

California Annual Performance Report



Federally Funded Adult Education WIA/Title II Programs
Program Year 2002-2003

Prepared for the California Department of Education by

CASAS

California Annual Performance Report

Federally Funded
WIA/AEFLA Title II Programs in California
2002-2003

California Department of Education

Contents i

Overview iii

Question 1: State Leadership Projects 1

Successful activities, programs, and projects supported with State Leadership Funds 1

Extent to which State Leadership Projects were successful in implementing state plan goals 1

Question 2: Core Indicators of Performance 3

Highlights of Accomplishments 3

Three Years of Summary Learner Data 4

Pay for Performance 5

Data Quality 5

Leveraging What Works 6

Program Management 6

At the Classroom Level 6

Question 3: Collaboration 7

Collaborative Arrangements and Integration of Activities 7

Title II Integration with the WIA Title I One-Stop System 7

Representation on Local Workforce Investment Boards (WIB) 8

WIA Title II Funds Used to Support Activities and Services of One-Stops 9

Question 4: EL Civics Grants 9

Successful Activities and Services 9

Numbers of Programs Funded and Students Served 10

Program Description and Contexts 10

Local Assistance Grants 11

Capacity Building Activity 11

Measuring and Reporting Learner and Program Outcomes 11

Continuous Improvement 11

Appendices

Appendix A: Provider Type Information

Appendix B: Core Performance Measures Information

Appendix C: Federal Tables

Overview

This is a report of California's responses to the four questions that the United States Department of Education (USDE), Division of Adult Education and Literacy (DAEL) requires of all states and territories receiving federal supplementary funding from the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA) of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) in the preparation of the narrative section of the required *Annual Performance Report*. Sources of information include: an annual survey sent to all federally funded California agencies in May 2003 (annual statewide survey), an online survey by the California Department of Education, Adult Education Office (CDE), data from Tracking Of Programs and Students management information system (TOPSpro); information submitted to comply with the federally mandated National Reporting System (NRS); data submitted by adult education providers to the assessment and evaluation contractor, the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS), reports from regional focus groups; stated comments and concerns expressed by attendees conferring at adult education professional association meetings and conferences; concerns and issues expressed in listservs; and, comments from interviews with field practitioners. Additional resources for English Literacy Civics Education (EL Civics) information included reports and contact logs from field practitioners contracted to provide technical assistance to local providers as well as quarterly reports from the local providers.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 promotes the following four basic principles as the pillars of educational reform: (1) stronger accountability for results; (2) increased flexibility and local control; (3) expanded options; and (4) an emphasis on proven methods of instruction. California's systemic approach to adult education, as reflected in the California State Plan, sustains these four pillars by supporting an infrastructure that provides quality data for high stakes pay-for-performance accountability, identifying vast arrays of instructional materials from which local providers can choose to select, promulgating a variety of effective instructional programs, practices and approaches, and continuing to identify and lever proven results throughout the state.

California's federal supplemental funding allocation plan is based on documented student performance and goal attainment in educational programs. It requires all agencies to collect the following information on all students for whom they receive federal supplemental funding:

- Collect demographic and program information
- Monitor and document individual student progress and learning gains
- Document other student outcomes such as the completion of a GED, attainment of a high school diploma, and acquisition of employment

In 2002-2003, California's third year of implementing the pay-for-performance system, the state met or exceeded all of its performance goals (see Appendix B). Supported by California's comprehensive infrastructure for capacity building, adult education providers throughout the state continued to improve their ability to collect complete and accurate data in full alignment with NRS reporting requirements and data quality standards. Local adult education providers now have the capacity to use current data to analyze and leverage program strengths and to identify opportunities for program improvement, innovation, and reform.

In 2002-2003, 258 agencies received WIA/AEFLA, Title II, Section 225/231 and EL Civics (WIA Title II) funding to provide adult literacy instruction. These funded agencies included adult schools, community colleges, community-based organizations (CBOs), faith-based organizations (FBOs), public libraries, county offices of education (COE), the California State University system (CSU), and state agencies (see Appendix A).

QUESTION 1: STATE LEADERSHIP PROJECTS

Describe successful activities, programs, and projects supported with State Leadership Funds and describe the extent to which these activities, programs, and projects were successful implementing the goals of the state plan.

Successful activities, programs, and projects supported with State Leadership Funds

Rather than funding short-term activities, programs, and projects that meet specific needs, CDE has used its State Leadership Funds to develop and implement a systemic approach in providing the critical infrastructure needed to support an effective adult literacy program that meets the evolving needs of new and continuing populations of adult learners. As developed, this infrastructure has been able to adapt to the issues associated with changing priorities and policies. This infrastructure provides:

- Professional development for administrative, instructional, and support staff that fosters continuous program improvement
- Distance learning strategies having special focus on underserved and unserved populations that increases program flexibility and options for adult learners
- Standardized accountability system that promotes rigorous data quality standards, documents and reports learner outcomes, and monitors program performance
- Dynamic communication linkages that provides comprehensive adult education and literacy data bases and disseminates best and promising practices based on research and proven performance

To accomplish this, CDE funds four State Leadership Projects:

- California Adult Literacy Professional Development Project (CALPRO)
- California Distance Learning Project (CDLP)
- Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS)
- Outreach and Technical Assistance Network (OTAN)

Extent to which State Leadership Projects were successful in implementing state plan goals

California is meeting the challenge of serving the largest and most diverse population of adult learners in the nation. In 2002-2003, 258 funded California adult education agencies served 565,311 learners that met NRS reporting guidelines. A goal of CDE was to expand the provider network. Efforts in this direction have resulted in a general increase in the number of agencies funded and a notable increase over the last program year in the number of participating CBOs and FBOs. The four State Leadership Projects have provided substantial resources to assist all the new agencies in meeting the accountability requirements of the NRS.

The challenge for CDE is to provide the necessary support for all agencies and provider types to meet or exceed core performance goals. Many of the newly funded agencies and provider types require technical assistance and training to provide educational services that comply with State and Federal guidelines, reporting, and accountability requirements. The challenge for the Leadership Projects is to provide ongoing support for experienced local providers while assisting new agencies.

The four State Leadership Projects employ a collaborative systems approach to (1) support teaching excellence grounded in current research and practice, (2) document and report student

progress and goal attainment, and (3) build capacity and promote continuous improvement in California's WIA Title II funded programs. This integrated system has successfully provided staff development, dissemination of information, assessment and documentation of learner outcomes, curriculum guidelines, technology support, and continuous program improvement. It also has enabled the state to address emerging needs and issues and readily adapt its educational delivery system to serve new populations, as well as effectively meet the challenges of changing priorities and policies.

