

California WIA Title II Program Implementation

Voices from the Field



July 1, 2002-June 30, 2003

Prepared for the California Department of Education by **CASAS**

California WIA Title II Program Implementation Voices from the Field

July 1, 2002-June 30, 2003

Contents

Acknowledgements	1
1 Introduction	3
The California State Plan	3
The Twelve Considerations	3
Using the Evaluation Findings	4
2 Methodology and Process	5
Data Collection	5
Data Review and Analysis	5
Profiles of Agency Respondents	6
<i>Respondents by Agency Size</i>	7
3 Implementing WIA Title II at the Program Management Level	10
Introduction	10
Key Findings for National Reporting System Core Indicators of Performance	10
<i>Literacy Skill Level Completion</i>	10
<i>Core Performance Follow-Up Measures</i>	10
Three Years of Summary Learner Data	12
Data Collection and Reporting	13
<i>Timeliness of Data Submissions</i>	13
<i>Data Quality</i>	13
<i>Use of Data</i>	14
Program Improvement Priorities	15
<i>Priorities by Agency Size</i>	16
<i>Trend Data: Refocusing Program Improvement Priorities</i>	16
<i>Successful Program Management Strategies</i>	17
<i>Key Program Management Strategies by Agency Size</i>	19
<i>Response to State Budget Cuts</i>	20
Summary: Program Management Strategies	21
Attendance and Retention Factors	21
<i>Targeting Instruction to Students' Needs and Goals</i>	22
<i>Student Bonding with Individual Teachers</i>	23
<i>Least-Used Strategies to Improve Attendance and Retention</i>	23
<i>Open vs. Managed Enrollment</i>	24
<i>Student Orientation Programs</i>	24
<i>Programs Most Affected by Attendance and Retention Factors</i>	25
<i>Other Factors Influencing Attendance or Retention</i>	25

Coordination and Collaboration	26
One-Stops	26
<i>The CDE Survey on Collaboration with One-Stops</i>	28
Workforce Investment Boards	28
<i>Other Collaborations</i>	31
Professional Development	32
<i>Priorities for Administrators</i>	32
<i>Trend: Changes in Professional Development Priorities for Administrators</i>	32
<i>Professional Development Priorities for Administrators by Agency Size</i>	32
<i>Priorities for Instructors</i>	33
<i>Trend: Changes in Professional Development Priorities for Instructors</i>	34
<i>Primacy of Technology as a Professional Development Priority for Instructors</i>	34
<i>Priorities for Instructors by Agency Size</i>	34
<i>Trend: Additional Changes in Professional Development Priorities for Instructors</i>	36
<i>Trend: Increase in Percentage of Agencies Identifying EL Civics as a High Professional Development Priority for Instructors</i>	36
<i>Professional Development Priorities for Other Staff</i>	36
<i>Professional Development Priorities for Support Staff by Agency Size</i>	37
Leadership Projects	38
<i>Agency Access to Leadership Project Services</i>	38
<i>Most Regularly Accessed</i>	39
<i>Using Services Provided by CALPRO</i>	40
<i>Using Services Provided by CDLP</i>	41
<i>Most Frequently Used Services Provided by Leadership Projects</i>	41
<i>Effectiveness of Services Provided by Leadership Projects</i>	42
Professional Development: Summary	42
4 Implementing WIA Title II at the Classroom Level	43
Introduction	43
Effective Educational Practices	43
<i>Key Instructional Strategies</i>	43
Technology	45
<i>Technology Use by Classroom Instructors</i>	45
<i>Increased Use of Technology</i>	46
<i>Computer Use By Agency Size</i>	47
<i>Using Other Forms of Technology</i>	48
<i>Distance Learning</i>	48
<i>Distance Learning, ADA, and CAP</i>	50

EL Civics	51
<i>Implementation</i>	51
<i>Numbers of Programs and Contexts</i>	51
<i>Promoting Civic Participation</i>	51
<i>Ensuring Successful Activities: Focus Group Feedback</i>	52
<i>Performance (Additional) Assessments</i>	52
<i>Types of Additional Assessments</i>	53
<i>Challenges and Resolutions</i>	53
Program Support	54
<i>Teacher Support and Concerns</i>	54
<i>EL Civics Program Specialists</i>	55
<i>Types of Assistance Provided</i>	56
<i>Suggestions from the Field</i>	56
EL Civics: Summary and Recommendations	57
The California High School Exit Exam	58
5 Summary and Recommendations	61
Data Collection and Reporting	61
<i>Data Match</i>	62
Program Management Strategies	62
<i>Attendance and Retention</i>	62
<i>Professional Development</i>	63
<i>Evidenced-Based Research</i>	64
Program Support Resources	65
<i>Leadership Projects</i>	65
<i>Technology</i>	65
Collaboration and Coordination	66
<i>Coordination</i>	66
<i>Advisory Groups</i>	66
Appendixes	
A. The Twelve Considerations	I
B. Federal Table 1: Serving the Most in Need	II
C. 2002-2003 Survey of WIA/AEFLA, Title II, 225/231 Programs in California	III

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to the staff in Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Title II funded programs throughout the state who took the time and effort to complete and submit the surveys mailed to them in May 2003. We would also like to thank the program administrators, coordinators, and instructors who took time from their busy schedules to participate in regional focus groups held throughout the state and at the CASAS (Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System) Summer Institute on June 18, 2003. Our sincere appreciation also goes to members of the Field Evaluation Design Team, the Program Evaluation Team, members of the California Department of Education (CDE) Adult Education Office and the State Leadership Projects, and the Technical Advisory Group who participated in the review of the draft survey document and assisted in the analysis and interpretation of survey data.

Susie Custodia was the principal writer, assisted by Grant Behnke and Autumn Keltner. Dick Stiles served as technical advisory coordinator. Patricia Rickard assisted with the evaluation design and acted as advisor to the evaluation project. Jared Jacobsen and Joe Silverman provided quantitative data and data analysis. Glen Ochoa and Matthew Cloney developed and coordinated the online survey design, data collection, and data aggregation process. Jennifer Suarez was responsible for print production. Ardis Breslauer, Robert Brown, Susie Custodia, Peggy Doherty, Sue Gilmore, Barbara Lehman, Pat Reed, Adriana Sanchez-Aldana, Jo Smith, Gary Sutherland, Patricia Thompson, and Susana van Bezooijen acted as facilitators for focus groups. Patricia Rickard, Susan Bacerra, Debalina Ganguli, and Jenny Garcia assisted with data aggregation and analysis plus integration of the quantitative data. Susan Bacerra and Matthew Cloney assisted with the development of graphic displays and presentations. Nancy Taylor provided review and editing of the document.

We extend our special thanks to those persons who participated in the project design, survey development, data analysis, and review processes. The data interpretations and program improvement recommendations received from the group of experienced adult education practitioners listed below were an extremely valuable contribution to the development of this document.

Technical Advisory Group

Jean Scott, CDE

Richard Stiles, Consultant

Sylvia Ramirez, MiraCosta College

2002-03

Field Evaluation Design Team

Kathy Block-Brown, CDE

Jose Ortega, CDE

Sharon Brannon, Montebello Adult School

Nancy Brooks, Rancho Santiago Community College District

Susan Lytle Gilmore, Sacramento City Unified School District

Wendi Maxwell, a CDE consultant
Marilyn Knight-Mendelson, Napa Valley Adult School
Barbara Lehman, Fresno Adult School
Kimberley Garth-Lewis, CDE
Adriana Sanchez-Aldana, Sweetwater Adult Resource Center
Gary Sutherland, California Department of Corrections

2003-04

Program Evaluation Team

Jean Scott, CDE
Dick Stiles, Consultant
Grant Behnke, Consultant
Adriana Sanchez-Aldana, Sweetwater Adult Resource Center
Barbara Lehman, Fresno Adult School
Cyndi Parulan-Colfer, Hacienda la Puente, CAEAA*
Ed Morris, Los Angeles Unified School District
Gary Sutherland, California Department of Corrections
Nancy Brooks, Rancho Santiago Community College District
Susan Lytle Gilmore, Sacramento Unified School District, ACSA**
Traci Dobronravova, Self Help for the Elderly

In addition to the persons listed above, we would also like to thank the members of the EL Civics Education Implementation Team who participated in the analysis and review of EL Civics education program data:

- The CDE EL Civics Team representatives: Mahnoush Harirsaz, Cliff Moss, Jose Ortega, and Myra Young
- CASAS EL Civics Program Specialists: Ardis Breslauer, Peggy Doherty, Lori Howard, Cuba Miller, Pat Reed, Lynne Robinson, Jo Smith, Patricia Thompson, and Susana van Bezooijen

* California Adult Education Administrators' Association

** Association of California School Administrators

1 INTRODUCTION

CASAS received 162 responses to the *2002-03 Survey of WIA Title II 225/231 Programs in California* released to the 258 funded local providers in California and posted online the first week of May. Respondents completing surveys came from a wide range of programs including K-12 school district adult schools, community college districts (CCDs), community-based organizations (CBOs), library literacy programs, county offices of education (COEs), jail programs, and four state agencies: California Department of Corrections (CDC), California Youth Authority (CYA), California Conservation Corps (CCC), and the California Department of Developmental Services (CDDS – state hospitals). Programs varied by size – including small, medium, and large agencies – and by geographic location.

The California State Plan

The California State Plan describes processes for evaluating local programs and provides details on how the state will use the evaluation findings to facilitate program improvement. This plan states:

A comprehensive evaluation of the federally funded Adult Education and Literacy Act program will be conducted annually and will address the extent to which local providers have implemented each of the twelve required activities specified in Sections 225 and 231.¹ This evaluation will: (1) collect local provider and student performance measures as specified in Chapter 5, (2) determine the level of student performance improvement, (3) identify program quality, and (4) determine the extent to which the populations specified in the State plan were served.” The Plan further states that the major focus of the evaluation is to be the effectiveness of state and local providers in attaining the core indicator performance levels negotiated with the U. S. Department of Education, Division of Adult Education and Literacy (ED/DAEL).

Results of the evaluation will provide relevant information about the

1. effectiveness of the Section 225/231 and EL Civics education grant programs.
2. characteristics of learners participating in each of the programs.
3. analyses of student learning gains and other outcomes.
4. extent to which populations specified in the state plan were served.
5. identification of best practices and emerging needs.

The Twelve Considerations

As indicated above, the annual evaluation of the WIA Title II program is to address the extent to which local providers have implemented each of the twelve required activities or considerations specified in Sections 225 and 231 of the WIA legislation. These twelve considerations have become an integral component of the California Compliance Review (CCR), the state’s program monitoring process. The CCR document provides agencies

¹ See Appendix A for a detailed list of the 12 required activities, referred to in the WIA Title II legislation as considerations.

with specific indicators of the extent to which their programs should incorporate each of the 12 considerations required by the federal legislation. The twelve considerations are also used to define the scope of services to be provided and the scoring criteria for applications for funding under WIA Title II in California.

While accountability requirements continue to place an additional burden on resources, especially in smaller agencies, the majority of local program providers responding to the survey have reported that they now realize the necessity and benefits of data-driven continuous improvement and appreciate having the ability to document and track student program progress and success.

Using the Evaluation Findings

The CDE can use the evaluation findings to

- obtain critical information about the effectiveness of the state and local WIA Title II educational services providers in attaining the core indicator performance levels negotiated with the ED.
- identify strategies, processes, and barriers to attaining the levels of performance of the core indicators.
- identify best practices and emerging needs.
- review and evaluate the outcomes, progress, and extent of program improvement.
- inform the WIA Title II reauthorization process.

Local agencies can use the evaluation report findings to

- maintain and promote responsiveness to the needs of students and community.
- learn and benefit from experiences and promising practices of other programs.
- compare local program data with statewide results to facilitate future planning and continuous program improvement.
- provide accountability and document program impact to local, state, and federal policymakers.

2 METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS

CASAS staff actively elicited feedback from the field in the survey development and review process to ensure that all stakeholders and providers of 225/231 programs would have the opportunity to contribute to the data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes, as well as to participate in the development of recommendations to the CDE. Program representatives were from small, medium, and large agencies providing 225/231 programs and services through adult schools, CCDs, CBOs, library literacy programs, state agencies, and COEs. Members of the CDE staff and members of the CASAS Field Evaluation Design Team, who represent 225/231 funded agencies, reviewed the draft survey prepared by the CASAS Evaluation Project staff. The final survey and questionnaire were sent to all 225/231 WIA Title II programs in California on May 1, 2003.

Survey respondents had two options for providing information about their programs. They could complete the survey by hand and mail it to CASAS or complete the survey online. Program coordinators were notified of this option via the California Outreach and Technical Assistance Network (OTAN) Web site and were encouraged to use this medium to respond to survey questions.

Summaries of field notes from focus group meetings represented an additional data source for the report. The purpose of the focus groups was to obtain additional “voices from the field” and collect qualitative data to

- document in a systematic fashion what is working in local programs.
- encourage program improvement and collaborations.
- identify strategies that are making a difference in agency classrooms in the areas of student retention and attainment of outcomes.

Data Collection

The data collection process for this report involved the collection of qualitative program level data from several sources: (1) the *2002-03 Survey of WIA, Title II, 225/231 Programs in California*, (2) regional and CASAS Summer Institute focus groups, and (3) oral and written feedback from the data review group and the Field Evaluation Design Team. Of these data sources, survey data represent the major data source for this report. Survey respondents represented small, medium, and large agencies providing WIA Title II programs and services to 815,310 learners² from diverse ethnic, educational, and socio-economic backgrounds through adult schools, CCDs, CBOs, library literacy programs, state agencies, and COEs throughout the state of California.

Data Review and Analysis

In 2002-03, 258 agencies received WIA Title II funding in California. Of the 258 funded agencies, 162 agencies (63 percent) returned completed questionnaires: one by mail and 161 online. The 162 agencies that submitted responses to the survey represent

² See Appendix B for specific demographic information.

small, medium, and large agencies of all provider types located in urban, suburban, and rural areas throughout California. CASAS staff aggregated and analyzed survey data by agency size, type, and geographic location. These demographics can be meaningful factors in the selection and application of program and classroom management strategies by agencies. Where the meaningfulness is evident, it is discussed within the context of the specific survey question.

The total number of responses to each question included in the WIA Title II 225/231 survey varied from question to question. Some survey respondents provided multiple responses to some questions and did not respond to other questions. Therefore, the total *N* indicated varies from table to table. In some instances, numbers were rounded to the nearest decimal point or to the nearest whole number. In these cases, the totals may not add up to exactly 100 percent.

Profiles of Agency Respondents

In 2002-03, 258 agencies received WIA Title II funding, an increase over the 225 agencies that received this funding the year before. Adult schools continue to make up the majority of these agencies; however all agency types, with the exception of library literacy programs, demonstrated enrollment increases over 2001-02.

Funded agencies in California provided educational services in one or more of the following WIA Title II grant categories during 2002-03:

1. Section 231 – 241 agencies received Section 231 funding.
2. Section 225 – 17 agencies received funding to serve institutionalized adults.
3. EL Civics – 106 agencies received both EL Civics and Section 231 funding, while 30 agencies received EL Civics funding only.

Table 2.1
CDE Funded Agencies by Provider Type 1999-2003

Provider Type	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003
Adult school	134	143	150	163
Community college	15	12	16	18
Community-based organization	13	13	26	43
Library literacy	10	8	10	8
County office of education	3	5	6	7
California Conservation Corps*	1	1	1	1
California State University**	0	0	0	1
225 funded***	13	13	16	17
Total	189	195	225	258

*For purposes of this report, this agency is classified in other tables as a state agency

**This agency did not respond to the survey and is not included in other tables in this report

***Included in this provider type are agencies for institutionalized adults – CDC, CDDS, and CYA – which are classified in other tables in this report as state agencies

CASAS 2004

Table 2.2
Survey Respondents by Provider Type 2001-03

Provider Type	2001-02	2002-03
Adult schools	107	118
Community based organizations	8	20
Community college districts	9	7
County offices of education	2	2
Jail programs	3	4
Library literacy programs	4	7
State agencies	2	4
Total	135	162

CASAS 2004

The 118 adult schools that responded to the 2002-03 WIA Title II survey represent 73 percent of all survey responses and 73 percent of the 163 adult schools that received WIA Title II funding. Seven of the 18 funded CCDs (39 percent) responded to the survey. Of the 43 funded CBOs, 20 (47 percent) responded to the survey; those 20 agencies represent 12 percent of the total number of survey responses received.

