

## GOAL 3: Ensure the Accessibility, Affordability and Accountability of Higher Education and Better Prepare Students and Adults for Employment and Future Learning

### Measures for Objective 3.1: Increase success in and completion of quality postsecondary education

	Results								Plan	
	(Years)*		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
<b>Postsecondary Enrollment</b>										
<b>3.1.A.</b> Percentage of High School Graduates Aged 16–24 Enrolling Immediately in College <sup>1</sup>	(2006)	68.6	68	66	68	67.2	68	Dec. 2010	69	69
<b>3.1.B.</b> Percentage of Upward Bound Participants Enrolling in College <sup>2</sup>	(2006)	79.0	65	77.4	70	Dec. 2010	75	Dec. 2011	75	76
<b>3.1.C.</b> Percentage of Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Transitioned to Postsecondary Education or Employment by December of the Year of Graduation <sup>3</sup>	(2005)	87	89	86	90	Dec. 2010	**	**	**	**
<b>Postsecondary Persistence</b>										
<b>3.1.D.</b> Percentage of Full-Time Degree-Seeking Undergraduate Students at Title IV Institutions Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution <sup>4</sup>	(2006)	70	71	70	71	71.1	71	Dec. 2010	72	72
<b>3.1.E.</b> Percentage of Full-Time Undergraduate Students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution <sup>4</sup>	(2005)	65	66	62	66	65	66	Dec. 2010	67	67
<b>3.1.F.</b> Percentage of Full-Time Undergraduate Students at Hispanic-Serving Institutions Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution <sup>4</sup>	(2004)	64	68	63.5	68	69	68	Dec. 2010	69	69
<b>Postsecondary Completion</b>										
<b>3.1.G.</b> Percentage of Students Enrolled at All Title IV Institutions Completing a Four-Year Degree Within Six Years of Enrollment <sup>5</sup>	(2005)	57.1	57	57.3	57	58	57	Jan. 2011	58	58
<b>3.1.H.</b> Percentage of Freshmen Participating in Student Support Services Who Complete an Associate's Degree at Original Institution or Transfer to a Four-Year Institution Within Three Years <sup>2</sup>	(2006)	24.6	27.5	25.1	27.5	27.8	28.0	Dec. 2010	28.0	28.5
<b>3.1.I.</b> Percentage of Students Enrolled at Four-Year Historically Black Colleges and Universities Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment <sup>5</sup>	(2005)	38	39	35	39	35	40	Dec. 2010	40	40
<b>3.1.J.</b> Percentage of Students Enrolled at Four-Year Hispanic-Serving Institutions Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment <sup>5</sup>	(2006)	35	37	44	37	42	44	Dec. 2010	45	45
<b>3.1.K.</b> Percentage of Postsecondary Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Completed a Postsecondary Degree or Certification <sup>3</sup>	(2005)	42	46	40	47	Dec. 2010	**	**	**	**

\*Year indicates the year that baseline target was established.

\*\*Amended measure and new baseline will be established under *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV) guidance

Sources:

<sup>1</sup>U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey.

<sup>2</sup>U.S. Department of Education, TRIO Annual Performance Report.

<sup>3</sup>Career and Technical Education Annual Performance Report and Grantee Performance Reports.

<sup>4</sup>U.S. Department of Education, NCES. Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, Enrollment Survey. Persistence measures the percentage of full-time degree-seeking undergraduate students at Title IV institutions who were in their first year of postsecondary enrollment in the previous year and are enrolled in the current year at the same institution.

<sup>5</sup>U.S. Department of Education, NCES. Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, Graduation Rate Survey.

### **Measure 3.1.A.: Percentage of High School Graduates Aged 16–24 Enrolling Immediately in College**

**Analysis of Progress:** The enrollment rate increased slightly from 2007 to 2008.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** The *Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2007–2012*, published in May 2007, included measures developed in FY 2006. Data for the 2007–2008 school year (column “2008” in the table) are expected for release in December 2010.

