

HEA: High School Equivalency Program (OESE)

FY 2017 Program Performance Report (System Print Out)

Strategic Goal 3

Discretionary

HEA, Title IV, Part A-5

Document Year 2016 Appropriation: \$

CFDA 84.141: Migrant Education_High School Equivalency Program

84.141A: High School Equivalency Program

84.149: Migrant Education_College Assistance Migrant Program

Program Goal: To assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students in obtaining the equivalent of a high school diploma and, subsequently, to begin postsecondary education, enter military service, or obtain employment.

Objective 1 of 2: An increasing percentage of HEP participants will receive their High School Equivalency (HSE) diploma.

Measure 1.1 of 4: The percentage of High School Equivalency Program (HEP) participants receiving a High School Equivalency (HSE) Diploma. (Desired direction: increase) 1114

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2003	60.0	63	Target Exceeded
2004	60.0	65	Target Exceeded
2005	65.0	66	Target Exceeded
2006	66.0	63	Target Not Met
2007	67.0	54	Target Not Met
2008	68.0	87	Target Exceeded
2009	69.0	61	Target Not Met
2010	69.0	70	Target Exceeded
2011	69.0	74	Target Exceeded
2012	69.0	67.4	Target Not Met
2013	69.0	74.5	Target Exceeded
2014	69.0	66.6	Target Not Met
2015	69.0	42.6	Target Not Met
2016	69.0	70.3	Target Exceeded
2017	69.0	67.5	Target Not Met
2018	69.0	(June, 2019)	Pending
2019	69.0	(June, 2020)	Pending
2020	69.0	(June, 2021)	Pending

Source. U.S. Department of Education (ED), High School Equivalency Program (HEP) grantee Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality. All High School Equivalency Program (HEP) 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 FY 2009, and the target of 69% will remain the same for FY 2018.

Explanation. For GPRA 1, OME determined that the measure is based upon the number of High School Equivalency (HSE) attainers, divided by the total number of funded/served (whichever is higher, by project), minus 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 HEP-College Assistance Migrant Program (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 HEP 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,

HEP performance results demonstrated that the program did not meet the GPRA Measure 1 target of 69%, with a performance of 67.5% (1,823 HSE Attainers/{3,871 MAX Funded/Served-1,170 Persisters}) in 2017.

Measure 1.2 of 4: The cost per HSE attainer in HEP commuter projects. (Desired direction: decrease) 89a1st

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2012	7,910.0	5,766	Target Exceeded
2013	8,306.0	5,409	Target Exceeded
2014	8,718.0	5,985	Target Exceeded
2015	9,104.0	12,882	Target Not Met
2016	9,509.0	8,075	Target Exceeded
2017	9,931.0	9,009	Target Exceeded
2018	10,030.0	(June, 2019)	Pending
2019	10,131.0	(June, 2020)	Pending
2020	10,232.0	(June, 2021)	Pending
2021	10,334.0	(June, 2022)	Pending
2022	10,438.0	(June, 2023)	Pending

Source.

U.S. Department of Education (ED), High School Equivalency Program (HEP) grantee Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

Data Quality.

All High School Equivalency (HEP) grantees submit an Annual Performance Report (APR), and no revisions to the HEP 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 did not change in 2017, and remained at 100%. The Office of Migrant Education (OME) continues to use the annually obligated project funds as the numerator and the number of High School Equivalency (HSE) attainers as the denominator in the HEP efficiency ratio.

Target Context.

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

- 1) Limitations. The efficiency targets measure "success" of the HEP program, i.e., the cost per HSE attainer. This measure of success does not include one component of the HEP GPRA Measure 1 formula, persists.
- 2) Baseline Costs. OME chose to use the 2011 actual costs of all four cohorts instead of three GPRA cohorts of HEP projects as the baseline year, because all projects within the entire group of cohorts are compared against the efficiency measure. OME chose projects with an average cost per HSE attainer that fell within two standard deviations, resulting in the removal of outlier projects that were located beyond 95% of the range of all HEP projects. This process eliminated six HEP projects 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 HEP Commuter projects. By selecting an Upper Quartile Estimation model that includes projects within the upper limit in a box and whiskers plot, 21 HEP projects met the 2011 baseline, leaving seven projects that did not meet this baseline.

4) Subpopulation Definition. OME used the latest quantitative data provided by the HEP 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 HEP Commuter project as one that included 100% commuter students.

