

# Archived Information

## TRIO PROGRAMS

<b>Goal:</b> Provide increased educational opportunities for low-income, first-generation students.	<b>Funding History</b> (\$ in millions)			
	<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Appropriation</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Appropriation</b>
<b>Legislation:</b> Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, Chapter 1 (20 U.S.C. 1070a-11 and 1070a-17).	1985	\$175	2000	\$645
	1990	\$242	2001	\$730
	1995	\$463	2002 (Requested)	\$780

### Program Description

The Federal TRIO Programs are educational opportunity outreach programs designed to improve college enrollment and completion rates among disadvantaged secondary and postsecondary students. TRIO includes six outreach and support programs targeted to serve and assist low-income, first-generation college, and disabled students advance from middle school to postbaccalaureate programs. TRIO also includes a training program for directors and staff of TRIO projects and a dissemination partnership program that provides avenues for TRIO projects to transport their best practices, components and strategies to institutions and agencies that do not have TRIO projects. Discretionary grants of 4 or 5 years in duration are awarded competitively to institutions of higher education and other public and private nonprofit institutions and agencies.

In general, at least two-thirds of the eligible participants in TRIO programs must be either low-income (below 150 percent of the poverty line) or first-generation college students (neither parent has earned a bachelor's degree). Particular eligibility requirements vary for each TRIO program. Detailed information on each of the TRIO programs can be found at: <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/HEP/trio/>

## Program Performance

OBJECTIVE 1: INCREASE PARTICIPATION AND COMPLETION RATES OF LOW-INCOME, FIRST-GENERATION INDIVIDUALS IN THE ACADEMIC PIPELINE.

Indicator 1.1 Persistence in and completion of education programs: TRIO students will persist in and complete their educational programs.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Upward Bound (UB): Length of time Upward Bound students participate in the project during high school, and college enrollment rates of UB participants</i>			<p><b>Status:</b> No 2000 data but progress toward targets are likely.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Data from the national evaluations of the Upward Bound and Student Support Services programs provide the baseline data for these programs. The 1998-99 annual performance reports provide the baseline data for the McNair program. The Student Support Services (SSS) and McNair performance reports will be used to determine if the performance targets are being met.</p> <p><b>Upward Bound (UB):</b> On average, Upward Bound participants persist in the project for only 19 months. The national evaluation of UB has shown that longer participation in the program (at least 24 months) significantly increases the educational benefits to students.</p> <p>Although the UB program has limited impact on the college enrollment rates of most participants, evaluation findings show that college enrollment rates increase significantly for Upward Bound participants academically at risk or with lower educational expectations</p> <p>According to the 1998-99 follow-up survey of UB participants (conducted by Mathematica) 63% of the students offered an opportunity to participate and 66% of those who participated in Upward Bound attended a postsecondary institution. Data on postsecondary attendance rates by length of program participation are not yet available.</p>	<p><b>Data Sources (UB):</b>                      (1) Upward Bound evaluation, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1999.  <i>Frequency:</i> Annually.  <i>Next collection update:</i> 2000.  <i>Date to be reported:</i> 2001.</p> <p>(2) Upward Bound Performance Report  <i>Frequency:</i> Annually starting in Fall 2001.  <i>Next collection update:</i> Fall 2001.  <i>Date to be reported:</i> Fall 2002.</p> <p><b>Data Sources (SSS):</b>                      (1) Student Support Services evaluation, Westat, Inc., 2000  <i>Frequency:</i> Final Report, April 2001.  <i>Next collection update:</i> 2000.  <i>Date to be reported:</i> April 2001.</p> <p>(2) Student Support Services Performance Reports  <i>Frequency:</i> Annually.  <i>Next collection update:</i> November 2000.  <i>Date to be reported:</i> Fall 2001.</p> <p><b>Data Source (McNair)</b>                      McNair performance reports, 1998-99.  <i>Frequency:</i> Annually.  <i>Next collection update:</i> December 2000.  <i>Date to be reported:</i> Fall 2001.</p>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			
1996:	Project Persistence	College Enrollment		
1996:	19 months (base)	No data available		
1997:	No Data Available	66% (in 1998-99)		
<b>2000:</b>	<b>No Data Available</b>	<b>No Data Available</b>		
2001:	Performance Report data		19 months; 66%	
2002:	will be available on project persistence in 2002		Continuing increase 66%	
Student Support Services (SSS): Percentage of students persisting at same postsecondary school for second year and postsecondary degree attainment rate at same institution within 6 years of starting postsecondary education.				
<i>College persistence</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
1994:	67% (base)			
1999:	67%		67%	
<b>2000:</b>	<b>Data Available Fall 2001</b>		<b>67%</b>	
2001:			67%	
2002:			Continuing increase	
<i>College completion</i>				
1998:	29% (base)			
1999:				
<b>2000:</b>				
2001:			29%	
2002:	Six-year graduation rates will be available in the fall of 2003		29%	
McNair: Percentage of McNair participants who enroll in graduate school within a year of completing the bachelor's degree, and percentage persisting toward or completing graduate degree.				
<i>Graduate school enrollment</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>		<b>Performance Targets</b>	
1999:	35% (base)			
<b>2000:</b>	<b>Data Available Fall 2001</b>		<b>35%</b>	
2001:			35%	
2002:			35%	

