AID FOR INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT, TITLES III AND V

Part A (Strengthening Institutions), Part A, sec.316 (American Indian Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities), Part A, sec.317 (Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions), Part B (Historically Black Colleges and Universities [HBCUs] and Historically Black Graduate Institutions), Part D (HBCU Capital Financing), Part E (Minority Science and Engineering Improvement Program), and Part V (Developing Hispanic-serving Institutions)

Goal: To assist institutions that have limited resources and that traditionally serve large numbers of low-income and minority students to continue to serve these students, and to improve the capacity of these institutions to provide ongoing, up-to-date quality education in all areas of higher education.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Title III Program supports the Department's overall goal of ensuring access and equity and enabling all students to achieve academic excellence. More specifically, Title III supports Objectives 3.1 (successful preparation for postsecondary education) and 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by serving large numbers of low-income and minority students for whom postsecondary access, retention, and degree attainment have been elusive.

FY 2000—$300,750,000

FY 2001—$357,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE THE ACADEMIC QUALITY OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS.

Indicator 1.1 Specialized accreditation: The percentage of Title III institutions having specialized accreditation, a measure of academic program quality, will be maintained or increased.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of Title III institutions having a specialized accreditation			**Status:** Progress cannot be judged until trend data are available. **Explanation:** In the 1998-99 school year, 66 percent of Title III institutions had received at least one specialized accreditation. Specialized accreditations are an indication that the quality of an academic program is sufficiently high to meet the rigorous standards imposed by an independent agency.	**Source:** 1999 Higher Education Directory. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedures:** Data are verified by the publisher by comparing against lists maintained by all accrediting agencies recognized by the Department of Education. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1998-99:	**66%**	**No target set**		
1999-00:		No target set		
2000-01:		Maintain or increase level		
2001-02:		Maintain or increase level		

Indicator 1.2 Graduation rates: Completion rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students in Title III 4-year and 2-year colleges will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of full-time, degree-seeking students at Title III institutions completing a 4-year degree within 6 years and a 2-year degree, certificate, or transferring to a 4-year school within 3 years				**Status:** No 1999 data are available; progress cannot be judged until trend data are available.	**Source:** Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) conducted as part of the Integrated Postsecondary Student Aid Study (IPEDS). *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedure**: Verified by ED data attestation process.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	4- Year	2- Year			
1997:	34%	22%			
1999:	**Data not available**		**Continuing increase in rate**		
2000:			Continuing increase in rate		
2001:			Continuing increase in rate		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Explanation: Approximately one-third of full-time degree-seeking students complete a 4-year degree within 6 years and one-fifth complete a 2-year degree, certificate, or transfer to a 4-year school within 3 years. These data only measure the extent to which students complete their degrees at the Title III institution they first attended. Therefore, the rates are understated to the extent to which students complete their degree at a different institution.	**Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Postsecondary institutions are not required to report graduation rates until 2002 (1999 for 2-year institutions). However, data were voluntarily submitted by institutions representing 87 percent of 4-year students at Title III institutions and 73 percent of 2-year students at Title III institutions.

OBJECTIVE 2: IMPROVE THE FISCAL STABILITY OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS.

Indicator 2.1 Fiscal balance: Over 90 percent of Title III institutions will maintain a positive fiscal balance.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of Title III institutions having a positive fiscal balance				**Status:** No 1999 data are available; progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** Among all Title III institutions, 92 percent had a positive fiscal balance in the 1995-96 school year. The percentage of public Title III institutions having a positive fiscal balance declined slightly from 92 percent in 1995-96 to 90 percent in 1996-97.	**Source:** Finance Survey conducted as part of the Integrated Postsecondary Student Aid Study (IPEDS). *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 1996-97 data for private institutions and 1997-98 data for all institutions will be available in 2000. **Validation Procedures:** Data validated by NCES review and NCES Statistical Standards. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** Data tend to be several years old. NCES is planning on instituting a Web-based data collection for IPEDS that should dramatically reduce the time required for information to be available.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	All Institutions	Public Institutions			
1995-96:	92%	92%			
1996-97:	N/A	90%			
1997-98:	Data not available				
1998-99:	**Data not available**		**90%**		
1999-00:			90%		
2000-01:			90%		

