

HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program (OESE)

FY 2017 Program Performance Report

Program Goal: Assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students to successfully complete their first academic year of college and to continue at a postsecondary education.

Objective 1 of 2: All CAMP students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.

Measure 1.1 of 1: The percentage of College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) participants completing the first year of their academic or postsecondary program. (Desired direction: increase) 1469

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2003	Not available.	81	Historical Actual
2004	83.0	84	Target Exceeded
2005	85.0	91	Target Exceeded
2006	86.0	86	Target Met
2007	86.0	75	Target Not Met
2008	86.0	79	Target Not Met but Improved
2009	86.0	86	Target Met
2010	86.0	85	Target Not Met
2011	86.0	89	Target Exceeded
2012	86.0	85.5	Target Not Met
2013	86.0	85.1	Target Not Met
2014	86.0	86.7	Target Exceeded
2015	86.0	84.5	Target Not Met
2016	86.0	88.1	Target Exceeded
2017	86.0	88.2	Target Exceeded
2018	86.0	(June, 2019)	Pending
2019	86.0	(June, 2020)	Pending
2020	86.0	(March, 2021)	Pending

Source. U.S. Department of Education (ED), grantee Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality.

All College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) grantees submit an Annual Performance Report (APR). The Office of Migrant Education (OME) continues to exclude first year projects and include all second through fifth year projects in the calculation of the Government Performance Results Act (GPRA) Measure 1. The measure is calculated this way because funding for first-year projects typically occurs in the summer, at a time when scheduled recruitment of students and other start-up activities usually occur.

OME continues to provide grantees a formatted APR spreadsheet that includes data checks and auto-calculations to ensure data accuracy, and grantees submit this spreadsheet by email. OME provided technical assistance to grantees by 1) hosting an APR training session for all project directors at the Annual Directors Meeting (ADM) 2) hosting an APR training session specifically for new project directors at the New Directors Orientation (NDO), 3) conducting webinar-based training on how to complete the APR, and 4) updating a grantee workbook that allows grantees to efficiently collect data to populate the APR.

After OME collected the FY 2016-17 performance data, the office used a standard process for review of all quantitative and qualitative data. The OME Data-Evaluation Team used a checklist to determine if grantees addressed financial requirements and project objectives adequately, and reviewed Project Statistics and GPRA Reporting, Student Participant Information, Project Services Information, and the APR Cover Sheet. If there were discrepancies in the APR data, members of the OME Data-Evaluation Team would contact the grantee, assist the grantee in the revision of the data, and update the final APR data, ensuring the most accurate and reliable data.

Target Context. OME's GPRA Measure 1 target is based upon APR data collected prior to fiscal year (FY) 2009, and the target of 86% will remain the same for FY 2018.

Explanation.

For GPRA 1, OME determined that the measure is based upon the number of first-year completers, divided by the total number of funded/served (whichever is higher, by project), minus those CAMP students who did not complete their first academic year in college and reenrolled for continuing instructional services in support of their first academic year of postsecondary education in the subsequent budget period, prior to the APR submission due date (persisters). This calculation holds projects accountable to the projected number of students they expected to serve in their application, it holds projects accountable for the success rate when they serve higher numbers of students, and it allows projects to serve students over multiple annual budget periods without being penalized.

During FY 2016-17, OME 1) revised and reconfigured content of the High School Equivalency Program (HEP)-CAMP toolkit and placed it on the ED.GOV website, 2) provided technical assistance on flexible spending at the NDO), 3) provided a one-page tool to assist first-year project directors, 4) delivered a session at the ADM that provided resources to directors in crisis management, 5) provided technical assistance to CAMP projects, so that they could implement recruiting plans, 6) provided technical assistance to grantees with large carry-over balances, 7) provided preventative technical assistance to grantees with a high incidence of annual data quality APR issues, 8) continued the Coaching Initiative, and 9) provided multiple APR, Evaluation, and Data Analysis presentations at the 2017 HEP-CAMP Annual Directors Meeting (ADM),

CAMP performance results demonstrated that the program exceeded the GPRA Measure 1 target of 86% with a performance of 88.2% (1,327 First-Year Completers/{1,683 MAX Funded/Served - 179 Persisters}) in FY 2017. Every first-year completer must, at a minimum, successfully complete 24 semester or 36 quarter credit hours.