Each of the projects has responsibility for providing professional development, training, and technical assistance related to its identified focus areas that include accountability, technology, distance learning, and instructional leadership. Each of the State Leadership Projects disseminates best practices and products within its identified focus areas. CDE also supports an extensive electronic network to distribute best practices and products through the Leadership Projects.

As an example of this collaborative systemic approach, responses from the 'Professional Development' section of the annual statewide survey identified the following priority professional development needs among adult education administrators, instructors, and support staff.

Priority professional development needs for **administrators** in 2002-2003:

1. Budget issues
2. Data analysis and using TOPSpro data to manage and improve programs
3. Technology use

Priority professional development needs for **instructors** in 2002-2003:

1. Implementing and integrating technology
2. Technology based instructional strategies and curricula
3. Curriculum development, improvement, and revision

Priority professional development needs for **support staff** in 2002-2003:

1. Accountability; data collection, and data quality, and TOPSpro implementation
2. Cross-training of support staff
3. Communication skills and customer service

Each of the Leadership Projects then used this information to direct training and technical assistance resources related to their own identified focus areas.

In 2002-2003, highlights of Leadership Projects activities include:

CALPRO:

- Commissioned Just-in-Time Leadership module on fiscal management
- Hosted a seminar on critical thinking and problem-solving for High School Diploma and GED instructors
- Developed three training modules on effective strategies for teaching adults with learning disabilities
- Provided an eleven chapter online guide for adult education administrators that included chapters on budgeting and data quality
- Offered staff development workshops through Regional Resource Centers (RRCs) in response to local needs assessments.

CDLP:

- Supported the CDE online application and annual report process for the adult school Innovation Program (distance learning)
- Completed the annual study of the Adult School Innovation Programs comparing distance learning alternatives to traditional classroom instruction
- Provided workshops on multi-media learning materials and distance learning nuts and bolts
- Piloted an online professional development course aimed at adult and family educators who teach English language and literacy to non-native speakers.

CASAS:

- Refined and continued to implement a standardized assessment and accountability system to meet all federal and state reporting and continuous improvement requirements
- Provided standardized testing instruments, processes and procedures including computer based testing (CBT) and assessments appropriate for adults with disabilities
- Maintained and refined a comprehensive student level data collection, management, and reporting system that allows local agencies to access student level information in a relational database environment and create local agency reports as well as meet all state and federal reporting and data quality requirements
- Promoted data-driven continuous program improvement
- Developed and implemented a six-hour training module on developing and implementing additional assessments.

OTAN:

- Provided comprehensive online support for instruction and technology use in adult education--average of 76,900 web site user sessions per month
- Maintained a list serve for California adult education administrators
- Moderated bulletin board to provide information about any adult education topic--including an archive containing answers to questions on 26 topics
- Developed and implemented presentations and training on locating and using Internet resources, integrating the Internet into instruction, and on specific skills such as using e-mail, web pages, and web authoring tools in instruction
- Provided technical support and assistance in developing agency technology plans and implementing technology resources.

QUESTION 2: CORE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE

Describe any significant findings from the state's evaluation of the effectiveness of the adult education and literacy activities based on the core indicators of performance.

For the second consecutive year, California's WIA Title II program met or exceeded all performance goals. A summary of the performance results for program year 2002-2003 is highlighted below. It should be noted that when enrollees have paired pre- and post-test data, their completion rates practically double the rates attained by all enrollees. Further analyses are being conducted to explain these extraordinary differences in learner performance gains.

Highlights of Accomplishments (Charts and Tables in Appendix C)

- Adult Basic Education Program met or exceeded each of the 15 benchmark levels (100 percent attainment).

- A total of 32.6 percent of all enrollees completed a level.
- A total of 38.3 percent of all enrollees progressed within a level.
- A total of 62.5 percent of all enrollees with paired data completed a level.
- Agencies followed-up all eligible enrollees by mail survey on three core performance measures: entered employment, retained employment, and/or entered postsecondary education or training. Response rates, which ranged from 9.4 to 10.3 percent in 2001-02, increased significantly in 2002-03, ranging from 17.1 to 19.0 percent.
- Follow-up survey results show that 54.4 percent of enrollees who indicated their program goal was to obtain employment, achieved that objective.
- Follow-up survey results show that 81.9 percent of enrollees who indicated their program goal was to retain employment, achieved that objective.
- Follow-up survey results show that 53.5 percent of enrollees who indicated their program goal was to enter postsecondary education, achieved that objective.

CDE uses a variety of methodologies for collecting performance data and follow-up measures. These include: (1) TOPSpro, the CASAS student management information system software, for collecting test results, (2) data match to assist in verifying receipt of the GED Certificate, (3) verification of receipt of high school diploma through validation of an agency submitted certified list of students awarded a high school diploma, (4) agency-generated follow-up mail surveys to determine the outcomes of core measures related to postsecondary education and employment.

Because California currently does not allow the use of Social Security numbers as a data match for employment-related goals and goals of entry into postsecondary education, the ability to capture a truly complete and accurate measure of core performance indicators is hampered. Data match would provide reliable and comprehensive information to reflect program success and to assist in targeting program improvement. The low rate of response from mail surveys tells only a partial story, inadequately documenting the success of California’s programs.

Three-Years of Summary Learner Data

The numbers of learners with Entry Records have increased over the three-year period (see Table 2.1). All Entry Records were sequentially screened hierarchically on each of the four conditions to comprise only learners qualifying for Federal table inclusion. Federal tables include 565,311 (69 percent), of the 815,310 learners served by California adult educators in 2002-2003. The 565,311 learners who met the conditions for enumeration in the WIA Title II Federal Report include learners who had twelve or more hours of instruction, were not concurrently enrolled in a K-12 program, were not under the age of sixteen, and had a valid instructional program.