**Target Context:** The Department did not meet its 2008 target of 68 percent, although enrollment increased from 66.0 percent in FY 2007 to 67.2 percent in FY 2008.

### **Measure 3.1.B.: Percentage of Upward Bound Participants Enrolling in College**

**Analysis of Progress:** Based on actual data significantly increasing over recent years, targets beyond 2008 have been increased.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** The annual performance report comprises self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

**Target Context:** Based on consecutive years of performance exceeding targets, the targets were increased to 70 percent for 2008 and 75 percent for 2009. The target for FY 2008 was increased to 70 percent as part of the fall 2006 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) update and to 75 percent for 2009 in the spring 2007 PART update.

### **Measure 3.1.C.: Percentage of Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Transitioned to Postsecondary Education or Employment by December of the Year of Graduation**

**Analysis of Progress:** Data for FY 2009 and FY 2008 will reflect changes in legislative requirements.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** Actual data are entered through FY 2007. Data for FY 2008 are expected in March 2010 and a new baseline will be established under *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV) guidance. States submit their reports to the Department each year through an electronic system. At that time, each grant recipient must attest to the accuracy and completeness of submissions by entering an Electronic Personal Identification Number that is supplied to them by the Department. The Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) staff then completes a check on the accuracy and completeness of the data and follows up with states as necessary.

**Target Context:** The Department met its 2005 target of setting the baseline. The FY 2008 and FY 2009 targets are based on state-adjusted performance levels that were negotiated with and approved by the Department.

**Measure 3.1.D.: Percentage of Full-Time Degree-Seeking Undergraduate Students at Title IV Institutions Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution**

**Analysis of Progress:** The rates declined slightly between FY 2007 and FY 2008.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Beginning in FY 2008, persistence was reported for the first time along with the numerator and denominator generating the percentage. Therefore, the rate established for any program can be aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

**Target Context:** The Department met its 2006 target of setting the baseline. It did not meet the 2007 national target of 71 percent. It met its 2008 target of 71 percent. Data for FY 2009 are expected in December 2010.

**Measure 3.1.E.: Percentage of Full-Time Undergraduate Students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution**

**Analysis of Progress:** The rates declined slightly between FY 2007 and FY 2008.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by NCES. Beginning with FY 2008, persistence was reported for the first time along with the numerator and denominator generating the percentage. Therefore, the rate established for any program can be aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

**Target Context:** Through FY 2007, institutions had reported a persistence rate, not the numerator and denominator. As a result, the persistence rate for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) program was calculated as a median. The target is derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for school year 2003–04, which was 3.6 percent. The reason for decline in persistence is unknown. The Department is beginning to analyze grantee performance for this program, which may provide some insight into factors behind this decline.

**Measure 3.1.F.: Percentage of Full-Time Undergraduate Students at Hispanic-Serving Institutions Who Were in Their First Year of Postsecondary Enrollment in the Previous Year and Are Enrolled in the Current Year at the Same Institution**

**Analysis of Progress:** The rates increased slightly between FY 2007 and FY 2008.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a review process by NCES. Beginning with FY 2008, persistence was reported for the first time along with the numerator and denominator generating the percentage. Therefore, the rate established for any program can be aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

**Target Context:** The long-term target for FY 2009 is 68 percent.

**Measure 3.1.G.: Percentage of Students Enrolled at All Title IV Institutions Completing a Four-Year Degree Within Six Years of Enrollment**

**Analysis of Progress:** The Department exceeded its FY 2007 target of 57 percent. The percentage of bachelor's degree-seeking students completing a four-year degree within six years of enrollment improved, increasing to 57.5 percent (58%) in FY 2008 from 57.3 percent in FY 2007.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by NCES. Beginning with FY 2008, persistence was reported for the first time along with the numerator and denominator generating the percentage. Therefore, the rate established for any program can be aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

### **Measure 3.1.H.: Percentage of Freshmen Participating in Student Support Services Who Complete an Associate's Degree at Original Institution or Transfer to a Four-Year Institution Within Three Years**

**Analysis of Progress:** The Department met its FY 2007 target of 27.5 percent. The percentage of Student Support Service participants completing an associate's degree at original institution or transferring to a four-year institution increased substantially from 2006 to 2007.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** The annual performance report collects self-reported data; a variety of data quality checks are used to assess the completeness and reasonableness of the data submitted.