Respondents by Agency Size

Three broad-based categories encompass agency size designation: small (500 annual enrollments or less), medium (501 to 8,000 enrollments), and large (greater than 8,000 enrollments). The highest number of survey respondents fell within the medium category (60 percent), followed by small (30 percent), and large (9 percent).

Table 2.3
Total Number of Funded Agencies by Size by Program Year

	1999-2000		2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small	52	29.5	50	27.5	71	31.8	92	35.7
Medium	112	63.7	118	64.8	135	60.6	149	57.7
Large	12	6.8	14	7.7	17	7.6	17	6.6
Total	176	100.0	182	100.0	223	100.0	258	100.0

CASAS 2004

Table 2.4
Survey Respondents by Agency Size

Agency Size	N	%
Small (500 students or less)	49	30
Medium (501 to 8000 students)	98	60
Large (8001 or more students)	15	9
Total	162	100

CASAS 2004

Of the 17 large funded agencies in 2002-03, 15 (88 percent) responded to the survey, compared with 98 of 149 medium agencies (66 percent) and 49 of 92 small agencies (53 percent). (See Table 2.5)

Table 2.5
Percentage of Respondents from Each Size Funded Agency

Agency Size	%
Small (500 students or less)	53
Medium (501 to 8000 students)	66
Large (8001 or more students)	88
Total	63

CASAS 2004

Across provider types, adult schools (of which 8 percent were large agencies), CCDs (of which 17 percent were large agencies), and state agencies (of which 25 percent were large agencies) were the sole large agency provider types (see Table 2.6). The majority of adult schools (74 percent) and CCDs (61 percent) were medium-sized.

Table 2.6
2002-03 Funded Agencies by Provider Type and Size

Provider Type	Small		Medium		Large		Type Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adult schools	29	18	121	74	13	8	163	100
Community colleges	4	22	11	61	3	17	18	100
CBOs	40	93	3	7	0	0	43	100
Library literacy	8	100	0	0	0	0	8	100
State agencies	0	0	3	75	1	25	4	100
Jail programs*	6	43	8	57	0	0	14	100
County offices of education	4	57	3	43	0	0	7	100

* Not including CDC and CYA, which are classified as state agencies for the purposes of this report.

CASAS 2004

When broken out by size, the percentage of funded agencies by provider type closely mirrors the percentage of survey respondents by provider type.

Table 2.7
2002-03 Survey Respondents by Provider Type and Size

Provider Type	Small		Medium		Large		Type Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adult schools	18	15	89	75	11	9	118	100
Community colleges	1	14	3	43	3	43	7	100
CBOs	19	95	1	5	0	0	20	100
Library literacy	7	100	0	0	0	0	7	100
State agencies	0	0	3	75	1	25	4	100
Jail programs*	2	50	2	50	0	0	4	100
County offices of education	2	100	0	0	0	0	2	100

* Not including CDC and CYA, which are classified as state agencies for the purposes of this report.

CASAS 2004

Of the 162 survey respondents, 95 were EL Civics (ELC) funded agencies. Of those 95, 69 were adult schools (72 percent), 15 were CBOs, 5 were CCDs, 2 were COEs, and 4 were library literacy programs. The respondents from these EL Civics agencies represented 59 percent of the total number of survey respondents, and more than 50 percent of the respondents from each participating EL Civics provider type.

Table 2.8
2002-03 EL Civics Respondents by Provider Type

Provider Type	N of ELC funded Respondents	% of ELC funded Respondents only	% of All Survey Respondents
Adult schools	69	72	58
Community colleges	5	5	71
CBOs	15	16	75
Library literacy	4	4	57
State agencies	0	0	0
Jail programs*	0	0	0
County offices of education	2	2	100
Total	95	100	59

* Not including CDC, CYA, and CDDS, which are classified as state agencies for the purposes of this report.
 CASAS 2004

Survey responses from the wide array of provider types and sizes were analyzed along with responses from focus group sessions to provide an overall view of how local agencies implemented WIA Title II considerations in their programs. Respondents provided valuable information defining the successes and challenges they encountered from the initial implementation of WIA Title II to its continued implementation in 2002-03.

3 IMPLEMENTING WIA TITLE II AT THE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT LEVEL

Introduction

This chapter examines accountability, program improvement, attendance and retention, professional development, collaboration, and other strategies and resources that survey respondents are implementing at the program management level.

Key Findings for National Reporting System Core Indicators of Performance **Literacy Skill Level Completion**

The National Reporting System (NRS) established guidelines to determine educational gains based upon literacy skill level completion. From these guidelines, California established performance goals for its adult education providers. The CDE uses CASAS assessments that measure literacy skills in a standardized continuum, providing an accurate and reliable measure of learning gains and goal attainment. During the program year 2002-03, California met or exceeded all 12 of its NRS core performance goals for literacy skill level completion.

Table 3.1

NRS Core Performance Measures: Literacy Skill Level Completion for NRS Eligible Learners

Entering Educational Functioning Level	Calif. 2002-03 Performance Goal	Calif. 2002-03 Performance (against all enrollees)	Calif. 2002-03 Performance (against enrollees with pre- and post-test results)
	%	%	%
ABE Beginning Literacy	20.0	21.2	43.9
ABE Beginning Basic	26.0	36.4	75.9
ABE Intermediate Low	26.0	38.1	73.0
ABE Intermediate High	22.0	29.6	53.6
ASE Low	7.0	24.6	79.4
ASE High	11.0	30.5	69.6
ESL Beginning Literacy	24.0	33.6	87.3
ESL Beginning	24.0	30.2	66.7
ESL Intermediate Low	28.0	40.6	67.3
ESL Intermediate High	28.0	42.8	69.2
ESL Advanced Low	22.0	22.6	35.6
ESL Advanced High	NA	18.8	36.4

CASAS 2004

Core Performance Follow-Up Measures

The NRS requires agencies to document student progress toward meeting the core indicators of performance established under the legislation, as shown in Table 3.2. Local agencies report these outcomes for those learners who had one of the following four goals and left their instructional program to (1) enter employment, (2) retain employment, (3) enter postsecondary education or training, or (4) attain a diploma of high school graduation or General Educational Development (GED) certificate.

Local agencies use a student follow-up survey to provide learner outcomes for those who entered employment, retained employment, and entered postsecondary education or training. Response rates for 2002-03 ranged between 17 percent and 19 percent. These rates, although representing a relatively small proportion of those learners who were surveyed, were an improvement from the rates achieved in 2001-02, which ranged from nine to 10 percent.

Results for students attaining a GED certificate were obtained using a data match. Data match results revealed that almost one-third (27.6 percent) of these learners achieved their goal.

Table 3.2

2002-03 Core Follow-Up Outcome Achievement						
Core Follow-Up Outcome Measures	Participants with Main or Secondary Goal	Participants Included in Survey or Data Match	Participants Responding to Survey or Data Match	Response or Data Match Rate	Participants Achieving Outcome	Weighted Percent Achieving Outcome
	N	N	N	%	N	%
Entered Employment	15,633	14,082	2,412	17.1	1,254	54.4
Retained Employment	6,808	6,049	1,036	17.1	852	81.9
Obtained GED or Secondary School Diploma	48,496	N/A	43,229	89.1	12,364	27.6
Entered Postsecondary Education or Training	14,523	13,132	2,499	19.0	1,209	53.5
CASAS 2004						

In their responses to the 2001-02 survey questions, providers cited the transience of the population as a barrier to the tracking of students who left the program. They also noted the lack of response from students to a follow-up survey and the reluctance of students to provide the type of information asked for, because of privacy concerns. Add to this the labor and costs involved, and agency consensus was that the follow-up by mail survey required disproportionately high effort and expense. These same factors were expressed in focus group sessions held during the 2002-03 program year, and were confirmed by members of the Field Evaluation Design Team.

California does not have a unique and reliable student identification system, nor does the state currently allow the use of Social Security numbers as a data match for employment-related goals and goals of entry into post-secondary education for WIA Title II programs. Therefore, the ability to capture a more complete and accurate measure of core performance indicators is hampered. Data match would provide continuously updated, reliable, and comprehensive information to accurately reflect program success and assist in targeting program-level improvement, as well as inform policy decisions and state-level actions.

Three Years of Summary Learner Data

The numbers of learners enrolling in WIA Title II programs in California has increased by more than 171, 000 over the three year period from 2000 to 2003 (See Table 3.3). However, NRS requirements limit the reporting of data to those learners who have had twelve or more hours of instruction, are not concurrently enrolled in a K-12 program, are at least sixteen years of age, and have a valid instructional program. Applying the NRS criteria substantially decreases the number of learners that California is able to include in its reports to the Federal Department of Education.

Of the 815,310 learners with Entry Records in 2002-03, 249,999, more than 30 percent of those who enrolled, could not be included in the report because they did not meet one or more of the criteria cited above.

Table 3.3

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/K-12	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

CASAS 2004

Table 3.4 provides summaries of data on learner performance outcomes and salient data rates for the past three years. Over these years, the percent of learners qualifying for inclusion in the Federal Report has consistently increased; however, the salient data rates for the five categories monitored appear to have stabilized.

1. The rate of Entry Records included in the Federal Tables has stabilized around 70 percent: 73.4 percent attained in 2000-2001, 68.3 percent in 2001-02, and 69.3 percent in 2002-03.
2. The percent of students with paired data is just above 50 percent.
3. The percent of students completing a level is just above 30 percent.
4. The percent of students with paired scores completing a level is just above 60 percent.
5. The annual enrollment has increased between 3.7 percent and 11.4 percent, with an overall gain of 19.5 percent between 2000-2001 and 2002-03.

Table 3.4

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%

CASAS 2004

Data Collection and Reporting

Timeliness of Data Submissions

An examination of local agency data submission records from program year 2000-2001 to program year 2002-03 shows a steady increase in the timeliness of data submission by agencies of all sizes.

Table 3.5

NRS Core Performance Data Submission Timeliness

Agency Size	Number of Agencies			% Submitted Data by First Deadline (08/15)		
	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003
Small	53	71	92	64.2	76.1	78.3
Medium	127	135	150	78.0	84.4	89.3
Large	15	17	17	60.0	94.1	100.0
Total	195	223	259	72.8	82.5	86.1

CASAS 2004

Data Quality

California has implemented the requirement of quarterly data submission in response to the NRS State Data Quality Standards. In compliance with 2002-03 federal requirements, agencies began submitting data on a quarterly basis. Survey responses indicate that this process permits quarterly data analysis throughout the program year and promotes enhanced data quality. Agencies state that they are able to identify and address problems of incomplete or inaccurate data earlier in the program year. Survey respondents state that assignment of dedicated staff to manage assessment and data collection strongly influences effectiveness in improving data quality at the local level.

CASAS is providing targeted presentations at various conferences for adult education providers throughout California that define the issues related to the high percentage of learners that could not be included in the Federal Tables and provide information on successful strategies for improving data quality.

Use of Data

California WIA Title II providers are demonstrating improved expertise and interest in reporting clean and accurate data. More providers now understand the power of data and have refined their data collection and reporting systems. They are currently exploring ways in which the information can assist them in increasing responsiveness to identifying learner priorities, diagnosing problems, highlighting and leveraging successes, and enabling continuous program improvement.

A large southern California adult school commented:

We improve each year. Convincing staff of the importance of the data collection has been probably the greatest key. We also use it during teacher evaluation to account for accuracy of data from teachers.

A large northern California adult school noted:

The program administrator is key to the success of the implementation and monitoring of strategies. The administrator needs to analyze/review system reports on a regular basis.

Following the recommendation made based on 2001-02 survey results, the CDE redoubled its focus on staff development in the area of local data quality improvement in 2002-03. This enhanced support has enabled providers to improve data collection and quality substantially. Clean and accurate data provide the hard evidence necessary to demonstrate what works, to determine what to fund, and to quantify in terms of outcomes how well specific strategies improve programs. The challenge in 2003-04 will be to provide equally successful professional development opportunities supporting the enhanced use of data to drive program improvement and change.

More than 87 percent of respondents reported using data in four ways: to determine program improvement priorities, provide feedback to staff, use as a staff development tool, and provide feedback to students. Fully 89 percent of respondents reported using data to inform and provide feedback to staff as well as using data to inform and provide feedback to students. Survey results demonstrated that fewer providers used data to share with the community in marketing and recruitment efforts, and that just 66 percent used data to communicate with governance. Agencies can address these issues in the coming year through professional development.

The WIA TITLE II survey asked providers how they used data/assessment results in program year 2002-03. Table 3.6³ below summarizes responses to this question.

Table 3.6
How Providers Use Data and Assessment Results

Agency Size	Improve Program		Feedback to Staff		Staff Develop		Feedback to Students		Governance Communication		Recruit Students	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Large	12	92	13	100	13	100	12	92	13	100	7	54
Medium	77	85	80	88	70	77	81	89	59	65	33	36
Small	45	96	44	94	36	77	41	87	28	60	19	40
Total	134	89	137	91	119	79	134	89	100	66	59	39

Total Respondents: 151; (13 Large, 91 Medium, 47 Small); could mark more than one response
 CASAS 2004

Survey respondents also noted additional uses of data and assessment results:

- Plan for grant writing
- Inform curriculum revision/alignment
- Analyze demographics
- Evaluate student retention
- Prepare Individualized Education Plans (IEPs)
- Plan master schedule of classes
- Provide outreach to the community
- Attract potential donors
- Identify competency areas needing improvement

Program Improvement Priorities

The 2002-03 WIA Title II survey asked respondents to identify a top priority for program improvement for the upcoming program year. Table 3.7 below summarizes the responses to this question. From a broad array of priorities, respondents noted these three:

- Technology implementation (34 percent)
- Curriculum development or improvement (27 percent)
- Data collection, uses, and outcomes (18 percent)

Implementation of technology was the key priority for providers of all sizes. Providers identified specific issues such as implementing distance learning, integrating computers into classroom instruction, increasing instructors' computer literacy, and incorporating the Internet into instruction.

³ The total number of responses to each question included in the WIA Title II, 225/231 survey varied from question to question. Some survey respondents provided multiple responses to some questions and did not respond to other questions. Therefore, the total N indicated varies from table to table. In some instances, numbers were rounded to the nearest decimal point or to the nearest whole number. In these cases, the totals may not add up to exactly 100 percent.

One respondent from a small library literacy program commented:

Our agency's highest priority is to develop a program for the adult learner in the information age, using computer technology and the Internet, in order to bring literacy learning beyond what is available in print format.

Priorities by Agency Size

Although agencies of all sizes reported many of the same priorities in the same order, more small agencies ranked the need to expand their services as a greater priority than either large or medium-sized agencies, surpassing both student retention and staff development as a pressing small agency priority.

Table 3.7
Program Improvement Priorities

Priority	Large (13)		Medium (79)		Small (42)		Total (134)	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Technology implementation	4	31	29	37	13	31	46	34
Curriculum development or revision	4	31	20	25	12	29	36	27
Data collection and reporting	4	31	13	16	7	17	24	18
Student retention, goal setting, and outreach	1	8	10	13	5	12	16	12
Expanded or more focused staff development	2	15	8	10	3	7	13	10
Expansion of services (new sites, classes, collaborations, etc.)	1	8	6	8	6	14	13	10
CAHSEE and related courses	1	8	5	6	2	5	8	6
EL Civics program	0	0	4	5	1	2	5	4

CASAS 2004

Trend Data: Refocusing Program Improvement Priorities

In 2001-02, agency priorities were focused on systematizing data collection and improving procedures for student assessment. This year, in contrast, the foremost priority among most providers is technology implementation. Curriculum development along with data collection and reporting remain essential program improvement priorities overall. Improved student retention surpassed staff development as an essential priority among adult education providers in 2002-03. Table 3.8 compares the top three program improvement priorities for program years 2001-02 and 2002-03.

Table 3.8
Comparison of Priority Program Improvement Strategies

2001-02	2002-03
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improve assessment, tracking, placement system ▪ Staff development ▪ Align curriculum with Model Standards, CASAS Competencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Technology implementation ▪ Curriculum development and revision ▪ Data collection and reporting

CASAS 2004

Successful Program Management Strategies

The majority of the 143 survey respondents responding to the question of which program management strategy they found to be most effective cited these top three:

- Sharing data/assessment results with staff (97 percent)
- Providing targeted training and professional development for all staff (87 percent)
- Setting up data quality control processes (85 percent)

Table 3.9 summarizes, by agency size, the most successful program management strategies identified by respondents to the 2002-03 survey of WIA Title II programs, as compared with priorities identified the previous program year.