Table 2.1 Three Years of Learners Entering Program but Dropped from Federal Tables

Number of Learners Entering Program and Hierarchically Dropped from Federal Table Inclusion	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003
Learners with entry records	644,062	771,905	815,310
Learners with less than 12 hours of instruction	154,492	190,507	191,349
Learners < 16 years	2,678	4,096	3,944
Learners concurrently enrolled in HS/K12	13,842	25,275	31,245
Learners without a valid instructional level	N/A	25,072	23,461
Total number of learners included in Federal tables	473,050	526,955	565,311

Table 2.2 contains summaries of data on learner performance outcomes and salient data rates for the past three years. Over these years, the number and percentage of learners with paired data,

and the number and percentage of learners completing an instructional level increased monotonically. While the percentage of learners with paired data completing an instructional level remained relatively constant, the number of learners with paired data and progressing within an instructional level and learners receiving a GED Certificate or High School Diploma increased monotonically over the past three years. As mentioned previously, the actual number of learners included in the Federal Tables have increased over the past three years, however, the percent for inclusion dropped 5.1 percentage points to 68.3 percent in 2001-2002 and 69.3 percent in 2002-2003 from 73.4 percent attained in 2000-2001.

Table 2.2 Performance Outcome Summary of Learners Included in Federal Tables for Three Years

Learners Included in Federal Tables	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003
Total number of learners included in Federal tables	473,050	526,955	565,311
Learners without paired data	240,434	257,649	270,255
Learners with paired data	232,616	269,306	295,056
Learners completing a level	140,532	169,007	184,277
Learners progressing within a level (paired data)	68,257	74,409	80,221
Learners receiving GED or HS Diploma	7,609	9,361	12,364
Salient Data Rates			
% of all learners included in Federal tables	73.4%	68.3%	69.3%
% with paired data	49.2%	51.1%	52.2%
% completing a level	29.7%	32.1%	32.6%
% completing a level (paired data)	60.4%	62.8%	62.5%
Enrollment increase from prior year (Federal table learners)	3.7%	11.4%	7.3%

Pay for Performance

Federal report data document California's continued success in significantly improving student-learning gains. CDE began a full pay-for-performance system in 2001-2002 for WIA Title II using learners' attainment of approved Core Performance Indicator benchmarks as the basis of funding. Agencies can earn up to three benchmark payments per learner within the annual grant period. These three pay points result when a learner achieves the following:

- Makes a significant learning gain¹
- Completes two instructional levels
- Receives a GED certificate or an adult high school diploma

In addition to the educational gains, agencies report on three follow-up core outcome measures. As previously mentioned, these include follow-up by mail survey on students who entered employment, retained employment, and obtained placement in postsecondary education or training, and who indicated these outcomes as a primary or secondary goal. The 2002-2003 follow-up survey response rates were significantly higher than in 2001-2002, although they remained below 20 percent.

Data Quality

California has made quality data a top priority. CDE provides technical assistance and training to agency staff to increase their understanding of accountability requirements and to improve data

¹ A 5-point CASAS scale score gain for learners with a pre-test score of 210 or below, or a 3-point gain at post-test for learners with a pre-test score of 211 or higher

collection. However, a greater level of training and support is necessary to build this capacity among the increasing number of smaller agencies that are valuable contributors in the education of the state's diverse adult population.

At the state level, this ongoing commitment to the systematization and continuous improvement of data quality has positioned California to respond to NRS State Data Quality Standards. In compliance with 2002-2003 federal requirements, agencies began submitting data on a quarterly basis. This permits intermittent analysis throughout the program year, and promotes enhanced data quality. Agencies are able to detect and address problems with incomplete or inaccurate data earlier in the program year. It is important to acknowledge that federal requirements make it crucial for agencies to assign dedicated staff to manage assessment, data collection, and data analysis effectively at the local level.

While accountability requirements place a significant burden on resources, especially in smaller agencies, the majority of local program providers indicate an appreciation of the ability to use data to document and track student progress and program success, and to pinpoint opportunities for program improvement to increase responsiveness to learner priorities.

Leveraging What Works

Program Management

Responses to the Annual 2002-2003 Survey of WIA/AEFLA, Title II, 225/231 Programs in California indicate that local providers are leveraging the use of data more effectively, to a greater extent, and in a greater variety of ways, at the program and classroom level. Over 80 percent of respondents to the survey indicated that they use data to:

- Determine program improvement priorities
- Inform and provide feedback to staff
- Inform and provide feedback to students

Over 60 percent of respondents report that they now use data to communicate with governing bodies and other stakeholders (e.g. school board, legislators, and other decision makers) and as a tool for staff development.

Agencies report that they continue to refine and improve methods to track students, report outcomes and analyze information. Of the strategies employed, the most effective seem to be: consistently sharing data and assessment results with staff, establishing data quality control processes, and providing targeted training and professional development for all staff in the areas of accountability, data quality improvement, and data analysis. A majority of respondents (61percent) indicated great success with providing a designated coordinator in charge of assessment, and with implementing student orientation and goal-setting processes, including assessing students during registration or program entry.

At the Classroom Level

At the classroom level, instructors are using data to empower students and encourage learner accountability through the sharing of assessment results, and to augment student options and program flexibility through the development of individualized educational plans. Over 60 percent of agencies report that instructors:

- Use group assessment results to inform instruction
- Use individual assessment results to provide feedback to learners and instruction

Instructors use student needs assessments, program attendance and persistence information, and test results to drive and improve instruction, to adjust and improve curriculum, and to select materials and mode of presentation. Students use individual and class feedback to make informed choices regarding their own educational progress and to collaborate with faculty in determining instructional content, program focus, and learning objectives. The most effective classroom-level strategy identified in the survey was the use of data to provide instruction to meet students' needs and goals.

In summary, the increase in learning gains achieved this year is evidence of the efficacy of data-driven program improvement, which has emphasized and reinforced the four pillars of educational reform: (1) achievement and increased accountability for results; (2) flexibility and local control; (3) expanded options for students; and (4) the leveraging of proven instructional practices. The reported results validate CDE's investment in developing a statewide systemic infrastructure for the support and development of adult education providers, which has steadily built agency capacity to identify and meet the needs of California's adult learners.

QUESTION 3: COLLABORATION

Describe how the state has supported the integration of activities sponsored under Title II with other adult education, career development, and employment and training activities. Include a description of how the eligible agency is being represented on the Local Workforce Investment Board, the provision of core and other services through the One-Stop system, and an estimate of the Title II funds being used to support activities and services through the One-Stop delivery system.

