

**U.S. Department
of Education**

**Office of
Migrant Education**

**HEP-CAMP
FY 2016
Report to Congress**

U.S. Department of Education

John King
Secretary

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Ann Whalen
Senior Advisor to the Secretary, Delegated the Duties and Functions of the Assistant Secretary

Office of Migrant Education

Lisa Ramírez
Director

July, 2016

This report is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should be: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Migrant Education, *HEP-CAMP FY 2016 Report to Congress*, Washington, D.C., 2016.

To order copies of this report,

write to: ED Pubs, Education Publications Center, U.S. Department of Education, P. O. Box 22207, Alexandria, VA 22304;

or **fax** your request to: (703) 605-6794;

or **e-mail** your request to: edpubs@edpubs.ed.gov.

or **call** in your request toll-free: 1-877-433-7827 (1-877-4-ED-PUBS). If 877 service is not available in your area, call 1-800-872-5327 (1-800-USA-LEARN). Those who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a teletypewriter (TTY), should call 1-877-576-7734 or 1-800-437-0833.

or **order online** at: www.edpubs.gov.

This report is also available on the Department's Web site at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ose/ome/index.html>.

On request, this publication is available in alternative formats, such as Braille, large print, or CD Rom. For more information, please contact Edward Monaghan at 202-260-2823 or edward.monaghan@ed.gov.

The Office of Migrant Education welcomes all comments and suggestions on both the content and presentation of this report. Please forward them to Edward Monaghan, at edward.monaghan@ed.gov.

Office of Migrant Education
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202-6135

“The mission of the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education is to promote academic excellence, enhance educational opportunities and equity for all of America’s children and families, and to improve the quality of teaching and learning by providing leadership, technical assistance and financial support.”

Website for the Office of Migrant
Education: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oese/ome/index.html>

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	iv
FOREWORD.....	1
SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE DATA.....	2
Program Performance Measures.....	2
Abbreviations.....	2
High School Equivalency Program Data	3
Table 1: HEP GPRA Measure 1 Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2013.....	4
Table 2: HEP GPRA Measure 2 Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2013.....	5
Table 3: HEP Efficiency Measure Results for FY 2012 – FY 2013.....	5
College Assistance Migrant Program Data	6
Table 4: CAMP GPRA Measure 1 Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2014.....	7
Table 5: CAMP GPRA Measure 2 Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2014.....	8
Table 6: CAMP Efficiency Measure Results for FY 2012 – FY 2014.....	9
Accomplishments and Initiatives.....	10
PERFORMANCE DETAILS AND DISAGGREGATED RESULTS.....	11
How to Read the Results.....	11
Definitions of Key Terms.....	11
HEP Performance Details and Disaggregated Results	13
Table 7: HEP Number Served Subgroup Results for FY 2012 – FY 2013.....	13
Table 8: HEP GPRA Measure 1 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2013.....	14
Table 9: HEP GPRA Measure 2 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2013.....	15
CAMP Performance Details and Disaggregated Results	16
Table 10: CAMP Number Served Subgroup Results for FY 2012 – FY 2014.....	16
Table 11: CAMP GPRA Measure 1 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2014.....	17
Table 12: CAMP GPRA Measure 2 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2014.....	18
CAMP Graduation Data.....	18
Table 13: CAMP Graduation Data for FY 2012 – FY 2014.....	19
APPENDIX.....	20
Office of Migrant Education Links.....	20

FOREWORD

The High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) are authorized in Title IV, Section 418A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA), as amended by section 408 of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA), P.L. 110-315. The purpose of the HEP is to help migrant and seasonal farmworkers and members of their immediate family obtain the equivalent of a secondary school diploma and subsequently to gain employment or be placed in the military, an institution of higher education (IHE) or other postsecondary education or training program. The purpose of the CAMP is to provide the academic and financial support necessary to help migrant and seasonal farmworkers and members of their immediate family who have been accepted into an IHE to successfully complete their first year of college.