OME developed the commuter definition based upon: 1) HEP project costs which 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 HEP and College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) data occurred in the percentage of commuter students, and OME attempted comparability with CAMP data in order to determine the cut points in the HEP 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. OME will review and adjust the targets in the future, as the new HSE assessments and corresponding results have impacted both program effectiveness and efficiency.

Explanation.

The Office of Migrant Education (OME) developed a predictive model for HEP costs based upon the two constants of inflation and expected improvement, in order to establish a trajectory for its efficiency measures. First, OME included a constant that increased costs annually by an estimated inflationary rate of 5.5%. Second, OME expects an improvement of efficiency in HEP projects, and a 1% improvement in efficiency will be represented as an expected 1% decrease in costs on an annual basis. In 2016, HEP Commuter projects exceeded their efficiency target. For the 2016-17 APR, HEP Commuter projects received obligated project funds totaling \$18,361,129 and reported 2,038 HSE attainers, for an average efficiency ratio of \$9,009.

Measure 1.3 of 4: The cost per HSE attainer in HEP commuter-residential projects. (Desired direction: decrease) 89a1su

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2012	12,502.0	11,160	Target Exceeded
2013	13,104.0	7,589	Target Exceeded
2014	13,732.0	7,433	Target Exceeded
2015	14,344.0	15,377	Target Not Met
2016	14,984.0	10,438	Target Exceeded
2017	15,653.0	13,932	Target Exceeded
2018	15,810.0	(March, 2019)	Pending
2019	15,968.0	(June, 2020)	Pending
2020	16,127.0	(June, 2021)	Pending
2021	16,289.0	(June, 2022)	Pending
2022	16,451.0	(June, 2023)	Pending

Source.

U.S. Department of Education (ED), High School Equivalency Program (HEP) grantee Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality. All High School Equivalency Program (HEP) grantees submit an Annual Performance Report (APR), and no revisions to the HEP 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 50% - 99% to 66% - 99% in 2017. The Office of Migrant Education (OME) continues to use the annually obligated project funds as the numerator and the number of High School Equivalency (HSE) attainers as the denominator in the HEP efficiency ratio.

Target Context. OME set annual efficiency targets for the HEP in July 2012. OME set the efficiency targets for 2012 through 2016, and considered the following in developing the targets:

1) Limitations. The efficiency targets measure "success" of the HEP, i.e., the cost per HSE attainer. This measure of success does not include one component of the HEP GPRA Measure 1 formula, persists.

2) Baseline Costs. OME chose to use the 2011 actual costs of all four cohorts instead of three GPRA cohorts of HEP projects as the baseline year, because all projects within the entire group of cohorts are compared against the efficiency measure. OME chose projects with an average cost per HSE attainer that fell within two standard deviations, resulting in the removal of outlier projects that were located beyond 95% of the range of all HEP projects. This process eliminated six HEP projects 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, 21 HEP projects met the 2011 baseline, leaving seven projects that did not meet this baseline.

4) Subpopulation Definition. OME used the latest quantitative data provided by the HEP 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 99% commuter students.

OME developed a predictive model for HEP costs based upon: 1) HEP 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 HEP and College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) data occurred in the percentage of commuter students, and OME attempted comparability with CAMP data in order to determine the cut points in the HEP 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. OME will review and adjust the targets in the near future, as the new HSE assessments and corresponding results have impacted both program effectiveness and efficiency.

Explanation. OME developed a predictive model for HEP costs based upon the two constants of inflation and expected improvement, in order to establish a trajectory for its efficiency measures. First, OME included a constant that increased costs annually by an estimated inflationary rate of

5.5%. Second, OME expects an improvement of efficiency in HEP projects, and a 1% improvement in efficiency will be represented as an expected 1% decrease in costs on an annual basis. In 2016, HEP Commuter projects exceeded their efficiency target. For the 2016-17 APR, HEP Commuter-Residential projects received obligated project funds totaling \$1,894,751 and reported 136 HSE attainers, for an average efficiency ratio of \$13,932.

Measure 1.4 of 4: The cost per HSE attainer in HEP residential projects. (Desired direction: decrease)

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2012	15,459.0	11,201	Target Exceeded
2013	16,195.0	9,667	Target Exceeded
2014	16,962.0	12,750	Target Exceeded
2015	17,719.0	22,847	Target Not Met
2016	18,511.0	10,649	Target Exceeded
2017	19,338.0	14,036	Target Exceeded
2018	19,531.0	(June, 2019)	Pending
2019	19,727.0	(June, 2020)	Pending
2020	19,924.0	(June, 2021)	Pending
2021	20,123.0	(March, 2021)	Pending
2022	20,324.0	(March, 2022)	Pending

Source.

