who take courses associated with AA, AS, PSAV, and PSVC programs have finished College Prep work, they are participating in the next level and thereby meeting this objective.  <b>Reliability:</b> There is a code in the Community College Student Data Base for exiting college preparatory classes. However, in the past the institutions have not used this code consistently. In recent years, there has been an effort to improve the quality of the data for this data element, but it is still not 100% accurate. The same program is used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information. The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from	

the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>Department</b> <b>Program</b> <b>Service/Budget Entity</b> <b>Measure #75</b>	<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b> <b>Division of Community Colleges</b> <b>Community College Programs</b> <b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b> <b>Percent of Associate in Arts (A.A.) degree transfers to the State University System (SUS) who started in College Prep and who earn a 2.5 in the SUS after one year</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one): <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b> <p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b>  <b>•Denominator</b> = Number of students who took at least one College Prep course, earned the AA degree in one academic year and transferred to the State University System in the next  <b>•Numerator</b> = Of those, the number who earned a 2.5 or above GPA in the SUS</p> <p><b>Validity:</b>  The objective seeks to increase the percentage of AA degree transfers to state universities who started in College Prep and who successfully complete upper-division coursework. A GPA of 2.5 or above is used to define “successful completion of coursework”. Therefore, this is a valid measure of the successful completion of coursework by AA transfer students.</p> <p><b>Reliability:</b>  This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. The same program is used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information. The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP.</p>	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department Program Service/Budget Entity Measure #76</b>	<b>Division of Community Colleges Community College Programs Postsecondary Educational Services Number/Percent of Associate in Arts (A.A.) partial completers transferring to the State University System (SUS) with at least 40 credit hours</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p>	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•<b>Denominator</b> = Number of students who earned 40 credit hours or more toward the AA degree, but did not earn the degree</li> <li>•<b>Numerator</b> = Of those, the number who transferred to the State University System</li> </ul>	
<b>Validity:</b>	
<p>The objective seeks to monitor the proportion of AA partial completers transferring to the SUS. Partial completers are defined as those earning at least 40 credit hours but not earning the degree. Therefore, this is a valid measure of the transfer of AA partial completers.</p>	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
<p>The credit hours on this measure should be changed to 30 credit hours to match the Performance Based Program Budget measure. Once this is done, this measuring procedure will yield the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. The same program is used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information. The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP.</p>	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Division of Community Colleges</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Community College Programs</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	<b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b>
<b>Measure #77</b>	<b>Number/Percent/FTEs of Associate in Arts (A.A.) students who do not complete 18 credit hours within four years</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•<b>Denominator</b> = Number of students in the AA program for four years</li> <li>•<b>Numerator</b> = Of those, number who did not complete 18 hours</li> <li>•<b>FTE</b> calculated using total number of credit hours earned divided by 30.</li> </ul> <p><b>Validity:</b></p> <p>This measure is not a valid indicator of AA students not reaching the 18 hour threshold due to the problems inherent in defining an AA student. For example, oftentimes students will declare themselves an AA degree-seeking student, but after taking one course determine this is not what they want to do and leave. This type of student should not be held against an institution. We request this measure be deleted.</p> <p><b>Reliability:</b></p> <p>This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. The same program is used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information. The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP.</p>	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<p><b>Department</b> <b>Program</b> <b>Service/Budget Entity</b> <b>Measure #78</b></p>	<p><b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b> <b>Division of Community Colleges</b> <b>Community College Programs</b> <b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b> <b>Of the economically disadvantaged Associate in Arts (A.A.) students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an A.A. degree within four years</b></p>
<p><b>Action</b> (check one):</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.</p>	
<p><b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b> Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A cohort of students who are economically disadvantaged:</b></li> <li>• <b>Denominator</b> = Number of students enrolled in a Florida Community College who earned at least 18 credit hours</li> <li>• <b>Numerator</b> = Of those, the number who earned an AA within four years of entering the program</li> </ul> <p><b>Validity:</b> The cohort needed to calculate this measure is too small to provide meaningful information. This measure, its objective, and its outcome should be eliminated. Measure #72 should be used instead.</p> <p><b>Reliability:</b> The cohort needed to calculate this measure is too small to provide meaningful information. This measure should be eliminated. Measure #72 should be used instead.</p>	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*



