

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

Overview

To meet the President's 2020 goal to have the highest proportion in the world of students graduating from college, millions of additional Americans will need to earn a baccalaureate or associate degree or certificate by 2020. Dramatically boosting community college and four-year college completion rates is essential if American youth are to compete successfully in the years ahead against their peers in a global economy.

Today, over 40 percent of students who enroll in four-year colleges fail to graduate within six years, and close to 70 percent who enroll in community college fail to complete a two-year program within three years. As a beginning, the President has challenged every American to commit to at least one year or more of higher education or career training—at a community college, four-year school, vocational-training school or program, or through an apprenticeship. It moves toward the 2020 goal, but it is not enough.

The *FY 2007–2012 Strategic Plan* data as collected and reported from FY 2007 through FY 2010 confirmed what other indicators have pointed to as well—institutions of higher education serve a remarkably diverse population of students, with a broad range of needs and challenges. Prospective students should have easily accessible information on the costs of a college education or training program, how to access federal student aid, placement and graduation rates, and other vital information.

The Department supports college access and completion, in large part, by providing simple, reliable, and efficient federal student aid. In addition, the Department administers \$2 billion annually in higher education grants to strengthen institutions and promote college readiness and an additional \$2 billion in grant funds for career and technical education, adult education and literacy, correctional education, and agricultural science to build skills and prepare adults for work, citizenship, and lifelong learning.

The Department has already taken significant steps to increase college access, completion, and quality. Through the *Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010*, Congress has ended the creation of new subsidized student loans to banks, saving billions of dollars that will be used for financial aid in Pell Grants and reducing borrowers' repayments. The law also provides \$3 billion in grants over the next few years to states and institutions to strengthen institutions and promote access to college and work readiness. In addition, the Department is simplifying the application for federal student aid so it is easier and faster for students to apply for aid.

The nation must close the opportunity gap by improving affordability and increasing access to college and workforce training, especially for adult learners, low-income students, and underrepresented minorities. In addition, the Department is committed to increasing degree and certificate completion and job placement, with special attention to underrepresented and economically disadvantaged populations, as well as to foster institutional quality, accountability, and transparency and to build social and economic resilience and prosperity.

Goal 3: Details

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

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
	Postsecondary Enrollment							
3.1.A. Percentage of High School Graduates Aged 16–24 Enrolling Immediately in College ¹	68	66	68	67.2	68	68.6	69	Aug. 2011
3.1.B. Percentage of Upward Bound Participants Enrolling in College ²	65	77	70	80	75	Dec. 2011	75	Dec. 2012
3.1.C. Percentage of Career and Technical Education Concentrators Retained in Postsecondary Education or Transferring to a Baccalaureate Degree Program Who Have Transitioned to Postsecondary Education or Employment by December of the Year of Graduation ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	58	70	58	May 2011
	Postsecondary Persistence							
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 ⁴	71	70	71	71.1	71	72.4	72	Aug. 2011
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 ⁴	66	62	66	65	66	64	68-4yr 57-2yr	68-4yr 53-2yr
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 ⁴	68	63.5	68	69	68	64.5	78-4yr 64-2yr	77-4yr 58-2yr
	Postsecondary Completion							
3.1.G. Percentage of Students Enrolled at All Title IV Institutions Completing a Four-Year Degree Within Six Years of Enrollment ⁵	57	57.3	57	57.2	57	April 2011	58	Jan. 2012
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 ⁶	27.5	25.1	27.5	27.8	28	March 2011	28	Dec. 2011
3.1.I. Percentage of First-Time, Full Time Degree Seeking Students Enrolled at Four-Year Historically Black Colleges and Universities Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment ⁵	39	35	39	35	40	34	40	Dec. 2011
3.1.J. Percentage of Students Enrolled at Four-Year Hispanic-Serving Institutions Graduating Within Six Years of Enrollment ⁵	37	44	37	42	44	42	45	Dec. 2011
3.1.K. Percentage of Postsecondary Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Completed a Postsecondary Degree or an Industry-Recognized Credential, Certificate, or Degree ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	56	54	56	May 2011

Sources:

¹ U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey.

² U.S. Department of Education, Upward Bound Annual Performance Report.

³ U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Consolidated Annual Performance, Accountability, and Financial Status Report (CAR) (grantee performance report). Beginning in FY 2009.

⁴ 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.

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

⁶ U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, Student Support Services Program Annual Performance Report.