U.S. Department of Education (ED), High School Equivalency Program (HEP) grantee Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality.

All High School Equivalency Program (HEP) grantees submit an Annual Performance Report (APR), and no revisions to the HEP 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% - 49% to 0% - 65% in 2017. The Office of Migrant Education (OME) continues to use the annually obligated project funds as the numerator and the number of High School Equivalency (HSE) attainers as the denominator in the HEP efficiency ratio.

Target Context. OME set annual efficiency targets for the HEP in July 2012. OME set the efficiency targets for 2012 through 2016, and considered the following in developing the targets:

1) Limitations. The efficiency targets measure "success" of the HEP, i.e., the cost per HSE attainer. This measure of success does not include one component of the HEP GPRA Measure 1 formula, persists.

2) Baseline Costs. OME chose to use the 2011 actual costs of all four cohorts instead of three GPRA cohorts of HEP projects as the baseline year, because all projects within the entire group of cohorts are compared against the efficiency measure. OME chose projects with an average cost per HSE attainer that fell within two standard deviations, resulting in the removal of outlier projects that were located beyond 95% of the range of all HEP projects. This process eliminated six HEP projects 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 HEP Commuter projects. By selecting an Upper Quartile Estimation model that includes projects within the upper limit in a box and whiskers plot, 21 HEP projects met the 2011 baseline, leaving seven projects that did not meet this baseline.

4) Subpopulation Definition. OME used the latest quantitative data provided by the HEP 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 HEP Residential project as one that included between 0% and 49% commuter students.

OME developed the commuter definition based upon: 1) HEP 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 HEP and CAMP data occurred in the percentage of commuter students, and OME attempted comparability with College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) data in order to determine the cut points in the HEP 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. OME will review and adjust the targets in the near future, as the new HSE assessments and corresponding results have impacted both program effectiveness and efficiency.

Explanation.

OME developed a predictive model for HEP costs based upon the two constants of inflation and expected improvement, in order to establish a trajectory for its efficiency measures. First, OME included a constant that increased costs annually by an estimated inflationary rate of 5.5%. Second, OME expects an improvement of efficiency in HEP projects, and a 1% improvement in efficiency will be represented as an expected 1% decrease in costs on an annual basis. In 2016, HEP Residential projects exceeded their efficiency target. For the 2016-17 APR, HEP Residential projects received obligated project funds totaling \$2,358,124 and reported 168 HSE attainers, for an average efficiency ratio of \$14,036.

Objective 2 of 2: *An increasing percentage of HEP recipients of the HSE will enter postsecondary education programs, upgraded employment, or the military.*

Measure 2.1 of 1: The percentage of HEP HSE recipients who enter postsecondary education programs, career positions, or the military. (Desired direction: increase) 1865

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2004	Not available.	76	Historical Actual
2005	80.0	81	Target Exceeded
2006	80.0	89	Target Exceeded
2007	79.0	84	Target Exceeded
2008	80.0	67	Target Not Met
2009	81.0	74	Target Not Met but Improved
2010	80.0	75	Target Not Met but Improved
2011	80.0	75	Target Not Met
2012	80.0	79.3	Target Not Met but Improved
2013	80.0	80.1	Target Exceeded
2014	80.0	79.9	Target Not Met
2015	80.0	78.2	Target Not Met
2016	80.0	78.7	Target Not Met but Improved
2017	80.0	85.6	Target Exceeded
2018	80.0	(June, 2019)	Pending
2019	80.0	(June, 2020)	Pending
2020	80.0	(June, 2021)	Pending

Source.

U.S. Department of Education (ED), High School Equivalency Program (HEP) grantee Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality.

All High School Equivalency Program (HEP) 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 Annual Performance Report 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 2 target is based upon APR data collected prior to 2009.

The target of 80% will remain the same for 2018.

Explanation.

For GPRA 2, OME determined that the measure is based upon the number of HSE attainers who were placed in postsecondary education/training or the military, or obtained employment, divided by the total number of HSE attainers.

HEP performance results demonstrated that the program exceeded the GPRA Measure 2 target of 80% with a performance of 85.6% (1,560 HSE Attainers Placed/1,823 HSE Attainers) in 2017.

OME continued to work with HEP projects in 2016-17 in the identification of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to an improved HSE placement rate, and the performance results were the highest in the program's history.