<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department Program Service/Budget Entity Measure #79</b>	<b>Division of Community Colleges Community College Programs Postsecondary Educational Services Of the disabled Associate in Arts (A.A.) students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an A.A. degree within four years</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b>  A cohort of students who are disabled:  •<b>Denominator</b> = Number of students enrolled in a Florida Community College who earned at least 18 credit hours  •<b>Numerator</b> = Of those, the number who earned an AA within four years of entering the program</p> <p><b>Validity:</b>  The cohort needed to calculate this measure is too small to provide meaningful information. This measure, its objective, and its outcome should be eliminated. Measure #72 should be used instead.</p> <p><b>Reliability:</b>  The cohort needed to calculate this measure is too small to provide meaningful information. This measure should be eliminated. Measure #72 should be used instead.</p>	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>Department</b> <b>Program</b> <b>Service/Budget Entity</b> <b>Measure #80</b>	<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b> <b>Division of Community Colleges</b> <b>Community College Programs</b> <b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b> <b>Of the black male Associate in Arts (A.A.) students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an A.A. degree within 4 years</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one): <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b> Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a> . A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.  As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.  Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.  <b>Methodology:</b> •A cohort of students who are black males: • <b>Denominator</b> = Number of students enrolled in a Florida Community College who earned at least 18 credit hours • <b>Numerator</b> = Of those, the number who earned an AA within four years of entering the program  <b>Validity:</b> The cohort needed to calculate this measure is too small to provide meaningful information. This measure, its objective, and its outcome should be eliminated. Measure #72 should be used instead.  <b>Reliability:</b> The cohort needed to calculate this measure is too small to provide meaningful information. This measure should be eliminated. Measure #72 should be used instead.	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<p><b>Department</b> <b>Program</b> <b>Service/Budget Entity</b> <b>Measure #81</b></p>	<p><b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b> <b>Division of Community Colleges</b> <b>Community College Programs</b> <b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b> <b>Of the English as Second Language (college prep) or English for Non-Speaker (college credit) students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an A.A. degree within 4 years</b></p>
<p><b>Action</b> (check one):</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.</p>	
<p><b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b> Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firm.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firm.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b> •A cohort of English as Second Language (college prep) or English for Non-Speaker (college credit) students: •<b>Denominator</b> = Number of students enrolled in a Florida Community College who earned at least 18 credit hours •<b>Numerator</b> = Of those, the number who earned an AA within four years of entering the program</p> <p><b>Validity:</b> The cohort needed to calculate this measure is too small to provide meaningful information. This measure, its objective, and its outcome should be eliminated. Measure #72 should be used instead.</p> <p><b>Reliability:</b> The cohort needed to calculate this measure is too small to provide meaningful information. This measure should be eliminated. Measure #72 should be used instead.</p>	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<p><b>Department</b> <b>Program</b> <b>Service/Budget Entity</b> <b>Measure #82</b></p>	<p><b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b> <b>Division of Community Colleges</b> <b>Community College Programs</b> <b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b> <b>Of the Associate in Arts (A.A.) graduates who have not transferred to the State University System or an independent college or university, the number/percent who are found placed in an occupation identified as high wage/high skill on the Workforce Estimating Conference list</b></p>
<p><b>Action</b> (check one):</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure.  <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.</p>	
<p><b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>  <b>Data Source:</b> All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firm.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firm.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p> <p>Information on the students employed in occupations identified as high wage/high skill is from Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program's (FETPIP) databases.</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b>  <b>•Denominator</b> = Number of students enrolled in a Florida Community College who earned the AA degree in an academic year  <b>•Numerator</b> = Of those, the number found by FETPIP to be employed in a high skill/high wage occupation and not enrolled in the SUS or an independent college or university; the threshold used for this calculation is \$10.74 per hour.</p> <p><b>Validity:</b>  This measure is linked with the objective to monitor the number of AA 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. However, this is not a valid measure because the AA degree does not equip a person for occupation on the Targeted Occupations List. Those occupations all require a technical education at the certificate- or degree-level. The AA degree is intended to be a transfer degree to a four-year university.</p>	

**Reliability:**

This measure is not a reliable measure because the occupations on the Workforce Estimating Conference list as high wage/high skill may change from year to year. The data, therefore, cannot be tracked longitudinally.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Division of Community Colleges</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Community College Programs</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	<b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b>
<b>Measure #83</b>	<b>Percent of prior year Florida high school graduates enrolled in community colleges</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p>	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Denominator</b> = Number of students who graduated from a Florida high school in an academic year</li> <li>• <b>Numerator</b> = Of those, the number found enrolled in a Florida community college in the following year</li> </ul>	
<b>Validity:</b>	
<p>The objective seeks to increase the percentage of prior year high school graduates who enroll in the community colleges. This measure is calculated on an annual basis and compared to previous years. Therefore, this is a valid measure of the increase of the percentage of prior year high school graduates who enroll in the community colleges.</p>	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
<p>This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. The same program is used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information. The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP.</p>	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Division of Community Colleges</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Community College Programs</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	<b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b>
<b>Measure #84</b>	<b>Number of Associate in Arts (A.A.) degrees granted</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p>	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Number of students enrolled in a Florida Community College who earned the AA degree in an academic year</li> </ul>	
<b>Validity:</b>	
<p>The objective seeks to increase the proportion of AA degree transfers granted annually. Measure #69 is the valid measure of this objective. The calculation in measure #84 (and outcome 1D.1) is not a valid measure of Objective 1D and should be removed.</p>	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
<p>This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. The same program is used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information. The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP.</p>	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Division of Community Colleges</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Community College Programs</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	<b>Postsecondary Educational Services</b>
<b>Measure #85</b>	<b>Number of students receiving college preparatory instruction</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p>	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Number of students enrolled in a Florida Community College who are enrolled in a College Prep course</li> </ul>	
<b>Validity:</b>	
<p>While this measure provides a valid indication of the stability of students receiving College Prep instruction, it is not appropriate to hold the institution accountable for changes due to (1) College Prep increases as enrollment increases; (2) College Prep increases as more non-traditional students who have been out of school for more than 2 years increases; and (3) as the economy decreases the number of students (and thus the number of students needing College Prep) increases. This measure and its corresponding objective and outcome should be removed from the LRPP.</p>	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
<p>This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. The same program is used annually with only the years updated to reflect the most currently available information. The information reported in the LRPP is extracted from the results of various SAS programs. These programs have been developed over the years as part of the DCC Accountability Program or specifically for the LRPP.</p>	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*



