

REPORT TO CONGRESS

High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and
College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP)
FY 2020



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

U.S. Department of Education

Betsy DeVos
Secretary

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education

Office of Migrant Education

Lisa C. Gillette
Director

October 2020

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 2020 Report to Congress*, Washington, D.C., 2020.

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 **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). Those who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a teletypewriter (TTY), should call 1-877-576-7734.

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

This report is also available on the Department's website at:

High School Equivalency Program: <https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-migrant-education/high-school-equivalency-program/performance-migrant-high-school-equivalency-program/>.

College Assistance Migrant Program: <https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-migrant-education/college-assistance-migrant-program/performance-college-assistance-migrant-program/>.

On request, this publication is available in alternative formats, such as Braille, large print, or CD Rom. For more information, please contact Christopher D. Hill, Ph.D. in the Office of Migrant Education at christopher.d.hill@ed.gov or 202-260-1164.

The Office of Migrant Education welcomes all comments and suggestions on both the content and presentation of this report. Please forward them to Christopher D. Hill, Ph.D. in the Office of Migrant Education at christopher.d.hill@ed.gov or 202-260-1164.

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

“The mission of the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) is to empower States, districts, and other organizations to meet the diverse needs of every student by providing leadership, technical assistance, and financial support.”

Website for the Office of Migrant Education: <https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-migrant-education/>.

CONTENTS

Table of Contents

CONTENTS	iv
FOREWORD	1
SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE DATA.....	2
Program Performance Measures	2
High School Equivalency Program Data	2
Table 1: HEP GPRA Measure 1 Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018	3
Table 2: HEP GPRA Measure 2 Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018	4
College Assistance Migrant Program Data	6
Table 4: CAMP GPRA Measure 1 Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018	7
Table 5: CAMP GPRA Measure 2 Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018	7
Table 6: CAMP Efficiency Measure Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018	8
Summary	9
PERFORMANCE DETAILS AND DISAGGREGATED RESULTS.....	10
How to Read the Results	10
HEP Performance Details and Disaggregated Results	11
Table 7: HEP Number Served Subgroup Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018.....	11
Table 8: HEP GPRA Measure 1 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018.....	12
Table 9: HEP GPRA Measure 2 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018.....	13
CAMP Performance Details and Disaggregated Results	14
Table 10: CAMP Number Served Subgroup Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018	14
Table 11: CAMP GPRA Measure 1 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018.....	15
Table 12: CAMP GPRA Measure 2 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018.....	16
CAMP Graduation Data	17
Table 13: CAMP Graduation Data for FY 2017 – FY 2018	17
Definitions of Key Terms	18
APPENDICES.....	21
Office of Migrant Education Links.....	21
Abbreviations	21

FOREWORD

The High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) are authorized by 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 assist migratory or seasonal farmworkers (or immediate family members of such workers) to obtain the equivalent of a secondary school diploma and subsequently to gain improved employment, enter into military service, or be placed in an institution of higher education (IHE) or other postsecondary education or training.

The purpose of the CAMP is to assist migratory or seasonal farmworkers (or immediate family members of such workers) who are enrolled or are admitted for enrollment on a full-time basis at an IHE complete their first academic year.

Section 418A(h) of the HEA requires the Secretary to annually collect data on persons receiving services under these programs, including their rates of secondary school graduation, entrance into postsecondary education, and completion of postsecondary education, as applicable, 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.

SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE DATA

Program Performance Measures

The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) requires all Federal agencies to establish strategic goals, performance measures, and performance targets. The U.S. Department of Education (Department) established two performance measures for HEP projects and two performance measures for CAMP projects. The performance measures for the HEP are: (1) the percentage of HEP participants who receive a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED); and (2) the percentage of HEP HSED recipients who enter postsecondary education training programs, upgraded employment, or the military. These measures are referred to as HEP GPRA measure 1 and 2, respectively. 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. These measures are referred to as CAMP GPRA measure 1 and 2, respectively. Prior to a performance period, the Department establishes targets for each performance measure (see below). The Department requires each HEP and CAMP grantee to submit an annual performance report (APR) that contains data regarding the grantee's progress in meeting the two approved performance targets for each program. This report includes data from the FY 2017 (July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017) and FY 2018 (July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018) fiscal years.

