HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program (OESE)

FY 2022 Program Performance Report

Program Goal: **Assist migrant and seasonal farmworker students in successfully completing their first academic year of college and in continuing their postsecondary education.**

Objective 1 of 2: *All College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.*

Measure 1.1 of 1: The percentage of CAMP participants completing the first year of their academic or postsecondary program. (Desired direction: increase)

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2017	86.0	88.2	Target Exceeded
2018	86.0	83.5	Target Not Met
2019	86.0	87.9	Target Exceeded
2020	86.0	83.8	Target Not Met
2021	86.0	70.8	Target Not Met
2022	86.0	73.1	Target Not Met
2023	86.0	(June 2024)	Pending
2024	86.0	(June 2025)	Pending

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

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality. All College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) 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 Program Performance 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 also provided technical assistance to grantees by 1) hosting a data training session for all project directors at the Annual Directors' Meeting (ADM), 2) hosting a data training session specifically for new project directors at the New Directors' Orientation (NDO), 3) conducting webinar-based training and office hours on how to complete the APR, and 4) distributing an optional grantee workbook that allows grantees to efficiently collect data to populate the APR.

After OME collected the Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 performance data,[1] the office used a standard process for review of all quantitative and qualitative data. OME used a checklist to determine if grantees addressed financial requirements and project objectives adequately, and reviewed Project Statistics and Program Performance Measure Reporting, Student Participant Information, Project Services Information, and the APR Cover Sheet. Once discrepancies in APR data were identified, OME contacted and assisted grantees as they revised their APR data, so that OME could ensure the most accurate and reliable data.

[1] Performance data for the 2021-2022 CAMP performance period were reported in November 2022 and reviewed and validated by OME staff in Spring 2023.

Target Context. OME's Program Performance Measure 1 target is based upon APR data collected prior to FY 2009, and the target of 86% will remain the same through FY 2024.

Explanation. For Measure 1, OME determined that the measure is based upon the number of first-year completers, divided by the total number of funded/served (whichever is higher, by project), minus those CAMP students who did not complete their first academic year in college and reenrolled for continuing instructional services in support of their first academic year of postsecondary education in the subsequent budget period, prior to the APR submission due date (persisters). This calculation holds projects accountable for the projected number of students they expected to serve in their application, and it allows projects to demonstrate the success rate when they serve higher numbers of students. This calculation also allows projects to serve students over multiple annual budget periods without being penalized as being considered low-performing.

During FY 2022, OME: 1) provided technical assistance to grantees with large carry-over balances and grantees that did not make substantial progress, 2) provided APR, budget, policy, evaluation, and data analysis presentations at the 2022 HEP-CAMP Annual Directors' Meeting and New Directors' Meeting, 3) provided evaluation technical assistance through a webinar, and 4) provided technical assistance to grantees on APR completion through a webinar, office hours, and virtual one-on-one meetings with grantees.

CAMP performance results demonstrated that the program did not meet the Program Performance Measure 1 target of 86% with a performance of 73.1% (1,394 First-Year Completers/{2,195 MAX Funded/Served - 287 Persisters}) in FY 2022. However, performance increased 2.3 percentage points from 2021. Every first-year completer must, at a minimum, successfully complete 24 semester or 36 quarter credit hours. Note: at the time of reporting, data was not yet due for three projects that had no cost extensions.

In FY 2022, the COVID-19 pandemic disruptions on program operations and project activities continued from FY 2021. CAMP grantees reported, among other pandemic-related disruptions: lost instructional time in high school that impacted performance in higher education; student mental health challenges; changes to course delivery, including limited or no in-person instruction; and challenges with recruitment of both staff and students. These disruptions led to staff shortages; reduced student enrollment; canceling of events such as student orientations, campus tours, parent seminars, and professional development and training. Many residential students returned home to attend classes online, while some students stopped attending school altogether to help support their families financially or because they were not interested in online schooling. Other students required additional support in the form of emergency stipends; virtual tutoring, mentoring, and advising; summer tuition; and funds for internet connections and electronic devices.