Section 418(h) of the HEA requires the Secretary to collect data annually on persons receiving services under these programs, including their rates of secondary school graduation, entrance into postsecondary education, and completion of postsecondary education, and to submit biennial reports to Congress on the most recently available data for the program. These reports must also be made available to the public.

The U.S. Department of Education's (Department's) *HEP-CAMP FY 2016 Report to Congress* also includes a summary of data for the performance measures established for each program under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010. Specifically, the document provides a summary of data for the HEP GPRA measures for fiscal year (FY) 2012 and FY 2013, and CAMP GPRA measures for FY 2012, FY 2013, and FY 2014. For HEP, data include the percentage of HEP participants receiving a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) and the percentage of HEP HSED recipients who enter postsecondary education programs, upgraded employment, or the military. For CAMP, data include the percentage of CAMP participants completing the first academic year of their program of study at an IHE, and the percentage of CAMP participants who, after completing the first year of college, continued their postsecondary education.

In addition to a summary of HEP and CAMP GPRA data, the document includes an efficiency ratio, expressed as the cost per participant with program success. The HEP efficiency ratio is the total appropriation for a given year divided by the number of HSED recipients (*i.e.*, cost per HSED) for the same year. The CAMP efficiency ratio is the total appropriation for a given year divided by the number of CAMP first academic year completers who continue their postsecondary education (*i.e.*, cost per first year completer who continued in postsecondary education) in the following year.

SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE DATA

Program Performance Measures

The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993 requires all Federal agencies to establish strategic goals, performance measures, and performance targets. The Department established two performance targets for projects implementing the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) in FY 2015. The performance measures for the HEP are (1) the percentage of HEP participants who receive a HSED, and (2) the percentage of HEP HSED recipients who enter postsecondary education training programs, upgraded employment, or the military. The performance measures for the CAMP are (1) the percentage of CAMP participants who complete the first academic year of their postsecondary program, and (2) the percentage of CAMP participants who complete their first academic year of college and continue their postsecondary education. The Department requires each HEP and CAMP grantee to submit an annual performance report (APR) that contains data with regard to the grantee's progress in meeting the two approved performance targets for each program.

Abbreviations

AA	<i>Associate of Arts</i>
APR	<i>Annual Performance Report</i>
BA	<i>Bachelor of Arts</i>
BS	<i>Bachelor of Science</i>
CAMP	<i>College Assistance Migrant Program</i>
FY	<i>Fiscal Year</i>
GED	<i>General Education Development</i>
GPRA	<i>Government Performance and Results Act of 1993</i>
HEA	<i>Higher Education Act of 1965</i>

HEOA	<i>Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008</i>
HEP	<i>High School Equivalency Program</i>
HSED	<i>High School Equivalency Diploma</i>
IHE	<i>Institution of Higher Education</i>
OME	<i>Office of Migrant Education</i>

High School Equivalency Program Data

The targets¹ the Department established for the HEP measures for use in FY 2012 through FY 2013 were (1) 69 percent of HEP participants would receive a HSED, and (2) 80 percent of HEP HSED recipients would enter postsecondary education or training programs, attain upgraded employment, or enter the military. During those years, between 67.4 percent and 74.5 percent of participants attained a HSED, and between 79.3 percent and 80.1 percent of HSED recipients entered postsecondary education or training programs, upgraded employment, or the military. The HEP exceeded the national target for HSED attainment and the national target for HSED recipients to enter postsecondary education or training programs, upgraded employment, or the military during FY 2013.

The Department, however, is unable to report HEP program data for FY 2014 at this time. On January 26, 2016, the General Education Development (GED) Testing Service announced that the passing score for the GED test had been recalibrated, effectively changing the passing score for the GED from 150 to 145. The GED Testing Service also approved this scoring change retroactive to January 1, 2014, and recommended that students who scored in the range of 145 to 149 be eligible for an HSED. All States where HEP projects are operated agreed to implement the scoring change as revised by the GED Testing Service. Due to these changes, the Office of Migrant Education (OME) will collect revised HEP program data to reflect the newly calibrated passing score in December 2016.