High School Equivalency Program Data

The targets¹ the Department established for the HEP GPRA measures for use in FY 2017 and FY 2018 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. For FY 2017, 67.5 percent of participants attained a HSED, and 85.6 percent of HSED recipients entered postsecondary education or training programs, upgraded employment, or the military. For FY 2018, 64.9 percent of participants attained a HSED, and 82.1 percent of HSED recipients entered postsecondary education or training programs, upgraded employment, or the military. Although the HEP achieved slightly below the GPRA 1 national target in FY 2017 and FY 2018, the program exceeded the GPRA 2 national target in both fiscal years.

¹ The Department used baseline data from FY 2002 to set the initial HEP GPRA 1 target in FY 2003. The Department increased the targets incrementally in subsequent fiscal years until they met a high, yet realistic expectation for program performance. The HEP GPRA 1 target was set at 60 percent (two points higher than the previous two years' results) in FY 2003 and incrementally increased to 69 percent by FY 2009. The Department will maintain this target through FY 2021. The Department set the initial HEP GPRA 2 target in FY 2006 at 80 percent (four points higher than the previous year's results). The Department will maintain this target through FY 2021. Targets have remained level due largely to two factors: (1) it is sometimes difficult to locate former HEP students to obtain GPRA 2 data; and (2) former HEP students may not achieve placement before the project is required to submit its annual performance report data (approximately 5 months after the performance period ends).

The Office of Migrant Education (OME) uses GPRA information to determine the overall success of individual HEP projects and uses an efficiency measure as a tool in the monitoring of HEP projects. The Department collects data on measures of program efficiency as well as performance outcomes for three categories of projects which 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. While all HSED programs may provide educational and/or assessment services, HEP projects typically provide instructional support services, e.g., counseling, tutoring, tuition, and stipends to a specific population of individuals associated with migrant and seasonal farm work, 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 require costs that other HSED programs may not have.

For the HEP, program efficiency is determined by dividing each project’s annual budget by the total number of HEP HSED attainers. Moreover, program efficiency targets are based on actual costs in 2011 (the baseline year), multiplied by an estimated rate of inflation for IHE-associated costs and then decreased by an expected improvement in program efficiency annually of one percent.

For FY 2017 and FY 2018, each type of HEP project exceeded its target for efficiency. The table below presents a summary of HEP GPRA 1 and GPRA 2 and the HEP efficiency measure results.

Table 1: HEP GPRA Measure 1 Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018

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

Measure. The percentage of HEP participants receiving a HSED. Target: 69%.

FY Year	HSED Attainers: Target	HSED Attainers: Actual
2017	69%	67.5%
2018	69%	64.9%
2019	69%	
2020	69%	
2021	69%	

Result: The HEP did not meet its GPRA Measure 1 target for FY 2017 and FY 2018. The HEP missed the national target by 1.5 percentage points for FY 2017 and by 4.1

percentage points for FY 2018. The percentage of HEP participants who received a HSED decreased by 2.6 percentage points from FY 2017 to FY 2018.

Table 2: HEP GPRA Measure 2 Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018

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. Target: 80%.

FY Year	HSED Placement: Target	HSED Placement: Actual
2017	80%	85.6%
2018	80%	82.1%
2019	80%	
2020	80%	
2021	80%	

Result: The HEP exceeded its GPRA measure 2 target for FY 2017 and FY 2018 by 5.6 percentage points and 2.1 percentage points, respectively. The percentage of HEP HSED recipients who entered postsecondary education programs, career positions, or the military showed a decrease of 3.5 percentage points between FY 2017 and FY 2018.

Table 3: HEP Efficiency Measure Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018

Fiscal Year	Cost per HSED Received: Target	Cost per HSED Received: Actual
FY 2017 Commuter Projects	\$9,931	\$9,009
FY 2017 Residential Projects	\$19,338	\$14,036
FY 2017 Commuter-Residential Projects	\$15,653	\$13,932
FY 2018 Commuter Projects	\$10,030	\$9,408
FY 2018 Residential Projects	\$19,531	\$13,164
FY 2018 Commuter-Residential Projects	\$15,810	\$13,650

Result: For FY 2017 and FY 2018, the HEP reported 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. For FY 2017 and FY 2018, each type of HEP project exceeded its target for efficiency—a consistent trend since FY2015. For FY 2018, the average ranged from a low of \$9,408 per student for participants in commuter projects to a high of \$13,650 per student for participants in commuter-residential projects.

