

Archived Information

Student Financial Assistance Programs - 2002

CFDA Numbers: 84.007 - Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants
84.032 - Federal Family Education Loans
84.033 - Federal Work-Study Program
84.037 - Loan Cancellations
84.038 - Federal Perkins Loan Program_Federal Capital Contributions
84.063 - Federal Pell Grant Program
84.069 - Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership
84.268 - Federal Direct Student Loans

Goal 8: Postsecondary student aid delivery and program management is efficient, financially sound, and responsive to customers.

Objective 8.1 of 3: Increase customer satisfaction.

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Increase Customer Satisfaction to a comparable private sector industry average - American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) rating of 75.9 (out of a possible score of 100) - by FY 2002

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Customer satisfaction rating</i>			<p>Status: Unable to judge</p> <p>Progress: The Department is re-evaluating how it, as a whole, performs customer monitoring. Therefore separate 2002 data are not available for FSA.</p> <p>Explanation: 1999-2001: The ACSI uses a widely accepted methodology to obtain standardized customer satisfaction for all its participants. Over 170 private-sector corporations use ACSI. Because it is widely used across all business sectors it allows us to benchmark and compare ourselves to the best in business. The 1999 data were based on SFA's student application process.</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: 1999-2001 American Customer Satisfaction Index.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Customer satisfaction rating	Customer satisfaction rating		
1999	63			
2000	72.90			
2001	74.20			
2002		75.90		

Objective 8.2 of 3: Decrease unit cost

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Reduce actual unit costs: By FY 2004, reduce actual unit costs from projected unit costs by 19 percent

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Unit Costs</i>			<p>Status: Unable to judge</p> <p>Progress: FSA is in the process of evaluating and refining its activity-based cost model and will develop separate unit cost for its major products and services. These data will be available in 2003.</p> <p>Explanation: 1999-2001 Data: Costs are defined as total obligations recorded in a fiscal year divided by the number of</p>	<p>Additional Source Information: 1999-2001 Data: The cost component comes from obligation incurred 1999 through 2001. Out-year estimates are based on budget projections. The number of unduplicated recipients comes from the Office of the Undersecretary.</p> <p>Frequency: Annually.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Projected Unit Costs	Projected Unit Costs		
1999	16.70	16.70		
2000	20.10	20.10		
2001	19.60	19.60		

	unduplicated recipients of loans and grants. Unit cost data are based on FSA Obligations and Contract Costs.	Collection Period: 2003 Data Available: September 2003 Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.
--	--	---

Objective 8.3 of 3: Increasing employee satisfaction

Indicator 8.3.1 of 1: Increase Customer Satisfaction to a comparable private sector industry average - American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) rating of 75.9 (out of a possible score of 100) - by FY 2002: Raise Gallup Workplace Management Grand Mean Score to at least 3.6 -- the private sector average -- by 2004.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>FSA Employee satisfaction ranking</i>			Status: Unable to judge	Additional Source Information: 1999-2000
Year	Actual Performance		Progress: The Department will monitor work place satisfaction issues as part of Objective 6.2 of the Strategic Plan, "Improve the strategic management of the Department's human capital." Explanation: 1999-2001 Data: Source data for this indicator changed in 2001 to the Gallup Organization's Workplace Measurement Tool. The Gallup tool not only provides long-term consistency; it provides more diagnostic information to gauge employee satisfaction. Additionally, it requires that individual work groups develop action plans to address employee satisfaction issues.	Data: OPM's Employee Opinion Survey 2000-
	OPM (out of 49)	Gallup (on a 5 point scale)		2001 Data: Gallup Workplace Management Tool (Survey).
1998	33			
1999	38			
2000	5	3.51		
2001		3.74	3.50	