The Department collects data on measures of program efficiency as well as performance outcomes for three categories of projects. For the HEP, program efficiency is determined by dividing each project's annual budget by the total number of HEP HSE attainers. Moreover, program efficiency targets are based on actual costs in

¹ The Department used baseline data from the previous year to set the initial GPRA targets in FY 2003, and increased the targets incrementally until they met a high, yet realistic expectation for program performance. The Department set the HEP GPRA 1 target in FY 2003 at 60% (two points higher than the previous two years' results), increased the target to 69% by FY 2009, and has maintained this target through FY 2016. The Department set the initial HEP GPRA 2 target in FY 2005 at 80 percent (four points higher than the previous year's results), and has maintained this target through FY 2016.

2011 (the baseline year), multiplied by an estimated rate of inflation for IHE-associated costs and then decreased by an expected improvement in efficiency annually of one percent.

The three categories of HEP projects are commuter projects, residential projects, and commuter-residential projects. Commuter projects serve mostly students who do not live in IHE-funded housing, residential projects serve mostly students who live in IHE-funded housing, and commuter-residential projects serve both students who live in IHE-funded housing and students who do not live in IHE-funded housing. Because of a wide variation in test costs, and types and levels of support by other HSED programs, any comparison with other HSED programs' efficiency ratios is problematic. While all HSED programs may provide educational and/or assessment services, HEP projects typically provide recruitment services, educational services, and supportive services to a specific population of individuals associated with migrant and seasonal farmwork, in order to assist participants in obtaining the HSED credential. These additional services for a mobile, largely non-English speaking population residing in rural areas presumably require costs that other HSED programs may not have.

Table 1: HEP GPRA Measure 1 Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2013

Objective: An increasing percentage of HEP participants will receive their HSED.

Measure. The percentage of HEP participants receiving a HSED.

Year	HSED Attainers: Target	HSED Attainers: Actual
2012	69%	67.4%
2013	69%	74.5%

Explanation: The HEP exceeded its GPRA Measure 1 target for one of the last two years, and the percentage of HEP participants who received a HSED increased 7.1% between 2012 and 2013.

Table 2: HEP GPRA Measure 2 Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2013

Objective: An increasing percentage of HEP participants receiving a HSED will enter postsecondary education programs, upgraded employment, or the military.

Measure. The percentage of HEP HSED recipients who enter postsecondary education programs, career positions, or the military.

Year	HSED Placement: Target	HSED Placement: Actual
2012	80%	79.3%
2013	80%	80.1%

Explanation: The HEP exceeded its GPRA Measure 2 target for one of the last two years, and the percentage of HEP HSED recipients who enter postsecondary education programs, career positions, or the military increased 0.8% between 2012 and 2013.

Table 3: HEP Efficiency Measure Results for FY 2012 – FY 2013

Year	Cost per HSED Received: Target ²	Cost per HSED Received: Actual
2012 Commuter Projects	\$7,910	\$5,766
2012 Residential Projects	\$15,459	\$11,201
2012 Commuter-Residential Projects	\$12,502	\$11,160
2013 Commuter Projects	\$8,306	\$5,409
2013 Residential Projects	\$16,195	\$9,667
2013 Commuter-Residential Projects	\$13,104	\$7,589

Explanation: In FY 2011, HEP reported baseline efficiency measure results for commuter projects that serve mostly students who do not live in IHE-funded housing,

² The Department set HEP efficiency targets for use in FY 2012 through FY 2016, using FY 2011 baseline data and an upper quartile estimation model that includes constants of inflation, expected improvement, and costs for new HSE assessments.

residential projects that serve mostly students who live in IHE-funded housing, and commuter-residential projects that serve both students who do not live in IHE-funded housing and students who live in IHE-funded housing. From FY 2012 through FY 2013, each type of HEP project exceeded its target for efficiency. By FY 2013, the average cost per HSED received in the HEP ranged from a low of \$5,409 per student who participated in a commuter project to a high of \$9,667 in a residential project.

College Assistance Migrant Program Data

The targets³ the Department established for the CAMP measures for use in FY 2012 through FY 2014 were (1) 86 percent of participants would complete their first academic year of their postsecondary program, and (2) 85 percent of CAMP participants who complete their first academic year in college would continue their postsecondary education.