College Assistance Migrant Program Data

The targets² the Department established for the CAMP GPRA measures for use in FY 2017 - FY 2018 were: (1) 86 percent of participants would complete their first academic year of their postsecondary program for GPRA 1; and (2) 85 percent of CAMP participants in FY 2017 and 88 percent of CAMP participants in FY 2018 who complete their first academic year in college would continue their postsecondary education for GPRA 2.

For FY 2017 and FY 2018, 88.2 percent and 83.5 percent of CAMP participants, respectively, completed the first academic year of their postsecondary program. The CAMP exceeded the national CAMP GPRA 1 target of 86 percent for completion in FY 2017 and was only 2.5 percentage points below the national GPRA 1 target in FY 2018. For GPRA 2 performance, 96.6 percent and 96.2 percent of CAMP students who completed their first year in college continued their postsecondary education, surpassing the national CAMP target of 85 percent for FY 2017 and 88 percent for FY 2018.

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

The tables below present a summary of CAMP GPRA 1 and GPRA 2 and the CAMP efficiency measure results.

² The Department used baseline data from FY 2003 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 will maintain this target at 86 percent through FY 2020. The Department set the initial CAMP GPRA 2 target in FY 2005 at 79 percent (one point higher than the previous two years' results) and increased it gradually over time. In FY 2017 and FY 2018, the target was 85 percent and 88 percent, respectively. The target increased to 90 percent for FY 2019 and will increase to 92 percent for FY 2020 and FY 2021.

Table 4: CAMP GPRA Measure 1 Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018

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. Target: 86%.

FY Year	First Year Completers: Target	First Year Completers: Actual
2017	86%	88.2%
2018	86%	83.5%
2019	86%	
2020	86%	
2021	86%	

Result: The CAMP exceeded its GPRA measure 1 target for FY 2017 by 2.2 percent. In FY 2018, CAMP was only 2.5 percentage points below the target. The percentage of CAMP participants completing their first year of a postsecondary program in good standing decreased by 4.7 percentage points between FY 2017 and FY 2018.

Table 5: CAMP GPRA Measure 2 Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018

Objective: Most 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. Target: 85% - 88%.

FY Year	First Year Completers Who Continue: Target	First Year Completers Who Continue: Actual
2017	85%	96.6%
2018	88%	96.2%
2019	90%	
2020	92%	
2021	92%	

Result: The CAMP exceeded its GPRA Measure 2 target for FY 2017 and FY 2018 by 11.6 percentage points and 8.2 percentage points, respectively. The percentage of CAMP participants who, after completing their first academic year of college and continued their postsecondary education, was stable for both FY 2017 and FY 2018.

Table 6: CAMP Efficiency Measure Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018

Fiscal Year	Cost per First Year Completer: Target³	Cost per First Year Completer Who Continues: Actual
2017 Commuter Projects	\$14,958	\$12,009
2017 Residential Projects	\$23,972	\$14,823
2017 Commuter-Residential Projects	\$18,229	\$13,765
2018 Commuter Projects	\$15,197	\$11,393
2018 Residential Projects	\$24,356	\$13,105
2018 Commuter-Residential Projects	\$18,521	\$12,939

Result: For FY 2017 and FY 2018, the CAMP reported 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. For FY 2017 and FY 2018, each type of CAMP project exceeded its target for efficiency. By FY 2018, the average cost per first year completer who continued in postsecondary education ranged from a low of \$11,393 per student for participants in commuter projects to a high of \$13,105 per student for participants in residential projects.

³ The Department set CAMP efficiency targets for use in FY 2017 through FY 2021 using FY 2011 baseline data and an upper quartile estimation model that includes constants of inflation and expected improvement.

Summary

In FY 2017 and FY 2018, HEP and CAMP projects continued to be successful in achieving or nearly achieving the performance targets established for both programs. Both programs also exceeded their targets for efficiency for both fiscal years.

Although HEP projects experienced a small decrease towards achievement of the national GPRA 1 performance target of 69%, HEP projects exceeded the national GPRA 2 performance target of 80% by 5.6 percentage points and 2.1 percentage points for FY 2017 and FY 2018, respectively.