Collaborative Arrangements and Integration of Activities

Local providers engage in a variety of collaborative arrangements that offer a direct benefit to their learners. Agencies cite partnerships with other educational providers, local community businesses, and California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) with greatest frequency. Adult Basic Education (ABE), English as a Second Language (ESL), and General Education Development Test (GED) and Adult Secondary Education (ASE) programs report successful collaborative arrangements with other schools or school districts as well as employment and training agencies. Family Literacy programs collaborate successfully with schools, libraries, and early childhood educational programs to provide childcare so the adults can learn. They also provide the children of adult learners with educational activities in which children and parents may participate together. EL Civics funded programs continue to form productive relationships with government and community service agencies that provide social services, health, childcare, and housing services, and with other federally-funded and state-funded educational programs such as Community Based English Tutoring (CBET) and Head Start. In 2002-2003, 13 percent of responding agencies formed partnerships with faith-based organizations. Recruitment of students through faith-based organization and offering on-site classes were cited as the most frequent types of collaborations.

Title II Integration with the WIA Title I One-Stop System

CDE continues to work with WIA Title I partners to support an effective integration of Title I and Title II activities. By building on local provider model programs and practices, California strives to improve and expand a comprehensive high quality workforce development system statewide. In pursuit of this systematization, differences between the objectives of AEFLA (which focus on providing basic learning skills including literacy skills instruction to those most in need) and the

objectives of the One-Stop system (which focus on postsecondary training and employability outcomes) present challenges, and require significant effort to align these two systems.

The annual statewide survey provides evidence of much effective collaboration between adult education and literacy providers and One-Stop systems; 57 percent of all survey respondents reported successful interactions with their local One-Stops. The survey also asked local providers to identify types of collaborative activities that involved local One-Stops. Fifty-eight percent reported receiving student referrals. Forty-one percent of survey respondents indicated that they offered classes in conjunction with One-Stops, up from 24 percent in 2001-2002. Career fairs, orientations, employer workshops, vocational assessment, and evaluation of learning disabilities extended the list of successful collaborative activities. In contrast, 29 percent of small agency respondents reported little or no involvement with One-Stops, indicating an opportunity for improved outreach, particularly in remote areas.

Representation on Local Workforce Investment Boards (WIB)

Over 49 percent of the 172 WIA survey respondents reported a successful degree of active engagement with the WIB, (the local governing board for the administration of Title I funds), of which there are fifty throughout the state. Referrals comprised the most frequently reported type of direct interaction. Others reported WIB participation such as attendance at meetings, board representation, or active membership. Thirty-one percent of respondents reported little or no interaction with their local WIB.

In November of 2002, CDE conducted an online survey of adult schools and literacy providers regarding their partnership with California's One-Stop system. The survey was formulated to capture current local perception, and is part of an ongoing project by the CDE Adult Education Office to improve the partnerships between adult education and the One-Stop system. Information was solicited in four key areas: (1) education services offered at the agency and at the One-Stop; (2) satisfaction with the number of people referred from the One-Stop; (3) existence of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the agency and the local WIB or One-Stop; and (4) agency representation on the local WIB. An open-ended set of questions asked for comments on effective partnerships, barriers, and state and local recommendations. Participation was voluntary, and resulted in a response rate of 22 percent.

The first section of the survey collected information about the variety of literacy services provided at the adult education site and at the One-Stop site. Adult education and literacy providers funded under WIA Title II are considered part of the "core and intensive services" in the One-Stop system and are required partners. Responses to the survey indicated the following:

- All respondents offered literacy classes at the school or agency site.
- Virtually all respondents (98 percent) offered literacy assessments at their school or agency site.
- Over half (58 percent) offered literacy assessments at the One-Stop.
- 32 percent of providers offered literacy classes at the One-Stop.

Many adult education agencies funded under WIA Title II also partner with the One-Stop system by offering vocational or pre-vocational classes. These classes are not funded by WIA but may be supported by other Federal sources such as Carl D. Perkins or WIA Title I. Adult education vocational courses are part of the "training services" offered through the One-Stop. The responses to the CDE survey in the area of vocational and pre-vocational classes revealed the following:

- 87 percent of respondents offered vocational or pre-vocational classes at school.
- 66 percent offered vocational or pre-vocational classes at the One-Stop.

According to respondents, certain key activities promoted effective partnerships at the local level:

- Agencies with an MOU feel their partnership is more effective.
- Creating formal liaisons or sharing staff improves relationships.
- One-Stop and adult education agencies in close proximity or with shared locations are more effective.
- Respondents feel that representation on the local WIB improves effectiveness.

One of the most frequently cited barriers to effective partnerships was bureaucracy, including conflicting accountability requirements and inconsistent paperwork requirements from neighboring WIBs.

Respondents made several recommendations and suggested policy changes for improving the relationship between adult education and literacy providers and the One-Stop system. These included:

- Clarify the role of adult education in the One-Stop system.
- Assist local providers in developing effective MOUs with their local One-Stop.
- Develop consistent systems at all One-Stops for training referrals.
- Collaborate to streamline and standardize data collection and accountability systems.
- Share case management information and tracking of referrals.

WIA Title II Funds Used to Support Activities and Services of One-Stops

CDE does not fund One-Stops directly; therefore, there is no way of estimating the amount of Title II funds being used to support activities and services through the One-Stop delivery system.

QUESTION 4: ENGLISH LITERACY CIVICS EDUCATION (EL CIVICS) GRANTS

Describe successful activities and services supported with EL Civics funds, including the number of programs receiving EL Civics grants and an estimate of the number of adult learners served.

Successful Activities and Services

EL Civics has had noteworthy impact on program content and instructional priorities, as well as the direction of professional development for participating instructors and the strength of interaction between participating agencies and various stakeholders within their communities. CDE's design and support of the implementation process for EL Civics has challenged grantees to improve responsiveness to student priorities and to increase involvement in the community at large. Administrative and instructional staffs of EL Civics agencies have accomplished the following:

- Designed and implemented student needs assessments that enable even low literacy learners to have a voice in selecting program priorities and objectives.
- Developed project-based curricula and supporting materials, which bridge the distance between the classroom and the community.
- Received intensive training in the use of performance-based assessments in addition to pencil and paper tests to measure student achievement

- Increased community outreach, not only by providing students with avenues for pursuing civic involvement, but by joining with local businesses, government, faith-based organizations, and social service agencies as active partners in bringing those students a powerful and relevant educational experience that carries into all aspects of community life and work.