During those years between 85.5 percent and 86.7 percent of CAMP participants completed the first academic year of their postsecondary program, exceeding the national CAMP target of 86 percent in FY 2014. Also, between 95 and 96.7 percent of CAMP students who completed their first year in college continued their postsecondary education, surpassing the national CAMP target of 85 percent in all three fiscal years. The CAMP GPRA Measure 1 performance results for FY 2012 through FY 2014 have stabilized compared to the result of 89 percent in FY 2011, when the Department developed a more specific, rigorous definition of first academic year completion. Also, the CAMP GPRA Measure 2 performance results have stabilized at a high rate since FY 2011. The data reported here for FY 2014 are higher than both of the national targets and the national retention rates for first-time college freshmen returning in their second year, which was 77.1 percent for four-year IHEs, and 54.3 percent for two-year IHEs in 2010.⁴

The Department collects data on measures of both program efficiency and performance outcomes for three categories of CAMP projects. For the CAMP, program efficiency is determined by dividing each project's annual budget by the total number of CAMP

³ The Department used baseline data from the previous year to set the initial GPRA targets in FY 2004, and increased the targets incrementally until they met a high, yet realistic expectation for program performance. The Department set the initial CAMP GPRA 1 target in FY 2004 at 83 percent (one point higher than the previous three years' results), increased the target to 86 percent by FY 2006, and has maintained this target at 86 percent through FY 2016. The Department set the initial CAMP GPRA 2 target in FY 2005 at 79 percent (one point higher than the previous two years' results), increased the target to 85 percent in FY 2010, and has maintained this target at 85 percent through FY 2016.

⁴ Retention rates – first-time college freshmen returning their second year (2010). Retrieved December 16, 2015, from National Center for Higher Education Policymaking and Analysis web site, [National Center for Higher Education Policymaking and Analysis web site](#).

completers who continued their postsecondary education. Moreover, program efficiency targets are based on actual costs in 2011 (the baseline year), multiplied by an estimated rate of inflation for college-associated costs and then decreased by an expected improvement in efficiency annually of one percent.

The three categories of projects include commuter projects, residential projects, and commuter-residential projects. Commuter projects serve mostly students who do not live in IHE-funded housing, residential projects serve mostly students who live in IHE-funded housing, and commuter-residential projects serve both students who live in IHE-funded housing and students who do not live in IHE-funded housing.

Table 4: CAMP GPRA Measure 1 Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2014

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

Measure. The percentage of CAMP participants completing their first year of a postsecondary program in good standing.

Year	First Year Completers: Target	First Year Completers: Actual
2012	86%	85.5%
2013	86%	85.1%
2014	86%	86.7%

Explanation: The CAMP exceeded its GPRA Measure 1 target for one of the last three years, and the percentage of CAMP participants completing their first year of a postsecondary program in good standing increased 1.2% between 2012 and 2014.

Table 5: CAMP GPRA Measure 2 Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2014

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

Measure. The percentage of CAMP participants who, after completing their first academic year of college, continue their postsecondary education.

Year	First Year Completers Who Continue: Target	First Year Completers Who Continue: Actual
2012	85%	96.7%
2013	85%	95.0%
2014	85%	96.2%

Explanation: The CAMP exceeded its GPRA Measure 2 target for each of the last three years, and the percentage of CAMP participants who, after completing their first academic year of college, continued their postsecondary education decreased 0.5% between 2012 and 2014.