### **Measure 3.1.I.: Percentage of Students Enrolled at Four-Year Historically Black Colleges and Universities Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment**

**Analysis of Progress:** The percentage of students enrolled at four-year Historically Black Colleges and Universities graduating within six years of enrollment remained at 35 percent in 2007.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

### **Measure 3.1.J.: Percentage of Students Enrolled at Four-Year Hispanic-Serving Institutions Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment**

**Analysis of Progress:** The Department significantly exceeded its FY 2008 target of 37 percent. The percentage of students enrolled at four-year Hispanic-Serving Institutions graduating within six years of enrollment increased from 2007.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

### **Measure 3.1.K.: Percentage of Postsecondary Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Completed a Postsecondary Degree or Certification**

**Analysis of Progress:** Data for FY 2009 and FY 2008 will reflect changes in legislative requirements.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** Actual data are entered through FY 2007. Data for 2008 are expected in March 2010 and a new baseline will be established under *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006* (Perkins IV) guidance. States submit their reports to the Department each year through an electronic system. At that time, each grant recipient must attest to the accuracy and completeness of submission by entering an Electronic Personal Identification Number that is supplied to them by the Department. The Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) staff then completes a check on the accuracy and completeness of the data and follows up with states as necessary.

**Target Context:** The Department met its 2005 target of setting the baseline. The FY 2008 and FY 2009 targets are based on state-adjusted performance levels that were negotiated with and approved by the Department.

**Measures for Objective 3.2: Deliver student financial aid to students and parents effectively and efficiently**

	Results *								Plan	
	(Years**)		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
<b>3.2.A.</b> Direct Administrative Unit Costs for Origination and Disbursement of Student Aid <sup>1</sup> ( <i>Total Cost per Transaction</i> )	(2006)	\$4.24	\$4.25	\$4.03	\$4.15	\$3.65	\$4.00	\$3.60	\$4.00	\$4.00
<b>3.2.B.</b> Customer Service Level on the American Consumer Satisfaction Index for the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web <sup>2</sup>	(2005)	81	82	80	83	83	84	84	85	85
<b>3.2.C.</b> Pell Grant Improper Payments Rate	(2006)	3.48%	3.48%	4.11%	3.48%	3.69%	3.41%	3.50%	3.35%	3.28%
<b>3.2.D.</b> Direct Loan Recovery Rate <sup>3</sup>	(2006)	19.00%	19.50%	20.8%	19.75%	21%	20.00%	18.0%	20.25%	20.50%
<b>3.2.E.</b> FFEL Recovery Rate	(2006)	19.3%	19.50%	19.60%	19.50%	23.6%	19.75%	19.70%	20.00%	20.25%

\* Targets are based on the Department's *Strategic Plan* and may differ from the targets presented in the *FSA Annual Report*

\*\*Year indicates the year that baseline target was established.

FFEL = Federal Family Education Loan.

Sources:

<sup>1</sup>Unit costs are derived from the Department's Activity-Based Management program using direct administrative costs. They do not include administrative overhead or investment/development costs.

<sup>2</sup>Based upon annual American Customer Satisfaction Index scores obtained through the CFI Group.

<sup>3</sup>The recovery rate equals the sum of collections on defaulted loans divided by the outstanding default portfolio at the end of the previous year.