Responding to the statewide annual survey, many agencies lauded the multiple benefits of EL Civics implementation. In a comment typical of many survey responses received, one Northern California adult school noted:

“EL Civics has made a positive impact on the entire ESL program. It has empowered students to apply English skills acquired in the classroom in real life by bringing real-life contexts into the classroom. It received high evaluation of students, teachers, and the administration. We feel it has a great potential for our program.”

The four Leadership Projects provided a comprehensive and integrated network of support to ensure the implementation of quality EL Civics programs in California. This capacity-building infrastructure helps funded agencies to meet NRS data quality and accountability standards, address the needs and objectives of California’s diverse learner population, increase learning options and program flexibility, and use data to drive program improvement. Leadership Projects also collaborate to identify, promote, and leverage effective program and classroom strategies, leading to increased student learning outcomes.

One of CDE’s most successful strategies over the past three years has been to contract and deploy a cadre of seasoned field practitioners—“EL Civics Program Specialists”—to assist local providers to develop and improve their EL Civics programs. These specialists work within an assigned geographic region, providing training and assistance to EL Civics agencies through workshops, site visits, telephone and e-mail contact, and regional networking meetings. These EL Civics field practitioners partner with CDE adult education consultant staff to provide comprehensive local assistance in fulfilling Federal and state accountability requirements including identification and refinement of student performance objectives, continuous improvement of data collection, reporting, and analysis processes, and development and implementation of additional assessment instruments. EL Civics Program Specialists also assist CDE by reviewing agency progress reports and disseminating information regarding research-based resources for assessment and instruction particularly suited to EL Civics programs.

Number of Programs Funded and Learners Served

The number of successful EL Civics programs has steadily increased over the three years since inception of the grant. From 2001-2002 to 2002-2003, the number of agencies doubled, and the number of students served more than doubled, as continuing agencies expanded their successful programs and additional agencies applied for funding. In 2002-2003, a total of 135 local agencies reported serving 86,050 students under the EL Civics grant authorized by USDE, under WIA Title II (see Appendix A).

Program Description and Contexts

Local agencies applied to CDE for EL Civics funding in one or more of the following categories:

Local Assistance Grants

- *Component 1, EL Civics Education Program Implementation Grants:* provide instruction in English language and literacy skills through contextualized and experiential learning and thematic units.
- *Component 2, Program Enrichment Grants:* add civic participation content and activities to ongoing ESL classroom instruction.
- *Component 3, Citizenship Preparation Grants:* supplement agency programs with collaborative, community-based literacy, civic participation, and citizenship preparation activities.

Capacity Building Activity

In 2002-2003, twenty-three agencies were awarded mini-grants to develop instructional products to enhance their EL Civics programs. The agencies received technical assistance and interim review as they formulated product development plans and draft versions of their products. Final products went through a rigorous review and approval process. Approved products include web-based citizenship materials, web-based staff development, and print and video supplementary civic participation lessons. Approved products are disseminated through the Outreach Technical Assistance Network (OTAN) Leadership Project.

Measuring and Reporting Learner and Program Outcomes

California agencies use the CASAS assessment and data collection system to document learner outcomes and benchmark attainment. CDE provides robust support resources to deliver staff development and technical assistance in support of continuous improvement of data quality and analysis.

The design of California's EL Civics program requires funded agencies to (1) identify priority civics objectives for program participants through student and community needs assessment; (2) describe the criteria used to measure, document, and report learner performance; (3) develop additional strategies to assess attainment of civics objectives that cannot be measured by paper and pencil tests, and (4) document ways in which they leverage results to improve program design and instructional practice. In addition to providing individual agencies with powerful tools for continued enhancement of their EL Civics programs, this information helps CDE to detect areas of needed support, and to identify and help disseminate information to all agencies regarding strategies that work.

Continuous Improvement

In a successful effort to capitalize on the advantages afforded by technology, CDE delivered EL Civics implementation training to newly funded agencies via Web cast in 2002-2003. The Web cast was broadcast to a number of designated downlink sites across the state, and delivered in conjunction with a hands-on workshop for participants at each site to give more detailed information on grant requirements and deliverables. The Web cast provided all participating California agencies with a simultaneous and consistent explanation of implementation guidelines. Attendees at each Web cast downlink site had the opportunity to submit questions, which were aggregated and answered during the Web cast. Subsequently, these questions and answers, in addition to a video of the Web cast, were made available on the web to all agencies for reference and review.

EL Civics agencies conducted student needs assessments as an initial step in determining their priority civics objectives. CDE ensured the provision of training and support in employing a variety of student needs assessment forms and formats, enabling students at all levels of proficiency to participate meaningfully in the information-gathering process. By basing

curriculum and instruction on learner-identified needs, agencies have been able to enhance recruitment, retention, and motivation, which is measured by increased benchmark achievement and enhanced learner outcomes.

Agencies submitted their civics objectives with corresponding language and literacy objectives to CDE for approval. This has been a challenging and labor-intensive endeavor for agency staff, requiring substantial training and support, including guidance in creating, administering and interpreting student needs assessments, formulating measurable learning objectives, and generating level-appropriate language and literacy objectives. From the approved list of submissions for 2002-2003, a list of 45 priority objectives with accompanying language and literacy objectives was refined and made available to agencies funded for the 2003-2004 program year. Agencies are now able to select objectives from this pre-approved list to match the priorities they identify through student and community needs assessment, further streamlining the approval process and allowing agencies to redirect valuable time and resources to the selection, development, and delivery of appropriate curriculum and assessment instruments.

To enhance program development and implementation in 2003-2004, Leadership Projects under CDE's direction:

- Created an intensive training module covering the development and implementation of additional assessments, which can be delivered in traditional workshop format or via distance learning alternative (CASAS).
- Continued the task of collecting and categorizing agency-developed additional assessments that can serve as models for others in developing their own performance-based assessment instruments (CASAS).
- Documented and evaluated the use of additional assessments, along several parameters, including the types of assessments being used, the types of performance assessments developed or adapted, the numbers of agencies using each type of assessment, the processes used for administration and scoring, and the assessment results obtained (CASAS).
- Provided workshops and technical support for EL Civics grantees to develop the required technology plan for CDE approval (OTAN).
- Provided support targeting technology implementation both as a development resource for instructors and as a means of increasing flexibility and options for learners (OTAN).
- Formed EL Civics regional networks to share information and resources (CALPRO).