Table 6: CAMP Efficiency Measure Results for FY 2012 – FY 2014

Year	Cost per First Year Completer: Target⁵	Cost per First Year Completer Who Continues: Actual
2012 Commuter Projects	\$12,003	\$9,111
2012 Residential Projects	\$19,236	\$14,860
2012 Commuter-Residential Projects	\$14,628	\$11,748
2013 Commuter Projects	\$12,543	\$10,686
2013 Residential Projects	\$20,102	\$14,534
2013 Commuter-Residential Projects	\$15,286	\$10,701
2014 Commuter Projects	\$13,107	\$10,170
2014 Residential Projects	\$21,007	\$12,521
2014 Commuter-Residential Projects	\$15,974	\$11,512

Explanation: In FY 2011, CAMP reported baseline efficiency measure results for commuter projects that serve mostly students who do not live in IHE-funded housing, residential projects that serve mostly students who live in IHE-funded housing, and commuter-residential projects that serve both students who do not live in IHE-funded housing and students who live in IHE-funded housing. From FY 2012 through FY 2014, each type of CAMP project exceeded its target for efficiency. By FY 2014, the average cost per first year completer who continued in postsecondary education ranged from a low of \$10,170 per student for participants in commuter projects to a high of \$12,521 per student for participants in residential projects.

⁵ The Department set CAMP efficiency targets for use in FY 2012 through FY 2016 using FY 2011 baseline data and an upper quartile estimation model that includes constants of inflation and expected improvement.

Accomplishments and Initiatives

In FY 2013, the Department began collecting Annual Performance Reports (APRs) electronically. This new format provides data checks and auto-calculations to ensure data accuracy and efficient use of time, and helped grantees improve verification of the APR data. The Department reviewed grantee performance in order to identify low performing projects and provide technical assistance to grantees. Specifically, the Department used the reported data to identify and prioritize projects that require more intensive program monitoring and technical assistance, and to inform program-level decisions with regard to both eligibility for continuation awards and issuance of new awards to applicants that had operated previously low-performing projects.

The Department plans to review its HEP GPRA performance targets after it has collected the 2016 APR, in order to determine whether to adjust those targets for subsequent fiscal years.

PERFORMANCE DETAILS AND DISAGGREGATED RESULTS

How to Read the Results

The following tables provide the HEP performance data for FY 2012 – FY 2013 and CAMP performance data for FY 2012 – FY 2014. In addition to providing information on the total population, each table provides the results and the explanations for subgroups. These subgroups include equal to or over-serving projects and under-serving projects, commuter, residential, and commuter-residential projects, open and structured enrollment projects, and large, medium, and small projects. Following each table is an analysis, which provides insights into grantees' progress.

Definitions of Key Terms

Commuter Projects: Projects that serve mostly students who do not live in IHE-funded housing. The parameters for determining commuter projects are adjusted annually, based upon the most recent APR data.

Commuter-Residential Projects: Projects that serve both students who live in IHE-funded housing and students who do not live in IHE-funded housing. The parameters for determining commuter-residential projects are adjusted annually, based upon the most recent APR data.

Equal to or Over-Serving Projects: Projects that serve the same number or more students than the number of students proposed in their approved applications.

Large CAMP Projects: CAMP projects that serve at least 75 students.

Large HEP Projects: HEP projects that serve at least 125 students.

Medium CAMP Projects: CAMP projects that serve between 50 and 74 students.

Number Funded to Be Served in CAMP Instruction: As identified in the approved CAMP project applications, the number of participants to be enrolled in CAMP instruction in an IHE during a budget period for which the Department provides financial support for CAMP instruction.

Number Funded to Be Served in HEP HSED Instruction: As identified in the approved HEP project applications, the number of participants to be enrolled in HSED

instruction in a HEP project during a budget period for which the Department provides financial support for HSED instruction.

Number Served in CAMP Instruction: The number of CAMP eligible students who completed intake and were enrolled and attending college courses past the Add/Drop deadline assigned by the project's IHE.

Number Served in HEP HSED Instruction: The number of HEP HSED eligible students who completed intake and were enrolled and attending HEP HSED instruction for at least 12 hours of instructional services during a budget period.

Open Enrollment Projects: Projects that allow continuous entry into instructional services (*i.e.*, there is no cut-off date for student enrollment in order to enter a course).

Open-Structured Projects: Projects that both allow continuous entry into instructional services, and allow enrollment for a defined period of time prior to the start of instructional services.

Projects at Four-Year IHEs: CAMP projects that reside in an IHE that offer a bachelor's degree upon successful completion of established graduation requirements.