Table 3.9
Priority Program Management Strategies by Agency Size

Agency Size	2001-02		2002-03	
	Strategy	%	Strategy	%
Large	▪ Reviewing all forms and answer sheets prior to scanning	100	▪ Sharing data/assessment results with staff	100
	▪ Providing targeted training and professional development	92	▪ Designating an assessment coordinator	100
	▪ Reassigning or adding staff for data collection and accountability	92	▪ Setting up data quality control; Reviewing all forms and answer sheets prior to scanning	100
Medium	▪ Reviewing all forms and answer sheets prior to scanning	80	▪ Setting up data quality control; Reviewing all forms and answer sheets prior to scanning	99
	▪ Providing a CASAS coordinator	78	▪ Sharing data/assessment results with staff	96
	▪ Implementing/setting up testing schedules	68	▪ Providing targeted training and professional development	89
Small	▪ Implementing student goal setting and orientation processes	53	▪ Sharing data/assessment results with staff	98
	▪ Providing a CASAS coordinator	53	▪ Collaborating with other agencies	89
	▪ Reviewing all forms and answer sheets prior to scanning	47	▪ Providing targeted training and professional development	83

Refer to Table 3.10 for Additional Information
 CASAS 2004

In program year 2002-03, provider comments have shifted emphasis from data collection, now viewed by most as fundamental, to the analysis and use of data. Agencies have steadily moved from compliance to using data as a management tool. In

program year 2000-2001, most agencies (98 percent of survey respondents) reported that accountability requirements had noticeably affected their programs and strained their resources. Year 2001-02 survey responses reflected progress in implementing accountability systems and improving data quality.

Reassignment or addition of staff to handle data collection and accountability tasks was cited as a principal program management strategy in 2001-02. Many agencies created the position of testing coordinator or CASAS liaison to assume primary responsibility for assessment and accountability. Large agencies continued to identify the designation of a coordinator in charge of assessment as one of the most effective program management strategies they employ. Agencies continue to implement quality control measures such as (1) the review of forms for completeness and accuracy prior to scanning, and (2) the setting of testing schedules in accordance with course length and meeting times to improve the efficiency and accuracy of data collection.

In 2002-03, providers across the board cited sharing data and assessment results with staff as a top program management strategy, again demonstrating a change in focus from data collection to data analysis and use. Comparison of the tables below shows the large increase in the percentage of agencies that report routine sharing of data and assessment results with staff, from 45 percent in 2001-02 to 97 percent in 2002-03. An increased percentage of agencies also reported using six other strategies of the nine listed in 2002-03.

Table 3.10

Effective Use of Program Management Strategies by Agency Size																
Strategy ⁴	Large				Medium				Small				Total			
	2001-02		2002-03		2001-02		2002-03		2001-02		2002-03		2001-02		2002-03	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Testing	11	84	9	69	60	68	61	73	14	44	21	46	85	62	91	64
Review	13	100	13	100	71	80	83	99	15	47	25	54	99	73	121	85
Pre-slug	7	53	9	69	57	64	71	85	7	22	14	30	71	52	94	66
Goal	8	61	12	92	44	50	60	71	17	53	34	74	69	51	106	74
Liaison	11	84	13	100	69	78	58	69	17	53	30	65	97	71	101	71
Reassign	12	92	12	92	57	64	58	69	10	31	32	70	79	58	102	71
Training	12	92	11	85	57	64	75	89	14	44	38	83	83	61	124	87
Collaborate	9	69	11	85	52	59	68	81	14	44	41	89	75	56	120	84
Results	8	61	13	100	43	48	81	96	10	31	45	98	61	45	139	97
<i>Total Respondents (2002-03): 143 (13 Large, 84 Medium, 46 Small); could mark more than one response</i>																
CASAS 2004																

⁴The nine strategies listed in the table:

- Testing:** Set up testing schedules for each class based on number of hours per week that classes meet
- Review:** Data quality control processes such as reviewing all forms and answer sheets prior to scanning
- Preslug:** Pre-slug entry/update forms and answer sheets
- Goal:** Implement student orientation and goal-setting processes
- Liaison:** Provide a designated coordinator in charge of assessment
- Reassign:** Reassign or add staff to data collection and accountability responsibilities
- Training:** Provide targeted training and professional development for all staff
- Collaborate:** Collaborate with other agencies
- Results:** Share data/assessment results with staff

Key Program Management Strategies by Agency Size

Agency size was a factor in the selection and application of program management strategies. Small agencies reported an impressive gain (67 percent) in the use of data and assessment results, from 31 percent of respondents in program year 2001-02 to 98 percent of respondents in 2002-03. Small agencies also leveraged the power of interagency collaboration to a far greater degree than medium or large providers did, from 44 percent in 2001-02 to 89 percent in 2002-03.

Table 3.11

Key Program Management Strategies Used by Small Agencies

Program Year	Test %	Review %	Pre-slug %	Goal %	Liaison %	Reassign %	Train %	Collab %	Results %
2001-02	44	47	22	53	53	31	44	44	31
2002-03	46	54	30	74	65	70	83	89	98

CASAS 2004

Medium-sized providers, those serving 501-8,000 adult learners, also reported an increase in the use of data and assessment results this program year, from 48 percent of agencies in 2001-02 to 96 percent of agencies in 2002-03. Also notable is a 25 percent increase, from 64 percent to 89 percent, in agencies of this size reporting the effective use of targeted staff development and training.

Table 3.12

Key Program Management Strategies Used by Medium Agencies

Program Year	Test %	Review %	Pre-slug %	Goal %	Liaison %	Reassign %	Train %	Collab %	Results %
2001-02	68	80	64	50	78	64	64	59	48
2002-03	73	99	85	71	69	69	89	81	96

CASAS 2004

Large agencies reported a 39 percent increase in the effective use of data and assessment results. Large providers also reported a 31 percent increase in agencies effectively implementing student orientation and goal-setting processes.

Table 3.13

Key Program Management Strategies Used by Large Agencies

Program Year	Test %	Review %	Pre-slug %	Goal %	Liaison %	Reassign %	Train %	Collab %	Results %
2001-02	84	100	53	61	84	92	92	69	61
2002-03	69	100	69	92	100	92	85	85	100

CASAS 2004

Responses indicated a decrease of 15 percent in the percentage of respondents from large agencies citing use of setting up testing schedules. Large agencies also indicated a decrease in providing targeted training (7 percent), while the reassignment of staff to data collection and accountability responsibilities has remained stable.

In a comment typical of those received, a respondent from a large adult school noted:

The most effective management strategies for our agency were the designation of a coordinator in charge of assessment, reassignment of additional staff, and targeted training.

Budget considerations, and accommodation of current and anticipated cuts in funding, also affected providers this program year. Reductions in staff and in training expenditures were among measures providers reported taking, as noted in the subsequent section of this report. Many respondents raised the budget issue concerning program administration and program improvement priorities. One large central California provider noted the struggle “to continue improvement of our learner results with substantially diminished support staff.” Another large adult school indicated that the top priority for the coming year was “surviving the State of California’s budget cuts in the most equitable way.”

Response to State Budget Cuts

Survey respondents were asked to enumerate the measures they had taken or planned to take in order to adapt to current and projected state budget cuts in education. Table 3.14 summarizes the results of the responses to this question.

Table 3.14
Measures Taken in Response to Budget Cuts Program Year 2002-03

Measures Taken	Yes (used)	
	N	%
Applying for additional/alternative sources of funding	116	77
Restricting materials/equipment expenditures	89	59
Cutting back staff development, including conference and workshop attendance	77	51
Reducing specific programs	70	46
Reducing summer program	58	38
Reducing support staff	56	37
Reducing staff hours	54	36
Reducing instructional staff	48	32
Limiting the program to fewer days during the regular school year	33	22
Eliminating specific programs	24	16
Not offering summer program	11	07
Other	21	14

*Total Respondents: 151; could mark more than one response
 CASAS 2004*

More than three quarters of respondents indicated that they had applied for or planned to apply for other sources of funding to sustain their programs. A majority of respondents (59 percent) cited restriction of expenditures on materials and equipment as a cost-cutting strategy they had employed. Fully half of the respondents noted that they had found it necessary to cut back staff development, including conference and workshop attendance.

Many providers also cited staff reduction as a response to budget cuts: 37 percent said that they had reduced support staff, 36 percent that they had cut back staff hours, and 32 percent that they had reduced instructional staff. A substantial number of providers, 46 percent, reported having taken the step of reducing specific programs, and an additional 16 percent had eliminated programs. Summer programs in particular suffered because of cuts in funding: 38 percent of respondents reported reducing summer offerings, and another 7 percent reported having made the decision not to offer a summer program.

Two medium-sized adult school respondents commented on their efforts to adapt to current and projected budget cuts:

We are more aggressive in our search for donations of goods and materials. We are more assertive in seeking collaborations that will provide us with rent-free use of facilities.

We are cutting everywhere we can, trying to keep the cuts away from the instructional programs.

A small CBO acknowledged:

We are a CBO so our situation is a bit different, but we are anticipating tighter federal and state funds so we are trying to increase our enrollment.

Summary: Program Management Strategies

In program year 2002-03, provider responses indicate that there is a growing understanding of the power of data, beyond compliance requirements. Results demonstrate a shift in emphasis from data collection to the analysis and use of data. Providers across the board cited sharing data and assessment results with staff as a top program management strategy. The percentage of agencies that report routine sharing of data and assessment results with staff increased from 45 percent in 2001-02 to 97 percent in 2002-03. An increased percentage of agencies also report using six other key program management strategies in program year 2002-03.

Budget considerations, and accommodation of current and anticipated cuts in funding, strongly affected providers this program year. Nearly three quarters of respondents indicated that they were seeking other sources of funding to sustain their programs. Providers indicated that they had taken measures such as restriction of expenditures on materials and equipment, cutbacks in staff development, staff reduction, and reduction of program offerings.

Attendance and Retention Factors

WIA Title II survey respondents identified a number of key factors having either a positive or a negative impact on student retention in their programs. The following factors were cited by more than 75 percent of respondents as positively affecting retention:

- Targeting instruction to students' needs and goals (96 percent)
- Student bonding with individual teachers (85 percent)
- Open enrollment (78 percent)

Table 3.15

Key Factors Affecting Student Retention

Factors	Positive		Negative		No Response Marked		Did Not Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Targeting instruction to students' needs and goals	136	96	0	0	0	0	6	4
Student bonding with individual teachers	120	85	3	2	1	1	18	12
Open enrollment	111	78	22	15	2	2	7	5
Student orientation program	87	61	1	1	1	1	53	37
Reward and recognition programs for goal attainment	79	56	2	1	0	0	61	43
Reward and recognition programs for attendance	75	53	1	1	1	1	65	45
Managed enrollment	55	39	5	3	3	2	79	56

Total Respondents: 142

CASAS 2004

Targeting Instruction to Students' Needs and Goals

Providers report that using data from student and community needs assessments to determine program priorities and course offerings results in improved attendance and retention. One medium-sized adult school described this process:

We surveyed students, analyzed the data, then developed classes to meet students' needs. We had to enhance and update the existing curriculum.

One Northern California adult school with multiple sites noted the importance of the community needs survey in determining learner priorities, as well as the effectiveness of an orientation program as an aid to recruitment:

In selecting our community sites, we found it effective to first conduct a community needs survey through the local elementary or secondary school and host a program of orientation. Working closely with parent advisory committees was also helpful. When we went through these steps first, we usually were able to open a new site successfully with strong attendance.

A medium-sized adult school specified a way to involve instructors in the use of needs assessment results:

Send (needs assessment results) to teachers to target instruction. During staff development we analyze assessment data and brainstorm instructional strategies to increase student retention.

Student Bonding with Individual Teachers

Both survey results and focus group responses indicate that student resistance to advancing to a higher instructional level remains a problem in many programs. Most respondents view this as a negative byproduct of otherwise positive bonding between students and specific teachers. Once students feel comfortable and secure in a setting, it can prove difficult to motivate them to advance and face the uncertainty of a new classroom environment. Some agencies have been able to make progress in eliminating this barrier through improved communication with students, including implementation of a comprehensive student orientation and frequent sharing of information regarding individual student progress.

A medium-sized agency demonstrates one way to resolve the dilemma of motivating students to progress:

Primarily, student assessments are used for placement of students at intake and to encourage transition to the next level. Students are apprehensive toward transition, but the CASAS test scores provide added incentive when accompanied by a certificate of level completion to move on.

Least-Used Strategies to Improve Attendance and Retention

Many survey respondents reported that four strategies affecting attendance and retention were used infrequently. The least used strategies (with the percentage of respondents that reported not using them):

- Managed enrollment (56 percent)
- Reward and recognition programs for attendance (45 percent)
- Reward and recognition programs for goal attainment (43 percent)
- Student orientation program (37 percent)

The respondents who did report employing each of the above strategies found them highly effective in improving attendance and retention, as shown in Table 3.16 below.

Table 3.16
Least-Used Strategies Affecting Retention

Least-Used Strategies	Positive Effect		Respondents Reporting Use
	N	%	N
Student orientation program	87	99	88
Reward and recognition programs for attendance	75	99	76
Reward and recognition programs for goal attainment	79	98	81
Managed enrollment	55	92	60

CASAS 2004

Open vs. Managed Enrollment

Programs with open enrollment considerably outnumber managed enrollment programs⁵, but survey results indicate that of the 60 providers who report that they have implemented managed enrollment, 92 percent have found it to be effective in improving attendance and retention. Only five respondents reported implementing managed enrollment and experiencing a negative effect on attendance or retention. A respondent from a large Southern California community college district advocating managed enrollment for ESL programs commented:

Many of our problems in ESL, in my opinion, are related to funding. Administrators sometimes confuse full classes with effective instruction. In fact, a full classroom may just be a mixing of new and continuing students, and they may be the cause of retention issues. Our students told us they didn't like new students entering all the time. Teachers would have to re-teach the same material, and the continuing students felt they weren't making progress. Before we went to Managed Enrollment, our teachers said students didn't want to be promoted. However, when we focused on student outcomes as opposed to attendance, students were pleased to be promoted. For the past three years, we have documented promotion rates of 50 percent (average to higher at lower levels and lower at higher levels).

Student Orientation Programs

Of the 91 providers who reported having student orientation programs, all but one found them to have a positive effect on attendance and retention. As one large agency noted:

To many of my students, goal setting and taking personal responsibility for achieving them is an alien concept. Their lives have been characterized by chaos, impulsivity, and escapism. The orderliness of the classroom environment, with its frequent assessment and focus on accountability assists them in developing a work ethic, which may be even more important than the specific skills they acquire.

The 2003 focus group participants were asked to describe their process for orienting students to their programs. Participants in the focus group for large agencies indicated that they conducted orientations covering registration, student goal setting and placement, and incorporating an assessment schedule for incoming students. One participant noted that new student testing was conducted on a weekly basis. Another commented that the most challenging individuals to place were those incoming students with either high literacy skills combined with low verbal skills or those with high verbal skills but low literacy skills. Two participants representing medium and small agencies indicated that they did not have student orientation programs in place. One commented, "They (students) are not getting that info."

⁵ Programs of both types are often used at the same agency.

Programs Most Affected by Attendance and Retention Factors

The survey also asked providers to specify the program(s) in which attendance and retention were most affected by these factors. ESL and ABE programs were cited with greatest frequency, as shown in Table 3.17.

Table 3.17

Programs Affected by Attendance/Retention Factors

Program	%Yes	%No
ABE	60	41
ASE	45	54
ESL	77	22
ESL-Citizenship	39	60

Total Respondents: 151; could mark more than one response

CASAS 2004

In comments, several respondents noted that some of these factors and strategies, such as managed enrollment, for example, were implemented for some programs but not others, or had different effects on different programs. A respondent from a northern California adult school wrote:

Managed enrollment is used for ABE and ASE only. For the migrant population in ESL, open enrollment is advantageous to support our population. The disadvantage of open enrollment would be capturing benchmarks.

Other Factors Influencing Attendance or Retention

Providers described several other factors they did not classify under any of the key factors listed above as having either a positive or a negative impact on student retention. The following table summarizes their responses.

