

HEA: High School Equivalency Program (OESE)

FY 2019 Program Performance Report

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 High School Equivalency Program (HEP) participants will receive their High School Equivalency (HSE) diploma.

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

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
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	64.9	Target Not Met
2019	69.0	66.6	Target Not Met
2020	69.0	(June, 2021)	Pending
2021	69.0	(June, 2022)	Pending
2022	69.0	(June, 2023)	Pending

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

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality. All HEP grantees submit an 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) conducting webinar-based training on how to complete the APR, and 3) updating a grantee workbook that allows grantees to efficiently collect data to populate the APR.

After OME collected the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 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 discrepancies in APR data were identified, members of the OME Data-Evaluation Team contacted and assisted grantees as they revised and resubmitted their APR data, so that OME could ensure 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 through FY 2022.

Explanation. For GPRA 1, OME determined that the measure is based upon the number of HSE attainers, divided by the total number of funded/served (whichever is higher, by project), minus the total number of persisters. This calculation holds projects accountable for 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 more than one annual budget period without being penalized.

During FY 2019, OME: 1) revised technical assistance resources and communicated information related to eligibility and recruitment, services to students, financial management, performance reporting and evaluation, grant management and monitoring, and meeting materials via the HEP CAMP list serv, 2) provided a one-page tool with tips for new directors, 3) provided technical assistance to grantees with large carry-over balances, 4) provided APR, budget, policy, evaluation, and data analysis presentations at the 2019 HEP-CAMP Annual Directors' Meeting and New Directors' Meeting, and 5) provided evaluation technical assistance through a webinar.

HEP performance results demonstrated that the program did not meet the GPRA Measure 1 target of 69%, with a performance of 66.6% (2,396 HSE attainers/{4,827 MAX Funded/Served-1,231 persisters}) in FY 2019. However, the HEP demonstrated a 1.7% increase from the FY 2018 GPRA 1 results due, in part, to an increased number of HSE attainers from those students who persisted from FY 2018 and a decrease in the number of persisters. OME will continue to provide technical assistance in order to support grantees to meet this GPRA Measure for future performance periods.

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

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2013	8,306.0	5,409	Target Exceed
2014	8,718.0	5,985	Target Exceeded
2015	9,104.0	12,882	Target Exceeded
2016	9,509.0	8,075	Target Exceeded
2017	9,931.0	9,009	Target Exceeded
2018	10,030.0	9,408	Target Exceeded
2019	10,131.0	8,594	Target Exceeded
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), grantee Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

Data Quality. All HEP grantees submit an APR, and no revisions to the HEP GPRA Measure 1 or 2 formulas have been made. OME considers a project to be a HEP Commuter project when 100% of students are Commuter students. This same definition was used for FY 2018. OME continues to use the annually obligated project funds as the numerator and the number of HSE attainers as the denominator in the HEP efficiency ratio.

Target Context. OME set annual efficiency targets for the HEP in July 2012 and created targets for 2012 through 2016. In March 2017, OME revised the formula and set efficiency targets through 2022. OME 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 completion of 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 recent changes to 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 2%. 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 2019, HEP Commuter projects (n = 41) exceeded their efficiency target. For the 2019 APR, HEP Commuter projects received obligated project funds totaling \$18,771,358 and reported 2,184 HSE attainers, for an average efficiency ratio of \$8,594.

Measure 1.3 of 4: The cost per HSE attainer in HEP Commuter-Residential projects. (Desired direction: decrease)

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
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	13,650	Target Exceeded
2019	15,968.0	16,378	Target Not Met

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), grantee Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality. All HEP grantees submit an APR, and no revisions to the HEP GPRA Measure 1 or 2 formulas have been made, i.e., all grantee data submitted through the APR are included in calculations for these measures. OME considers a project to be a HEP Commuter-Residential project when between 54% and 99% of students are Commuter students. This same definition was used in 2018. OME continues to use the annually obligated project funds as the numerator and the number of HSE attainers as the denominator in the HEP efficiency ratio.

Target Context. As noted above, OME set annual efficiency targets for the HEP in July 2012 and created targets for 2012 through 2016. In March 2017, OME revised the formula and set efficiency targets through 2022. The Office 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, persisters.
- 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 54% and 99% Commuter students.

OME developed a predictive model for HEP costs for 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 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.

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 2%. 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

2019, HEP Commuter-Residential projects (n = 3) did not meet their efficiency target. The number of Commuter-Residential projects showed a decrease of one project from FY 2018; one project from the Commuter-Residential category moved into the Commuter category (2018 HEP Commuter-Residential projects n = 4). In addition, there was an increased number of persisters from FY 2018 to FY 2019. For the 2019 APR, HEP Commuter-Residential projects received obligated project funds totaling \$1,424,925 and reported 87 HSE attainers, for an average efficiency ratio of \$16,378.

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

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
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	13,164	Target Exceeded
2019	19,727.0	15,197	Target Exceeded
2020	19,924.0	(June, 2021)	Pending
2021	20,123.0	(June, 2021)	Pending
2022	20,324.0	(June, 2022)	Pending

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

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality. All HEP grantees submit an Annual Performance Report (APR), and no revisions to the HEP GPRA Measure 1 or 2 formulas have been made, i.e., all grantee data submitted through the APR are included in calculations for these measures. OME considers a project to be a HEP Residential project when between 0% and 53% of students are Commuter students. This same definition was used in 2018. The Office of Migrant Education (OME) continues to use the annually obligated project funds as the numerator and the number of HSE attainers as the denominator in the HEP efficiency ratio.

Target Context. As noted above, OME set annual efficiency targets for the HEP in July 2012 and created targets for 2012 through 2016. In March 2017, OME revised the formula and set efficiency targets through 2022. The Office 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, persisters.

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 53% 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 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 2%. 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 2019, HEP Residential projects (n = 4) exceeded their efficiency target. For the 2019 APR, HEP Residential projects received obligated project funds totaling \$1,899,693 and reported 125 HSE attainers, for an average efficiency ratio of \$15,197.

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)

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2013	80.0	80.1	Target Met
2014	80.0	79.9	Target Not Met
2015	80.0	78.2	Target Not Met
2016	80.0	78.7	Target Not Met
2017	80.0	85.6	Target Exceeded
2018	80.0	82.1	Target Exceeded
2019	80.0	83.9	Target Exceeded
2020	80.0	(June, 2021)	Pending
2021	80.0	(June, 2022)	Pending
2022	80.0	(June, 2023)	Pending

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

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality. All HEP grantees submit an 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 GPRA Measure 2.1. 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) conducting webinar-based training on how to complete the APR, and 3) updating a grantee workbook that allows grantees to efficiently collect data to populate the APR.

After OME collected the FY 2019 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. Once discrepancies in APR data were identified, members of the OME Data-Evaluation Team contacted and assisted grantees as they revised their APR data, so that OME could ensure the most accurate and reliable data were collected and recorded.

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 through 2022.

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 83.9% (2,011 HSE attainers placed/2,396 HSE attainers) in 2019.

OME continued to work with HEP projects in FY 2019 in the identification of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to an improved HSE placement rate.