Projects at Two-Year IHEs: CAMP projects that reside in an IHE that offer an associate's degree upon successful completion of established graduation requirements.

Residential Projects: Projects that serve mostly students who live in IHE-funded housing. The parameters for determining residential projects are adjusted annually, based upon the most recent APR data.

Small CAMP Projects: CAMP projects that serve fewer than 50 students.

Small HEP Projects: HEP projects that serve fewer than 125 students.

Structured Enrollment Projects: Projects that allow enrollment for a defined period of time prior to the start of instructional services. Once the defined period of enrollment has expired, students must wait until the next semester or series of instructional services to participate in services.

Total CAMP Projects: The national total number of CAMP projects.

Total HEP Projects: The national total number of HEP projects.

Two and Four-Year Projects: CAMP projects that reside in both an IHE that offers at least an associate's degree upon successful completion of established graduation requirements, and in an IHE that offers a bachelor's degree upon successful completion of established requirements.

Under-Serving Projects: Projects that serve fewer students than the number of students proposed in their approved application.

HEP Performance Details and Disaggregated Results

Table 7: HEP Number Served Subgroup Results for FY 2012 – FY 2013

HEP Projects	Number of Projects FY 2012	Number of Projects FY 2013	Percent of Students Served Based on the No. of Students Proposed to Be Served FY 2012	Percent of Students Served Based on the No. of Students Proposed to Be Served FY 2013
Total HEP Projects	42	43	103%	102%
Equal to or Over-Serving Projects	34	33	109%	111%
Under-Serving Projects	8	10	84%	79%
Commuter Projects	32	33	102%	102%
Residential Projects	4	3	108%†	104%†
Commuter-Residential Projects	6	7	101%	102%
Open Enrollment Projects	28	29	102%	99%
Structured Enrollment Projects	11	14	97%	108%
Open-Structured Enrollment Projects	3	0	133%†	NA*
Large Projects (greater than 124)	18	18	105%	107%
Small Projects (less than 125)	24	25	100%	95%

*= Not Applicable

†=Low "N" Size (Number of Projects<5)

Explanation: The data for FY 2012 through FY 2013 show little variation in the number of HEP projects. For subgroups with at least five projects, the percentage of students who are served relative to the number grantees proposed to serve in their project applications decreased slightly from 103 percent to 102 percent. Structured enrollment projects report the largest increase in the percentage of students who are served, an increase of 11 percentage points between FY 2012 through FY 2013. Small projects report the largest decrease, a decrease of five percentage points.

Table 8: HEP GPRA Measure 1 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2013

HEP Objective: An increasing percentage of HEP participants will receive their HSED diploma.

Measure. The percentage of HEP participants receiving a HSED.

HEP Projects	Percent GPRA 1 Target FY 2012-2013	GPRA 1 Actual FY 2012 Percent	GPRA 1 Actual FY 2013 Percent
Commuter Projects	69%	69%	73%
Residential Projects	69%	61%†	76%†
Commuter-Residential Projects	69%	72%	74%
Open Enrollment Projects	69%	70%	73%
Structured Enrollment Projects	69%	65%	74%
Open-Structured Enrollment Projects	69%	69%†	NA*
Large Projects (greater than 124)	69%	72%	79%
Small Projects (less than 125)	69%	63%	66%

*= Not Applicable

†=Low "N" Size (Number of Projects<5)

Explanation: For subgroups with at least five projects, structured enrollment projects report the largest increase in the GPRA Measure 1, an increase of nine percentage points between FY 2012 and FY 2013. No subgroups report a decrease in the GPRA Measure 1.

Table 9: HEP GPRA Measure 2 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2013

HEP Objective: An increasing percentage of HEP recipients of the HSED will enter postsecondary education or training programs, upgraded employment, or the military.

Measure. An increasing percentage of HEP recipients of the HSED will enter postsecondary education programs, upgraded employment, or the military.