CAMP projects performed similarly well. For the last four performance periods, CAMP projects exceeded or achieved within 2.5 percentage points of the national GPRA 1 performance target, 86%, for all four years. CAMP projects scored significantly higher than the national GPRA 2 performance targets for the same performance periods. In both fiscal years, CAMP exceeded the national retention rates for first-time college freshmen returning in their second year, which was 81 percent for four-year IHEs and 62 percent for two-year IHEs in 2017.⁴

The Department continues to review grantee annual performance report (APR) data in order to identify low-performing projects and provide technical assistance to grantees. Specifically, the Department uses 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.

In FY 2020, the Department succeeded in making awards to new projects and continuing projects earlier in the fiscal year. In doing so, projects will have more time to enroll students for programs that begin in the fall and will, if planned by the project, allow students to participate in an IHE's summer learning program without concern for when funding will be allocated. It is our goal to continue making awards on this earlier timeline so that grantees can effectively identify and recruit participants for the academic year, and offer services, as appropriate, before student arrival for the benefit of their projects.

The Department also continues its emphasis on the use of evidence. HEP and CAMP grant competitions since FY 2016 have required applicants to describe in their proposed applications how they will incorporate interventions that demonstrate a rationale for their particular services based on evidence that will produce promising evidence about the project's effectiveness. Our efforts to build grantee capacity include gauging the evidence needs of grantees, among other needs, to plan and carry out technical assistance to address these needs.

⁴ Institutional retention and graduation rates for undergraduate students (2017). Retrieved December 26, 2019, from National Center for Educational Statistics web site, [National Center for Educational Statistics web site](https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/ipedsdatacenter.asp).

PERFORMANCE DETAILS AND DISAGGREGATED RESULTS

How to Read the Results

The following tables provide the HEP performance data for FY 2017 and FY 2018, CAMP performance data for FY 2017 and FY 2018, and data on former CAMP students' completion of postsecondary education. 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, large, medium, and small projects, 2-year and 4-year institutions, as appropriate (see Definitions of Key Terms). Following each table is an analysis which provides insights into grantees' progress.

HEP Performance Details and Disaggregated Results

Table 7: HEP Number Served Subgroup Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018

HEP Projects	Number of Projects FY 2017	Number of Projects FY 2018	Percent of Students Served Based on the No. of Students Proposed to Be Served FY 2017	Percent of Students Served Based on the No. of Students Proposed to Be Served FY 2018
Total HEP Projects	50	48	95%	103%
Equal to or Over-Serving Projects	36	37	101%	110%
Under-Serving Projects	14	11	78%	86%
Commuter Projects	41	40	98%	102%
Residential Projects	5	4	94%	95%†
Commuter-Residential Projects	4	4	120%†	122%†
Open Enrollment Projects	31	31	101%	103%
Structured Enrollment Projects	13	12	102%	100%
Open-Structured Enrollment Projects	6	5	89%	105%
Large Projects (greater than 124)	12	9	107%	103%
Small Projects (less than 125)	38	39	94%	103%

†=Low "N" Size (Number of Projects<5)

Result: From FY 2017 to FY 2018, the percentage of students who are served relative to the number grantees proposed to be served in project applications increased from 95 percent to 103 percent. Open-Structured Enrollment projects reported the largest increase in the percentage of students who are served, an increase of 16 percentage points from FY 2017 to FY 2018. Structured enrollment and large projects are the only subgroups to report percentage decreases of two- and four-percentage points, respectively.

For FY 2017, commuter-residential projects served the highest percentage of students relative to the number projected to be served in project applications, 120 percent. As expected, under-serving projects served the lowest percentage of students relative to the number projected to be served in project applications, 78 percent. Open-structured enrollment projects served the second lowest percentage of students relative to the number projected to be served in project applications, for subgroups with at least five

projects, 89 percent. For FY 2018, equal-to and over-serving projects served the highest percentage of students.

Table 8: HEP GPRA Measure 1 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018

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

Measure. The percentage of HEP participants receiving a HSED. Target: 69%.