Appendices

Appendix A: Provider Type Information

Number of Funded Agencies by Provider Type

Provider Type	1999-2000		2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Adult School	135	71.1	143	73.2	150	66.6	163	63.1
Community College	15	7.9	12	6.2	16	7.1	18	7.0
Community-Based Organization	13	6.8	13	6.7	26	11.6	43	16.7
Library	10	5.3	8	4.1	10	4.4	8	3.1
State Agency	5	2.6	4	2.1	4	1.8	4	1.6
Jail Program	9	4.7	9	4.6	13	5.8	14	5.4
County Office of Education	3	1.6	6	3.1	6	2.7	7	2.7
CSU*	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.4
Total	190	100.0	195	100.0	225	100.0	258	100.0

*California State University

Enrollment by Provider Type*

Provider Type	2001-2002		2002-2003	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Adult School	419,491	79.6	446,955	79.1
Community College	66,556	12.6	70,182	12.4
Community-Based Organization	3,298	0.6	6,105	1.1
Library	1,049	0.2	1,216	0.2
State Agency	26,233	5.0	29,099	5.1
Jail Program	7,360	1.4	8,367	1.5
County Office of Education	2,968	0.6	3,309	0.6
CSU	0	0.0	78	0.0
Total	526,955	100.0	565,311	100.0

EL Civics Enrollment by Provider Type*

Provider Type	2002-2003	
	<u>N</u>	%
Adult School	78,568	91.3
Community College	4,009	4.7
Community-Based Organization	2,858	3.3
Library	196	0.2
State Agency	0	0.0
Jail Program	0	0.0
County Office of Education	341	0.4
CSU	78	0.1
Total	86,050	100.0

* Enrollment totals include only those learners that met the criteria outlined by the National Reporting System for Adult Education (NRS).

Appendix B: Core Performance Measures Information

Entering Educational Functional Level	1999-00			2000-01			2001-02			2002-03		
	Performance Goal	Performance (Against all Enrollees)	Performance (Against Enrollees with Pre- & Post Test Results)	Performance Goal	Performance (Against all Enrollees)	Performance (Against Enrollees with Pre- & Post Test Results)	Performance Goal	Performance (Against all Enrollees)	Performance (Against Enrollees with Pre- & Post Test Results)	Performance Goal	Performance (Against all Enrollees)	Performance (Against Enrollees with Pre- & Post Test Results)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
ABE Beginning Literacy	13.0	13.0	45.2	15.0	22.6	51.7	17.0	25.7	52.4	20.0	21.2	43.9
ABE Beginning Basic	20.0	17.7	57.5	22.0	33.2	71.3	24.0	36.4	74.0	26.0	36.4	75.9
ABE Intermediate Low	20.0	18.0	65.7	22.0	34.5	71.2	24.0	37.7	73.6	26.0	38.1	73.0
ABE Intermediate High	22.0	13.7	32.4	24.0	29.3	54.0	26.0	29.9	52.7	27.0	29.6	53.6
ASE Low	NA	1.7	21.7	14.0	13.6	55.3	15.0	25.4	78.7	17.0	24.6	79.4
ASE High	7.0	18.5	14,399	8.0	26.9	66.8	9.0	28.3	68.0	11.0	30.5	69.6
ESL Beginning Literacy	18.0	14.1	71.6	20.0	30.6	88.1	22.0	32.2	88.0	24.0	33.6	87.3
ESL Beginning	20.0	12.5	58.0	22.0	26.7	65.9	24.0	28.4	67.2	24.0	30.2	66.7
ESL Intermediate Low	22.0	27.2	54.5	24.0	37.0	64.2	26.0	39.8	66.6	28.0	40.6	67.3
ESL Intermediate High	22.0	30.0	65.9	24.0	39.7	68.9	26.0	43.0	70.6	28.0	42.8	69.2
ESL Advanced Low	18.0	13.0	25.7	20.0	21.7	35.6	22.0	22.7	36.1	22.0	22.6	35.6
ESL Advanced High	N/A	18.1	35.8	N/A	17.7	36.8	N/A	19.3	38.0	N/A	18.8	36.4

Core Follow-Up Outcome Measures	1999-00			2000-01		2001-02		2002-03	
	Performance Goal	Performance (Students w/ Education or Employment Goal)*	Performance (Total Students)	Performance Goal	Performance (Students w/Education or Employment Goal)	Performance Goal	Performance (Students w/Education or Employment Goal)	Performance Goal	Performance (Students w/Education or Employment Goal)
	#	#	#	%	%	%	%	%	%
GED/HS Completion	12,000	14,399	21,056	8%	27%	9%	23%	11%	82%
Entered Employment	10,000	11,068	33,599	9.0	17.8	10.0	54.5	12.0	54.4
Retained Employment	18,000	25,877	55,256	11.0	34.3	12.0	85.7	14.0	81.9
Entered Postsecondary Education	23,000	392	8,287	6.0	11.7	7.0	60.4	8.0	53.5

* Either the student or local educational official reported these numerical performance values.

** These performance results were obtained from a year-end student survey and include those students that returned the survey. Performance from previous years, as mentioned, was based on data entered by students or local education officials. Results differed significantly based on the two methodologies. In addition, performance results are weighted by program.

Appendix C: Federal Tables
Index

Federal Table 1: Participants by Entering Educational Functioning Level, Ethnicity, and Sex

Federal Table 2: Participants by Age, Ethnicity, and Sex

Federal Table 3: Participants by Program Type and Age

Federal Table 4: Educational Gains and Attendance by Educational Functioning Level

Federal Table 4b: Educational Gains and Attendance for Pre- and Post-tested Participants

Federal Table 5: Core Follow-up Outcome Achievement

Federal Table 6: Participant Status and Program Enrollment

Federal Table 7: Adult Education Personnel by Function and Job Status

Table 1 – Program Year 2002-2003
Participants by Entering Educational Functioning Level, Ethnicity and Sex

Enter the number of participants* by educational functioning level,** ethnicity,** and sex.