HEP Projects	GPRA 2 Target FY 2012–FY 2013 Percent	GPRA 2 Actual FY 2012 Percent	GPRA 2 Actual FY 2013 Percent
Commuter Projects	80%	79%	81%
Residential Projects	80%	78%†	78%†
Commuter-Residential Projects	80%	67%	80%
Open Enrollment Projects	80%	77%	83%
Structured Enrollment Projects	80%	78%	76%
Open-Structured Enrollment Projects	80%	78%†	NA*
Large Projects (greater than 124)	80%	79%	84%
Small Projects (less than 125)	80%	75%	75%

*= Not Applicable

†=Low “N” Size (Number of Projects<5)

Explanation: For subgroups with at least five projects, commuter-residential projects report the largest increase in the GPRA Measure 2, an increase of 13 percentage points between FY 2012 and FY 2013. Structured enrollment projects report the largest decrease in the GPRA Measure 2, a decrease of two percentage points.

CAMP Performance Details and Disaggregated Results

Table 10: CAMP Number Served Subgroup Results for FY 2012 – FY 2014

CAMP Projects	Number of Projects FY 2012	Number of Projects FY 2013	Number of Projects FY 2014	Percent of Students Served Based on the No. of Students Proposed to Be Served FY 2012	Percent of Students Served Based on the No. of Students Proposed to Be Served FY 2013	Percent of Students Served Based on the No. of Students Proposed to Be Served FY 2014
Total CAMP Projects	38	39	39	106%	109%	106%
Equal to or Over-Serving Projects	31	36	34	109%	111%	110%
Under-Serving Projects	7	3	5	93%	70%†	78%
Commuter Projects	12	13	13	102%	104%	101%
Residential Projects	14	17	15	115%	116%	114%
Commuter-Residential Projects	12	9	11	103%	110%	106%
Projects at Two-Year IHEs	10	12	10	105%	106%	99%
Projects at Four-Year IHEs	26	27	29	107%	110%	108%
Two and Four Year Projects	2	0	0	92%†	NA*	NA*
Large Projects (greater than 74)	5	6	4	108%	120%	113%†
Medium Projects (50-74)	11	8	9	110%	114%	112%
Small Projects (less than 50)	22	25	26	102%	101%	101%

*= Not Applicable

†=Low "N" Size (Number of Projects<5)

Explanation: The data for FY 2012 through FY 2014 show little variation in the number of CAMP projects or the percentage of students who are served, based on the proposed size of the projects. For subgroups with at least five projects, commuter-residential projects report the largest increase, an increase of three percentage points between FY

2012 and FY 2014. Projects at two-year IHEs report the largest decrease in the percentage of students who are served, a decrease of six percentage points.

In FY 2014, residential projects served the highest percentage of students relative to the number projected to be served in project applications, 114 percent, while projects at two-year IHEs served the lowest percentage of students who are served, 99 percent.

Table 11: CAMP GPRA Measure 1 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2014

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

Measure. The percentage of CAMP participants completing the first year of their academic or postsecondary program.

CAMP Projects	Percent GPRA 1 Target FY 2012 – FY 2014	Percent GPRA 1 Actual FY 2012	Percent GPRA 1 Actual FY 2013	Percent GPRA 1 Actual FY 2014
Commuter Projects	86%	87%	86%	85%
Residential Projects	86%	83%	80%	88%
Commuter-Residential Projects	86%	82%	86%	87%
Projects at Two-Year IHEs	86%	79%	86%	87%
Projects at Four-Year IHEs	86%	87%	83%	87%
Two and Four Year Projects	86%	71%†	NA*	NA*
Large Projects (greater than 74)	86%	90%	88%	87%†
Medium Projects (50-74)	86%	82%	92%	90%
Small Projects (less than 50)	86%	83%	77%	85%

*= Not Applicable

†=Low "N" Size (Number of Projects<5)

Explanation: For subgroups with at least five projects, projects at two-year IHEs and medium projects report the largest increase in the GPRA Measure 1, an increase of eight percentage points each between FY 2012 and FY 2014. Only one subgroup reports a decrease in the GPRA Measure 1, and commuter projects report a decrease of two percentage points.