Objective 2 of 2: *A majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first year of college will continue in postsecondary education.*

Measure 2.1 of 4: The percentage of College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) participants who, after completing the first year of college, continue their postsecondary education. (Desired direction: increase) 1471

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2003	Not available.	95	Historical Actual
2004	79.0	96	Target Exceeded
2005	80.0	93	Target Exceeded
2006	81.0	93	Target Exceeded
2007	82.0	91	Target Exceeded
2008	83.0	91	Target Exceeded
2009	84.0	91	Target Exceeded
2010	85.0	88	Target Exceeded
2011	85.0	95	Target Exceeded
2012	85.0	96.7	Target Exceeded
2013	85.0	95	Target Exceeded
2014	85.0	96.2	Target Exceeded
2015	85.0	96.7	Target Exceeded
2016	85.0	96.5	Target Exceeded
2017	85.0	96.6	Target Exceeded
2018	88.0	(June, 2019)	Pending
2019	90.0	(June, 2020)	Pending
2020	92.0	(June, 2021)	Pending

Source.

U.S. Department of Education (ED), College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) grantee Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality.

All College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) grantees submit an Annual Performance Report (APR). The Office of Migrant Education (OME) continues to exclude first-year projects and include all second through fifth year projects in the calculation of the Government Performance Results Act (GPRA) Measure 2. The measure is calculated this way because funding for first-year projects typically occurs in the summer, at a time when scheduled recruitment of students and other start-up activities usually occur.

OME continues to provide grantees a formatted APR spreadsheet that includes data checks and auto-calculations to ensure data accuracy, and grantees submit this spreadsheet by email. OME provided technical assistance to grantees by 1) hosting an APR training session for all project directors at the Annual Directors Meeting (ADM) 2) hosting an APR training session specifically for new project directors at the New Directors Orientation (NDO), 3) conducting webinar-based training on how to complete the APR, and 4) updating a grantee workbook that allows grantees to efficiently collect data to populate the APR.

After OME collected the FY 2016-17 performance data, the office used a standard process for review of all quantitative and qualitative data. The OME Data-Evaluation Team used a checklist to determine if grantees addressed financial requirements and project objectives adequately, and reviewed Project Statistics and GPRA Reporting, Student Participant Information, Project Services Information, and the APR Cover Sheet. If there were discrepancies in the APR data, members of the OME Data-Evaluation Team would contact the grantee, assist the grantee in the revision of the data, and update the final APR data, ensuring the most accurate and reliable data.

Target Context. OME's current GPRA Measure 2 target is based upon APR data collected prior to 2009. Future GPRA Measure 2 targets are based upon the most recent data, and because actual GPRA Measure 2 performance has increased since the GPRA 1 requirements were revised in FY 2012, the target of 85% will increase to 88% for FY 2018.

Explanation.

For GPRA 2, OME determined that the measure is based upon the number of first-year completers who continued postsecondary education, divided by the total number of first-year completers.

CAMP performance results demonstrated that the program exceeded the GPRA Measure 2 target of 85% with a performance of 96.6% (1,282 First-Year Completers Who Continued/1,327 First-Year Completers) in FY 2017. This percentage represents a very high CAMP GPRA 2 performance result for those first-year completers who continued postsecondary education.

