Performance & Efficiency Measure Results: 2005-06

Background

The 2005-06 performance and efficiency measure results for the TRIO Student Support Services (SSS) Program portray measurable educational outcomes for the projects funded by the program. The following provides an introduction and description of the methodology and terms used to calculate and analyze the outcomes: persistence, graduation and efficiency. The tables provide the actual data and results of the analyses for each grantee and a summary by project groupings. The analyses are not the result of a rigorous, independent evaluation of the SSS program.

Introduction

The Department is committed to continually improving its management of programs and improving the educational outcomes of students. Improvements are guided by monitoring and assessing performance, improving the data used for these assessments, collaborating with stakeholders, implementing recommendations, and re-assessing performance. Providing data to the public is a key element in promoting improvement and collaborating with stakeholders.

The performance measures for SSS projects are based on a cohort of full-time, freshman participants who enrolled at the grantee institution in a particular year and are:

- the persistence (retention) rate, and
- the graduation (completion) rate.

The efficiency measure is the gap or difference between the cost per participant who received SSS services in a particular year and who persisted in postsecondary education, graduated with a postsecondary degree, and/or transferred to another institution in that same year (*successful outcomes*) and the cost per participant who received SSS services in that particular year.

For additional information regarding how the persistence, graduation, and efficiency measure results were calculated, please refer to the *Methodology* section.

Selected Findings

> Persistence

- Of the 959 projects that were funded in 2005-06, 834 projects provided data that resulted in the calculation of the persistence rate. (See Limitation of Data and Findings for a more detailed explanation.)
- The overall persistence rate (79.2 percent) for those projects for which a rate was calculated exceeded the Department's goal of 72 percent. (See Table 1.)
- Of the 834 projects for which a rate was calculated, there was an even distribution (50 percent) among two-year and four-year institutions.

- Overall, the rate of persistence at four-year institutions was slightly higher than at two-year institutions, 80 percent vs. 78 percent, respectively.
- Seventy-percent (70 percent) of all SSS projects for whom a rate was calculated had persistence rates of 72 percent or higher (i.e., Department's targeted goal).
- Of the 70 percent of projects with persistence rates of 72 percent or higher, there was an even distribution (50 percent) among four-year and two-year institutions.

> Six-Year Graduation Rates (4-year institutions)

- Of the 477 projects at four-year institutions that were funded in 2005-06, 356 projects provided data that resulted in the calculation of the persistence rate. (See Limitation of Data and Findings for a more detailed explanation.)
- Of the 356 projects for which a rate was calculated, 29 percent were private-institutions while 71 percent were public institutions.
- The overall six-year graduation rate (34.2 percent) for those projects for which a rate was calculated exceeded the Department's goal (28 percent). (See Table 2.)
- Nearly two-thirds (64 percent) of all SSS projects for whom a rate was calculated had graduation rates of 28 percent or higher (i.e., Department's targeted goal).
- Of the 64 percent of projects with graduation rates of 28 percent or higher, there was slightly more representation among public than private institutions which is within the range of the number of type of institutions being funded.

> Three-Year Graduation/Transfer Rates (2-year institutions)

- Of the 482 projects at two-year institutions that were funded in 2005-06, 415 projects provided data that resulted in the calculation of the persistence rate. (See Limitation of Data and Findings for a more detailed explanation.)
- Of the 415 projects for which a rate was calculated, two percent were private-institutions while 98 percent were public institutions.
- The overall three-year graduation rate (24.7 percent) for those projects for which a rate was calculated did not exceed the Department's goal (27 percent). (See Table 3.)
- Forty-one percent (41 percent) of all SSS projects for whom a rate was calculated had graduation/transfer rates of 27 percent or higher (i.e., Department's targeted goal).
- Of the 41 percent of projects with graduation rates of 27 percent or higher, there was similar representation among public and private institutions.

> Efficiency Measures

- Of the 959 projects that were funded in 2005-06, 940 projects provided data that resulted in the calculation of the efficiency measure. (See Limitation of Data and Findings for a more detailed explanation.)
- The overall efficiency measure (\$165) for those projects whose efficiency measure was calculated improved in comparison to the 2004-05 overall

- efficiency measure (\$191) reported at http://www.ed.gov/programs/triostudsupp/appendix2004-05.xls. (See Table 4.)
- The 2005-06 efficiency measure improvement is the result of a two percentage-point increase in the success rate to 89 percent from 87 percent in 2004-05, despite a four percent increase in the overall cost per participant from 2004-05 (\$1,320 vs. \$1,272, respectively).
- Of the 940 projects for which a rate was calculated, there was a nearly even distribution among two-year (51 percent) and four-year (49 percent) institutions.
- Overall, the efficiency measure at two-year institutions was more than double that at four-year institutions, \$234 vs. \$108, respectively.

Limitation of Data and Findings

> Persistence Rate

- A total of 959 SSS projects were funded in 2005-06. Of these, 78 projects (8 percent) were first funded in 2005-06; therefore, a persistence rate could not be calculated.
- Thirty-nine (39) projects or four percent of the projects did not serve any full-time freshmen in the year the cohort was established (i.e., 2004-05); therefore, a persistence rate could not be calculated.
- Seven (7) projects or one percent did not submit an APR in either 2004-05 or 2005-06 for various reasons (e.g., Hurricane Katrina); therefore, a persistence rate could not be calculated.
- One (1) project served only upperclassmen participants; therefore, the persistence rate could not be calculated since the cohort is based on full-time freshmen.