**Measure 3.2.A.: Direct Administrative Unit Costs for Origination and Disbursement of Student Aid**

**Analysis of Progress:** Federal Student Aid has made significant progress in its efforts to reduce the administrative unit costs. The actual unit cost for origination and disbursement is significantly lower than the baseline amount set in FY 2006. The Department anticipates an increase in costs and workload volumes in the coming years, as part of the new Direct Loan Initiative.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** The actuals are the data reported as final in the current fiscal year. Because it takes some time after the closeout of the fiscal year to receive completed data and to validate results, the data lag by one year. For example, in FY 2009, the unit costs were based on data from FY 2008. To calculate the unit cost of Origination and Disbursement of Student Aid, the total amount spent on originating and disbursing Direct Loans and Grants is divided by the total number of Direct Loan and Grant disbursements.

**Target Context:** The target for this measure is expected to remain flat for FY 2010. Targets will be reviewed for the new *Strategic Plan*.

**Measure 3.2.B.: Customer Service Level on the American Consumer Satisfaction Index for the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web**

**Analysis of Progress:** The target was met for 2008. With an American Customer Satisfaction Index score of 83 (on a 1–100 scale), Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web scores in

the "Excellent" range in comparison to other entities that appear in the index. This category includes such high-performing companies as UPS, Amazon and Mercedes.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** In 2008, the student aid applicants were asked through an electronic surveying capability their opinions about the experience directly after completing the online aid application. This new capability allowed the Department to obtain opinions directly after the experience rather than a month or more down the road and allowed it to expand the sample universe, yielding more accurate results.

**Target Context:** Targets are based upon American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) customer satisfaction scores and the Department expects to show slight improvement in the out years.

### Measure 3.2.C.: Pell Grant Improper Payments Rate

**Analysis of Progress:** The Department did not meet its target. The improper payment rate that results from the Internal Revenue Service study is based on a randomly selected group of applicants each year. As such, the rate is subject to arbitrary fluctuations that reflect the randomness of the sample for any given year. The Department continues to make refinements to the application process that, based on the results of the study, will ultimately lead to a lower level of improper payments.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** The FY 2009 Pell error rate is final at 3.5 percent.

**Target Context:** Target remains the same from FY 2006 to FY 2008. The FY 2009 target was not realized and 2010–2011 targets remain constant at 3.5 percent.

### Measure 3.2.D.: Direct Loan Recovery Rate

**Analysis of Progress:** The FY 2009 target of 20 percent was not met. This target was based, in part, on the expectation that a new collection system would be in place in 2009. The new system would have included more sophisticated collection tools. Data will now be collected through another process, with implementation during FY 2011.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** Data are reported through the end of FY 2009 using the Default Management and Collections System (DMCS). A new service, which will include a new system, is being procured. The new service will enable FSA to manage its portfolio using methodologies, such as segmenting the portfolio and increasing overall collections. The new service is expected to improve FSA's productivity by streamlining processes, including invoices and workflow.

**Target Context:** The recovery rate equals the sum of collections on defaulted loans divided by the outstanding default portfolio at the end of the previous year. The full extent of the economic downturn was not considered when the targets were originally established. This measure and out-year targets will be re-evaluated when developing the next *Strategic Plan*.

### Measure 3.2.E.: FFEL Recovery Rate

**Analysis of Progress:** The FY 2009 target of 19.75 percent was almost met, as reflected in the actual results of 19.70 percent.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** Data are through the end of FY 2008.

**Target Context:** The recovery rate equals the sum of collections on defaulted loans divided by the outstanding default portfolio at the end of the previous year. The full extent of the economic downturn was not considered when the targets were originally established and loan sales were not as high as expected.

**Measures for Objective 3.3: Prepare adult learners and individuals with disabilities for higher education, employment and productive lives**

	Results								Plan	
	(Years*)		FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	FY 2011
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target
<b>3.3.A.</b> Percentage of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies That Meet the Employment Outcome Standard for the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants Program**	(2004)	66	71	82	76	79	78	Apr. 2010	80	82
<b>3.3.B.</b> Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With a High School Completion Goal Who Earn a High School Diploma or Recognized Equivalent	(2005) 46	51	52	59	53	62	54	Feb. 2010	55	56
<b>3.3.C.</b> Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With a Goal to Enter Postsecondary Education or Training Who Enroll in a Postsecondary Education or Training Program	(2005) 30	34	37	55	39	55	41	Feb. 2010	43	45
<b>3.3.D.</b> Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With an Employment Goal Who Obtain a Job by the End of the First Quarter After Their Program Exit Quarter	(2005) 40	37	41	61	41	61	42	Feb. 2010	42	43

\*Year indicates the year that baseline target was established.