Measure 2.2 of 4: The cost per 1st year CAMP completer that continued their postsecondary education in CAMP Commuter projects. (Desired direction: decrease) 89a1sq

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2012	12,003.0	9,111	Target Exceeded
2013	12,543.0	10,686	Target Exceeded
2014	13,107.0	10,170	Target Exceeded
2015	13,697.0	10,326	Target Exceeded
2016	14,314.0	10,161	Target Exceeded
2017	14,958.0	12,009	Target Exceeded
2018	15,197.0		Not Collected
2019	15,440.0		Not Collected
2020	15,688.0		Not Collected
2021	15,939.0		Not Collected
2022	16,194.0		Not Collected

Source.

U.S. Department of Education (ED), College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) grantee Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality.

All College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) grantees submit an Annual Performance Report (APR), and no revisions to the CAMP Government Performance Results Act (GPRA) Measure 1 or 2 formulas have been made. The range of the percentage of commuter students in a Commuter project changed from 95% - 100% to 97% - 100% in FY 2017. The Office of Migrant Education (OME) continues to use the annually obligated project funds as the numerator and the number of first-year completers that continue postsecondary education as the denominator in the CAMP efficiency ratio.

Target Context.

OME created annual efficiency targets for the CAMP in July 2012. OME set the efficiency targets through FY 2022, and considered the following in developing the targets:

1) Limitations. The efficiency targets measure "success" of the CAMP, i.e., the cost per CAMP first-year completer that continued postsecondary education. This measure of success does not include one component of the CAMP GPRA Measure 1 formula, persists.

2) Baseline Costs. OME chose to use the FY 2011 actual costs of all four cohorts instead of three GPRA cohorts of CAMP projects as the baseline, because all projects within the entire group of cohorts are compared against the efficiency measure. OME chose projects with an average cost per first-year completer who continued postsecondary education that fell within two standard deviations, resulting in the removal of outlier projects that were located beyond 95% of the range of all CAMP projects. This process eliminated one CAMP project from the baseline data set.

3) Upper Quartile Estimation Model. When reviewing actual costs, OME chose a model that includes the costs of 75% of Commuter projects. By selecting an Upper Quartile Estimation model that includes projects within the upper limit in a box and whiskers plot, nine CAMP projects met the FY 2011 baseline, leaving three projects that did not meet this baseline.

4) Subpopulation Definition. OME used the latest quantitative data provided by the CAMP APRs, in conjunction with "natural" breaks in the data. The office chose these data as they are the most up-to-date and precise, and defined a Commuter project as one that included greater than or equal to 97% commuter students.

OME developed the commuter definition based upon: 1) CAMP project costs are necessarily more expensive for projects that serve residential students, as these projects typically provide funding for meals and lodging (the logical progression of costs should range from projects with lowest costs, Commuter projects, to projects with the highest costs, Residential projects); 2) Natural breaks in CAMP data occurred in the percentage of commuter students, and OME attempted comparability with High School Equivalency Program (HEP) data in order to determine the cut points in the CAMP data; and 3) OME completes an annual review of the percentage of commuter students, in order to provide flexibility to individual projects that experience variation in the percentage of commuter students, so that OME may adjust the cut points based upon the data.

Explanation. OME developed a predictive model for CAMP costs based upon the two constants of inflation and expected improvement, in order to establish a trajectory for its efficiency measures. Because the inflation rate for college-associated costs consistently outpaced the national inflationary rate for the years FY 2003 through FY 2007, OME included a constant that increased costs annually by 7.5%, accounting for inflation. Additionally, OME expects an

improvement of efficiency in CAMP projects, and a 1% improvement in efficiency will be represented as an expected 1% decrease in costs on an annual basis. In FY 2017, CAMP Commuter projects, for the sixth year in a row, exceeded their efficiency target. For the FY 2016-17 APR, CAMP Commuter projects received obligated project funds totaling \$6,521,096 and reported 543 first-year completers who continued, for an average efficiency ratio of \$12,009.