<b>Indicator 1.1 (cont'd) Persistence in and completion of education programs: TRIO students will persist in and complete their educational programs.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Graduate school persistence</i>		<p><b>Student Support Services (SSS):</b> Data from the national evaluation of SSS showed that 67 percent of full-time freshman participants in SSS returned to the same school for the second year. Preliminary data from the 1997-98 and 1998-99 annual performance reports show that 67 percent of SSS participants returned to the same school for the second year.</p> <p>The national study also showed that 29 percent of the SSS students earned an associate's, bachelor's, or higher degree within 6 years of starting postsecondary education at the same college (68 percent earned an associate's or higher from any college within 6 years of starting).</p> <p>The college completion targets for SSS are based on the percentage of SSS students who complete an associate's degree or higher within 6 years of starting college at the same college. Although this substantially underestimates the percentage that received a postsecondary degree, the SSS performance report only requires grantees to track the academic progress of students who remain at their institution through graduation. Therefore, reliable data on graduation rates is only available annually for SSS students who remain at the same college. Because approximately 45 percent of SSS grants are at 2-year institutions, the target is based on students who earn an associate's or higher degree.</p> <p>Performance targets for 2000 and 2001 are set at the baseline. Based on the findings of the national evaluation of the SSS program, SSS participants benefit significantly from the program. Although increases in the persistence and college completion rates of SSS students are desirable, increases are unlikely in 2000 and 2001 given the current funding levels for these projects.</p> <p><b>McNair:</b> Data from the 1998-99 performance reports show that between 31 and 47 percent of McNair participants enroll in graduate school within a year of completing the bachelor's degree. Further, 48 percent of McNair students who have begun a graduate program are persisting.</p>	<p><b>Validation Procedures:</b> The data collected by the national evaluation studies meet the data quality standards developed by the Department, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., and Westat, Inc., used sampling techniques consistent with National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) guidelines. Further, response rate for students surveyed also meets Department standards.</p> <p>The performance report data come from the universe of grantees. Under contract with the Department, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., reviews and edits the data to ensure valid data are provided.</p> <p><b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> The national evaluations have provided baseline data for the UB and SSS programs and also provide data on appropriate comparison groups. However, these evaluations cannot be used to measure program improvements on an annual basis. Therefore, the Department has developed new performance reports to collect the needed information. Currently, the data collected from the SSS and McNair reports is being analyzed to determine if annual performance targets are met. The new Upward Bound performance report will capture data appropriate to the performance indicators.</p>	
1999:	48% (base)			
<b>2000:</b>	<b>Data Available Fall 2001</b>			<b>48%</b>
2001:				48%
2002:				48%

OBJECTIVE 2: IMPROVE SERVICE DELIVERY.

<b>Indicator 2.1 Streamlined grants award process: The time from receipt of applications to the notification/awards to grantees will be reduced.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Average time elapsed</i>		<p><b>Status:</b> Over the last few years the Office of Federal TRIO programs has substantially reduced the time between receipt of applications and the notification of awards from an average of 10 months to 8 months.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> *In Fiscal Year 2000, competitions were conducted under two small TRIO programs facilitating a streamlined grant-awards process. **However, in Fiscal Year 2001 reductions in the time elapsed are not realistic because of the number of applications received and the number of grants to be awarded (i.e., in fiscal year 2001, we received 1,200 applications and will award between 800 and 900 awards).</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> ED grant review schedule, 1999.  <i>Frequency:</i> Annually.  <i>Next collection update:</i> Fiscal Year 2001.  <i>Date to be reported:</i> Fall 2001.</p> <p><b>Validation Procedures:</b> Review of grant award process from application deadline through notification of awards.</p> <p><b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> None.</p>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>			<b>Performance Targets</b>
1997:	10 months			
1998:	9 months			
1999:	7-8 months			8 months
<b>2000:</b>	<b>3-4 months *</b>			<b>8 months</b>
2001:				**8 months
2002:		8 months		