\*\*A state vocational rehabilitation agency meets the standard if at least 55.8 percent of individuals who have received services achieve an employment outcome.

Source: Vocational Rehabilitation agency data submitted to the Department's Rehabilitation Services Administration; Adult Education Annual Performance Report and Grantee Performance Reports.

**Measure 3.3.A.: Percentage of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies That Meet the Employment Outcome Standard for the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants Program**

**Analysis of Progress:** In fiscal years 2007 and 2008, the percentage of general or combined state vocational rehabilitation agencies that met the performance criterion remained relatively constant at 82 percent and 79 percent, respectively. The percentage of general and combined vocational rehabilitation agencies that met the employment outcome standard in FY 2008 declined from 82 to 79 percent because two fewer agencies passed the standard due to more challenging economic conditions as well as a more difficult disability population being served. (Note: the FY 2006 number reported for FY 2007 in last year's report was 66 percent rather than 82 percent. The percentage was revised as a result of a miscalculation in prior years.)

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** State vocational rehabilitation agencies are required to submit their Rehabilitation Services Administration RSA-911 data by November 30 for the previous fiscal year. The data are considered very reliable because of the RSA editing process to which agency data are submitted. Data quality and timeliness have improved significantly in recent years. The RSA-911 database for fiscal years 2005 and 2006 was complete within 5 months of the close of fiscal year. Completion of the 2007 database was delayed because of late data submissions; however, RSA is working to ensure that the 2009 database is complete by February 2010 and available for timely analysis of performance data. Vocational rehabilitation data will be available in April 2010.

**Target Context:** The decline in employment outcomes had stabilized in 2005 with improving economic conditions and performance targets for 2008 and future years were raised, but they may have to be revisited with the current economic crisis, especially in employment.

### **Measure 3.3.B.: Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With a High School Completion Goal Who Earn a High School Diploma or Recognized Equivalent**

**Analysis of Progress:** The program exceeded its 2008 target as well as the 2007 actual performance data. Part of the explanation for the increase may stem from improved data collection methods used by states to collect and report on this measure through the National Reporting System for Adult Education.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** As a third-tier recipient of this data, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

**Target Context:** The Department negotiated approved targets with OMB for a 15-year period.

### **Measure 3.3.C.: Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With a Goal to Enter Postsecondary Education or Training Who Enroll in a Postsecondary Education or Training Program**

**Analysis of Progress:** The target has been met. There was a spike in the 2007 actual data. Factors include (1) improved follow-up methodologies implemented the states and (2) training and technical assistance by OVAE in providing support to states regarding methodologies related to transitioning adult students into postsecondary education and training opportunities.

During 2009, states maintained their data methodologies to support local entities and OVAE maintained its technical assistance in providing support to states regarding methodologies related to transitioning adult students into postsecondary education and training opportunities.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

**Target Context:** The Department negotiated approved targets with OMB for a 15-year period.

### **Measure 3.3.D.: Percentage of Adults Served by the Adult Education State Grants Program With an Employment Goal Who Obtain a Job by the End of the First Quarter After Their Program Exit Quarter**

**Analysis of Progress:** The target has been met. The actual data for 2008 exceeded the target and remained consistent with the actual data for 2007. There was a spike in the 2007 actual data. Factors include improved follow-up methodologies implemented by the states to collect and report employment. Prior to 2007, the performance data reflected the percentage of adult learners with an employment goal who, upon exit from an adult education program, obtained a job. States maintained their follow-up methodologies during 2009.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the states and local programs to collect and report data within published guidelines. OVAE has developed a data quality review process for states based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.

**Target Context:** The Department negotiated approved targets with OMB for a 15-year period.