OME will continue to provide technical assistance to support grantees to meet this Program Performance Measure for future performance periods.

Objective 2 of 2: *Majority of CAMP students who successfully complete their first year of college will continue in postsecondary education.*

Measure 2.1 of 4: The percentage of College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) participants who, after completing the first year of college, continue their postsecondary education. (Desired direction: increase)

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2017	85.0	96.6	Target Exceeded
2018	88.0	96.2	Target Exceeded
2019	90.0	96.4	Target Exceeded
2020	92.0	95.6	Target Exceeded
2021	92.0	96.4	Target Exceeded
2022	92.0	95.6	Target Exceeded
2023	92.0	(June 2024)	Pending
2024	92.0	(June 2025)	Pending

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

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality. All CAMP grantees submit an APR. OME continues to exclude first-year projects and include all second through fifth year projects in the calculation of Program Performance Measure 2. 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 also provided technical assistance to grantees by 1) hosting a data training session for all project directors at the Annual Directors' Meeting (ADM), 2) hosting a data training session specifically for new project directors at the New Directors' Orientation (NDO), 3) conducting webinar-based training and office hours on how to complete the APR, and 4) updating an optional grantee workbook that allows grantees to efficiently collect data to populate the APR.

After OME collected the FY 2022 performance data, the office used a standard process for review of all quantitative and qualitative data. OME used a checklist to determine if grantees addressed financial requirements and project objectives adequately, and reviewed Project Statistics and Program Performance Measure Reporting, Student Participant Information, Project Services Information, and the APR Cover Sheet. Once discrepancies in APR data were identified, OME contacted and assisted grantees as they revised their APR data, so that OME could ensure the most accurate and reliable data.

Target Context. OME's current Program Performance Measure 2 target is based upon the most recent data, and because actual Measure 2 performance has increased since the Measure 2 requirements were revised in FY 2012, OME determined for FY 2020 that the target of 90% would increase to 92% and remain the same through FY 2024.

Explanation. For Measure 2, OME determined that the measure is based upon the number of first-year completers who continued postsecondary education, divided by the total number of first-year completers.

CAMP performance results demonstrated that the program exceeded the Program Performance Measure 2 target of 92% with a performance of 95.6% (1,333 First-Year Completers Who Continued/1,394 First-Year Completers) in FY 2022. This percentage represents a continued high level of CAMP Measure 2 performance for those first-year completers who continued postsecondary education. Grantees reported students' motivation to persist in and complete their postsecondary degree; staff creating and monitoring

individual college success/learning plans; and mentoring and financial aid advising services as contributing factors, among others. Note: at the time of reporting, data was not yet due for three projects that had no cost extensions.

Measure 2.2 of 4: The cost per 1st year CAMP completer that continued their postsecondary education in CAMP Commuter projects. (Desired direction: decrease)

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2017	14,958	12,009	Target Exceeded
2018	15,197	11,393	Target Exceeded
2019	15,440	10,061	Target Exceeded
2020	15,688	11,145	Target Exceeded
2021	15,939	11,044	Target Exceeded
2022	16,194	16,105	Target Exceeded
2023	16,453	(June 2024)	Pending
2024	16,716	(June 2025)	Pending

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

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality. All CAMP grantees submit an APR, and no revisions to the CAMP Program Performance 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 Commuter project when greater than or equal to 96% of students are Commuter students. OME continues to use the annually obligated project funds as the numerator and the number of first-year completers that continue postsecondary education as the denominator in the CAMP efficiency ratio.

Target Context. OME set annual efficiency targets for the CAMP in July 2012 and created targets for 2012 through 2016. In March 2017, OME revised the formula and set efficiency targets through 2024. OME considered the following in developing the targets:

1) Limitations. The efficiency targets measure "success" of the CAMP, i.e., the cost per CAMP first-year completer that continued postsecondary education. This measure of success does not include one component of the CAMP Measure 1 formula, persisters. Note: at the time of reporting, data was not yet due for three projects that had no cost extensions.