Entering Educational Functioning Level (A)	American Indian or Alaskan Native		Asian		Black or African American		Hispanic or Latino		Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		White		Total (N)
	Male (B)	Female (C)	Male (D)	Female (E)	Male (F)	Female (G)	Male (H)	Female (I)	Male (J)	Female (K)	Male (L)	Female (M)	
ABE Beginning Literacy	130	59	216	206	1,598	737	2,150	1,252	115	99	2,064	1,420	10,046
ABE Beginning Basic Ed	210	120	274	199	1,963	982	3,713	2,279	182	99	1,411	640	12,072
ABE Intermediate Low	323	232	413	393	2,376	1,354	4,843	3,741	303	234	1,772	1,200	17,184
ABE Intermediate High	798	621	1,058	955	4,827	2,926	11,932	10,159	764	570	5,057	3,527	43,194
ABE Subtotal	1,461	1,032	1,961	1,753	10,764	5,999	22,638	17,431	1,364	1,002	10,304	6,787	82,496
ASE Low	641	620	1,341	1,392	3,434	3,197	11,628	12,186	962	838	7,172	6,392	49,803
ASE High	252	217	432	484	1,118	914	4,517	4,388	371	308	2,838	2,081	17,920
ASE Subtotal	893	837	1,773	1,876	4,552	4,111	16,145	16,574	1,333	1,146	10,010	8,473	67,723
ESL Beginning Literacy	106	115	1,471	3,390	73	152	8,935	10,013	36	69	548	846	25,754
ESL Beginning	556	663	5,840	12,765	294	536	45,068	51,895	188	349	2,389	3,882	124,425
ESL Intermediate Low	637	863	5,962	13,287	290	441	41,230	51,912	241	352	2,493	4,313	122,021
ESL Intermediate High	339	320	3,943	9,450	198	278	19,658	25,481	183	317	1,428	2,920	64,515
ESL Low Advanced	363	325	4,422	10,452	238	273	20,634	25,636	266	397	1,686	3,725	68,417
ESL High Advanced	57	33	918	2,221	50	45	2,606	2,660	39	84	358	889	9,960
ESL Subtotal	2,058	2,319	22,556	51,565	1,143	1,725	138,131	167,597	953	1,568	8,902	16,575	415,092
Total	4,412	4,188	26,290	55,194	16,459	11,835	176,914	201,602	3,650	3,716	29,216	31,835	565,311

*A participant is an adult who receives at least twelve (12) hours of instruction. Work-based project learners are not included in this table.

**See attached definitions for educational functioning levels.

***A participant should be included in the racial/ethnic group to which he or she appears to belong, identifies with, or is regarded in the community as belonging.

OMB Number 1830-0027, Expires 1/31/03.

Table 2 – Program Year 2002-2003
Participants by Age, Ethnicity and Sex

Enter the number of participants by age,* ethnicity, and sex.

Age Group (A)	American Indian or Alaskan Native		Asian		Black or African American		Hispanic or Latino		Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		White		Total (N)
	Male (B)	Female (C)	Male (D)	Female (E)	Male (F)	Female (G)	Male (H)	Female (I)	Male (J)	Female (K)	Male (L)	Female (M)	
16-18	644	449	1,683	1,277	2,944	2,109	17,952	12,984	873	595	4,950	3,500	49,960
19-24	1,500	1,000	3,427	4,994	4,157	2,832	56,941	41,390	1,244	871	6,644	5,968	130,968
25-44	1,828	2,122	10,453	27,268	6,715	5,234	85,373	116,293	1,143	1,504	11,358	13,129	282,420
45-59	348	514	5,896	13,881	2,261	1,281	13,202	25,182	290	570	3,930	5,441	72,796
60+	92	103	4,831	7,774	382	379	3,446	5,753	100	176	2,334	3,797	29,167
Total	4,412	4,188	26,290	55,194	16,459	11,835	176,914	201,602	3,650	3,716	29,216	31,835	565,311

The totals in Columns *B-M* should equal the totals in Column *B-M* of Table 1. Row totals in Column *N* should equal corresponding column totals in Table 3.
 OMB Number 1830-0027, Expires 1/31/03.

Table 3 – Program Year 2002-2003

Participants by Program Type and Age

Enter the number of participants by program type and age.

Program Type (A)	16-18 (B)	19-24 (C)	25-44 (D)	45-59 (E)	60+ (F)	Total (G)
Adult Basic Education	14,941	22,550	34,279	8,903	1,823	82,496
Adult Secondary Education	17,676	21,536	22,911	4,232	1,368	67,723
English-as-a-Second Language	17,343	86,882	225,230	59,661	25,976	415,092
Total	49,960	130,968	282,420	72,796	29,167	565,311

The total in Column *G* should equal the total in Column *N* of Table 1.

The total in Columns *B-F* should equal the totals for the corresponding rows in Column *N* of Table 2 and the total in Column *N* of Table 1.

OMB Number 1830-0027, Expires 1/31/03.

Table 4 – Program Year 2002-2003

Educational Gains and Attendance by Educational Functioning Level

Enter number of participants for each category listed, total attendance hours, and calculate percentage of participants completing each level.

Entering Educational Functioning Level (A)	Total Number Enrolled (B)	Total Attendance Hours (C)	Number Completed Level (D)	Number who Completed a Level and Advanced One or More Levels (E)	Number Separated Before Completed (F)	Number Remaining within Level (G)	Percentage Completing Level (H)
ABE Beginning Literacy	10,046	3,722,279	2,127	1,277	2,523	5,396	21%
ABE Beginning Basic Ed	12,072	1,962,836	4,395	2,581	3,972	3,705	36%
ABE Intermediate Low	17,184	2,765,684	6,553	3,226	6,040	4,591	38%
ABE Intermediate High	43,194	6,238,495	12,784	5,307	14,466	15,944	30%
ASE Low	49,803	5,079,759	12,239	3,647	18,170	19,394	25%
ASE High*	17,920	2,059,816	5,460	1,185	5,945	6,515	30%
ESL Beginning Literacy	25,754	2,847,185	8,647	6,475	7,999	9,108	34%
ESL Beginning	124,425	15,134,252	37,608	27,843	38,201	48,616	30%
ESL Intermediate Low	122,021	18,650,570	49,519	35,215	29,105	43,397	41%
ESL Intermediate High	64,515	10,779,085	27,642	19,107	15,380	21,493	43%
ESL Low Advanced	68,417	11,664,793	15,431	10,261	19,390	33,596	23%
ESL High Advanced	9,960	1,545,053	1,872	1,211	3,322	4,766	19%
Total	565,311	82,449,807	184,277	117,335	164,513	216,521	33%

The total in Column B should equal the total in Column N of Table 1.

Column D + F + G should equal the total in Column B.

Each row total in Column H is calculated using the following formula:

Work-based project learners are not included in this table.

*Completion of ASE high level is attainment of a secondary credential or passing GED tests.

OMB Number 1830-0027, Expires 1/31/03.