Table 3.18

Other Factors Influencing Attendance Or Retention	
Positive factors	Negative factors
Location and day/time of classes (8)	Student transience (6)
Teacher behaviors/attitude/expertise (6)	Location and day/time of classes (5)
Child care availability (5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No classes at outreach sites ▪ Curtailing night classes ▪ Relocation to more remote site ▪ Security concerns ▪ Transportation obstacles
Distance learning option (2)	
Small classes (2)	
Mandatory attendance (2)	
EL Civics Civic Participation (2)	
Administrative and instructor involvement	Lack of student bonding with teacher (3)
School-wide career week	Other (7)
Student comfort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No childcare (2) ▪ Testing (2) ▪ Computer usage in ESL classes ▪ State budget reductions
Monthly social time for families	
One-on-one tutoring	
Staff development and mentoring	
Referrals by EDD	Low literacy level/high dropout rate
One-on-one appointments for placement	
Word of mouth about program	

CASAS 2004

Coordination and Collaboration One-Stops

Many survey respondents reported effective collaborations between adult education and literacy providers and One-Stop systems. Sixty-eight percent reported receiving student referrals, the most frequent type of interaction reported. Forty-seven percent of survey respondents indicated that they offered classes in conjunction with One-Stops, up from 24 percent in 2001-02. Career fairs, orientations, employer workshops, vocational assessment, and evaluation of learning disabilities extended the list of successful collaborative activities. In contrast, 14 of 46 small agency respondents (30 percent) reported little or no involvement with One-Stops, indicating an opportunity for improved outreach, particularly in remote areas.

Table 3.19

Percent of Respondents Engaged in Each Type of Collaboration⁶ with Local One-Stop

Agency Size	Receive Referrals		Staff Liaison		Reimburse One-Stops		Provide Classes		Provide Skills Labs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Large	10	77	5	38	0	0	10	77	8	62
Medium	61	71	33	38	4	5	45	52	31	36
Small	27	59	7	15	2	4	13	28	6	13
Total	98	68	45	31	6	4	68	47	45	31

Agency Size	Conduct Meetings		Arrange Job Fairs		Provide Testing		Little or No Involvement		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Large	7	54	8	62	7	54	3	23	3	23
Medium	34	40	18	21	32	37	16	19	11	13
Small	14	30	10	22	8	17	14	30	3	7
Total	55	38	36	25	47	32	33	23	17	12

Total Respondents: 145 (13 Large, 86 Medium, 46 Small)

CASAS 2004

Survey respondents were also asked to characterize the success of their collaboration with the One-Stop Center. More than half (59 percent) of respondents from agencies of all sizes reported either somewhat or very successful relationships. Of the respondents from medium-sized agencies, more than 60 percent indicated some degree of success in their interactions with local One-Stops, while more than 50 percent of both large and

⁶ Types of collaboration:

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Receive Referrals | Receive student referrals |
| Staff Liaison | Staff liaison posted at One-Stop Center |
| Reimburse One-Stops | Reimburse One-Stop Center for services rendered |
| Provide Classes | Provide classes or training |
| Provide Skills Labs | Provide skills labs |
| Conduct Meetings | Conduct workshops, conferences, or informational meetings |
| Arrange Job Fairs | Arrange job fairs |
| Provide Testing | Provide testing/assessment services |
| Little or No Involvement | Little or no involvement with One-Stop Center |
| Other | Other (please describe) |

small agencies reported some success. One respondent from a large central California adult school remarked, "Working relationship with local one-stop is outstanding. Referrals go both ways." Responses are summarized in Table 3.20.

Table 3.20
Degree of Success in Collaborating with Local One-Stop

Agency Size	Very successful		Somewhat successful		Somewhat unsuccessful		Very unsuccessful		Not sure		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Large	4	31	3	23	0	0	4	31	2	15	13	100
Medium	17	26	24	36	10	15	9	14	6	9	66	100
Small	4	13	13	41	3	9	7	22	5	16	32	100
Total	25	23	40	36	13	12	20	18	13	12	111	100

CASAS 2004

However, 30 percent of all respondents (31 percent of large agencies, 29 percent of medium-sized agencies, and 31 percent of small agencies) reported a less than successful association with the One-Stop. Several providers provided additional insight through comments:

From a Northern California adult school:

We still want to develop a more vibrant, cohesive relationship with our One-Stop. Even though we are co-located and have some shared staff, it often feels like we are two very separate entities with different missions and clientele.

From a Central California adult school:

Perhaps WIA could establish guidelines as to how One-Stops and adult schools can work together.

From a Southern California adult school:

We are working to develop a closer working relationship with the One-Stop center, they do refer to us, but we have no way of identifying these referrals. We refer to them, but they offer very few services for the non-English speaking population.

The CDE Survey on Collaboration with One-Stops

In November of 2002, the CDE also conducted an online survey of adult schools and literacy providers regarding their partnership with California's One-Stop system. Participation was voluntary and resulted in a response rate of 22 percent.

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

- Agencies with a Memorandum of Understanding (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.
- 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 to the CDE survey made several recommendations and suggested policy changes for improving the relationship between adult education and literacy providers and the One-Stop system. These included:

- clarification of the role of adult education in the One-Stop system.
- assistance to local providers in developing effective MOUs with their local One-Stop.
- development of consistent systems used at all One-Stops for referrals for training.
- collaboration to streamline and standardize data collection and accountability systems, enable the sharing of case management information and the tracking of referrals.

Workforce Investment Board Coordination and Collaboration

Survey respondents enumerated ways their agencies interacted with the local Workforce Investment Board (WIB), as shown in Table 3.21. Of the 145 answers to this question on the survey, 93 respondents (64 percent) reported active engagement with the local WIB. Referrals comprised the most frequently reported type of direct interaction. Others reported varying degrees of involvement, from participation such as attendance at meetings to board representation. Thirty-six percent of respondents reported little or no interaction with their local WIB.

Table 3.21
Number of Respondents Engaged In Each Type of Interaction with WIB⁷

Agency Size	Direct Rep		Attend Mtgs		Committee Members		Consortium		MOU		Receive Referrals		Receive News		Little/No Interact	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Large	6	46	8	62	6	46	3	23	6	46	10	77	7	54	2	15
Medium	19	22	33	38	17	20	30	35	33	38	39	45	27	31	25	29
Small	2	4	6	13	3	7	9	20	3	7	16	35	6	13	25	54
Total	27	19	47	32	26	18	42	29	42	29	65	45	40	28	52	36

Total Respondents: 145 (13 Large, 86 Medium, 46 Small)

CASAS 2004

The survey also asked providers to characterize the success of their collaboration with the local WIB. Their responses are summarized in Table 3.22.

Table 3.22
Degree of Success in Collaborating with Local WIB

Agency Size	Very successful		Somewhat successful		Somewhat unsuccessful		Very unsuccessful		Not sure		Total by Agency Size	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Large	5	38	3	23	1	8	1	8	3	23	13	100
Medium	14	22	21	33	12	19	4	6	13	20	64	100
Small	3	10	8	26	3	10	4	12	13	42	31	100
Total	22	20	32	30	16	15	9	8	29	27	108	100

CASAS 2004

Half of survey respondents characterized their interaction with the local WIB as either somewhat or very successful. However, 23 percent indicated less than successful relationships, and 27 percent indicated that they had not yet had sufficient contact with the local WIB to judge the quality of the relationship.

One respondent from a Central California adult school remarked:

People fall through the cracks when trying to access their services. Their case managers are not fully aware of all programs offered in the community, and therefore do not always make the best referrals.

⁷ Types of interaction with local WIB listed in Table 3.21:

Direct rep	Direct representation: Staff member serves on WIB board
Attend Mtgs	Staff attend WIB meetings
Committee Members	Staff serve as WIB committee members
Consortium	Represented through consortium
MOU	Agency has Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with WIB
Receive Referrals	Receive referrals
Receive News	Receive newsletters
Little or No Interact	Little or no involvement with WIB

A large Southern California provider reported:

We contract with the WIB to operate one of 5 centers. We operate as a partner with a second center. The relationship has been excellent. The secretary of labor visited it as a successful model. The relationship has been in the area of office skills and vocational training. The centers have not effectively served the ABE or ESL students in our program. These students have been indirectly referred or gone through self-referral and have been frustrated by the limited assistance they received.

Again, as with the One-Stops, there is some indication that small agencies experience greater barriers than larger providers do in forming successful relationships with their local WIBs. Only 35 percent of small agencies reported some degree of successful interaction, while 42 percent indicated they had not had sufficient interaction with the WIB to be able to characterize the interaction. A small central California CBO commented that they were “Unsure how to increase our involvement with the WIB.” (See Table 3.22.)

A respondent from a small southern California adult school made the following observation:

Although the client population is apparent, there is a lack of referrals being referred to our agency. Calls, letters, e-mails, flyers, etc. have not done the trick. We will be offering courses for clients again and hope we can assist as was requested.

When comparing the relationships between agencies and the local One-Stops or WIBs (see Table 3.23), an equal number of large agencies reported a “very successful” collaboration with the One-Stop as reported a “very unsuccessful” collaboration. Large agencies also reported greater success with the WIB than the One-Stop; the reverse seemed to hold true for medium and small agencies. When collaborations with One-Stops worked, they worked very well or fairly well, but when they did not work, they tended not to work at all – although medium-sized agencies seemed better able to salvage some part of the relationship than large or small agencies. Overall, agencies reported being more uncertain of their relationship with the local WIB than with the local One-Stop.

Table 3.23
Comparison of Success in Collaborating with Local One-Stop vs. Local WIB

Agency Size	Very successful		Somewhat successful		Somewhat unsuccessful		Very unsuccessful		Not sure	
	One-Stop	WIB	One-Stop	WIB	One-Stop	WIB	One-Stop	WIB	One-Stop	WIB
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Large	31	38	23	23	0	8	31	8	15	23
Medium	26	22	36	33	15	19	14	6	9	20
Small	13	10	41	26	9	10	22	13	16	42
Total	23	20	36	30	12	15	18	8	12	27

CASAS 2004

Other Collaborations

In addition to the One-Stops, survey respondents listed other collaborative relationships formed with community partners that have had marked impact on their WIA Title II programs. Table 3.24 reports their responses.

Table 3.24

Successful Collaborations				
Partner Type	Large	Medium	Small	Total
Other educational institution	11	57	27	95
Local community business or agency	12	53	24	89
CalWORKS	12	53	21	86
Other social services agency	8	46	22	76
Literacy program or agency	8	38	22	68
Health services agency	7	31	16	54
Child services agency	9	30	11	50
Employment agency	7	29	14	50
Hospital or health care provider/facility	6	31	11	48
Government, military, or law enforcement agency	6	31	10	47
Other (please specify):	6	15	12	33
Total by Agency Size	92	414	190	696

*Total Respondents: 145 (13 Large, 86 Medium, 46 Small); could mark more than one response
 CASAS 2004*

Many providers listed multiple partners with whom they engage in productive collaborations. Agencies of all sizes reported successful partnerships with other educational institutions, local community businesses or agencies, and CalWORKS with greatest frequency. Twenty-three agencies identified their collaborative partners as faith-based organizations. Many reported that they recruit students or offer classes at community churches or do both. Twenty-nine agencies specifically reported that none of their partners were private or faith-based organizations.

Two medium-sized adult schools described their collaborations:

A local church provides space for our largest adult education center and classrooms for citizenship instruction. We use YMCA facilities on our districts' elementary school campuses for ESL instruction.

We work with a community organization called Parkside Family alliance. It is comprised of social service agencies. The local Baptist church wrote the grant and provided the leadership to pull the alliance together.

A small CBO noted:

The church we collaborate with is faith-based and the library is a grassroots, community contribution funded program with nearly all

volunteer workers. The library provides us with an early childhood teacher for our students' children that they pay for with a grant they received.

A small adult school reported:

Our school is located on the CCC site. We collaborate on the educational program for the corps members. The CCC does CASAS testing of its corps members which precludes our agency from doing it.

**Professional Development
 Priorities for Administrators**

When asked to rank a list of topics by degree of importance (high, medium, or low priority) for the program year 2002-03, the greatest percentages of respondents identified the following high priority professional development needs for administrators in 2002-03:

1. Budget issues
2. Data analysis/using TOPSpro data to manage and improve programs
3. Technology use, including database management other than TOPSpro
4. California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE)/GED
5. Data collection and quality/TOPSpro implementation

Trend: Changes in Professional Development Priorities for Administrators

Budget issues and technology have moved up in priority from 2001-02 to appear among the top three priority professional development topics for administrators in 2002-03. Data analysis has surpassed data collection and quality as a training focus for administrators, echoing the shift in emphasis seen in key program management strategies cited for 2002-03.

Table 3.25
Highest Professional Development Priorities for Administrators

2001-02	2002-03
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Attend professional meetings ▪ TOPSpro data collection and quality ▪ Updates on legislation, regulations, compliance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget issues ▪ Data analysis/using data to manage and improve programs ▪ Technology use

CASAS 2004

Professional Development Priorities for Administrators by Agency Size

Most respondents cited multiple high priority areas for professional development. Table 3.26 summarizes results by agency size. Budget issues were a principal concern for large and medium-sized providers. Large and medium-sized agencies continue to cite legislative updates, among the top three professional development concerns in 2001-02, as a high priority. Small providers, in particular, identified data analysis and using TOPSpro data to manage and improve programs as a principal professional development need, along with a

need for additional EL Civics training. A greater number of large agency respondents selected CAHSEE/GED as a high priority topic for administrators than did small agency respondents.

Table 3.26

Professional Development Priorities for Administrators by Agency Size								
Issue	Large (12)		Medium (80)		Small (44)		Total (136)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Budget issues	9	75	58	73	19	43	86	63
Data analysis/using TOPSpro data to manage and improve programs	6	50	34	43	22	50	62	46
Technology use, including database management other than TOPSpro	8	67	34	43	18	41	60	44
Calif. High School Exit Exam/GED	7	58	35	44	14	32	56	41
Data collection and quality/TOPSpro implementation	6	50	32	40	17	39	55	40
Updates on legislation and regulations	8	67	40	50	7	16	55	40
EL Civics	6	50	27	34	20	45	53	39
New administrator orientation/issues	3	25	24	30	12	27	39	29
Other	1	8	1	1	3	7	5	4
CASAS 2004								

One small adult school stated:

We need more support for quasi-administrators – those who are designated as coordinators in the very small schools. The challenges that face us are different than larger districts and the solutions that would work for us are distinctly different than for larger districts. Most of the admin conferences are all about huge schools. What about good role models for us small schools?

One medium-sized CCD provided this insightful comment:

I think change happens by supporting the leaders, the doers, the most willing, and then empowering them to “mentor” others. Our approach for change has always been working with a small group, building “what works” and then sharing the ideas with others.

Priorities for Instructors

Survey respondents most frequently cited the following professional development needs for instructors in 2002-03:

1. Implementation or integration of technology
2. Technology based instructional strategies and curricula
3. Curriculum development, improvement, revision
4. Data analysis and using TOPSpro data to target and improve instruction
5. Instructional strategies, research-based methodologies

Trend: Changes in Professional Development Priorities for Instructors

Technology implementation, which was among the top three professional development priorities for instructors in 2001-02, continues to be a priority for the greatest percentage of agencies overall. Training in technology-based instructional strategies and curricula is also among the top three areas cited for teachers' professional development this program year, overtaking general instructional strategies and research-based methodology.

As one large agency noted:

Our focus for staff development in the coming year will be implementation of technology, classroom management strategies, and curriculum development and revision (incorporation of ESLERS and new content standards in to course outlines and lessons). Many of the above indicated needs, such as data analysis of TOPSpro data and CASAS test results, are ongoing with new staff and addressed throughout the year.

Table 3.27
Highest Professional Development Priorities for Instructors

2001-02	2002-03
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Attend workshops, conferences, in-services ▪ Instructional strategies ▪ Implementing/integrating technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementing/integrating technology ▪ Technology based instructional strategies / curricula ▪ Curriculum development, improvement, revision

CASAS 2004

Primacy of Technology as a Professional Development Priority for Instructors

The percentage of survey respondents indicating technology implementation as a high priority for instructors' professional development increased dramatically over the last program year. The percentage of agencies of all sizes indicating that technology training was a high priority for their instructors has increased by 40 percent or more since 2001-02.

Table 3.28
Technology as a High Professional Development Priority for Instructors by Agency Size

	Large	Medium	Small
2001-02	52%	19%	10%
2002-03	92%	63%	57%

CASAS 2004

Priorities for Instructors by Agency Size

Three quarters of respondents (75 percent) from large agencies selected instructional strategies and research-based methodology as a high priority for instructors' professional development. A high percentage of all agencies cited data analysis as well as data collection as top areas for teacher training. A greater percentage of medium-

sized providers than of large or small providers indicated that CAHSEE/GED figured among high priority professional development concerns for their instructors.