Indicator 2.2 Endowment: The percentage of Title III institutions having an endowment will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data				Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The percentage of Title III institutions having a positive endowment				**Status**: No 1999 data are available; progress toward target is likely. **Explanation**: Among all Title III institutions, 57 percent had a positive endowment in the 1995-96 school year. The percentage of public Title III institutions having a positive endowment increased from 51 percent in 1995-96 to 56 percent in 1996-97.	**Source:** Finance Survey conducted as part of the Integrated Postsecondary Student Aid Study (IPEDS). *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 1996-97 data for private institutions and 1997-98 data for all institutions will be available in 2000. **Validation Procedures**: Data validated by NCES review and NCES Statistical Standards.
Year	**Actual Performance**		**Performance Targets**		
	All institutions	Public institutions			
1995-96:	57%	51%			
1996-97:	N/A	56%			
1997-98:	Data not available				
1998-99:	**Data not available**		**Continuing increase**		
1999-00:			Continuing increase		
2000-01:			Continuing increase		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data tend to be several years old. NCES is planning on instituting a Web-based data collection for IPEDS that should dramatically reduce the time required for information to be available.

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Assist Title III institutions in serving low-income and minority students by disseminating information to institutions on effective practices.
- Establish a formal mechanism for exchange of information with Title III-related organizations and higher education agencies and associations.
- Conduct consistent, thorough reviews of performance reports with feedback to grantees.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Develop a listserv for obtaining grantee feedback on performance indicators.
- Address the lack of program data on specific outcomes of grantee activities, identify and collect measures of the impact of Title III funds on institutions. In addition, identify and collect data on specific outcomes related to the various component programs that make up the Title III Program.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Program works with the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans, and Tribal Colleges to coordinate assistance being provided across the Federal government to these institutions.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- The Inspector General (IG) is expected to release a report on the Title III programs shortly. Once the report has been received, a plan for addressing the IG's concerns will be developed.
- Title III funds are given to institutions in order to meet specific needs identified in their Comprehensive Development Plan. This flexibility greatly increases the usefulness of the program for institutions but makes it difficult to identify common goals and indicators that apply to all schools.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.2 was modified to replace institutional persistence rates with the IPEDS GRS data in order to reduce burden on schools since they already have or will have to report the IPEDS data. Also, the IPEDS data are likely to be much more uniform since they have standard definitions.
- Indicator 2.2 was modified to replace institutional endowment information with the IPEDS Finance data in order to reduce burden on schools since they already have to report the IPEDS data. Also, the IPEDS data are likely to be much more uniform since they have standard definitions.

Dropped

- The remaining indicators were dropped for three reasons. Two-year-old Indicators 1.1, 1.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, and 6.1 were dropped because there was no data collection plan in place to obtain the needed information and were replaced by indicators based on ongoing national data collection systems. Two-year-old Indicators 2.1, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, and all the indicators listed under management improvement were dropped because these are internal indicators needed to operate and manage the program but are not suitable for reporting the outcomes of the program to external constituents. The remainder of the indicators are related to the specific component programs of the Title II Program and were dropped in favor of uniform measures across the Title III Program.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.2 was modified to reflect more current information available from audited financial statements related to the fiscal strength of institutions.
- Indicator 3.2 was modified to replace institutional degree attainment rates with the IPEDS GRS data in order to reduce burden on schools since they already have or will have to report the IPEDS data. Also, the IPEDS data are likely to be much more uniform since they have standard definitions.

Dropped

- Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 3.1 were dropped because there was no data collection plan in place to obtain the needed information and were replaced by indicators based on ongoing national data collection systems. The remainder of the indicators related to the specific component programs of the Title III Program and were dropped in favor of uniform measures across the Title III Program.

New

- Indicator 1.1 uses nationally available data on specialized accreditation to address issues regarding improvements in the quality of academic programs.