<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department Program Service/Budget Entity Measure #86</b>	<b>Division of Community Colleges Community College Programs Postsecondary Educational Services Number of students enrolled in baccalaureate programs offered on community college campuses</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<p>Data Source: All of the data elements used in calculating the measures contained in the LRPP are contained in the Community College and Technical Center MIS. The community college files in this database are built from submission files provided by each of the 28 institutions in the Florida Community College System (FCCS). Instructions for file submissions and elements definitions are contained in the Student Data Base Data Element Dictionary distributed each summer at the Annual Reports Workshop (ARW) and posted to <a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm">http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/ccdictionary/dictionary_main.htm</a>. A regular component of the ARW is a discussion of the changes in the elements of the SDB from the previous year.</p> <p>As part of the standard submission process for the SDB, verification reports are generated for each data element. These reports are available to each institution for their use. Once the institutions have had an opportunity to review their submissions, they provide the Division of Community Colleges a certification report signifying that the data are accurate to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>Information from the twenty-eight institutions is then combined into one system level file. Record counts are maintained to ensure that the system file contains all of the information submitted.</p>	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
Number of students enrolled in community college baccalaureate programs and the number of students enrolled in concurrent-use baccalaureate programs.	
<b>Validity:</b>	
The objective seeks to promote the offering of upper-level courses on the community college campus. Students currently have two avenues for taking upper-level courses on the community college campus: concurrent-use program, which is housed on a community college campus, or community college baccalaureate program. This measure combines the enrollment for both programs to show if it is increasing. Therefore, this is a valid measure of enrollment in upper-level courses on the community college campus.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
This is currently not a reliable measure. Information on the number of students enrolled in concurrent-use baccalaureate programs is gathered on the Concurrent-Use Report submitted by community colleges each spring. However, the community colleges must gather this information from their university contacts for each concurrent-use program and this has not always been possible. Efforts are currently being taken to increase the number of programs reporting enrollment, but it is not currently 100%.	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>State Board of Education (4880)</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>PK 20 Executive Budget</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	<b>Executive Direction (ACT0010)</b>
<b>Measure 87</b>	<b>Percent of program administration and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions (Division of Public Schools)</b>

**Action** (check one):

Requesting revision to approved performance measure.  
 Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.  
 Requesting new measure.  
 Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

**Data source:** Department of Education Office of Budget Management, compilation of positions and expenditures by activity code. Data used are for 2004-05; data updated with 2005-06 numbers will be available in September 2006.

**Methodology:**

**Costs:**  
 Denominator = Costs for executive direction (ACT0010), Department of Education  
 Numerator = Costs for executive direction (ACT0010), Division of Public Schools (data reported do not include costs for the teacher quality offices)

**2004-05 calculation:**

Costs:  $\$2,821,159 / \$18,336,180 = 15.4$  percent

**Positions:**  
 Denominator = Total positions for Department of Education, executive direction  
 Numerator = Total positions for Division of Public Schools, executive direction (data reported do not include positions for the teacher quality offices)

**2004-05 Calculation**

Positions:  $14.0 / 97.9 = 14.3$  percent

**Validity:** It is not a valid measure of the department's objectives to compare administrative workload (costs or positions) of the department as a whole to the administrative workload of the Division of Public Schools. Since 2002, the Department of Education has organized to emphasize a "seamless K20 education accountability system (s. 1008.31, F.S.)."