> Six-Year Graduation Rates (4-year institutions)

- Fifty-one (51) projects or 11 percent were funded for the first time in the 2001-02 project year; therefore, a bachelor's degree completion rate could not be calculated since these projects were not in operation during the year in which the cohort was established (i.e., 2000-01).
- Thirty-four (34) projects or seven percent were funded for the first time in 2005-06; therefore a bachelor's degree completion rate could not be calculated.
- Twenty-four (24) projects or five percent did not report serving any full-time freshmen participants in the year the cohort was established; therefore, the graduation rate could not be calculated.
- Eleven (11) projects or two percent did not submit an APR in 2000-01; therefore, the graduation rate could not be calculated because the cohort could not be established.

• One (1) project served only upperclassmen participants; therefore, the graduation rate could not be calculated since the cohort is based on full-time <u>freshmen</u>.

➤ Three-Year Graduation/Transfer Rates (2-year institutions)

- Forty-four (44) projects or nine percent were funded for the first time in 2005-06; therefore an associate's degree/transfer rate could not be calculated.
- Twenty (20) projects or four percent did not report serving any full-time freshmen participants in the year the cohort was established (i.e., 2003-04); therefore, the graduation/transfer rate could not be calculated.
- Two (2) projects did not submit an APR in 2005-06; therefore, the graduation/transfer rate could not be calculated because only two years worth of data was available and the rate is based on a three-year time-span.
- One (1) project submitted their APR; however, the data was not in the required format resulting in unusable data.

In addition, incomplete data in any of the data fields used to determine the cohort such as college grade level and enrollment status could distort the calculated rate.

> Efficiency Measures

- Fourteen (14) projects or one percent were unable to report the academic outcomes of more than 15 percent of the participants who were served by the SSS project in 2005-06; therefore, a persistence rate could not be calculated.
- Five (5) projects either did not submit an APR in 2005-06 or submitted their APR with data, which was not in the required format resulting in unusable data; therefore, an efficiency measure could not be calculated.
- The results of the efficiency measure calculations in Table 4 cannot be compared to the program-level findings reported in the Department's goals since projects that were unable to report the academic outcomes of more than 15 percent of the participants who were served by the SSS project in 2005-06 were not included and the results were adjusted for those participants in the 2005-06 year for which the project did not report academic outcomes.

Methodology

> Student Cohort for Persistence, Graduation and/or Transfer Rates:

 Comprised of participants who are freshmen, enrolled full-time, and received SSS services for the first time during a designated year (i.e., new participants).¹

> Persistence Rate Calculation

Please note that this definition of the cohort for the program performance measures is different from the participants included in the cohort for the objectives used for the assessment of a grantee's prior experience. For the prior experience objectives, the cohort consists of all participants served by a project for the first-time in the designated year.

• Divide the number of full-time freshman participants who were served by the SSS project in 2004-05 and who were also enrolled at the grantee institution during the 2005-06 academic year (numerator) by the number of full-time freshman participants served by the SSS project in 2004-05 (denominator).²

> Six-Year Graduation Rates (four-year institutions)

Divide the number of full-time freshman students who were served by the SSS project in 2000-01 and who graduated with a bachelor's degree from the grantee institution before or during the 2005-06 academic year (numerator) by the number of full-time freshman students served by the SSS project in 2000-01 (denominator).³

> Three-Year Graduation and/or Transfer Rates (two-year institutions)

• Divide the sum of the number of full-time freshman students who were served by the SSS project in 2003-04 and who graduated with an associate's degree from the grantee institution and/or transferred to a four-year institution by 2005-06 (numerator) by the number of full-time freshman students served by the SSS project in 2003-04 (denominator).

> Efficiency Measures

- Subtract the quotient of the 2005-06 federal funding (numerator) divided by the number of participants who were served by the SSS project in 2005-06 (denominator) from the quotient of the revised 2005-06 federal funding (not shown in Table 4) (numerator) divided by the number of participants who were served by the SSS project in 2005-06 and who also received a certificate/diploma/associate's degree/bachelor's degree, transferred to another institution, were still enrolled at the grantee's institution, and/or completed program requirements but did not receive a certificate, diploma, or degree (denominator).
- The revised 2005-06 federal funding (not shown in Table 4) is the actual 2005-06 funding multiplied by the ratio of the number of participants who were served by the SSS project in 2005-06 and whose academic status was known (numerator) to the number of participants who were served by the SSS project in 2005-06 (denominator).
- Projects were excluded from the analysis if the ratio of the number of participants who were served by the SSS project in 2005-06 and whose academic status was unknown to the number of participants who were served by the SSS project in 2005-06 exceeded 0.15.

² Data from the annual performance reports (APRs) for 2003-04 and 2004-05 were used to calculate a grantee's persistence rate.

³ Data from the 2000-01 APR were used to establish the cohort of full-time first-year participants. APR data on degree completion for subsequent years (2001-02; 2002-03; 2003-04; 2004-05; and 2005-06) was used to determine the number of the 2000-01 full-time freshmen who received a bachelor's degree from the grantee institution by 2005-06.

⁴ Data from the 2003-04 APR was used to establish the cohort of full-time freshman students. APR data on degree completion and/or transfers for subsequent years (2004-05; and 2005-06) was used to determine the number of the 2003-04 full-time freshmen who received an associate's degree from the grantee institution and/or transferred from the grantee institution to a four-year institution by 2005-06.