Measure 2.3 of 4: The cost per 1st year CAMP completer that continued their postsecondary education in CAMP Commuter-Residential projects. (Desired direction: decrease) 89a1sr

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2012	14,628.0	11,748	Target Exceeded
2013	15,286.0	10,701	Target Exceeded
2014	15,974.0	11,512	Target Exceeded
2015	16,693.0	11,503	Target Exceeded
2016	17,444.0	12,311	Target Exceeded
2017	18,229.0	13,765	Target Exceeded
2018	18,521.0		Not Collected
2019	18,817.0		Not Collected
2020	19,118.0		Not Collected
2021	19,424.0		Not Collected
2022	19,735.0		Not Collected

Source.

U.S. Department of Education (ED), College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) grantee Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality.

All College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) grantees submit an Annual Performance Report (APR), and no revisions to the CAMP Government Performance Results Act (GPRA) Measure 1 or 2 formulas have been made. The range of the percentage of commuter students in a Commuter-Residential project changed from 49% - 94% to 50% - 96% in FY 2017. The Office of Migrant Education (OME) continues to use the annually obligated project funds as the numerator and the number of first-year completers that continue postsecondary education as the denominator in the CAMP efficiency ratio.

Target Context.

OME created annual efficiency targets for the CAMP in July 2012. OME set the efficiency targets for FY 2012 through FY 2016, and considered the following in developing the targets:

- 1) Limitations. The efficiency targets measure "success" of CAMP, i.e., the cost per CAMP first-year completer that continued postsecondary education. This measure of success does not include one component of the CAMP GPRA Measure 1 formula, persists.
- 2) Baseline Costs. OME chose to use the FY 2011 actual costs of all four cohorts instead of three GPRA cohorts of CAMP projects as the baseline, because all projects within the entire group of cohorts are compared against the efficiency measure. OME chose projects with an average cost

per first-year completer who continued postsecondary education that fell within two standard deviations, resulting in the removal of outlier projects that were located beyond 95% of the range of all CAMP projects. This process eliminated one CAMP project from the baseline data set.

3) Upper Quartile Estimation Model. When reviewing actual costs, OME chose a model that includes the costs of 75% of Commuter projects. By selecting an Upper Quartile Estimation model that includes projects within the upper limit in a box and whiskers plot, nine CAMP projects met the FY 2011 baseline, leaving three projects that did not meet this baseline.

4) Subpopulation Definition. OME used the latest quantitative data provided by the CAMP APRs, in conjunction with "natural" breaks in the data. The office chose these data as they are the most up-to-date and precise, and defined a Commuter-Residential project as one that included between 50% and 96% commuter students.

OME developed the commuter definition based upon: 1) CAMP project costs are necessarily more expensive for projects that serve residential students, as these projects typically provide funding for meals and lodging (the logical progression of costs should range from projects with lowest costs, Commuter projects, to projects with the highest costs, Residential projects); 2) Natural breaks in High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and CAMP data occurred in the percentage of commuter students, and OME attempted comparability with HEP data in order to determine the cut points in the CAMP data; and 3) OME completes an annual review of the percentage of commuter students, in order to provide flexibility to individual projects that experience variation in the percentage of commuter students, so that OME may adjust the cut points based upon the data.

Explanation.

OME developed a predictive model for CAMP costs based upon the two constants of inflation and expected improvement, in order to establish a trajectory for its efficiency measures. Because the inflation rate for college-associated costs consistently outpaced the national inflationary rate for the years FY 2003 through FY 2007, OME included a constant that increased costs annually by 7.5%, accounting for inflation. Additionally, OME expects an improvement of efficiency in CAMP projects, and a 1% improvement in efficiency will be represented as an expected 1% decrease in costs on an annual basis. In FY 2016, CAMP Commuter-Residential projects, for the sixth year in a row, exceeded their efficiency target. For the FY 2016-17 APR, CAMP Commuter-Residential projects received obligated project funds totaling \$6,318,031 and reported 459 first-year completers who continued, for an average efficiency ratio of \$13,765.