Table 4b – Program Year 2002-2003

Educational Gains and Attendance for Pre- and Post-tested Participants

Enter number of pre- and post-tested participants for each category listed, calculate percentage of post-tested participants completing each level, and enter total attendance hours for post-tested completion.

Entering Educational Functioning Level (A)	Total Number Enrolled Pre- and Post-tested (B)	Total Attendance Hours (C)	Number Completed Level (D)	Number who Completed a Level and Advanced One or More Levels (E)	Number Separated Before Completed (F)	Number Remaining within Level (G)	Percentage Completing Level (H)
ABE Beginning Literacy	4,849	2,237,831	2,127	1,277	321	2,401	44%
ABE Beginning Basic Ed	5,792	1,409,612	4,395	2,581	531	866	76%
ABE Intermediate Low	8,974	2,062,836	6,553	3,226	1,017	1,404	73%
ABE Intermediate High	23,834	4,790,155	12,784	5,307	4,147	6,903	54%
ASE Low	15,406	2,342,653	12,239	3,647	1,207	1,960	79%
ASE High*	7,849	1,273,367	5,460	1,185	984	1,405	70%
ESL Beginning Literacy	9,903	1,890,641	8,647	6,475	316	940	87%
ESL Beginning	56,412	10,979,677	37,608	27,843	4,836	13,968	67%
ESL Intermediate Low	73,534	15,256,219	49,519	35,215	5,904	18,111	67%
ESL Intermediate High	39,957	8,980,409	27,642	19,107	3,362	8,953	69%
ESL Low Advanced	43,404	9,748,173	15,431	10,261	7,035	20,938	36%
ESL High Advanced	5,142	1,143,790	1,872	1,211	898	2,372	36%
Total	295,056	62,115,363	184,277	117,335	30,558	80,221	62%

Included in this table are only students who were both pre- and post-tested.

Column *D* is the total number of learners who completed a level, including learners who left after completing and learners who remain enrolled and moved to one or more higher levels.

Column *E* represents a sub-set of Column *D* (Number Completed Level) and is learners who completed a level and enrolled in one or more higher levels.

Column *F* includes students who left the program or received no services for 90 consecutive days and have no scheduled services.

Column $D + F + G$ should equal the total in Column *B*.

Column *G* represents the number of learners still enrolled who are at the same educational level as when entering.

Each row total in Column *H* is calculated using the following formula: $H = \text{Column } D / \text{Column } B$

Work-based project learners are not included in this table.

*Completion of ASE high level is attainment of a secondary credential or passing GED tests.

OMB Number 1830-0027, Expires 1/31/03.

Table 5 – Program Year 2002-2003

Core Follow-up Outcome Achievement

Enter the number of participants for each of the categories listed and calculate the percentage achieving each outcome.

Core Follow-up Outcome Measures	Number of Participants with Main or Secondary Goal	Number of Participants Included in Survey (Sampled and Universe)	Number of Participants Responding to Survey or Used for Data Matching	Response Rate or Percent Available for Match	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome	Weighted Average Percent Achieving Outcome
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)
Entered Employment*	15,633	14,082	2,412	17%	1,254	54%
Retained Employment**	6,808	6,049	1,036	17%	852	82%
Obtained a GED or Secondary School Diploma***	48,496	N/A	43,229	89%	12,364	28%
Entered Postsecondary Education or Training****	14,523	13,132	2,499	19%	1,209	53%

* Report in Column B the number of participants who were unemployed at entry and who had a main or secondary goal of obtaining employment and exited during the program year.

**Report in Column B: (1) the number of participants who were unemployed at entry and who had a main or secondary goal of employment who exited in the first and second quarter and entered employment by the end of the first quarter after program exit, and (2) the number of participants employed at entry who had a main or secondary goal of improved or retained employment who exited in the first and second quarter. Exclude from this total all participants who exited in the third and fourth quarters of the program year (see Implementation Guidelines for explanation).

*** Report in Column B the number of participants with a main or secondary goal of passing the GED tests or obtaining a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent. **Effective the program year beginning July 1, 2001** report in Column B *only* students with this goal who *exited* during the program year.

**** Report in Column B the number of participants with a main or secondary goal of placement in postsecondary education or training. **Effective the program year beginning July 1, 2001** report in Column B *only* students with this goal who *exited* during the program year.

OMB Number 1830-0027, Expires 1/31/03.

**Table 6 – Program Year 2002-2003
Participant Status and Program Enrollment**

Enter the number of participants for each of the categories listed.

Participant Status on Entry into the Program (A)	Number (B)
Disabled	9,162
Employed	201,760
Unemployed	157,109
Not in the Labor Force	83,507
On Public Assistance	28,548
Living in Rural Areas*	Not Collected
Program Type	
In Family Literacy Programs**	16,705
In Workplace Literacy Programs**	1,422
In Programs for the Homeless**	1,773
In Programs for Work-based Project Learners**	0
Institutional Programs	
In Correctional Facilities	33,668
In Community Correctional Programs	677
In Other Institutional Settings	Not Collected
Secondary Status Measures (Optional)	
Low Income	3,527
Displaced Homemaker	1,912
Single Parent	21,073
Dislocated Worker	1,341
Learning Disabled Adults	Not Collected

*Rural areas are places of less than 2,500 inhabitants and outside urbanized areas.

**Participants counted here must be in program specifically designed for that purpose.

OMB Number 1830-0027, Expires 1/31/03.

Table 7 – Program Year 2002-2003
Adult Education Personnel by Function and Job Status

Enter an unduplicated count of personnel by function and job status.

Function (A)	Adult Education Personnel		Unpaid Volunteers (D)
	Total Number of Part-time Personnel (B)	Total Number of Full-time Personnel (C)	
State-level Administrative/ Supervisory/Ancillary Services	0	34	0
Local-level Administrative/ Supervisory/Ancillary Services	340	771	79
Local Teachers	8,454	2,696	398
Local Counselors	126	74	0
Local Paraprofessionals	895	883	213

In Column *B*, count one time only each part-time employee of the program administered under the Adult Education State Plan who is being paid out of Federal, State, and/or local education funds.

In Column *C*, count one time only each full-time employee of the program administered under the Adult Education State Plan who is being paid out of Federal, State, and/or local education funds.

In Column *D*, report the number of volunteers (personnel who are not paid) who served in the program administered under the Adult Education State Plan.

OMB Number 1830-0027, Expires 1/31/03.