Table 3.29

Professional Development Priorities for Instructors by Agency Size

Issue	Large (12)		Medium (80)		Small (44)		Total (136)	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Implement/integrate technology	11	92	50	63	25	57	86	63
Technology based instructional strategies / curricula	10	83	48	60	27	61	85	63
Curriculum development, improvement, revision	7	58	42	53	23	52	72	53
Data analysis/using data to target/improve instruction	8	67	40	50	18	41	66	49
Instructional strategies, research-based methodology	9	75	38	48	18	41	65	48
Calif. High School Exit Exam/GED	6	50	45	56	11	25	62	46
EL Civics	6	50	34	43	18	41	58	43
Align curriculum with Model Standards	6	50	35	44	15	34	56	41
Align curriculum with CASAS or SCANS competencies	5	42	31	39	12	27	48	35
Data collection and quality/ TOPSpro implementation	7	58	28	35	12	27	47	34
Classroom management strategies	6	50	26	33	9	20	41	30

CASAS 2004

Several agencies commented on the importance of providing continuous staff development:

From a large adult school:

The need is always there for professional development. We need to be selective when doing professional development in this budget crisis era. More discussion/problem solving of what's being taught and how. Less direct staff development and more application/group-work training.

From a medium-sized CCD:

Focus on the instructor. Administrators and staff have ways to get training, but instructors need to be engaged in professional development. They often feel isolated, and increased staff development would help build community among instructors.

From a medium-sized adult school:

Curriculum and effective instruction are always the highest priority needs. The key is to develop effective instruction USING data analysis, legislation, technology, etc.

From a medium-sized adult school:

Our staff has become very proficient in the collection of data, however, continuous staff development is needed to keep them up to date with all the changes and different versions that come out throughout the year.

Trend: Additional Changes in Professional Development Priorities for Instructors

Preparation for implementation of the CAHSEE may well explain a the notable increase over 2001-02 in the percentage of providers of all sizes citing the CAHSEE as a discernible high priority professional development issue, as seen in Table 3.30 below. For small providers, the percentage of respondents rating classroom management as a high priority professional development issue has remained stable, while its priority as an issue for medium and large agencies has dramatically increased.

Table 3.30

CAHSEE as a Professional Development Priority for Instructors by Agency Size

Issue	2001-02			2002-03		
	Large	Medium	Small	Large	Medium	Small
CAHSEE/GED	26%	6%	13%	50%	57%	27%
Classroom management strategies	0%	4%	19%	50%	33%	20%

CASAS 2004

Trend: Increase in Percentage of Agencies Identifying EL Civics as a High Professional Development Priority for Instructors

In 2002-03, EL Civics was named by more than 40 percent of respondents from providers of all sizes as a high priority area for instructors' professional development. This represents a substantial increase over 2001-02 figures, particularly among large agencies.

Table 3.31

EL Civics as a Professional Development Priority for Instructors by Agency Size

	Large	Medium	Small
2001-02	4%	12%	13%
2002-03	50%	43%	41%

CASAS 2004

Professional Development Priorities for Other Staff

Respondents to the WIA TITLE II survey identified the following priority professional development needs for support staff in 2002-03:

1. Accountability; data collection and quality/ TOPSpro implementation
2. Cross-training of support staff

3. Communication skills/customer service
4. Implementing technology (including computer literacy)
5. Program administrative issues (such as attendance)
6. Database management other than TOPSpro

Accountability has remained the principal focus for professional development provided to support staff. Cross-training and communication skills have surpassed technology implementation in 2002-03 as high priority development areas for this group.

Table 3.32
Highest Professional Development Priorities for Other Staff

2001-02	2002-03
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accountability; TOPSpro data collection ▪ Implementing/integrating technology ▪ Unspecified professional development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accountability; TOPSpro data collection and quality ▪ Cross-training of support staff ▪ Communication skills/customer service

CASAS 2004

Professional Development Priorities for Support Staff by Agency Size

More than 40 percent of all respondents selected three of the issues as high priorities:

- Accountability; data collection and quality/TOPSpro implementation
- Cross-training of support staff
- Communication skills/customer service

A higher percentage of medium-sized providers selected database management other than TOPSpro as an area of note for support staff development.

Table 3.33
High Priority Professional Development Needs for Other Staff by Agency Size

Issue	Large (12)		Medium (80)		Small (44)		Total (136)	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Accountability; data collection and quality/ TOPSpro implementation	7	58	38	48	22	50	67	49
Cross-training of support staff	8	67	37	46	17	39	62	46
Communication skills/customer service	7	58	35	44	17	39	59	43
Implementing technology (including computer literacy)	8	67	27	34	17	39	52	38
Program administrative issues (such as attendance)	4	33	28	35	16	36	48	35
Database management other than TOPSpro	2	17	21	26	6	14	29	21

CASAS 2004

Leadership Projects

The CDE supports a focused system of professional development through contracts with the four State Leadership Projects: CALPRO, CASAS, CDLP, and OTAN⁸. Each of the projects has responsibility for the provision of professional development, training, and technical assistance related to its identified focus areas. Through the leadership projects, the CDE also supports an extensive electronic network for distribution of best practices and products. Each of the State Leadership Projects is responsible for disseminating best practices and products within its identified focus areas.

Responses from the Professional Development section of the annual statewide Survey of WIA TITLE II Funded Programs in California help to identify priority professional development needs among adult education administrators, instructors, and support staff. Survey responses also provided feedback regarding the frequency with which providers access materials and services provided by the Leadership Projects, and the degree of satisfaction experienced with that support. This information from the field is shared with the Leadership Projects to ensure that programs and support resources provided appropriately address the concerns and priorities of the field.

Agency Access to Leadership Project Services

Respondents to the 2002-03 survey provided feedback on a question about the frequency with which they used support provided by the Leadership Projects. Table 3.34 presents this information.

Table 3.34
Leadership Projects: Frequency of Access

Leadership Project	Accessed Regularly		Accessed Occasionally		N/A or Did not access		No Response Marked	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CASAS	97	72	38	28	0	0	0	0
OTAN	85	63	48	36	0	0	2	1
CALPRO	37	27	62	46	31	23	5	4
CDLP	10	7	45	33	67	50	13	10

Total Respondents: 135
 CASAS 2004

Virtually all respondents to this question indicated that they accessed support provided by OTAN and CASAS, and more than half of these agencies characterized themselves as regular consumers of their services.

⁸ CALPRO: California Adult Literacy Professional Development Project
 CASAS: Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System
 CDLP: California Distance Learning Project
 OTAN: Outreach and Technical Assistance Network

Most Regularly Accessed

OTAN and CASAS provide a broad range of services delivered in both traditional workshop settings and through alternative media. Both also provide ongoing technical support by telephone, e-mail, and occasionally through site visits. Many respondents commented at length both on the type and quality of support OTAN provided. Several representative narrative responses follow:

From several medium-sized adult schools:

We depend on OTAN for all kinds of information. We are frequent users of the service, and it just keeps getting better. We are endeavoring to increase the teaching staff's use of OTAN for teachers by offering help with registration and in-house training on how to navigate the site. Once they get an introduction, they can't believe what is available to them.

Technical assistance and workshops on use of technology in classroom instruction. Used for EL Civics lesson planning, general information, posting job opportunities, and staff development.

Technical support with online forms/applications. Video resources have been borrowed to assist with our EL Civics project.

Used OTAN staff for staff development. OTAN conducted an on-site workshop for instructors on using the Internet as an instructional tool. Teachers and program specialists use OTAN as an informational resource all the time.

ITAP participation: assistance in using technology, training ESL staff, monitoring progress. Also, accessing information on a regular basis.

From a large community college district:

Mentoring – ITAP project; trouble shooting in submitting data and grant application; lessons downloaded; workshops; immediate help for any problem.

From a small adult school:

Enhancing curriculum through technology and technical assistance.

From a library literacy program:

OTAN is an excellent source for information pertinent to the program. The program uses information downloads, technical assistance when needed, grants available, and calendar of workshops and meetings.

Comments regarding CASAS also cited the variety and value of services provided:

From a large adult school:

Resource staff has attended the CASAS consortium, EL Civics trainings, and the CASAS Summer Institute. Our data technician has received direct support through e-mail from CASAS tech staff regarding software issues.

From a medium-sized adult school:

Selected staff attended CASAS Summer Institute and various CASAS workshops. Additionally, CASAS technical support has been very helpful in implementing our new ASAP/ TOPSpro integration system.

From a small CBO:

Very good support. I am sorry that I was not aware of what they could do to help us sooner in the year.

From a small CBO:

Workshops and technical support have been invaluable.

Using Services Provided by CALPRO

Of 133 providers describing their use of the services provided by CALPRO, 27 percent reported that they accessed CALPRO support regularly, 46 percent reported that they used CALPRO occasionally, and 23 percent of respondents reported that they had not accessed the services of CALPRO. Respondent comments indicate that those providers able to avail themselves of CALPRO support were satisfied with the quality of services provided, but that staff of some agencies, particularly those located in more remote rural areas, were unable to attend professional development events offered by CALPRO. Several representative comments are included below:

From a small adult school:

Regional support has been very useful; doing an excellent job.

From a large adult school:

CALPRO has been very helpful assisting us with workshops conveniently scheduled for our locations. They have solicited our ideas on presentations and provided workshops that address our teaching needs.

From a medium-sized adult school:

We had a hard time using the project as the classes were far and notification was usually just a few days before.

From a medium-sized adult school:

We take advantage of the workshops and trainings offered though the RRCs. Unfortunately, the distance from our community to the centers discourages many of our staff members from attending the workshops.

From a small CBO:

Could have used more localized training. Had to travel two hours to get to anything.

Using Services Provided by CDLP

CDLP is chartered to proffer support to those providers implementing distance learning. Of the 125 agencies responding to this survey question, 7 percent indicated that they were regular consumers of CDLP services, and 33 percent that they occasionally accessed CDLP support. Half of the respondents, probably most of those without distance learning programs, indicated that they had not used CDLP. As the comments below demonstrate, consumers of CDLP services have found the ongoing support invaluable:

From a large adult school:

We have implemented a very successful distance-learning program at 3 of 4 of our main sites. Distance learning instructors have frequently received assistance from CDLP staff in designing and implementing the program.

From a medium-sized adult school:

We have worked with the CDLP since 1997. They have been very helpful with the application and reporting process and in answering questions. CDLP products have been very good. We would like to see more products become available, more sharing of resources among the agencies involved as is happening for EL Civics.

Most Frequently Used Services Provided by Leadership Projects

WIA Title II survey respondents were asked to indicate the type of Leadership Project support they used (workshops, curriculum or materials, technical assistance, information downloads, and other supports). Table 3.35 summarizes their responses.

Table 3.35

Types of Leadership Project Support Most Frequently Cited

Leadership Project	N	Type of Support
CASAS	129	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Technical support ▪ Workshops and training ▪ Data collection, quality, and analysis
OTAN	119	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Online and telephone technical support and assistance ▪ Workshops ▪ Curriculum resources
CALPRO	89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Workshops ▪ Meetings, networking meetings, and roundtables ▪ Staff development (general) ▪ Leadership Institute
CDLP	51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information, information downloads ▪ Technical support and assistance ▪ Videos and other materials

CASAS 2004

Effectiveness of Services Provided by Leadership Projects

The survey asked respondents to indicate how effective they found the Leadership Project services they accessed. The 135 respondents to this question provided the information in Table 3.36 below.

Table 3.36

Effectiveness of Leadership Project Services

Leadership Project	Effective		Ineffective		Did not use		No Response Marked	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
OTAN	132	98	0	0	1	1	2	1
CASAS	129	96	6	4	0	0	0	0
CALPRO	92	68	4	3	32	24	7	5
CDLP	48	36	4	3	67	50	16	11

Total Respondents: 135

CASAS 2004

Of the 135 respondents who indicated they had used the services of the Leadership Projects, 97 percent (410 out of 415 responses) found the services to be effective. Of the 132 OTAN users, all 132 (100 percent) indicated their services were effective. Of 135 CASAS users, 129 (96 percent) felt the services were effective. Of the 96 users that rated the services provided to them by CALPRO, 92 (96 percent) indicated that the services were effective. In addition, of the 52 users that accessed the services of CDLP, 48 (92 percent) found them to be effective.

Professional Development: Summary

Budget issues and technology implementation have taken precedence in 2002-03 as key topics for staff development for administrators. Data analysis has surpassed data

collection and quality as an administrative training focus, echoing the shift in emphasis seen in key program management strategies cited for 2002-03.

The percentage of agencies indicating that technology training was a high priority for their instructors increased dramatically, to more than 60 percent of respondents in 2002-03.

Preparation for implementation of the CAHSEE may be responsible for the increase over 2001-02 in the percentage of providers citing the CAHSEE and classroom management techniques as professional development issues.

In 2002-03, EL Civics was named by 39 percent of respondents from providers of all sizes as a high priority area for instructors' professional development. This represents a substantial increase over 2001-02 figures, particularly among large agencies.

Results indicate that almost all users accessing the Leadership Projects found their services effective. Virtually all respondents indicated that they accessed support provided by OTAN and CASAS, and more than half of these agencies characterized themselves as regular consumers of their services. Many respondents indicated that they did not use services provided by CALPRO (31) or CDLP (67), indicating a possible opportunity for further outreach. Those agencies that did use the services of these projects reported that their support was invaluable.

4 IMPLEMENTING WIA TITLE II AT THE CLASSROOM LEVEL

Introduction

This chapter describes the instructional strategies and methodologies providers have tried and found effective. An analysis of respondents feedback specific to the EI Civics implementation process and a review of the potential impact of the California High School Exit Examination implementation, CAHSEE are also included.

Effective Educational Practices

Key Instructional Strategies

The WIA Survey asked respondents to rate the effectiveness of specific instructional strategies that agencies had identified as effective in 2001-02. Responses indicate that all of the strategies listed continued to be employed effectively by sizeable percentages of respondents. The three strategies most often used and cited as effective in 2002-03 were:

- Target instruction to students' needs and goals
- Use individual assessment results to target feedback and instruction
- Integrate technology, such as computer, video, audio

Table 4.1⁹
Use and Effectiveness of Instructional Strategies

Instructional Strategy	% Effective	% Ineffective	% Did not use
Target instruction to students' needs and goals	94	02	05
Use individual assessment results to target feedback and instruction	90	02	09
Integrate technology, such as computer, video, audio	89	02	09
Align curriculum with CASAS or SCANS competencies	84	04	12
Use multiple measures of assessment	82	05	13
Use group assessment results to target instruction	81	02	17
Align curriculum with the Model Program Standards	78	05	18
Assign support staff such as tutors or instructional aides	67	08	32
Revise curriculum content or design	46	02	52

Total Respondents: 129
 CASAS 2004

Survey comments documented that student needs assessments played an integral part in creating and maintaining a successful curriculum:

⁹ The total number of responses to each question included in the WIA, Title II, 225/231 survey varied from question to question. Some survey respondents provided multiple responses to some questions and did not respond to other questions. Therefore, the total *N* indicated varies from table to table. In some instances, numbers were rounded to the nearest decimal point or to the nearest whole number. In these cases, the totals may not add up to exactly 100 percent.

From a medium-sized CCD:

Student needs assessments inform how and what we teach students. I find the most effective way to get students feedback is through focus groups of 5-7 students.

From a small adult school:

Needs assessments gave us information to guide student placement level in computer classes. Also informed our choice of topics in ESL classes and pacing in the Citizenship Preparation class.

From a small CBO:

We used the data gathered through the student needs assessment to set our priority objectives and plan the curriculum.

From a small jail program:

Student assessments determine level of student capabilities and, as such, determine specific curricular components to be implemented.

From a small library literacy program:

Through using students' needs assessments, the program is able to target curriculum to the individual needs.... student's profile in TOPSpro is used as a curriculum development tool and to aid in ordering instructional materials. It is also used as a way to determine what kind of simulation life skills classes should be held.

When asked for additional comments on classroom-level strategies, respondents focused largely on successful instructional methods, program alignment and curriculum development or adaptation, staff development strategies, or technology implementation. Representative comments follow:

Instructional methods/techniques:

In our ASE classes, we looked at content reading skills to improve the reading levels of our students.

We found that "hands on" techniques in EL Civics projects enhanced English acquisition.

Multilevel and grouping strategies were very effective.

Curriculum development, alignment, or adaptation:

We have found that there is a discrepancy between what different teachers think should be taught on each ESL level. This can lead to problems when students are transitioning from one class to another. This can affect student retention. We are planning to have the teachers meet to discuss expectations and find ways to remedy this situation.

Technology:

We use the audio technology very well; it's the computer technology in the classroom that is lagging.

With the WIA Technology Grant, we will be able to use technology as a part of our instructional delivery practices.