N/A: This measure replaced an earlier, similar measure in FY 2008 to conform with requirements of *the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006 (Perkins IV)*.

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 2008 to 2009.

Data Quality and Timeliness: The *Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2007–2012*, published in May 2007, included measures developed in FY 2006. Data for SY 2009–10 (column “2010” in the table) are expected for release in August 2011.

Target Context: The Department exceeded its 2009 target of 68 percent.

Report Explanation: While overall enrollment increased between 2008 and 2009, there was a shift in enrollment from four-year to two-year schools. Enrollment increased at two-year schools from 24.1 percent to 27.7 percent, while enrollment at four-year schools decreased from 43.1 percent to 40.9 percent.

Since 1990, the overall enrollment rate has fluctuated between 60.1 percent and the current 68.6 percent.

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

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2008 target was exceeded. Data for FY 2010 and 2009 are not currently available. The target for 2007 was exceeded.

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.

Report Explanation: With a greater proportion of Upward Bound participants being higher risk as a result of two recent funding initiatives encouraging Upward Bound projects to serve more higher risk students, continual program improvements will be required to maintain the college enrollment rate at current levels.

Additional Information: The Upward Bound Program Web site may be accessed at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/trioupbound/index.html>.

Measure 3.1.C.: Percentage of Career and Technical Education Concentrators Retained in Postsecondary Education or Transferring to a Baccalaureate Degree Program Who Have Transitioned to Postsecondary Education or Employment by December of the Year of Graduation

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: States submit their CARs to the Department each year through an electronic system. At that time, each grant recipient must attest to the accuracy and completeness of their CAR submission by signing their data submissions. State directors who submitted their data electronically to the Department attested to the accuracy and completeness of their data using an electronic personal identification number (PIN) that is supplied to them by the Department. OVAE staff and a contractor then complete a check on the accuracy and completeness of the data and follow up with states as necessary. OVAE staff verifies the data through an on-site monitoring process.

Target Context: The target is the average of the performance levels that have been negotiated between the Department and the states.

Report Explanation: This is a new measure (3P1) established under the *Perkins IV Act*.

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 national persistence increased from FY 2008 to FY 2009.

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 calculated for the nation or for any program for the first time was aggregated as a mean instead of a median rate—increasing the accuracy of the measurement.

Target Context: The Department exceeded its FY 2009 target of 71 percent.

Report Explanation: 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.

Related Information: The FY 2009 national persistence rate of 72.4 percent reflects a rate for 78.4 percent for four-year institutions and a rate of 60.1 percent for two-year institutions.

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 2008 and FY 2009.

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: The FY 2009 persistence rate of 64 percent did not meet the target.

Report Explanation: Until FY 2008, institutions reported only 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. Beginning with FY 2008, institutions are required to report a denominator (an adjusted cohort of the students attending their first-year of school in the prior year) and a numerator (the number of students in the prior year's adjusted cohort, who remain in the same institution in the current year). Therefore, the Department is now calculating a mean persistence rate.

Beginning with FY 2010 data, persistence rates for the HBCU and the other Institutional Development programs are presented separately for two- and four-year institutions. Overall persistence rates are presented for HBCUs and other Institutional Development programs in the years prior to 2010. Because persistence rates for two-year schools are generally lower than at four-year schools, the current proportion of two- and four-year schools influences the overall rate for any program. Since the proportion of grantee institutions that are two- or four-year schools is likely to change from one grant competition to another in several of the Institutional Development programs, the two- and four-year retention rates for the program will not be influenced by this variable mix of school types each year and will therefore better reflect program performance than the overall retention rate.

Related Information: The Persistence Measure for the HBCU and the other Institutional Development programs has been changed so to reflect separate persistence measures for two- and four-year schools. Targets through 2013 have been set for these new measures and future data will be reported separately against these separate targets. We have continued to show the former combined persistence measure rates prior to 2010.

Additional Information: The HBCU Program Web site may be accessed at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/iduestitle3b/index.html>.

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 FY 2010 targets of 78 percent for four-year HSIs and 64 percent for two-year HSIs were not met. The actual persistence rates were 77 percent for four-year HSIs and 58 percent for two-year HSIs. However, if the rates for both types of institutions were to be combined (the explanation directly below explains why the rates are calculated separately) the program-wide rate would be 66 percent. Performance declined in FY 2009 from the FY 2008 level. The FY 2009 target was not met.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by grantee institutions, which certify their accuracy.