In FY 2014, medium projects report the highest GPRA Measure 1, 90 percent, and commuter and small projects report the lowest GPRA Measure 1, 85 percent.

Table 12: CAMP GPRA Measure 2 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2012 – FY 2014

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

Measure. The percentage of CAMP participants who, after completing the first year of college, continue their postsecondary education.

CAMP Projects	Percent GPRA 2 Target FY 2012–FY 2014	Percent GPRA 2 Actual FY 2012	Percent GPRA 2 Actual FY 2013	Percent GPRA 2 Actual FY 2014
Commuter Projects	85%	97%	95%	94%
Residential Projects	85%	99%	97%	97%
Commuter-Residential Projects	85%	96%	94%	97%
Projects at Two-Year IHEs	85%	95%	97%	96%
Projects at Four-Year IHEs	85%	98%	95%	96%
Two and Four Year Projects	85%	95%†	NA*	NA*
Large Projects (greater than 74)	85%	97%	94%	98%†
Medium Projects (50-74)	85%	97%	95%	95%
Small Projects (less than 50)	85%	97%	97%	96%

* = Not Applicable

†=Low "N" Size (Number of Projects<5)

Explanation: For subgroups with at least five projects, commuter-residential projects and projects at two-year IHEs report the only increases in the GPRA 2 Measure, an increase of one percentage point between FY 2012 through FY 2014.

In FY 2014, residential projects and commuter-residential projects report the highest GPRA 2 Measure, 97 percent, while commuter projects report the lowest GPRA 2 Measure, 94 percent.

CAMP Graduation Data

The Department began collecting data on former CAMP students who graduated with an Associate of Arts (AA), a Bachelor of Arts (BA), or a Bachelor of Science (BS) degree in FY 2009. These former CAMP students would have participated in the program anytime between FY 2004 and FY 2013. During FY 2012 through FY 2014, the Department emphasized the need for grantees to secure complete CAMP graduation data, and it will continue to do so in future technical assistance to grantees.

Enrollment data for FY 2012 through FY 2014 indicate a trend of slightly declining enrollment in CAMP projects, with an increase in the number of participants enrolled in four-year IHE's and a decrease in the number of participants enrolled in two-year IHE's. In FY 2014, a total of 1,825 CAMP students were served by the program, with 402 students enrolled in two-year IHE projects and 1,423 students enrolled in four-year projects.

There has been an increase in the number of former CAMP students who have graduated from two-year IHE projects and four-year IHE projects over these three year periods due to a number of factors, including the variation in the number of projects that are funded each year and the number of new projects. The total number of BA or BS graduates has increased from 588 to 649 between FY 2012 and FY 2014, while the total number of AA graduates has varied from 191 to 238 during the same time period.

Table 13: CAMP Graduation Data for FY 2012 – FY 2014

Number of Students/Graduates	Total CAMP	Two-Year IHE Projects	Four-Year IHE Projects	Two and Four Year IHE Projects
Number of Students Served FY 2012	1,882	546	1,276	60
Number of Students Served FY 2013	1,870	599	1,271	NA*
Number of Students Served FY 2014	1,825	402	1,423	NA*
Number of AA Graduates FY 2012	191	154	30	7
Number of AA Graduates FY 2013	211	147	64	NA*
Number of AA Graduates FY 2014	238	134	104	NA*
Number of BA or BS Graduates FY 2012	588	40	548	NA*
Number of BA or BS Graduates FY 2013	570	96	474	NA*
Number of BA or BS Graduates FY 2014	649	27	622	NA*

* = Not Applicable

APPENDIX

Office of Migrant Education Links.

The Office of Migrant Education provides links to the HEP and CAMP application information, technical assistance, performance plans, and other program information.

Office of Migrant Education: [Office of Elementary and Secondary Education: Office of Migrant Education](#)

HEP: [Migrant Education - High School Equivalency Program](#)

CAMP: [Migrant Education - College Assistance Migrant Program](#)

HEP Annual Project Profiles: [High School Equivalency Program Performance](#)

CAMP Annual Project Profiles: [College Assistance Program Performance](#)