HEP Projects	GPRA 1 Actual FY 2017 Percent	GPRA 1 Actual FY 2018 Percent
Commuter Projects	65%	66%
Residential Projects	66%	71%†
Commuter-Residential Projects	74%†	48%†
Open Enrollment Projects	65%	60%
Structured Enrollment Projects	71%	69%
Open-Structured Enrollment Projects	58%	88%
Large Projects (greater than 124)	70%	71%
Small Projects (less than 125)	62%	62%

†=Low "N" Size (Number of Projects<5)

Result: For subgroups with at least five projects, open-structured enrollment projects reported the largest increase in the GPRA Measure 1, an increase of 30 percentage points from FY 2017 to FY 2018. For subgroups with at least five projects, open enrollment projects reported the largest decrease in the GPRA Measure 1, a decrease of 5 percentage points.

For FY 2018, open-structured enrollment projects reported the highest GPRA Measure 1, 88 percent, while open enrollment projects reported the lowest GPRA Measure 1, 60 percent, for subgroups with at least five projects.

Table 9: HEP GPRA Measure 2 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018

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. Target: 80%.

HEP Projects	GPRA 2 Actual FY 2017 Percent	GPRA 2 Actual FY 2018 Percent
Commuter Projects	83%	83%
Residential Projects	80%	85%†
Commuter-Residential Projects	78%†	78%†
Open Enrollment Projects	81%	80%
Structured Enrollment Projects	85%	85%
Open-Structured Enrollment Projects	87%	89%
Large Projects (greater than 124)	82%	86%
Small Projects (less than 125)	83%	81%

†=Low "N" Size (Number of Projects<5)

Result: For subgroups with at least five projects, large projects reported the greatest increase in the GPRA Measure 2, an increase of 4 percentage points from FY 2017 and FY 2018. Small projects reported the largest decrease in the GPRA Measure 2, a decrease of 2 percentage points.

For FY 2018, open-structured enrollment projects reported the highest GPRA Measure 2, 89 percent, while open enrollment projects reported the lowest GPRA 2 Measure, 80 percent, for subgroups with at least five projects.

CAMP Performance Details and Disaggregated Results

Table 10: CAMP Number Served Subgroup Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018

CAMP Projects	Number of Projects FY 2017	Number of Projects FY 2018	Percent of Students Served Based on the No. of Students Proposed to Be Served FY 2017	Percent of Students Served Based on the No. of Students Proposed to Be Served FY 2018
Total CAMP Projects	51	53	101%	107%
Equal to or Over-Serving Projects	38	47	111%	111%
Under-Serving Projects	13	6	55%	73%
Commuter Projects	16	17	103%	107%
Residential Projects	20	21	97%	109%
Commuter-Residential Projects	15	15	103%	106%
Projects at Two-Year IHEs	12	12	93%	111%
Projects at Four-Year IHEs	39	41	103%	106%
Large Projects (greater than 74)	1	1	108%†	107%†
Medium Projects (50-74)	17	16	115%	114%
Small Projects (less than 50)	33	36	89%	102%

†=Low "N" Size (Number of Projects<5)

Result: For subgroups with at least five projects, under-serving projects and projects at two-year IHEs reported the largest increase in the percentage of students who are served, an increase of 18 percentage points from FY 2017 to FY 2018. Medium projects were the only subgroup to report a decrease in the percentage of students who are served, a decrease of 1 percentage point.

For FY 2018, medium projects served the highest percentage of students relative to the number projected to be served in project applications, 114 percent, while under-serving projects served the lowest percentage of students relative to the number projected to be served in project applications, 73 percent, for subgroups with at least five projects.

Table 11: CAMP GPRA Measure 1 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018

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. Target: 86%.

CAMP Projects	Percent GPRA 1 Actual FY 2017	Percent GPRA 1 Actual FY 2018
Commuter Projects	81%	80%
Residential Projects	77%	86%
Commuter-Residential Projects	82%	84%
Projects at Two-Year IHEs	74%	83%
Projects at Four-Year IHEs	82%	83%
Large Projects (greater than 74)	89%†	80%†
Medium Projects (50-74)	89%	87%
Small Projects (less than 50)	70%	80%

†=Low "N" Size (Number of Projects<5)

Result: For subgroups with at least five projects, small projects reported the largest increase in the GPRA Measure 1, an increase of 10 percentage points from FY 2017 to FY 2018 for both subgroups. For subgroups with at least five projects, medium projects reported the largest decrease in the GPRA Measure 1, a decrease of 2 percentage points.

For FY 2018, medium projects reported the highest GPRA Measure 1, 87 percent, while commuter and small projects reported the lowest GPRA Measure 1, 80 percent, for subgroups with at least five projects.