Target Context: Beginning with 2010 data, persistence is now calculated separately for two- and four-year schools. Because persistence rates for two-year schools are generally lower than at four-year schools, the current proportion of two- and four-year schools at any given time influences the overall rate for any program. Since the proportion of grantee institutions that are two- or four-year schools is likely to change from one grant competition to another in several of the Institutional Development programs, the two- and four-year retention rates for the program will no longer be

influenced by this variable mix of school types each year and will therefore better reflect program performance than the overall retention rate.

However, for transition purposes, the overall persistence rate (above) is still being calculated for the FY 2010 Key Measure Report, in addition to the new two-year and four-year rates. Through FY 2007, only an overall persistence rate was calculated for Hispanic-Serving Institutions and other Institutional Development programs.

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 2008 target of 57 percent. The percentage of bachelor's degree-seeking students completing a four-year degree within six years of enrollment remained at about the same level as the previous year (57.2 percent in FY 2008 compared with 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.

Target Context: The target of 57 percent for FY 2008 was exceeded.

Report Explanation: Fifty-eight percent was previously reported incorrectly for FY 2008. The final rate for the year was 57.2 percent.

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: Data are not available for FY 2009. The FY 2008 target of 27.5 percent was exceeded.

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

Target Context: FY 2008 represents the first time that the program target has been met or exceeded.

Report Explanation: Program experience was used to estimate targets. An increase of 0.5 percentage points every other year was used to generate annual targets each year through 2013.

Additional Information: The student support services Web site may be accessed at: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/triostudsupp/index.html>.

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 HBCUs graduating within six years of enrollment declined to 34 percent in 2009.

The 2006 target for the four-year graduation rate was derived by applying the difference between regression-based predicted values from Title IV institutions and actual grantee values for a school year. Beginning with the FY 2007 target, values were established based on program experience.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by NCES.

Target Context: The FY 2009 graduation rate of 34 percent did not meet the target of 40 percent set for this year. The target of 40 percent, set for the years 2010–11, is ambitious given the recent data. Beginning with the FY 2007 target, values were established based on program experience.

Additional Information: The HCBU Program Web site may be accessed at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/iduestitle3b/index.html>.

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 did not meet its FY 2009 target of 44 percent. The percentage of students enrolled at four-year Hispanic-Serving Institutions graduating within six years of enrollment decreased from 2008.

Data Quality and Timeliness: Data are provided by institutions and are subject to a rigorous review process by NCES.

Target Context: Targets beginning with 2009 have been increased based on higher performance in 2007 and 2008. The outyear targets, which reflect a 0.5 percentage point growth each year from FY 2010 to FY 2013, will serve to gradually reduce the performance gap between the program and all public and private four-year schools nationally (58 percent).

Report Explanation: The 42 percent graduation rate for FY 2009 represents 9,347 students graduating with a bachelor's degree or equivalent by August 2009 out of 22,002 degree-seeking students having enrolled in the same institution in fall 2003. This rate was unchanged from FY 2008.

Additional Information: The developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program Web site may be accessed at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/idueshsi/index.html>.

Measure 3.1.K.: Percentage of Postsecondary Career and Technical Education Students Who Have Completed a Postsecondary Degree or an Industry-Recognized Credential, Certificate, or Degree

Analysis of Progress: The FY 2009 target was exceeded.

Data Quality and Timeliness: States submit their CARs to the Department each year through an electronic system. At that time, each grant recipient must attest to the accuracy and completeness of their CAR submission by signing their data submissions. State directors who submitted their data electronically to the Department attested to the accuracy and completeness of their data. OVAE staff and a contractor then complete a check on the accuracy and completeness of the data and follow up with states as necessary. OVAE staff verifies data through an on-site monitoring process.

Target Context: The target is the average of the performance levels that have been negotiated between the Department and the states.

Report Explanation: This is a new measure (2P1) established under the *Perkins IV Act*.