2) Baseline Costs. OME chose to use the FY 2011 actual costs of all four cohorts instead of three Program Performance Measure cohorts of CAMP projects as the baseline, because all projects within the entire group of cohorts are compared against the efficiency measure. OME chose projects with an average cost per first-year completer who continued postsecondary education that fell within two standard deviations, resulting in the removal of outlier projects that were located beyond 95% of the range of all CAMP projects. This process eliminated one CAMP project 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, nine CAMP projects met the FY 2011 baseline, leaving three projects that did not meet this baseline.

4) Subpopulation Definition. OME used the latest quantitative data provided by the CAMP 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 project as one that included greater than or equal to 96% Commuter students.

OME developed the Commuter definition based upon the following considerations: 1) CAMP 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 CAMP data occurred in the percentage of Commuter students, and OME attempted comparability with High School Equivalency Program (HEP) data in order to determine the cut points in the CAMP 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.

Explanation. OME developed a predictive model for CAMP costs based upon the two constants of inflation and expected improvement, in order to establish a trajectory for its efficiency measures. Because the inflation rate for college-associated costs consistently outpaced the national inflationary rate for the years FY 2003 through FY 2007, OME included a constant that increased costs annually by 2.6%, accounting for inflation. Additionally, OME expects an improvement of efficiency in CAMP projects, and a 1% improvement in efficiency will be represented as an expected 1% decrease in costs on an annual basis. In FY 2022, CAMP Commuter projects (n = 20), as in the prior five years, exceeded the efficiency target. For the FY 2022 APR, CAMP Commuter projects received obligated project funds totaling $8,696,769 and reported 540 first-year completers who continued, for an average efficiency ratio of $16,105.

Measure 2.3 of 4: The cost per 1st year CAMP completer that continued their postsecondary education in CAMP Commuter-Residential projects. (Desired direction: decrease)

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2017	18,229	13,765	Target Exceeded
2018	18,521	12,939	Target Exceeded
2019	18,817	11,551	Target Exceeded
2020	19,118	13,765	Target Exceeded
2021	19,424	17,550	Target Exceeded
2022	19,735	17,215	Target Exceeded
2023	20,051	(June 2024)	Pending
2024	20,372	(June 2025)	Pending

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

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality. All CAMP grantees submit an APR, and no revisions to the CAMP Program Performance 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 Commuter-Residential project when between 47% and 95% of students are Commuter students. OME continues to use the annually obligated project funds as the numerator and the number of first-year completers that continue postsecondary education as the denominator in the CAMP efficiency ratio.

Target Context. OME set annual efficiency targets for the CAMP in July 2012 and created targets for 2012 through 2016. In March 2017, OME revised the formula and set efficiency targets through 2024. OME considered the following in developing the targets:

1) Limitations. The efficiency targets measure "success" of CAMP, i.e., the cost per CAMP first-year completer that continued postsecondary education. This measure of success does not include one component of the CAMP Measure 1 formula, persisters. Note: at the time of reporting, data was not yet due for three projects that had no cost extensions.

2) Baseline Costs. OME chose to use the FY 2011 actual costs of all four cohorts instead of three Program Performance Measure cohorts of CAMP projects as the baseline, because all projects within the entire group of cohorts are compared against the efficiency measure. OME chose projects with an average cost per first-year completer who continued postsecondary education that fell within two standard deviations, resulting in the removal of outlier projects that were located beyond 95% of the range of all CAMP projects. This process eliminated one CAMP project 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, nine CAMP projects met the FY 2011 baseline, leaving three projects that did not meet this baseline.

4) Subpopulation Definition. OME used the latest quantitative data provided by the CAMP 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 47% and 95% Commuter students.

OME developed the Commuter definition based upon the following consideration: 1) CAMP 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 High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and CAMP data occurred in the percentage of Commuter students, and OME attempted comparability with HEP data in order to determine the cut points in the CAMP 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.