**Reliability:** This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. Due to reorganization, however, the benchmarks and standards established by previous reports reflect different employees from the current report.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department Florida Program Service/Budget Entity Measure 88</b>	<b>Florida Department of Education Bureau of Educator Certification Teacher Certification (ACT0630) Percent of teacher certificates issued within 30 days after receipt of complete application and the mandatory fingerprint clearance notification</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
Bureau of Educator Certification Databases housed at Northwest Regional Data Center.	
<p>The bureau reports the percentage of certificates that were issued within 30 days of receiving the mandatory fingerprint clearance notification and not 30 days from receiving the initial application. This measure most accurately reflects the workload and efficiency of the bureau in completing this phase of the certification process where it has control.</p> <p><b>Denominator:</b> Number of certification applications that are designated as complete, and fingerprint clearance notification received</p> <p><b>Numerator:</b> Of those, the number that are issued certificates within 30 days 2005-06 calculation: 99.42%</p>	
<b>Validity:</b>	
As an indicator of progress toward the statutory goal of quality efficient services, the prompt processing of certification is a valid indicator of progress toward the objective of increasing the number of teachers to meet instructional demands.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
The data are complete, reliable, and sufficiently error free.	
<p>The logical construct methodology of the Lag Time Statistics component within the BEC Database was designed to specifically calculate the time (in days) required for completion of certification files for which the mandatory fingerprint clearance has been received.</p> <p>Construct: Upon receipt, a data entry record for the fingerprint clearance is made in the BEC Database and the fingerprint hold is cleared. At this time, a system date/timestamp is automatically captured within the database as the clock start date and the applicant file is scheduled for work as a hold release work type. When the applicant file has been processed to completion by Bureau staff, the system captures a second date/timestamp as the clock end date.</p> <p>The lapse between the clock start date and the clock end date is then calculated to determine the number of days required for completion. Percentages are calculated based on the total files of this hold release work type completed within a specified date range.</p> <p>The only perceived threat factor to data reliability comes from human error in data entry of the fingerprint clearance record and hold clearance.</p>	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>State Board of Education (48800)</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Teacher Quality</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	<b>Professional Training (ACT0610)</b>
<b>Measure 89</b>	<b>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</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
Bureau of Educator Recruitment and Professional Development	
<p>Districts report to the bureau an annual assessment of data indicating the linkage between student achievement and instructional personnel. The bureau assures that professional development activities focus on analysis of student achievement data, ongoing formal and informal assessments of student achievement, identification and use of enhanced and differentiated instructional strategies that emphasize rigor, relevance, and reading in the content areas, enhancement of subject matter expertise, integrated use of classroom technology than enhances teaching and learning, classroom management, parent involvement and school safety, as required by s. 1012.98, F.S.</p> <p>All 67 districts have implemented a Department of Education approved system of high quality professional development. District site reviews have been completed for all districts using a set of 66 standards adopted as Florida's Professional Development System Evaluation Protocol. Districts have submitted and implemented action plans for improvement for any standard rated less than acceptable to insure continuous improvement in their system of high quality professional development.</p>	
<b>Validity:</b>	
<p>The number of districts with high quality professional development systems is a valid indicator of progress toward Strategic Objective 1.1, Acquire Effective Teachers. Research proves that effective teachers are the most important variable in improved student rates of learning, and Florida's professional development system is based on research and the identification of the type of training that will be tailored to the needs of the school and the instructor.</p>	
<b>Reliability:</b> This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free.	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Department of Education</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Office of Grants Management</b>
<b>Service/Budget</b>	<b>Grants Management (ACT0190)</b>
<b>Entity</b>	
<b>Measure 89</b>	<b>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</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
Data Sources:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grants Management System – an electronic tracking system maintained by the Department of Education</li> <li>• Comptroller's payment records – an accounting system that records payments from the Department of Education to grant recipients</li> </ul>	
Methodology:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Denominator: Number of competitive state grants for which funds are appropriated in the annual General Appropriations Act; count each individual grant referenced in a Specific Appropriation as a separate grant</li> <li>• Numerator: Of that number, the number that had initial disbursements by the date specified in the General Appropriations Act, or, if not specified, by August 15 of the fiscal year</li> </ul>	
<b>Validity:</b>	
As an indicator of progress toward meeting the Department of Education's statutory goal of quality efficient services, the efficiency of awarding and disbursing funds for competitive state grants has validity. However, the measure is of minor importance when compared to other types of grants awarded. For instance, of approximately 4,000 grants managed by the Department of Education, fewer than 25 percent are in this category. At least 75 percent of grants are in the federal category, and 90 percent of state grants are noncompetitive	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free.	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>Department of Education 48800</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>Bureau of Educator Certification</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	<b>Teacher Certification (ACT0630)</b>
<b>Measure 91</b>	<b>Number of certification applications processed</b>
<b>Action</b> (check one):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Requesting revision to approved performance measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Change in data sources or measurement methodologies. <input type="checkbox"/> Requesting new measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Backup for performance measure.	
<b>Data Sources and Methodology:</b>	
<b>Data Source:</b>	
Bureau of Educator Certification Databases housed at Northwest Regional Data Center.	
<b>Methodology:</b>	
The system collects summary data on all certification files, applications, and transactions processed. Upon request, the system generates reports and user-defined inquiries to supply the data requested.	
The count reported is of the number of certification certification transactions (files) processed. The data reported is for the measure of total work load of the Bureau of Educator Certification, the number of certification files processed.	
<b>Validity:</b>	
As an indicator of progress toward the objective of increasing the number of teachers to meet instructional demands, an increase in the number of transactions processed is a valid workload measure. However, an increase in the number of transactions does not necessarily mean an increase in educator supply, because some educators maintain certification without seeking employment in a public school district.	
<b>Reliability:</b>	
The measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free.	
The continuous processing completion of certification files of all types limits the perceived reliability for such data calculations. Because certification files are processed on a relatively continuous basis, the specific data is constantly in flux and is not static in nature. However, the construct of the data collection (as above) is believed to yield accurate results over repeated trials.	
Though the data may fluctuate, the system programming ensures that each time the program reports these statistics, it is including the same data on repeated trials.	

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP EXHIBIT IV: Performance Measure Validity and Reliability</b>	
<b>Department</b>	<b>State Board of Education (4880)</b>
<b>Program</b>	<b>PK 20 Executive Budget</b>
<b>Service/Budget Entity</b>	<b>Executive Direction (ACT0010)</b>
<b>Measure 92</b>	<b>Percent of program administration and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions</b>

**Action** (check one):

Requesting revision to approved performance measure.

Change in data sources or measurement methodologies.

Requesting new measure.

Backup for performance measure.