Staff Development:

We have invested in a peer coach who has gone to many classrooms to work one to one with teachers wanting to add or improve strategies. This has been very successful.

Mentoring has reinforced and improved teaching pedagogy.

Technology

Technology Use by Classroom Instructors

The increasing emphasis on technology as an instructional tool is evident in survey results for 2002-03. Technology integration and technology-based instructional strategies are cited as the foremost professional development priorities for instructors. More sophisticated use of assessment data has enabled instructors to individualize learning plans, to identify student needs and goals, and to respond by more specifically targeting crucial skill areas in the development of their lesson plans. Technology increasingly enables alternative forms of delivery that have made instruction more flexible and increased options for students.

Increased Use of Technology

In 2001-02, the most frequent classroom use of technology, cited by 35 percent of respondents, centered on software that supplemented classroom work or provided some core instructional content. Computer labs were the second most frequently mentioned use of technology (19 percent). In 2002-03, 83 percent of agencies indicated that they now use computers and computer software as a supplement to classroom instruction, and 79 percent provide a computer lab for student use. Additionally, the majority of respondents cite computer availability in the classroom (79 percent), Web access for student use as a resource for research (65 percent) or a vehicle for instruction (60 percent), and provision of Internet access including e-mail to students (53 percent) as effective uses of computer technology that they currently implement.

More than one-third (49 percent) of respondents stated that they used computers to provide core instructional content. Table 4.2 summarizes these responses.

Table 4.2
How Agencies Use Computer Technology in the Classroom

Type of computer technology use	Implemented	
	N	%
Use computers/software as a supplement to classroom instruction	110	83
Provide computer lab for student use	105	79
Make computer(s) available in classroom	105	79
Provide Web access for student use as a research resource	87	65
Provide Web access for student use as an instructional resource	80	60
Provide e-mail/Internet access for student use	71	53
Use computers/software to provide core instructional content	65	49
Use Internet/e-mail for communication between instructors and students	39	29
Make computer(s) available in library	30	23
<i>Total Respondents: 133</i>		
<i>CASAS 2004</i>		

Computer Use By Agency Size

When responses are examined by agency size, some notable differences emerge. When compared to medium-sized or large agencies, fewer small agencies indicate that their students are using Web access as an instructional or research tool. Large agency respondents indicate they use computers to provide core instructional content, while medium and small agencies indicate less use of computers for this purpose. Additionally, more large agencies report use of the Internet and e-mail as a student resource than do medium and small agencies.

Table 4.3
How Agencies of Different Sizes Employ Computers

Type of Computer Use	Large (13)		Medium (80)		Small (40)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Use computers/software as a supplement to classroom instruction	13	100	68	85	29	73
Provide computer lab for student use	12	92	68	85	25	63
Make computer(s) available in classroom	13	100	66	83	26	65
Provide Web access for student use as a research resource	11	85	57	71	19	48
Provide Web access for student use as an instructional resource	10	77	54	68	16	40
Use computers/software to provide core instructional content	11	85	39	49	15	38
Provide e-mail/Internet access for student use	9	69	43	54	19	48
Use /e-mail for communication between instructors and students	9	69	24	30	6	15
Make computer(s) available in library	2	15	17	21	11	28
<i>CASAS 2004</i>						

Using Other Forms of Technology

Survey results indicate that, just as the implementation of computers has risen dramatically, so has the use of other forms of technology. In 2001-02, for example, video as a supplement to classroom instruction was mentioned by only 7 percent of the respondents. In program year 2002-03, 91 percent of respondents report using video to supplement instruction, and 47 percent indicate that they use video to provide core instructional content. The advent of PowerPoint as a tool for both teachers and students is also documented in responses to this survey question.

Table 4.4
How Agencies Implemented Other Forms of Technology in the Classroom

Type of technology use	Implemented	
	N	%
Use video as a supplement to classroom instruction	121	91
Use audio/cassettes/CDs as a supplement to classroom instruction	113	85
Use video to provide core instructional content	62	47
Use audio/cassettes/CDs to provide core instructional content	56	42
Instructor use of PowerPoint presentations to deliver instructional content	40	30
Student use of PowerPoint presentations to complete assignments/reports	29	22
Produce CDs to supplement classroom instruction	16	12
Other	7	5

Total Respondents: 133
 CASAS 2004

Distance Learning

In 2001-02, nearly 50 percent of survey respondents reported that they had some form of distance learning program in place. The 2002-03 survey requested that respondents provide more detailed information regarding these programs, including the type of program for which the distance learning option was available, and whether the program was supplemental or stand-alone. While ESL programs comprised the greatest percentage of both supplemental and stand-alone distance programs (57 percent), slightly more than one fourth (26 percent) of ABE, ASE, ESL-Citizenship, and EL Civics programs combined provided a distance learning option. Table 4.5 summarizes providers' responses.

Table 4.5
Distance learning by Program Type

Program	Stand-Alone distance program		Supplemental distance option		Do Not Offer distance option		Program Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ABE	09	11	11	13	65	77	85	100
ASE	11	13	11	13	61	74	83	100
ESL	40	38	20	19	46	43	106	100
ESL-Citizenship	12	15	11	13	60	72	83	100
EL Civics	07	09	15	18	60	73	82	100
Other	08	25	05	16	19	59	32	100

CASAS 2004

Providers with distance learning programs generally report that they are successful programs, and that the option is very popular with students. A central California adult school notes:

Our students LOVE this program. While we were skeptical, they seem to make progress based on the assessments they take and they come regularly to exchange their tapes and to meet one-on-one with a teacher. I would like to get more lower-level students in this program.

A northern California adult school comments:

We've only been able to participate in distance learning through EL Civics, but this has been a great opportunity for our community. This year, we provided video checkout or on-site facilitated instruction at 6 locations, including a work site, library, elementary school, and CBO.

Survey respondents were also asked to indicate the delivery format of their distance programs. The most frequently reported form of delivery, a combination of video and text, was cited by 63 of the 73 agencies that responded to this question.

Table 4.6
Distance Program Delivery Format

Delivery Format	N	%
Video and text/workbook/study packet	63	86
Audio cassette and text/workbook/study packet	28	38
Text/workbook/ study packet only	24	33
Web/Internet based activities or journals/logs	15	21
Interactive CD	10	14
TV program or remote satellite transmission	9	12
Web/Internet based program	9	12
CD and text/workbook/study packet	5	07
<i>Total Respondents: 73</i>		

CASAS 2004

The survey requested that agencies with distance learning programs cite the method they used to document program effectiveness. Most agencies reported multiple methods of tracking success. The highest percentages of agencies reported the use of CASAS assessment instruments or other paper and pencil assessments. Responses are summarized in Table 4.7 on the next page.

Table 4.7
Assessing Distance Learner Success

Method Used	N	%
CASAS assessments	57	81
Other paper and pencil assessments	53	76
Attendance/retention data	46	66
Student evaluations	37	53
Alternative assessment method	24	34
Other ¹⁰ or None; N/A	07	10

Total Respondents: 70
CASAS 2004

Several agencies commented on the challenge of assessing students in distance programs, especially as assessment instruments must be administered in a standardized manner, which requires specific administration conditions (e.g. proctoring, specific time limits, and so on) and, therefore, cannot be administered through a distance option. A mid-sized adult school noted:

It is very difficult to test students enrolled in the distance-learning program; many students use this modality because they have very little time, and as such, they refuse to test. The CASAS test should be an online option for these folks.

Distance Learning, ADA, and CAP

Remarks made by providers asked for further feedback regarding distance learning indicate that current regulations may be impeding the expansion of distance learning options, especially stand-alone distance programs. Representative comments appear below:

From a large community college district:

The formula for distance ed for community colleges is not cost effective.

From a medium-sized adult school:

Because we are over CAP each year, we have used our distance learning only as a supplemental enrichment program, and we keep no attendance records on these students at this time.

From a medium-sized adult school:

Distance learning is a very popular option for our ESL students. We have a 7 percent ADA waiver, but easily offer 10 percent (3 percent unreimbursed).

¹⁰ Responses under 'Other' included: enrollment numbers, number of times students check out materials, teacher evaluations, MIS within software, and student learning logs.

From a medium-sized adult school:

Make the distance learning option over CAP for schools that have already met their CAP. I believe you should focus on rewarding schools who are efficiently serving their communities and consistently running over CAP rather than bolstering under-serving schools.

EL Civics Implementation

The application and implementation process for EL Civics has challenged grantees to improve responsiveness to student priorities and to increase involvement in the community at large. Provider feedback indicates that EL Civics has had noteworthy impact on program content and curriculum design. It has shaped the direction of professional development for participating instructors and strengthened interaction between participating agencies and various stakeholders within their communities.

Responding to the 2002-03 Survey of WIA Title II 225/231 Programs in California, many agencies lauded the multiple benefits of EL Civics implementation. In a comment typical of many survey responses received, one central California adult school noted:

The requirements of curriculum development and assessment that came with the EL Civics grant have improved teacher awareness and focus in delivery of instruction for those who participate. The Technology Plan developed through that grant is providing a good medium for helping the ESL department progress in integrating computer learning into instruction and getting training for teachers. There is more awareness of community organizations within the school and connection to them through EL Civics. In sum, the program management strategies written into the structure of the grant have worked to improve our program in a number of ways.

Numbers of Programs and Contexts

The number of successful EL Civics programs has steadily increased over the three years since inception of the grant. From 2001-02 to 2002-03, the number of funded agencies doubled, and the number of students served more than tripled, as continuing agencies expanded their successful programs and additional agencies applied for funding. In 2002-03, 136 local agencies reported serving 105,754 students under the EL Civics grant authorized by USDE, under WIA, Title II. Of the 136 agencies, 106 agencies received both 231 and EL Civics funding, while 30 agencies received EL Civics funding only.

Promoting Civic Participation

The WIA survey asked EL Civics providers to identify one successful activity promoting civic participation, and to identify the civics objective the activity was designed to support. Most of the respondents to this question mentioned multiple activities. Of the 44 responses to this question, 18 cited participation in field trips as a successful strategy. These field trips promoted student interaction in places in their communities

such as health clinics, polling places, courtrooms in session, city council meetings, banks, and public libraries. Other successful strategies indicated by respondents included having students present reports, participate in role-plays, fill out forms, interact with guest speakers in class, and participate in informational fairs. Respondents indicated that as a result of these activities, students acquired the language and literacy skills needed to function more effectively in their communities: locating and using government services, communicating with health care professionals, interacting with personnel in their children's schools, taking appropriate actions in an emergency, participating in job interviews, and other related activities.

Ensuring Successful Activities: Focus Group Feedback

Octavio spoke to me after class today to tell me he would not be returning to class. He had gotten a new job, and his schedule for class would have to be changed. I asked if the material that we had studied had been any help to him. He smiled broadly and replied that, yes, it had. In fact, he said, he took his materials from the portfolio and studied them carefully before his interview. He felt satisfied that he had done a good job because he was prepared.

As illustrated in the quote from one instructor above, participants involved in focus groups for EL Civics agencies engaged in active discussion of the strategies and materials they found to be most effective. They corroborated the success of activities such as field trips, guest speakers, and student presentations or reports on accessing community resources, and offered many concrete suggestions for enhancing the effectiveness of these activities.

A participant in the EL Civics focus group for medium to large agencies at the 2003 CASAS National Summer Institute reported that instructional staff partnered with staff from a local housing agency to be sure that the curriculum they used was an accurate representation of their community. The housing agency staff read curriculum and corrected inaccuracies. Another participant stated that a social service agency her agency collaborated with in producing EL Civics curriculum obtained a grant to help inform the community.

Another contributor to the medium-to-large agency EL Civics focus group commented on the importance of adequate planning for activities incorporating guest speakers. In the case of this agency, success was enhanced when students met with guest speakers ahead of time, so that the speaker would understand the language level and content that students would find accessible. The instructor also informed the speakers of what students were engaged in learning, gave them examples of student work, and shared information on the language objectives the students were studying to attain.

Performance (Additional) Assessment

The design of the EL Civics program in California requires funded agencies to develop additional strategies to assess attainment of civics objectives that are difficult to measure using multiple choice or fill-in-the-blank tests.

To support agencies in this endeavor CASAS:

- delivered intensive training to EL Civics agency staff on developing and implementing additional assessment plans.
- continued the task of collecting and categorizing agency-developed EL Civics objectives and additional assessment plans to serve as models for other agencies.
- documented and evaluated the use of additional assessment plans along several parameters: 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.

One medium-sized CCD using performance assessment noted:

I think our instructors now understand how to look at performance assessment coupled with CASAS standardized scores and make informed decisions about promoting students. The emphasis on outcomes and 'what a student can do' in a defined period of time has changed the culture of our program.

Types of Additional Assessments

Survey respondents were asked to identify one type of additional assessment that they developed or implemented successfully. Role-play was the most often cited form of additional assessment employed and involved learners in assessments where students would take the parts of: workers, job applicants, hospital patients, store customers, drivers stopped for traffic violations, and so forth. Table 4.8 summarizes the responses.

Table 4.8

EL Civics: Types of Additional Assessments

Assessment Type	N
Role-play	14
Fill out authentic application or other form	10
Write an e-mail, resume, or letter	7
Oral interview	7
Portfolio	5
Pre-post survey	4
Presentation	2
Observation checklist	2
Other	5
Total responses	56

CASAS 2004

Challenges and Resolutions

When asked to indicate whether barriers were encountered in the attainment of any EL Civics objective, providers indicated two principal areas of concern: the low literacy level of students or some other skill deficit, such as lack of computer literacy, which impeded students from achieving the objective. Table 4.9 summarizes providers' responses.

Table 4.9

EL Civics: Barriers to Achievement of Civics Objectives

Barrier encountered	Large		Medium		Small		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low literacy level of students	8	89	14	30	15	68	37	47
Other skill deficit	4	44	11	23	8	36	23	29
Too broad a scope	1	11	6	13	4	18	11	14
Instructors' lack of preparation	3	33	4	9	4	18	11	14
Lack of qualified instructors	1	11	1	2	1	5	3	4
Other ¹¹	3	33	12	26	3	14	18	23

Total Respondents: 78 (9 Large, 47 medium, 22 Small)
 CASAS 2004

Respondents also indicated whether and how they were able to compensate for the barriers they encountered. Their solutions are summarized in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10

EL Civics: Overcoming Barriers to the Achievement of Civics Objectives

Solution to compensate for barrier	Total
Modify materials, techniques	9
Provide tutorial support, including peer tutoring	8
Revise/develop curriculum	6
Provide bilingual support	5
Did not, unable to compensate	4
Provide staff development	3
Refer students to/ place in other classes	3
No problem: staff are experienced with low literacy students	2
Other	11
Total	49

CASAS 2004

Program Support

Teacher Support and Concerns

Several comments focused on the importance and extent of support for instructors in EL Civics programs. Several comments indicated a degree of frustration among teachers regarding the labor-intensiveness of EL Civics implementation and a resistance to continued involvement. Representative comments regarding instructor support and concerns follow:

Teacher preparation improved as the year went on and we became comfortable with our new objectives and provided more staff training. Lack of qualified teachers is always a problem, and we need to set up better regional systems of recruiting from our local teacher-training institutions.

¹¹ Responses under 'Other' included: students unprepared for tasks/level of difficulty, late start to program, attendance, lack of appropriate materials, and teacher resistance.

Teachers had extensive support and many of the problems were overcome but some have expressed a desire to not be involved next year, which is of some concern. It seems that with budget cuts and the stresses of the times that teachers are unwilling to take on anything extra.

We involved an eager group of teachers at various levels and backgrounds to participate from the beginning to help write objectives and assessments so that the teachers had some personal buy-in for the project. This helped encourage and assist other teachers to become involved.

EL Civics Program Specialists

One of the 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 refine their EL Civics programs. The 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 EL Civics objectives; continuous improvement of data collection, reporting, and analysis processes; and development and implementation of additional assessment plans. EL Civics program specialists also assist the CDE by reviewing agency progress reports and disseminating information regarding research-based resources for assessment and instruction particularly suited to EL Civics programs.

EL Civics agencies responding to the WIA survey were asked to indicate which resources they relied on most extensively in providing support for their EL Civics projects. The program specialists were the resource most frequently accessed by the greatest number of respondents. Many also cited CASAS support and EL Civics trainings and workshops.