Explanation. OME developed a predictive model for CAMP costs based upon the two constants of inflation and expected improvement, in order to establish a trajectory for its efficiency measures. Because the inflation rate for college-associated costs consistently outpaced the national inflationary rate for the years FY 2003 through FY 2007, OME included a constant that increased costs annually by 2.6%, accounting for inflation. Additionally, OME expects an improvement of efficiency in CAMP projects, and a 1% improvement in efficiency will be represented as an expected 1% decrease in costs on an annual basis. In FY 2022, CAMP Commuter-Residential projects (n = 11), as for the prior five years, exceeded the efficiency target. For the FY 2022 APR, CAMP Commuter-Residential projects received obligated project funds totaling $4,751,234 and reported 276 first-year completers who continued, for an average efficiency ratio of $17,215.

Measure 2.4 of 4: The cost per 1st year CAMP completer that continued their postsecondary education in CAMP Residential projects. (Desired direction: decrease)

Year	Target	Actual (or date expected)	Status
2017	23,972	14,823	Target Exceeded
2018	24,356	13,105	Target Exceeded
2019	24,745	13,429	Target Exceeded
2020	25,141	15,109	Target Exceeded
2021	25,543	20,837	Target Exceeded
2022	25,952	16,548	Target Exceeded
2023	26,367	(June 2024)	Pending
2024	26,789	(June 2025)	Pending

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

Frequency of Data Collection: Annual

Data Quality. All CAMP grantees submit an APR, and no revisions to the CAMP Program Performance 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 CAMP Residential project when between 0% and 46% of students are Commuter students. OME continues to use the annually obligated project funds as the numerator and the number of first-year completers that continue postsecondary education as the denominator in the CAMP efficiency ratio.

Target Context. OME set annual efficiency targets for the CAMP in July 2012 and created targets for 2012 through 2016. In March 2017, it revised the formula and set efficiency targets through 2024. The Office considered the following in developing the targets:

1) Limitations. The efficiency targets measure "success" of CAMP, i.e., the cost per CAMP first-year completer that continued postsecondary education. This measure of success does not include one component of the CAMP Measure 1 formula, persisters. Note: at the time of reporting, data was not yet due for three projects that had no cost extensions.

2) Baseline Costs. OME chose to use the FY 2011 actual costs of all four cohorts instead of three Program Performance Measure cohorts of CAMP projects as the baseline, because all projects within the entire group of cohorts are compared against the efficiency measure. OME chose projects with an average cost per first-year completer who continued postsecondary education that fell within two standard deviations, resulting in the removal of outlier projects that were located beyond 95% of the range of all CAMP projects. This process eliminated one CAMP project 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, nine CAMP projects met the FY 2011 baseline, leaving three projects that did not meet this baseline.

4) Subpopulation Definition. OME used the latest quantitative data provided by the CAMP 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 Residential project as one that included between 0% and 46% Commuter students.

OME developed the Commuter definition based upon: 1) CAMP 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 High School Equivalency (HEP) and CAMP data occurred in the percentage of commuter students, and OME attempted comparability with HEP data in order to determine the cut points in the CAMP 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 CAMP costs based upon the two constants of inflation and expected improvement, in order to establish a trajectory for its efficiency measures. Because the inflation rate for college-associated costs consistently outpaced the national inflationary rate for the years FY 2003 through FY 2007, OME included a constant that increased costs annually by 2.6%, accounting for inflation. Additionally, OME expects an improvement of efficiency in CAMP projects, and a 1% improvement in efficiency will be represented as an expected 1% decrease in costs on an annual basis. In FY 2022, CAMP Residential projects (n = 21), as for the prior five years, exceeded the efficiency target. For the FY 2022 APR, CAMP Residential projects received obligated project funds totaling $8,555,469 and reported 517 first-year completers who continued, for an average efficiency ratio of $16,548.