**Data Sources and Methodology:**

**Data source:** Department of Education Office of Budget Management, compilation of positions and expenditures by activity code. Data used are for 2004-05; data updated with 2005-06 numbers will be available in September 2006.

**Methodology:**

**Costs:**  
Denominator = Total costs for Department of Education  
Numerator = Costs for State Board of Education (unit code 4880) executive direction (activity code 0010)

**2004-05 calculation:**  
Costs: \$18,336,180 / \$15,668,147,979 = 1.0 percent

**Positions:**  
Numerator = Total positions for State Board of Education (unit code 4880) executive direction (activity code 0010)  
Denominator = Total positions for Department of Education

**2004-05 Calculation**  
Positions: 97.90 / 2,620.5 = 4.0 percent

**Validity:** As a measure of the statutory goal of quality efficient services, a valid indicator could be the ratio of administrative to program costs and positions. However, research does not establish the most efficient and effective ratio. It would not be valid to conclude that less administration means greater efficiency; the point of diminishing returns has not been established. Also, it would be best to establish new benchmark data because of the department's extensive restructuring to provide K20 rather than sector-specific accountability. Additional restructuring occurred in 2003 when the Board of Governors began independently governing the State University System, and the Divisions of Blind Services and Vocational Rehabilitation are now within the Department of Education.

**Reliability:** This measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials, and data are complete and sufficiently error-free. However, as a result of governance mandates, the actual employees used in the calculation differ from year to year. As a result of the emphasis on K20 administration, many employees who have some administrative responsibilities also have program responsibilities.

*Office of Policy and Budget – July, 2006*

<b>LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures</b>		
	<b>Division of Vocational Rehabilitation</b>	
<b>#</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)</b>	<b>Associated Activities Title</b>
1	Number / percent of customers gainfully employed (rehabilitated) in at least 90 days	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
2	Number/percent of VR significantly disabled who are gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
3	Number/percent of all other VR disabled who are gainfully employed (rehabilitated) at least 90 days	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
4	Number/percent of VR customers placed in competitive employment	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
5	Number/percent of VR customers retained in employment after 1 year	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
6	Average annual earning of VR customers at placement	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
7	Average annual earning of VR customers after 1 year	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
8	Percent of case costs covered by third-party payers	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
9	Average cost of case life (to division) for significantly disabled VR customers	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
10	Average cost of case life (to division) for all other disabled VR customers	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
11	Number of customers reviewed for eligibility	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
12	Number of written service plans	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
13	Number of active cases	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
14	Customer caseload per counselor	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
15	Percent of eligibility determinations completed in compliance with federal law	Vocational Rehab – General Program (ACT1625)
16	Number of program applicants provided reemployment services	Workers Compensation (ACT0561)



17	Percent of eligible injured workers receiving reemployment services with closed cases during the fiscal year and returning to suitable gainful employment	Workers Compensation (ACT0561)
<b>Division of Blind Services</b>		
#	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)</b>	<b>Associated Activities Title</b>
18	Number/percent of rehabilitation customers gainfully employed at least 90 days	Determine eligibility, provide counseling, and facilitate provision of rehabilitative treatment and job training to blind customers (ACT0740)
19	Number/percent rehabilitation customers placed in competitive employment	Determine eligibility, provide counseling, and facilitate provision of rehabilitative treatment and job training to blind customers (ACT0740)
20	Projected average annual earnings of rehabilitation customers upon placement	Determine eligibility, provide counseling, and facilitate provision of rehabilitative treatment and job training to blind customers (ACT0740)
21	Number/percent successfully rehabilitated older persons in non-vocational rehabilitation	Determine eligibility, provide counseling, and facilitate provision of rehabilitative treatment and job training to blind customers (ACT0740)
22	Number/percent of customers (children) successfully rehabilitated/transitioned from pre-school to school	Determine eligibility, provide counseling, and facilitate provision of rehabilitative treatment and job training to blind customers (ACT0740)
23	Number/percent of customers (children) successfully rehabilitated/transitioned from school to work	Determine eligibility, provide counseling, and facilitate provision of rehabilitative treatment and job training to blind customers (ACT0740)
24	Number of customers reviewed for eligibility	Determine eligibility, provide counseling, and facilitate provision of rehabilitative treatment and job training to blind customers (ACT0740)
25	Number of written plans for services	Determine eligibility, provide counseling, and facilitate provision of rehabilitative treatment and job training to blind customers (ACT0740)
26	Number of customers served	Determine eligibility, provide counseling, and facilitate provision of rehabilitative treatment and job training to blind customers (ACT0740)
27	Average time lapse (days) between application and eligibility determination for rehabilitation customers	Determine eligibility, provide counseling, and facilitate provision of rehabilitative treatment and job training to blind customers (ACT0740)

28	Customer caseload per counseling/case management team member	Determine eligibility, provide counseling, and facilitate provision of rehabilitative treatment and job training to blind customers (ACT0740)
29	Cost per library customer served	Provide Braille and recorded publications services (ACT0770)
30	Number of blind vending food service facilities supported	Provide food service vending training, work experience, and licensing (ACT0750)
31	Number of existing food service facilities renovated	Provide food service vending training, work experience, and licensing (ACT0750)
32	Number of new food service facilities constructed	Provide food service vending training, work experience, and licensing (ACT0750)
33	Number of library customers served	Provide Braille and recorded publications services (ACT0770)
34	Number of library items (Braille and recorded) loaned	Provide Braille and recorded publications services (ACT0770)