Measure 2.4 of 4: The cost per 1st year CAMP completer that continued their postsecondary education in CAMP Residential projects. (Desired direction: decrease) 89a1ss

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2012	19,236.0	14,860	Target Exceeded
2013	20,102.0	14,534	Target Exceeded
2014	21,007.0	12,521	Target Exceeded
2015	21,952.0	12,354	Target Exceeded
2016	22,940.0	13,279	Target Exceeded
2017	23,972.0	14,823	Target Exceeded
2018	24,356.0		Not Collected
2019	24,745.0		Not Collected
2020	25,141.0		Not Collected
2021	25,543.0		Not Collected
2022	25,952.0		Not Collected

Source.

U.S. Department of Education (ED), College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) grantee Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality.

All College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) grantees submit an Annual Performance Report (APR), and no revisions to the CAMP Government Performance Results Act (GPRA) Measure 1 or 2 formulas have been made. The range of the percentage of commuter students in a Residential project changed from 0% - 48% to 0% - 49% in FY 2017. The Office of Migrant Education (OME) continues to use the annually obligated project funds as the numerator and the number of first-year completers that continue postsecondary education as the denominator in the CAMP efficiency ratio.

Target Context.

OME created annual efficiency targets for the CAMP in July 2012. OME set the efficiency targets for FY 2012 through FY 2016, and considered the following in developing the targets:

- 1) Limitations. The efficiency targets measure "success" of CAMP, i.e., the cost per CAMP first-year completer that continued postsecondary education. This measure of success does not include one component of the CAMP GPRA Measure 1 formula, persisters.
- 2) Baseline Costs. OME chose to use the FY 2011 actual costs of all four cohorts instead of three GPRA cohorts of CAMP projects as the baseline, because all projects within the entire group of cohorts are compared against the efficiency measure. OME chose projects with an average cost per first-year completer who continued postsecondary education that fell within two standard deviations, resulting in the removal of outlier projects that were located beyond 95% of the range of all CAMP projects. This process eliminated one CAMP project from the baseline data set.
- 3) Upper Quartile Estimation Model. When reviewing actual costs, OME chose a model that includes the costs of 75% of Commuter projects. By selecting an Upper Quartile Estimation model that includes projects within the upper limit in a box and whiskers plot, nine CAMP projects

met the FY 2011 baseline, leaving three projects that did not meet this baseline.

4) Subpopulation Definition. OME used the latest quantitative data provided by the CAMP APRs, in conjunction with "natural" breaks in the data. The office chose these data as they are the most up-to-date and precise, and defined a Residential project as one that included between 0% and 49% commuter students.

OME developed the commuter definition based upon: 1) CAMP project costs are necessarily more expensive for projects that serve residential students, as these projects typically provide funding for meals and lodging (the logical progression of costs should range from projects with lowest costs, Commuter projects, to projects with the highest costs, Residential projects); 2) Natural breaks in High School Equivalency (HEP) and CAMP data occurred in the percentage of commuter students, and OME attempted comparability with HEP data in order to determine the cut points in the CAMP data; and 3) OME completes an annual review of the percentage of commuter students, in order to provide flexibility to individual projects that experience variation in the percentage of commuter students, so that the office may adjust the cut points based upon the data.

Explanation.

OME developed a predictive model for CAMP costs based upon the two constants of inflation and expected improvement, in order to establish a trajectory for its efficiency measures. Because the inflation rate for college-associated costs consistently outpaced the national inflationary rate for the years FY 2003 through FY 2007, OME included a constant that increased costs annually by 7.5%, accounting for inflation. Additionally, OME expects an improvement of efficiency in CAMP projects, and a 1% improvement in efficiency will be represented as an expected 1% decrease in costs on an annual basis. In FY 2017, CAMP Residential projects, for the sixth year in a row, exceeded their efficiency target. For the FY 2016-17 APR, CAMP Residential projects received obligated project funds totaling \$8,374,980 and reported 565 first-year completers who continued, for an average efficiency ratio of \$14,823.