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

	Results*							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
3.2.A. Direct Administrative Unit Costs for Origination and Disbursement of Student Aid ¹ (<i>Total Cost per Transaction</i>)	\$4.25	\$4.03	\$4.15	\$3.65	\$4.00	\$3.60	\$3.76	\$3.35
3.2.B. Customer Service Level on the American Consumer Satisfaction Index for the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) on the Web ²	82	80	83	83	84	84	85	86
3.2.C. Pell Grant Improper Payments Rate	3.48%	4.11%	3.48%	3.69%	3.41%	3.50%	3.35%	3.12%
3.2.D. Direct Loan Recovery Rate ³	19.5%	20.8%	19.75%	21%	20.0%	18.0%	20.25%	17.4%
3.2.E. FFEL Recovery Rate	19.5%	19.6%	19.5%	23.6%	19.75%	19.7%	20.0%	21.9%

* Targets are based on the Department's *Strategic Plan* and may differ from the targets presented in the *FSA Annual Report*.
FFEL = Federal Family Education Loan.

Sources:

¹Unit 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.

²Based upon annual American Customer Satisfaction Index scores obtained through the CFI Group.

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

NOTE: Measures for Objective 3.2 were discontinued as key Departmental measures at the end of the FY2010 reporting cycle. Data have been provided. For additional information on FSA measures contained in its FY 2010 Annual Report, please see FSA's Annual Report at http://federalstudentaid.ed.gov/static/gw/docs/fsa_annual_report_2010.pdf.

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

Analysis of Progress. Federal Student Aid (FSA) continued to reduce its administrative costs, exceeding the target developed for FY 2010. The fixed costs associated with originations and disbursements were spread over a significantly higher volume, leading to a reduction in unit costs.

Data Quality. The "actual" data are the data reported as final in the current fiscal year. Because it takes some time after the close out of the fiscal year to receive completed data and to validate results, the data lag by one year. For example, in FY 2010, the unit costs were based on data from FY 2009. 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 number of Direct Loan and Grant disbursements.

Target Context. The measurement will be discontinued in 2011 and beyond, as FSA issued its new strategic plan in September 2010 to cover the FY 2011–15 period. In the new strategic plan, FSA will collapse this measurement with an application unit cost to reveal the total cost of delivering student aid.

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. In FY 2010, FAFSA on the Web exceeded its performance target with a score of 86 (on a 100-point scale).

Data Quality. CFI Group collects and analyzes data and reports the results. At each stage of the process, they conduct quality control checks to ensure that accurate and reliable data and information are delivered.

Target Context. Scores are based on the ACSI Index (100-point scale). Going forward, this measure will be combined with scores from servicing and the student's in-school experience to produce a measure that is more reflective of students as they progress through the entire aid lifecycle.

Measure 3.2.C.: Pell Grant Improper Payments Rate

Analysis of Progress. Federal Student Aid will continue to explore ways to facilitate the detection of error based on the results of the FAFSA/IRS Data Statistical Study. Additionally, Federal Student Aid continues to simplify the application process, which now includes real-time access for applicants and their parents to previously filed IRS tax information. These enhancements, coupled with improved error detection, should allow Federal Student Aid to further reduce improper payments.

Data Quality. A sampling of records is taken from the applicant file and compared to statistical averages from the IRS. The improper payment rate has two parts (over- and under-awards), which are added together to estimate the overall rate.

Target Context. Grant and loan improper payments will continue to be reported in the *Agency Financial Report*, but will not be a primary measure for FSA.

Measure 3.2.D.: Direct Loan Recovery Rate

Analysis of Progress. Through the end of the fiscal year, the default portfolio recovery rate was 17.4 percent for Direct Loans and 21.89 percent (August 2010) for FFEL. To identify possible reasons for this difference, FSA is comparing collection activity for the Direct Loan portfolio and FFEL portfolio held by guaranty agencies to analyze contract pricing, incentives, and structure and identify possible changes that could increase Direct Loan recovery rates. As part of this analysis, the Direct Loan portfolio will be adjusted to control for guaranty agencies' ability to assign their worst-performing loans to the Department and thus reduce the size and improve the relative quality of their collection portfolio.

Data Quality. Processes and procedures are in place to verify and validate the results. The A-123 process for debt management collection systems reviews payment and reconciliation processes.

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 targets were originally established. This measure will continue to be a key measure in monitoring collection performance, but will not be one of the primary performance measures tracked for external performance reporting.

Measure 3.2.E.: FFEL Recovery Rate

Analysis of Progress. The FY 2010 target of 20 percent has been met with data reported through August 2010.

Data Quality. Processes and procedures are in place to verify and validate the results. The A-123 process for debt management collection systems reviews payment and reconciliation processes.