<b>LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures</b>		
#	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Associated Activities Title
<b>Private Colleges and Universities</b>		
35	Graduation rate of FTIC (first time in college) award recipients, using a 6-year rate (Florida Resident Access Grant - FRAG)	Florida Resident Access Grants (ACT1962)
36	Number of degrees granted for FRAG recipients and contract program recipients (Florida Resident Access Grant - FRAG)	Florida Resident Access Grants (ACT1962)
37	Retention rate of award recipients (Delineate by: Academic Contract*; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities**)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic Contract* (Activities 1901, 1904, 1906, 1914, 1918, 1920, 1922, 1932, 1935, 1944, 1946, 1956, 1964, 1966, 1968)</li> <li>• Florida Resident Access Grants (ACT1962)</li> <li>• Historically Black Colleges and Universities** (Activities 1936, 1938, 1940, 1960)</li> </ul>
38	Graduation rate of award recipients (Delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic Contract (Activities 1901, 1904, 1906, 1914, 1918, 1920, 1922, 1932, 1935, 1944, 1946, 1956, 1964, 1966, 1968)</li> <li>• Florida Resident Access Grants (ACT1962)</li> <li>• Historically Black Colleges and Universities (Activities 1936, 1938, 1940, 1960)</li> </ul>
39	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; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic Contract (Activities 1901, 1904, 1906, 1914, 1918, 1920, 1922, 1932, 1935, 1944, 1946, 1956, 1964, 1966, 1968)</li> <li>• Florida Resident Access Grants (ACT1962)</li> <li>• Historically Black Colleges and Universities (Activities 1936, 1938, 1940, 1960)</li> </ul>
40	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; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic Contract (Activities 1901, 1904, 1906, 1914, 1918, 1920, 1922, 1932, 1935, 1944, 1946, 1956, 1964, 1966, 1968)</li> <li>• Florida Resident Access Grants (ACT1962)</li> <li>• Historically Black Colleges and Universities (Activities 1936, 1938, 1940, 1960)</li> </ul>

41	Licensure/certification rates of award recipients, (where applicable), (Delineate by Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; and Historically Black Colleges and Universities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic Contract (Activities 1901, 1904, 1906, 1914, 1918, 1920, 1922, 1932, 1935, 1944, 1946, 1956, 1964, 1966, 1968)</li> <li>• Florida Resident Access Grants (ACT1962)</li> <li>• Historically Black Colleges and Universities (Activities 1936, 1938, 1940, 1960)</li> </ul>
42	Number/percent of baccalaureate degree recipients who are employed 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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic Contract (Activities 1901,1904, 1906, 1914, 1918, 1920, 1922, 1932, 1935, 1944, 1946, 1956, 1964, 1966, 1968)</li> <li>• Florida Resident Access Grants (ACT1962)</li> </ul>
43	Number of prior year's graduates (delineate by: Academic Contract; Florida Resident Access Grant; Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic Contract (Activities 1901, 1904, 1906, 1914, 1918, 1920, 1922, 1932, 1935, 1944, 1946, 1956, 1964, 1966, 1968)</li> <li>• Florida Resident Access Grants (ACT1962)</li> <li>• Historically Black Colleges and Universities (Activities 1936, 1938, 1940, 1960)</li> </ul>
44	Number of prior year's graduates remaining in Florida (Academic Contracts)	Academic Contract (Activities 1901, 1904, 1906, 1914, 1918, 1920, 1922, 1932, 1935, 1944, 1946, 1956, 1964, 1966, 1968)
45	Number of FTIC students, disaggregated by in-state and out-of-state (Historically Black Colleges and Universities)	Historically Black Colleges and Universities (Activities 1936, 1938, 1940, 1960)

\*Academic contracts include the following:

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barry University/Bachelor of Science – Nursing and Master of Social Work (ACT1901)</li> <li>• University of Miami Medical Training and Simulation Laboratory (ACT1904)</li> <li>• Florida Institute of Technology – Bachelor of Science— Engineering and Bachelor of Science --Science Education (ACT1906)</li> <li>• University of Miami First Accredited Medical School – CancerResearch PhD Program in Biomedical Science, College of Medicine, and Sylvester Cancer Center (ACT1914)</li> <li>• Nova Southeastern University / Osteopathic Medicine (ACT 1918)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nova Southeastern University / Pharmacy (ACT1920)</li> <li>• Nova Southeastern University / Optometry (ACT1922)</li> <li>• Nova Southeastern University/ Nursing (ACT1935)</li> <li>• Nova Southeastern University / Rural and Unmet Needs (ACT1932)</li> <li>• University of Miami / Regional Diabetes Center (ACT1944)</li> <li>• University of Miami /Rosentiel Marine Science Center and Bachelor of Science, and Master of Fine Arts / Motion Pictures (ACT1946)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nova Southeastern University / Master of Science - Speech Pathology (ACT1956)2+2 Partnership Baccalaureate Incentive (ACT1964)</li> <li>• LECOM (Lake Erie College of Osteopathic Medicine / Health Programs (ACT1966)</li> <li>• University of Tampa / Critical Training Needs Equipment (ACT1968)</li> </ul> <p>**Historically Black Colleges and Universities include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bethune Cookman (ACT1936)</li> <li>• Edward Waters College (ACT1938)</li> <li>• Florida Memorial College (ACT1940)</li> <li>• Library Resources (ACT 1960)</li> </ul> |
|--|---|---|