Table 12: CAMP GPRA Measure 2 Subgroup Performance Results for FY 2017 – FY 2018

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. Target: For FY 2017 - 85%. For FY 2018 - 88%.

CAMP Projects	Percent GPRA 2 Actual FY 2017	Percent GPRA 2 Actual FY 2018
Commuter Projects	97%	97%
Residential Projects	97%	97%
Commuter-Residential Projects	96%	95%
Projects at Two-Year IHEs	97%	95%
Projects at Four-Year IHEs	97%	97%
Large Projects (greater than 74)	100%†	95%†
Medium Projects (50-74)	96%	97%
Small Projects (less than 50)	96%	96%

†=Low "N" Size (Number of Projects<5)

Result: Medium projects reported a one percentage point increase in the GPRA Measure 2, from FY 2017 to FY 2018; however, many of the projects maintained their previous GPRA Measure 2 performance. Projects at two-year IHEs reported the largest decrease in the GPRA 2 Measure, a decrease of 2 percentage points.

For FY 2018, commuter and residential projects, projects at four-year IHEs, and medium projects reported the highest GPRA Measure 2 performance, 97 percent, while commuter-residential projects and projects at two-year IHEs reported the lowest GPRA Measure 2 performance, 95 percent, for subgroups with at least five projects.

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 FY2009. These former CAMP students would have participated in the CAMP program anytime from FY 2004 to FY 2018. For FY 2017 and FY 2018, 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 2017 and FY 2018 indicate a trend of increasing enrollment in CAMP projects. For FY 2017, a total of 2,119 CAMP students were served by the program, with 510 students enrolled in two-year IHE projects and 1,609 students enrolled in four-year projects. For FY 2018, there were a total number of 2,371 CAMP students served by the program, with 599 students enrolled in two-year IHE projects and 1,772 students enrolled in four-year projects.

There has been an increase in the number of former CAMP students who have graduated between FY 2017 and FY 2018 with AA, BA, and BS degrees. The total number of BA or BS graduates has increased from 775 to 884 from FY 2017 to FY 2018, while the total number of AA graduates showed a decrease from 312 to 295 during the same time period.

Table 13: CAMP Graduation Data for FY 2017 – FY 2018

Number of Students/Graduates	Total CAMP	Two-Year IHE Projects	Four-Year IHE Projects
Number of Students Served FY 2017	2,119	510	1,609
Number of Students Served FY 2018	2,371	599	1,772
Number of AA Graduates FY 2017	312†	250†	62†
Number of AA Graduates FY 2018	295†	205†	90†
Number of BA or BS Graduates FY 2017	775†	91†	684†
Number of BA or BS Graduates FY 2018	884†	83†	801†

†=The number of former CAMP students who graduated with a BA/BS or AA is dependent upon each CAMP project's number of former CAMP students served through one or more grant cycles and each project's capacity for tracking former CAMP students.

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.

Continuing Postsecondary Education: CAMP students who completed their first academic year of college in a reporting period, and continued in postsecondary education programs by re-enrolling in an IHE in the academic year immediately following the one in which he or she is reported as being a first academic year completer, and remaining enrolled past the date when students can no longer add/drop courses, or a census date.

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: HEP 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: HEP 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 in an IHE that offers a bachelor's degree upon successful completion of established graduation requirements.

Projects at Two-Year IHEs: CAMP projects in an IHE that offers 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: HEP 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.

Upgraded Employment: A qualifying placement for purposes of the GPRA 2 Measure. For a student to have obtained upgraded employment, the student must have done at least one of the following: 1) moved to a job that is both full-time and salaried, compared to the job immediately prior to and/or during instructional services; or 2) moved to a job with increased benefits, such as healthcare, worker's compensation, unemployment insurance, social security, and vacation and sick leave, compared to the job immediately prior to and/or during instructional services; or 3) obtained a position upgrade with same employer, such as a move to a supervisory position, compared to

the job immediately prior to and/or during instructional services; or 4) moved to a new job with pre-defined career ladder, regardless of wage change (e.g. management trainee, formal apprenticeship), compared to career ladder options at the job immediately prior to and/or during instructional services; or 5) moved to a job with higher hourly wages than the job immediately prior to and/or during instructional services.

APPENDICES

Office of Migrant Education Links

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 Migrant Program Performance](#)

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>
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>