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. This measure will continue to be a key measure in monitoring collection performance, but will not be one of the primary performance measures tracked for external performance reporting. There is a significant lag time from the close of the fiscal year until final data are reported. The actual data reported through August 2010 show a recovery rate of 21.9 percent.

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

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
3.3.A. Percentage of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies That Meet the Employment Outcome Standard for the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants Program ¹	71	82	76	79	78	61	Discontinued	
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 ²	52	59	53	62	54	64	55	Feb. 2011
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 ²	37	55	39	55	41	59	43	Feb. 2011
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 ²	41	61	41	61	42	55	42	Feb. 2011

Sources:

1 OSERS/RSA/Quarterly Caseload Report

2 U. S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Consolidated Annual Program Performance Report, Accountability, and Financial Status Report (CAR) grantee performance report.

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: The FY 2009 target was not met. 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. In FY 2009, the percentage of agencies fell to 61 percent because 10 fewer agencies passed the standard due to more challenging economic conditions, as well as a more difficult disability population being served.

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.

Target Context: This measure has been discontinued. Employment outcomes increased from 2005 to 2007 with improving economic conditions. Performance targets for 2008 and future years were raised, but the targets 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 FY 2007, 2008, and 2009 targets. A part of the explanation of the increase in completions was improved data collection methods used by formula grantees to collect and report data for this measure.

Data Quality and Timeliness: As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the grantees (states and outlying areas) to collect from sub-recipients and report data within published guidelines. OVAE has developed and refined a data quality review process for grantees based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. All grantees are expected to provide these data in their annual performance report and all grantees have reported. Grantees are required to certify an annual Data Quality checklist which is completed online and reviewed by OVAE staff. A Data Quality Improvement Plan may be required if OVAE's review indicates it is needed. High school diplomas issued are certified by local educational agencies or the state educational agency and GED high school equivalency diplomas are confirmed through data match with the state GED administrative database.

Target Context: Targets are set in line with the goal of continuous improvement in program performance. Trend data on actual performance (from 2000 to present) are considered when annual targets are established. Targets have been authorized by OMB through 2015.

Report Explanation: The data represent the number of enrolled adults who earned a high school diploma or GED (equivalency) diploma upon exit from the program divided by the total number of enrolled students with a goal to earn a high school or GED (equivalency) diploma who exited the program. Data were reported from all grantees (50 states, District of Columbia, and six outlying areas including American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands).

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 program exceeded its FY 2007, 2008, and 2009 targets. Exceeding the performance target for this fiscal year was a result of the improved follow-up methodologies implemented by the formula grantees and the training and technical assistance provided by the OVAE on 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 grantees and sub-recipients to collect and report data within published guidelines. All grantees are expected to provide these data in their annual performance report. All grantees have reported. OVAE has developed and refined a data quality review process for grantees based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. Grantees are required to certify an annual Data Quality checklist that completed online and reviewed by OVAE staff. A Data Quality Improvement Plan may be required if OVAE's review indicates it is needed.

Target Context: Targets are set in line with the goal of continuous improvement in program performance. Trend data on actual performance (from 2000 to present) are considered when annual targets are established. Targets have been authorized by OMB through 2015.

Report Explanation: The target has been met. Factors include (1) improved follow-up methodologies implemented by 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.

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 program exceeded its FY 2007, 2008, and 2009 targets. The formula grantees and their local program providers continue to work to identify follow-up methodologies that will prove to be both reliable and valid. Early in this period, approximately one-half of the formula grantees collected employment status through the use of follow-up surveys which provide sporadic response rates impacting both the quantity and quality of data collected. The trend toward increased use of data-matching has contributed to an overall increase in the quality of the data used for this measure.

Data Quality and Timeliness: As a third-tier recipient of these data, OVAE must rely on the grantees and sub-recipients to collect and report data within published guidelines. All grantees are expected to provide these data in their annual performance report. All grantees have reported. OVAE has developed and refined a data quality review process for grantees based on the Department's Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data. Grantees are required to certify an annual Data Quality checklist that is completed online and reviewed by OVAE staff. A Data Quality Improvement Plan may be required if OVAE's review indicates it is needed.

Target Context: Targets are set in line with the goal of continuous improvement in program performance. Trend data on actual performance (from 2000 to present) are considered when annual targets are established. Targets have been authorized by OMB through 2015.

Report Explanation: The target has been met. The actual data for 2008 exceeded the target and remained consistent with the actual data for 2007. 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.