Table 4.11
EL Civics: Access to Support Resources

Resource	Used Extensively		Used Occasionally		Used Infrequently		Did Not Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
EL Civics Program Specialist	39	59	21	32	4	6	2	3
EL Civics Workshops And Training	32	48	24	36	6	9	1	2
Networking With Other Agencies	24	36	27	41	7	11	4	6
CDE Regional Consultant	8	12	34	52	16	24	3	5
Local Agency Resource Teacher	29	44	11	17	2	3	19	29
CASAS	31	47	25	38	2	3	5	8
OTAN	13	20	35	53	11	17	4	6
CDE	11	17	31	47	13	20	6	9
CALPRO	7	11	19	29	19	29	15	23
CDLP	0	0	3	5	11	17	42	64

Total Respondents: 66
 CASAS 2004

Types of Assistance Provided

When survey respondents were asked to describe the types of assistance received from the EL Civics support resources that they accessed most extensively, help with additional assessment plans and civics objectives topped the list. Several mentioned assistance with progress reports and curriculum resources as well.

Generally, comments reflected the growth in capacity that EL Civics has fostered.

A medium-sized northern California agency 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.

A small library literacy program wrote:

EL Civics is just great. It has made a difference in the lives of our students and service providers. EL Civics has introduced a new population of community participants throughout our two counties. It has given service providers a new client base.

A small CBO reflected:

This is a great program providing functional learning. Students really enjoy the classes because they can see the importance of what they're learning. Teachers like it because it's information students can use. Results are tangible.

Suggestions from the Field

Several comments offered suggestions for improvement of both the EL Civics grant administration process, and of program design and implementation, based upon local agency experience. Some agencies expressed frustration with the lengthy approval process for additional assessment plans.

One southern California provider commented:

It was extremely difficult to attain the datasets needed for the year when our assessments were not approved until December. In spite of this, the students were able to complete objectives well. The additional paperwork to put additional assessments into TOPSpro was time consuming.

A central California respondent made the following comment and suggestion:

We didn't make the SODS that we projected because we needed more development time than we anticipated. It might be helpful to new agencies to get some estimates on time it takes to develop curriculum.

Another central California agency suggested further improving opportunities to network and benefit from the experience of other providers:

Would like to see more modeling of what is expected from agencies in terms of examples of objectives, assessments, reports, and where to find appropriate EL Civics lessons and resources. Would like to have more opportunities for networking with other agencies.

EL Civics: Summary and Recommendations

EL Civics is distinguished by the design of its application and implementation process, which has served to improve responsiveness to student priorities, guide professional development for participating instructors, and strengthen interaction between participating agencies and their communities.

The integration of English language learning with civic participation has proved a winning combination. The number of successful EL Civics programs has steadily increased over the past three years, as has the number of students served by these programs. While many providers have expressed frustration with the labor-intensiveness of grant administration, particularly the documentation and approval process for civic objectives and additional assessment plans, providers who have successfully implemented EL Civics programs consistently report increased student motivation, tremendous gains in instructor expertise and enthusiasm, and increased community interaction and involvement.

Through the evolution and improvement of EL Civics programs, providers have identified successful strategies for enhancing success. Comments indicate that teacher preparation and intensive administrative support, including a strong investment in professional development, may be a key factor in program outcomes. The field has made excellent use of the support infrastructure set in place for EL Civics. Survey response indicates a strong reliance on and appreciation of the EL Civics Program Specialists as a fundamental support resource.

As one medium-sized adult school observed:

With EL Civics funding, we assigned a veteran ESL teacher to become a half-time EL Civics resource teacher. She developed most of the modules and assessments for components 1 and 2, provided most of the staff training, arranged field trips and guest speakers, and provided one-on-one intervention for teachers as they implemented civics education instruction.

Most comments indicate tremendous enthusiasm regarding the perceived and realized benefits of EL Civics. Providers suggest a continued streamlining of the implementation process, as well as clear modeling and examples of required deliverables.

The California High School Exit Exam

The WIA survey asked providers to indicate whether they had experienced an increase in the number of younger students (20 years old or less) in their programs. Responses indicated that, due to the delayed implementation of the CAHSEE, only a slight enrollment impact has occurred to date. As indicated in Table 4.12 below, more than half of the respondents report that their programs have not experienced a notable increase in the number of younger students enrolled. These respondents indicated that, in spite of this lack of an increase, they project increased enrollment of younger students when these students are denied a diploma because they failed the exit exam.

Table 4.12
Increase in Younger Student Population

Agency size	No		Yes		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Large	8	61.5	5	38.5	13	100.0
Medium	39	52.0	36	48.0	75	100.0
Small	22	53.7	19	46.3	41	100.0
Total	69	53.5	60	46.5	129	100.0

CASAS 2004

Almost half (47 percent) of the 129 respondents to this question observed that their enrollment of younger students had increased. Respondents who did experience an increase were asked to note the programs in which the greatest gain in the number of younger students occurred. Of the 151 responses received, the greatest gain was in Adult Secondary Education programs, with 23 percent reporting an impact on their ASE programs. Respondents felt that this impact was due to students trying to complete their graduation requirements in order to obtain their diplomas before the implementation of the CAHSEE.

Of the 111 responses received to the question regarding the impact of the CAHSEE, 38 (34 percent) indicated that they had not yet experienced any impact (Table 4.13). Thirty (27 percent) providers that had experienced an impact cited an increased urgency to align the curriculum with content standards as the most notable effect. Another 26 (23 percent) noted the necessity of adding specific classes or programs to meet a need created by the imminent implementation of the CAHSEE. The subject of mathematics, and more specifically algebra, accounted for the majority of new classes or programs reported by respondents. Two respondents indicated that they had already instituted a CAHSEE preparation course.

Table 4.13
Impact of the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE)

Impact reported	Large (12)		Medium (67)		Small (31)		Total (111)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No impact as yet or N/A	1	8	13	19	24	77	38	34
Align curriculum with content standards	4	33	22	33	4	13	30	27
Add classes or programs	5	42	17	25	4	13	26	23
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Math/Algebra (18) ▪ Writing/English (4) ▪ CAHSEE Prep (2) ▪ Unspecified (2) 								
Increased enrollment	0	0	9	13	1	3	10	9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased concurrent enrollment (3) ▪ Increased enrollment of students trying to graduate before test becomes mandatory (7) 								
New texts/materials	0	0	6	9	0	0	6	5
Anticipate enrollment increase	0	0	5	7	0	0	5	5
Provide additional instructional support (tutoring, remediation)	0	0	4	6	0	0	4	4
Target staff development	2	17	2	3	0	0	4	4
Other ¹²	1	8	12	18	5	16	18	16

CASAS 2004

Several agencies commented at greater length on the projected impact of the CAHSEE. Representative comments from a variety of providers are cited below:

The new California High School Exit Exam will affect our program if it is required. The real impact has been the uncertainty of when and how it will be applied to adult programs. There has not been any direct information from the CDE concerning adult schools. The information coming from other sources (CALPRO, OTAN, and various CDE consultants) has been conflicting. We are upgrading our curriculum to meet the standards required for the test.

Need clarification on Proficiency Tests — do students need to pass the Proficiency Test and CAHSEE? Or only CAHSEE? Will students receive a Certificate of Completion of High School at a graduation ceremony,

¹² Responses under 'Other' included: increased test anxiety, added staff, new instructional strategies, more frequent assessment, pilot testing, just beginning to feel the effects, 'raised the bar' on academic content, reallocation of resources, anticipating changes, and just starting to strategize.

although they are not graduating? Before receiving a Certificate of Completion of High School, must they pass the Proficiency Tests? (Since they cannot pass CAHSEE). Do adult schools need to also add a CAHSEE Workshop Course prior to tests? Can adult schools receive permission from ETS/CAHSEE to administer the test in the evenings on a regular basis? It is a hardship for students to miss employment three mornings in a row.

We expect next year that the California High School Exit Exam will affect our high school diploma program. I know from experience that high school students are struggling with this exam and I am positive that adults that have been out of school for several years will have a difficult time passing this test.

We have just begun to strategize on how we are going to address the California High School Exit Exam.

We are a 37 CAP school with four high schools in the district. We can't possibly assist them.

In the Professional Development section of the WIA survey, respondents prioritized the professional development needs for instructors for the 2002-03 program year by assigning a priority level of low, medium, or high. The impact of an increased younger student population and preparation for implementation of the CAHSEE may well explain the increase over 2001-02 in the percentage of providers of all sizes citing the CAHSEE as a professional development issue, as seen by comparing Tables 4.14 below. For small providers, the percentage of respondents rating classroom management as a high priority professional development issue has remained stable, while its priority as an issue for medium and large agencies has dramatically increased.

Table 4.14

Professional Development Needs for Instructors by Agency Size

Issue	2001-02			2002-03		
	Large	Medium	Small	Large	Medium	Small
CAHSEE/GED	26%	6%	13%	50%	57%	27%
Classroom management strategies	0%	4%	19%	50%	33%	21%

Refer to Chapter 3 for additional information.

CASAS 2004

Narrative comment indicated that agencies do anticipate changes directly related to the CAHSEE, and expect an influx of younger students related to the implementation of the exit examination. Providers are just beginning to strategize in preparation for the impact on their programs. This impact has begun to affect professional development needs and priorities, alignment of Language Arts and Math curriculum with state ASE standards, and selection of appropriate instructional materials.

5 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Local agency responses to the *2002-03 Survey of WIA Title II 225/231 Programs in California* provide evidence that agencies are continuing to refine methods for tracking students, reporting outcomes, and analyzing information. Supported by California's comprehensive infrastructure for capacity building, respondents from WIA Title II programs throughout the state indicated that they are continuing to improve their ability to collect complete and accurate data in full alignment with the NRS reporting requirements and data quality standards. Survey respondents further indicate that they are now building their capacity to use current data to analyze and leverage program strengths and to identify opportunities for program improvement, innovation, and collaboration.

Local providers stated that, in the past year, they have more generally implemented program and classroom management strategies that other funded agencies have identified as effective. At the classroom level, instructors are using data to increase student empowerment and encourage learner accountability through the sharing of assessment results, augmenting student options and increasing program flexibility. Instructors are using student needs assessments, retention and attendance information, and test results to inform changes in curriculum and choice of materials, subject matter, and modes of instruction. Students use individual and class feedback to make informed choices regarding their own educational progress and to collaborate with faculty in determining instructional content.

In 2002-03, the state met or exceeded all of its performance goals. However, survey respondents noted that, in order to facilitate continuous program improvement and meet the performance goals established for 2003-04, greater levels of professional development, training, and support for both administrative and instructional staff would be needed.

The following recommendations to the California Department of Education (CDE) reflect the analysis of survey and focus group data as well as input from the voices from the field. Survey respondents request that the CDE consider these recommendations to support them in their efforts to achieve California's goals for continuous program improvement.

Data Collection and Reporting

Data Quality and Analysis

California adult education providers report improved expertise and interest in ensuring the capture of clean and accurate data. Data collection and quality has steadily improved as providers have adjusted to standards and requirements and have set processes in place. Administrative staffs have moved from the struggle to achieve compliance to developing a grasp of the utility of data as a management tool.

Most agencies are using data to provide feedback to instructors and students in order to increase learning gains and outcomes. Survey results convey that providers would also

like to make more effective use of data in marketing and recruitment efforts, and to communicate with governance, an indication of development opportunities to address through training and conference presentations in the coming year.

Recommendation 1:

Provide technical support and resources to assist local agencies to

- continue to increase data quality and reporting accuracy.
- read and analyze data reports and use them to drive continuous program improvement and increase student outcomes.
- build capacity to use local data for marketing, recruitment, and communication with governance.

Data Match

Without a unique student identifier, the ability of California to capture a truly complete and accurate measure of core performance indicators is hampered. Local agencies report a low rate of response from core performance follow-up mail surveys. The minimal data they receive fails to provide meaningful information for program change directly related to employment and postsecondary outcomes, and tells only a partial story, inadequately documenting the success of state programs.

Recommendation 2:

Provide authority and resources to implement a data match system for adult educational agencies in California to capture core performance outcome measures (entered employment, retained employment, entered postsecondary education or training) and thereby provide reliable, current, and comprehensive information that

- accurately reflects program successes and challenges.
- meaningfully demonstrates return on investment.
- enables continuous program improvement of learning gains and outcomes directly related to employment.
- supports effective state level policy decisions.

Program Management Strategies

Attendance and Retention

Providers report that using data from student and community needs assessments to determine program priorities and course offerings resulted in improved attendance and retention. Four underutilized strategies with demonstrated merit in improving attendance and retention:

- managed enrollment
- reward and recognition programs for attendance
- reward and recognition programs for goal attainment
- student orientation program

Significantly, respondents who reported employing each of the above strategies found them highly successful. Of the providers who indicated that they have implemented managed enrollment, 92 percent found it to be markedly effective in improving attendance and retention, and 90 of the 91 providers who reported that they were implementing student orientation and goal setting programs found them to have a positive effect.

Recommendation 3:

Provide support and resources to

- identify models of effective programs implementing the practices listed above.
- research successful programs to determine their shared characteristics and to accurately describe their effect on attendance and retention.
- develop opportunities to disseminate best practices that increase attendance and retention.

Professional Development

Survey responses confirm that staff development remains a top program improvement priority for providers overall. Data analysis has surpassed data collection and quality as a training focus for program managers. Budget issues and technology also appear among the three highest priority professional development topics for administrators.

Agency respondents deemed technology a key priority for instructors' professional development. The percentage of agencies indicating that technology training was a high priority for their instructors increased dramatically, to more than 50 percent of respondents in 2002-03. There was also a marked increase in the percentage of providers citing classroom management and instructional strategies as a priority professional development issue.

Preparation for implementation of the high school exit exam may partially explain a notable increase over 2001-02 in the percentage of providers of all sizes citing the CAHSEE as a major professional development issue for instructors.

In 2002-03, EL Civics was named by more than 40 percent of respondents from providers of all sizes as a high priority area for instructors' professional development. This represents a substantial increase over 2001-02 figures. Providers indicated that the numbers of low literacy level students in their programs pose a principal barrier to success in achieving EL Civics objectives.

A number of factors raise barriers to the ability of providers to access professional development opportunities. Time, distance, conflict with class schedules, and budgetary considerations all impose constraints, especially on small agencies, where one person may fill multiple positions. Alternative modes of delivery may alleviate some of the strain and enable expanded outreach.

Recommendation 4:

Provide increased opportunities and alternative delivery options for professional development targeting

- data analysis and use of data for program administrators and other decision-makers.
- technology implementation for administrators and instructors.
- curriculum alignment with California content standards in response to the need created by implementation of the CAHSEE.
- development, identification, and adaptation of curriculum and materials for classes or programs added in response to local needs assessment.
- research-based methodologies and materials.
- classroom management for instructors.
- ESL instruction fundamentals, including renewed availability of ESL Institute modules.
- realistic civic and supporting language and literacy objectives for EL Civics programs serving low literacy level students.
- materials to use with low literacy level students in EL Civics.

Evidenced-Based Research

When asked to indicate whether they had encountered barriers to students' attainment of EL Civics objectives, providers indicated that the low literacy levels of their learners often impeded their efforts toward achieving their goals. Approximately 30 percent of the 565,311 learners who met the criteria for inclusion in the federal reporting system were functioning at the Beginning Literacy or Beginning levels of instruction (CASAS scale score below 210) and, therefore, were likely to face problems in their ESL or ABE classes.

Research on identifying effective instructional strategies to use with this population is limited. Results of research conducted by practitioners with similar student populations can be very helpful to ABE and ESL instructors, as the findings would likely be more applicable to their populations and instructional contexts.

Recommendation 5:

Provide support to ensure that evidence-based adult learning strategies inform instruction by

- evaluating the feasibility of adapting K-12 research study findings for use in adult education programs.
- supporting practitioner-based research studies related to adult literacy.
- identifying and disseminating effective programs and practices to address instructors' professional development needs as indicated in Recommendation 4 above.

Program Support Resources

Leadership Projects

Results indicate that the majority of the users accessing the Leadership Projects found their services effective. Virtually all respondents indicated that they accessed support provided by OTAN and CASAS, and more than half of these agencies characterized themselves as regular consumers of their services.

Recommendation 6:

Provide support and resources for expanded outreach by Leadership Projects:

- marketing and training targeted to small agencies
- alternative modes of training delivery

Technology

Most agencies now use computers and computer software as a supplement to classroom instruction, and provide computer labs for student use. Additionally, the majority of respondents cite computer availability in the classroom, web access for student use as a resource for research or a vehicle for instruction, and provision of Internet access including e-mail to students as effective uses of computer technology that they currently implement. Nearly half of respondents stated that they used computers to provide core instructional content.

Fewer small agencies, when compared to medium-sized or large agencies, indicate that their students are using Web access as an instructional or research tool. More than 50percent of large agencies indicate that they use computers to provide core instructional content. Additionally, more large agencies report use of the Internet and e-mail as a student resource than do agencies serving fewer than 8,000 students.