<b>LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures</b>			
	<b>Student Financial Aid Program</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)</b>		<b>Associated Activities Title</b>
46	Percent of high school graduates who successfully completed the 19 core credits (Bright Futures)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Bright Futures Scholarship Program (ACT2014)</li> <li>• Leadership and Management – State Programs (ACT2001)</li> </ul>
47	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)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Bright Futures Scholarship Program (ACT2014)</li> <li>• Leadership and Management – State Programs (ACT2001)</li> </ul>
48	Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system (Bright Futures)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Bright Futures Scholarship Program (ACT2014)</li> <li>• Leadership and Management – State Programs (ACT2001)</li> </ul>
49	Percent of high school graduates attending Florida postsecondary institutions (Bright Futures)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Bright Futures Scholarship Program (ACT2014)</li> <li>• Leadership and Management – State Programs (ACT2001)</li> </ul>
50	Number of Bright Futures recipients		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Bright Futures Scholarship Program (ACT2014)</li> <li>• Leadership and Management – State Programs (ACT2001)</li> </ul>
51	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)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Postsecondary Student Assistance Grant (ACT2038)</li> <li>• Private Student Assistance Grant (ACT2042)</li> <li>• Public Student Assistance Grant (ACT2044) Leadership and Management – State Programs (ACT2001)</li> </ul>
52	Graduation rate of FTIC award recipients, by delivery system (Florida Student Assistance Grant)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Postsecondary Student Assistance Grant (ACT2038)</li> <li>• Private Student Assistance Grant (ACT2042)</li> <li>• Public Student Assistance Grant (ACT2044)</li> <li>• Leadership and Management – State Programs (ACT2001)</li> </ul>
53	Percent of recipients who, upon completion of the program, work in fields in which there are shortages (Critical Teacher Shortage Forgivable Loan Program)		Critical Teacher Shortage Program (ACT2008)

<b>LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures</b>		
	<b>Public Schools, State Grants / K-12 Non-FEFP</b>	
<b>#</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)</b>	<b>Associated Activities Title</b>
54	Number/percent of teachers with National Teacher's Certification, reported by district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to School Districts / Non-Florida Education Finance Program (ACT0695)</li> </ul>
55	Number/percent of A schools, reported by district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curriculum and Instruction (ACT0565)</li> <li>• School Improvement (ACT0605)</li> <li>• Florida Education Finance Program (ACT0660)</li> <li>• Assessment and Evaluation (ACT0635)</li> </ul>
56	Number/percent of D or F schools, reported by district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curriculum and Instruction (ACT0565)</li> <li>• School Improvement (ACT0605)</li> <li>• Florida Education Finance Program (ACT0660)</li> <li>• Assessment and Evaluation (ACT0635)</li> </ul>
57	Number/percent of schools declining one or more letter grades, reported by district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curriculum and Instruction (ACT0565)</li> <li>• School Improvement (ACT0605)</li> <li>• Florida Education Finance Program (ACT0660)</li> <li>• Assessment and Evaluation (ACT0635)</li> </ul>
58	Number/percent of schools improving one or more letter grades, reported by district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curriculum and Instruction (ACT0565)</li> <li>• School Improvement (ACT0605)</li> <li>• Florida Education Finance Program (ACT0660)</li> <li>• Assessment and Evaluation (ACT0635)</li> </ul>

**LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance**

<b>LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance</b>		
	<b>Workforce Development</b>	
<b>#</b>	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)</b>	<b>Associated Activities Title</b>
59	Number/percent of 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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding and Support Activities (ACT3010)</li> <li>• Instruction and Assessment (ACT3015)</li> <li>• Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (ACT0925)</li> </ul>
60	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding and Support Activities (ACT3010)</li> <li>• Instruction and Assessment (ACT3015)</li> <li>• Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (ACT0925)</li> </ul>
61	Number/percent of persons earning vocational certificate 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 are continuing their education at the vocational certificate level (Level I)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding and Support Activities (ACT3010)</li> <li>• Instruction and Assessment (ACT3015)</li> <li>• Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (ACT0925)</li> </ul>
62	Number/percent of workforce development programs which meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards for those programs that teach a subject matter for which there is a nationally recognized accrediting body	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding and Support Activities (ACT3010)</li> <li>• Instruction and Assessment (ACT3015)</li> </ul>
63	Number/percent of students attending workforce development programs that meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding and Support Activities (ACT3010)</li> <li>• Instruction and Assessment (ACT3015)</li> </ul>
64	Number/percent of students completing workforce development programs that meet or exceed nationally recognized accrediting or certification standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding and Support Activities (ACT3010)</li> <li>• Instruction and Assessment (ACT3015)</li> </ul>
65	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding and Support Activities (ACT3010)</li> <li>• Instruction and Assessment (ACT3015)</li> <li>• Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (ACT0925)</li> </ul>

**LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance**

**Community Colleges**

#	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Associated Activities Title
66	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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (ACT0925)</li> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
67	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 level program (Level II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (ACT0925)</li> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
68	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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (ACT0925)</li> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
69	Percent of Associate in Arts (AA) degree graduates who transfer to a state university within 2 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
70	Percent of AA degree transfers to the State University System who earn a 2.5 GPA or above in the SUS after 1 year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
71	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (ACT0925)</li> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>



#	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)</b>	<b>Associated Activities Title</b>
72	Of the AA students who complete 18 credit hours, the percent of whom graduate in 4 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
73	Percent of students graduating with total accumulated credit hours that are less than or equal to 120 percent of the degree requirement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
74	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
75	Percent of AA degree transfers to the State University System who started in College Prep and who earn a 2.5 GPA in the SUS after 1 year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
76	Number/Percent of AA partial completers transferring to the State University System with at least 40 credit hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
77	Number/Percent/FTEs of AA students who do not complete 18 credit hours within 4 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
78	Of the economically disadvantaged AA students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an AA degree within 4 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
79	Of the disabled AA students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an AA degree within 4 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
80	Of the black male AA students who complete 18 credit hours, the number and percent who graduate with an AA degree within 4 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
81	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>

#	<b>Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)</b>	<b>Associated Activities Title</b>
82	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (ACT0925)</li> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
83	Percent of prior year Florida high school graduates enrolled in community colleges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (ACT0925)</li> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
84	Number of AA degrees granted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
85	Number of students receiving college preparatory instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>
86	Number of students enrolled in baccalaureate programs offered on community college campuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Grants to Districts and Community Colleges (ACT 3050)</li> <li>• Community College Program Fund (ACT0571)</li> <li>• Academic and Student Services (ACT30000)</li> </ul>

### LRPP Exhibit V: Identification of Associated Activity Contributing to Performance Measures

State Board of Education		
#	Approved Performance Measures for FY 2006-07 (Words)	Associated Activities Title
87	Percent of program administration and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions - Division of Public Schools	Executive Direction (ACT0010)
88	Percent of teacher certificates issued within 30 days after receipt of complete application and the mandatory fingerprint clearance notification	Teacher Certification (ACT0630)
89	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	Recruitment and Retention (ACT0560) Professional Training (ACT0610)
90	Percent of current fiscal year competitive grant initial disbursements made by August 15 of the current fiscal year, or as provided in the General Appropriations Act	Grants Management (ACT 0190)
91	Number of certification applications processed	Teacher Certification (ACT0630)
92	Percent of program administration and support costs and positions compared to total agency costs and positions	Executive Direction (ACT0010)

# Exhibit VI AGENCY-LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY

EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF		FISCAL YEAR 2005-06			
SECTION I: BUDGET		OPERATING			FIXED CAPITAL OUTLAY
TOTAL ALL FUNDS GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT				13,663,088,197	#####
ADJUSTMENTS TO GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT (Supplementals, Vetoes, Budget Amendments, etc.)				111,753,601	141,204,887
FINAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY				13,774,841,798	2,302,131,721
SECTION II: ACTIVITIES * MEASURES		Number of Units	(1) Unit Cost	(2) Expenditures (Allocated)	(3) FCO
<i>Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology (2)</i>					2,302,131,721
Workers' Compensation * <b>Number of Program Applicants Provided Reemployment Services</b>		2,611	3,737.75	9,759,253	
Determine Eligibility, Provide Counseling, Facilitate Provision Of Rehabilitative Treatment, And Job Training To Blind Customers * <b>Customers served</b>		13,100	3,626.50	47,507,147	
Provide Food Service Vending Training, Work Experience And Licensing * <b>Facilities supported</b>		153	17,523.62	2,681,114	
Provide Braille And Recorded Publications Services * <b>Customers served</b>		44,290	55.60	2,462,606	
Independent Living Services * <b>Number of clients served</b>		18,747	267.76	5,019,633	
Migrant Worker Initiative * <b>Number of clients served</b>		224	993.09	222,453	
Vocational Rehabilitation - General Program * <b>Number of individualized written plans for services</b>		19,810	9,764.38	193,432,458	
TOTAL				261,084,664	2,302,131,721
SECTION III: RECONCILIATION TO BUDGET					
PASS THROUGHS					
TRANSFER - STATE AGENCIES					
AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS					
PAYMENT OF PENSIONS, BENEFITS AND CLAIMS					
OTHER				13,167,294,201	
REVERSIONS				273,702,100	
TOTAL BUDGET FOR AGENCY (Total Activities + Pass Throughs + Reversions) - Should equal Section I above. (4)				13,702,080,965	2,302,131,721
<b>EXHIBIT VI: AGENCY-LEVEL UNIT COST SUMMARY</b>					

(1) Some activity unit costs may be overstated due to the allocation of double budgeted items.  
 (2) Expenditures associated with Executive Direction, Administrative Support and Information Technology have been allocated based on FTE. Other allocation methodologies could result in significantly different unit costs per activity.  
 (3) Information for FCO depicts amounts for current year appropriations only. Additional information and systems are needed to develop meaningful FCO unit costs.  
 (4) Final Budget for Agency and Total Budget for Agency may not equal due to rounding.

## 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