Current regulations may be impeding the expansion of distance learning options, especially stand-alone distance programs. Current funding rules regarding ADA and CAP affect the ability and desire of agencies to increase the number of learners served through distance education.

Recommendation 7:

Provide resources and support to

- ensure that all grantees have a well formulated plan for technology utilization.
- leverage OTAN's successful technology mentoring program.
- examine the effect of current regulations on the potential expansion of distance education.
- ensure targeted networking and training opportunities to address small agency challenges in technology implementation.

Collaboration and Coordination

Coordination

Sixty nine percent of the WIA survey respondents reported some degree of interaction with their local Workforce Investment Board (WIB). Small agency providers appear to experience greater barriers than larger agencies in forming successful relationships with their local WIBs. Many small agency respondents also reported little or no involvement with One-Stops, indicating an opportunity for improved outreach, particularly in remote areas.

Recommendation 8:

Provide resources and support for shared use to expand and strengthen collaboration with local WIBS and One Stops by

- identifying models of effective collaboration.
- sharing effective programs and practices.
- providing incentives to local providers for strengthening Title I/Title II. collaborations, particularly those involving small agencies.

Advisory Groups

Input received from the voices from the field during the survey development and review process ensures that all stakeholders and providers of WIA 225/231 programs will have the opportunity to contribute to the data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes, as well as to participate in the development of recommendations to the CDE.

Recommendation 9:

Continue to support WIA Title II field level advisory groups and regional focus groups, as specified in the California State Plan, as well as other structured opportunities for communication and feedback from the field.

Appendixes

Appendix A **The Twelve Considerations**

Twelve Considerations to be used in awarding funding under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Title II, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA).

In awarding grants or contracts under this section, the eligible provider shall consider:

- (1) The degree to which the eligible provider will establish measurable goals;
- (2) The past effectiveness of an eligible provider in improving the literacy skills of adults and families, and, after the 1-year period beginning with the adoption of an eligible agency's performance measures under Sec. 212 of AEFLA, the success of an eligible provider receiving funding under this subtitle in meeting or exceeding such performance measures, especially with respect to those adults with lower levels of literacy;
- (3) The commitment of the eligible provider to serve individuals in the community who are most in need of literacy services, including individuals who are low-income or have minimal literacy skills;
- (4) Whether or not the program is of sufficient intensity and duration for participants to achieve substantial learning gains; and uses instructional practices, such as phonemic awareness, systematic phonics, fluency, and reading comprehension that research has proven to be effective in teaching individuals to read;
- (5) Whether the activities are built on a strong foundation of research and effective educational practice;
- (6) Whether the activities effectively employ advances in technology, as appropriate, including the use of computers;
- (7) Whether the activities provide learning in real life contexts to ensure that an individual has the skills needed to compete in the workplace and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship;
- (8) Whether the activities are staffed by well-trained instructors, counselors, and administrators;
- (9) Whether the activities coordinate with other available resources in the community, such as establishing strong links with elementary schools and secondary schools, postsecondary educational institutions, one-stop centers, job training programs, and social service agencies;
- (10) Whether the activities offer flexible schedules and support services (such as child care and transportation) that are necessary to enable individuals, including individuals with disabilities or other special needs, to attend and complete programs;
- (11) Whether the activities maintain a high-quality information management system that has the capacity to report participant outcomes and to monitor program performance against the eligible agency performance measures; and
- (12) Whether the local communities have a demonstrated need for additional English literacy programs (Sec. 231)(e)).

Appendix B

Serving the Most in Need

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

Approximately 66 percent (272,200) of the ESL learners and 47 percent of the ABE learners in California were enrolled in the lowest instructional levels, Beginning Literacy through Intermediate Low, CASAS scale scores below 210. Less than 12 percent were enrolled in ASE.

Appendix C

**2002-2003 Survey of WIA/AEFLA, Title II,
225/231 Programs in California**

Agency Name: _____

Contact Name: _____

Name of Person Filling Out Survey: _____

Position: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ Zip: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

Please note that you may access and complete this survey online at the CASAS Web site:
www.casas.org.

225/231 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

1. Please indicate the total number of sites used by your agency to provide instruction for WIA Title II programs (ABE, ESL, ESL-Citizenship, GED/H.S, EL Civics): _____
2. What is your agency's **highest priority for program improvement** during the coming year? How did your agency determine this program improvement priority?
3. How does your agency use **data/assessment results**? Please check all that apply.
 - Determine program improvement priorities
 - Inform/provide feedback to staff
 - Use as a staff development tool
 - Inform/provide feedback to students
 - Communicate with governance (e.g. school board, legislators, and other decision makers)
 - Share with community as a marketing/recruitment tool
 - Other (please specify):

4. Below is a list of **program management strategies** that agencies indicated they employed last year. For those activities listed below that your agency did employ in 2002-2003 (this year), please indicate whether you found the strategy effective or ineffective. If you did not employ the strategy, please select 'N/A'.

N/A Ineffective Effective

Setting up testing schedules for each class based on number of hours per week that classes meet

Setting up data quality control processes such as reviewing all forms and answer sheets prior to scanning

Pre-slugging entry/update forms and answer sheets

Implementing student orientation and goal-setting processes, including assessing students at registration or program entry

Providing a designated coordinator in charge of assessment

Reassigning or adding staff to data collection and accountability responsibilities

Providing targeted training and professional development for all staff

Collaborating with other agencies

Sharing data/assessment results with staff

5. Did your agency employ any program management strategy **other** than those listed above that you found to be particularly effective? If so, please describe it briefly in the space provided:

6. Additional comments on **program management strategies**:

7. Please identify **key factors** in the list below **that have had either a positive or a negative impact on student retention** in your agency. If not a relevant factor or not used by your agency, please check N/A.

N/A + **Positive** - **Negative**
 effect **effect**

Student perception of individual teachers
Managed enrollment
Open enrollment
Student orientation program
Targeting instruction to students' needs and goals
Reward and recognition programs for attendance
Reward and recognition programs for goal attainment

8. Was there any factor other than those listed above that has had either a positive or a negative impact on student retention in your agency? If so, please describe the factor and its impact in the space provided:

9. Did the key factors indicated in Questions 7 and 8 relate to retention within a specific program or across all programs? Please check all programs affected.

ABE
ASE
ESL
ESL-Citizenship
Other (please specify):

10. Additional comments on **attendance and retention**:

11. Is your agency experiencing an increase in the number of **younger students** (20 years old or less) in your programs?

Yes No (If no, please skip to Question 15.)

12. If yes, which programs are affected? Please check all that apply:

ABE
ASE
ESL
ESL-Citizenship
Other (please specify):

13. Within your agency, what has been the impact of the increased younger population?
Please check all circumstances that apply.

Changes in curriculum
Changes in classroom management practices
Increased enrollment in certain programs
Decreased enrollment in certain programs
Decreased enrollment of older students
Facilities/security issues
Other (please specify):

14. Additional comments on **increase in younger student population**:

15. What measures is your agency taking to adapt to current and projected **state budget cuts** in education? Please check all that apply.

Applying for additional/alternative sources of funding
Eliminating specific programs
Reducing specific programs
Reducing summer program
Not offering summer program
Limiting the program to fewer days during the regular school year
Reducing staff hours
Reducing support staff
Reducing instructional staff
Cutting back staff development, including conference and workshop attendance
Restricting materials/equipment expenditures
Other (please describe):

COORDINATION

16. Please indicate the type(s) of collaboration you have engaged in with your local One-stop Center:

- Receive/give student referrals
- Staff liaison posted at One-Stop Center
- Reimburse One-Stop Center for services rendered
- Provide classes or training
- Provide skills labs
- Conduct workshops, conferences, or informational meetings
- Arrange job fairs
- Provide testing/assessment services
- Little or no involvement with One-Stop Center
- Other (please describe):

17. How would you characterize the success of the collaboration with the One-Stop Center indicated in Question 16?

Very unsuccessful	Somewhat unsuccessful	Not sure/too soon to tell	Somewhat successful	Very successful
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. Additional comments regarding coordination with One-stops:

19. Please indicate any partner(s) other than the local One-stop with whom your agency has forged a successful collaborative arrangement, and which has had significant impact on WIA, Title II, program(s).

- Local community business or agency
- Hospital or health care provider/facility
- Other educational institution
- Child services agency
- Health services agency
- Employment agency
- Other social services agency
- CalWORKS
- Literacy program or agency
- Government, military, or law enforcement agency
- Other (please specify):

20. Please indicate which if any of the partners indicated in Question 19 are private or faith-based organizations:

21. Additional comments regarding coordination with the community partners indicated in Question 19:

22. In what ways does your agency interact with the local Workforce Investment Board (WIB)?

- Direct representation: Staff member serves on WIB board
- Staff attend WIB meetings
- Staff serve as WIB committee members
- Represented through consortium
- Agency has Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with WIB
- Receive referrals
- Receive newsletters
- Little or no involvement with WIB
- Other (please specify):

23. How would you characterize the success of the relationship with your local Workforce Investment Board indicated in Question 22?

Very unsuccessful	Somewhat unsuccessful	Not sure/too soon to tell	Somewhat successful	Very successful
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

24. Additional comments regarding interaction with the Workforce Investment Board:

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

25. Please indicate the priority professional development needs in your agency for **administrators** in 2002-2003 (select a priority level of Low, Medium, High, or N/A):

N/A Low Med High

Data collection and quality/TOPSPRO implementation
Data analysis/using TOPSPRO data to manage and improve programs
EL Civics
Updates on legislation and regulations
Technology use, including database management other than TOPSPRO
CA High School Exit Exam/GED
Budget issues
New administrator orientation/issues
Other (please specify):

26. Please indicate the priority professional development needs in your agency for **instructors** in 2002-2003 (select a priority level of Low, Medium, High, or N/A):

N/A Low Med High

Data collection and quality/TOPSPRO implementation
Data analysis/using TOPSPRO data to target and improve instruction
Classroom management strategies
Curriculum development, improvement, revision
Instructional strategies, research-based methodologies
Technology based instructional strategies / curricula
Implementing/integrating technology
Aligning curriculum with Model Standards
Aligning curriculum with CASAS or SCANS competencies
EL Civics
CA High School Exit Exam/GED
Other (please specify):
Data collection and quality/TOPSPRO implementation

27. Please indicate the priority professional development needs in your agency for **other staff** in 2002-2003 (select a priority level of Low, Medium, High, or N/A):

N/A Low Med High

Accountability; data collection and quality/TOPSPRO implementation
Implementing technology (including computer literacy)
Communication skills/customer service
Cross-training of support staff
Program administrative issues (such as attendance)
Database management other than TOPSPRO
Other (please specify):

28. Do you have any additional comments regarding 2002-2003 **professional development needs and priorities** for 2002-2003 for administrators, instructors, or other staff?

29. How have you utilized the support available through the Leadership Projects? Please check those projects from which your agency has received support. For each leadership project checked, please briefly describe the type of support provided (workshops, curriculum or materials, technical assistance, information downloads, etc.)

Leadership Project	Type of support provided to your agency
<p>OTAN (Outreach and Technical Assistance Network) Provides electronic collaboration, access to information, and research, development, and assistance in utilizing technology to improve adult education</p>	
<p>CASAS (Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System) Provides technical assistance, training, and support for assessment, data collection, quality, analysis, and accountability</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> CALPRO (California Adult Literacy Professional Development Project) Provides professional development delivered through regional Resource Centers to enhance the quality of instruction and services delivered to adult learners</p>	
<p>CDLP (California Distance Learning Project) Provides information, technical assistance and resources for the development and implementation of distance learning in adult education</p>	

30. Please indicate **how frequently you accessed the services listed in Question 29** by marking one of the boxes next to the name of each Leadership Project.

N/A

Occasionally

Regularly

OTAN

CASAS

CALPRO

CDLP

31. Please indicate **how effective you found the services listed in Question 29** by marking one of the boxes next to the name of each Leadership Project.

N/A	Ineffective	Effective	
			OTAN
			CASAS
			CALPRO
			CDLP

32. Additional comments on **professional development needs or concerns in 2002-2003:**

EFFECTIVE EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES, REAL LIFE LEARNING

33. Below is a list of **instructional strategies** that agencies indicated they employed last year. For those activities listed below that you did employ in 2002-2003 (this year), please indicate whether you found the strategy effective or ineffective. If you did not employ the strategy, please select 'did not use'.

N/A	Ineffective	Effective	Strategy
			Targeting instruction to students' needs and goals
			Using group assessment results to target instruction
			Using individual assessment results to target feedback and instruction
			Using multiple measures of assessment
			Aligning curriculum with the Model Program Standards
			Aligning curriculum with CASAS or SCANS competencies
			Major revisions to curriculum content or design
			Assignment of support staff such as tutors or instructional aides
			Integrating technology, such as computer, video, audio

34. Did your agency employ any instructional strategy **other** than those listed above that you found to be particularly effective? If so, please describe it briefly in the space provided:

35. Additional comments on classroom-level strategies:

36. Please briefly describe the way(s) you utilize data gathered through student needs assessments:

37. How has the new CA High School Exit Exam impacted your programs? Please briefly describe any changes.

TECHNOLOGY

38. Below is a list of ways in which agencies indicated they implemented **computer technology** last year. Please indicate which of the activities listed your agency employed in 2002-2003.

- Use computers/software to provide core instructional content
- Use computers/software as a supplement to classroom instruction
- Provide computer lab for student use
- Provide e-mail/internet access for student use
- Use internet/e-mail for communication between instructors and students
- Provide Web access for student use as a research resource
- Provide Web access for student use as an instructional resource
- Make computer(s) available in classroom
- Make computer(s) available in library
- Other (please specify:

39. Below is a list of ways in which agencies indicated they implemented **other forms of technology** last year. Please indicate which of the activities listed your agency employed in 2002-2003.

- Use video to provide core instructional content
- Use video as a supplement to classroom instruction
- Use audio/cassettes/CD's to provide core instructional content
- Use audio/cassettes/CD's as a supplement to classroom instruction
- Instructor use of PowerPoint presentations to deliver instructional content
- Student use of PowerPoint presentations to complete assignments/reports
- Produce CD's to supplement classroom instruction
- Other (please specify:

40. Additional comments regarding **implementing/integrating technology**:

EL CIVICS

Components 1, 2, and 3

46. Please identify one **activity promoting civic participation** that worked well at your agency. In your response, please state **the objective the activity supported**, and indicate **the literacy level of the students**. If possible, please indicate **the reasons for the success** of this activity. (If you need more room, please use the back of the page.)

Objective supported by this activity:
Literacy Level of Students:
Describe activity:
Why successful?

47. Please identify one **additional assessment** that worked well at your agency. In your response, please state **the objective the assessment was developed to measure**, describe the assessment itself and indicate **the literacy level of the students**. If possible, please indicate **the reasons for the success** of this assessment.

EL Civics Objective for which this additional assessment was developed:
Literacy Level of Students:
Describe assessment:
Why successful?

48. Please indicate whether you encountered any of the **barriers** listed below in the execution of any EL Civics **objective**:

- Low literacy level of students
- Students lacked necessary skill level in areas other than language/literacy
- Scope of objective exceeded time/resources
- Lack of appropriate preparation for instructors
- Lack of qualified instructors
- Other(please specify):

49. Please indicate whether and how you were able to compensate for the barrier indicated in Question 48:

50. Please indicate whether you encountered any **barriers** in the implementation of any **additional assessment** developed to measure achievement of an EL Civics objective. In your response, please state the objective the assessment was developed to measure, describe the assessment itself and indicate the literacy level of the students.

Objective:
Literacy Level of Students:
Describe Additional Assessment:
Describe Barriers Encountered:

51. Using the boxes beside each item, please indicate which of the resources listed below you have relied on most extensively in providing support for your EL Civics project(s):

Not Used	Used Infrequently	Used Occasionally	Used Extensively
-------------	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------

EL Civics program specialist
CDE Regional consultant
Local agency resource teacher
EL Civics workshops and training
Networking with other agencies
CDE
CALPRO
OTAN
CDLP
CASAS
Other (please specify):

52. Please briefly describe the type of assistance you received from the EL Civics support resources you accessed most extensively, as indicated in Question 51:

53. Any additional comments on EL Civics:

General comments on WIA Title II programs:

Thank you. We appreciate the time and effort you have taken to complete this survey.
If you have any questions, please call Susan Bacerra at ext. 112 or Susie Custodia at ext. 156.

Please return by Friday, May 30, 2003