

California Annual Performance Report

Federally Funded
Adult Education
WIA/Title II
Programs

Program Year 2002
July 1, 2001-June 30, 2002

California Department of Education

CONTENTS

I.	OVERVIEW	1
II.	QUESTION 1: STATE LEADERSHIP PROJECTS	2
	Goals of the California State Plan	2
	Priority Professional Development Needs	2
	Successful Implementation of the State Plan	3
	Identified Needs and Additional Projects	3
III.	QUESTION 2: CORE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE	3
	Highlights of Accomplishments	4
	Pay for Performance	5
	Data Collection Integrity	5
	Expanding What Works	5
	<i>Program Management at the State Level</i>	5
	<i>Program Management at the Classroom Level</i>	6
IV.	QUESTION 3: COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION	6
	Integration of Accomplishments	
	<i>Collaborative Arrangements</i>	6
	<i>Title I and Title II Integration</i>	7
V.	QUESTION 4: EL CIVICS GRANTS	8
	Program Goal	8
	Numbers of Programs and Contexts	8
	Successful Activities and Services	8
	Measuring and Reporting Learner and Program Outcomes	9
	Leveraging the Findings for Continuous Improvement	9

APPENDICES

A.	Number of Funded Agencies by Type
B.	Section 223 Activities Addressed by State Projects
C.	Core Performance Measures Information
	Benchmark Accomplishment Highlights
	Core Performance Measures 1999-2002
	Responses from the 2001-2002 WIA Survey Questions on Core Performance Measures
D.	2001-2002 NRS Federal Tables

OVERVIEW

On January 8, 2002, President Bush signed into law the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. The Act promotes four basic principles as the pillars of educational reform; they include stronger accountability for results, increased flexibility and local control, expanded options, and an emphasis on proven methods of instruction. California, as reflected in the adult education state plan, has raised and sustained these four pillars through the methodical development of an infrastructure that delivers accountability, data quality, teaching excellence, and statewide leveraging of proven results.

As required by the United States Department of Education (USDE), Division of Adult Education and Literacy (DAEL), this narrative report responds to four specific questions. In addition, there are appendices and tables for added clarity to support the narrative. One major source of information for this report was the results of the *2001-2002 Survey of WIA/AEFLA, Title II, 225/231 Programs in California*, a survey sent to all funded agencies in May 2002. Other resources include TOPSpro federally mandated National Reporting System (NRS) data submitted to CASAS by local educational providers, reports from regional focus groups, conference attendees, listservs, and interviews with field practitioners. Additional resources for English Literacy and Civics Education (EL Civics) information included program specialists' reports and contact logs as well as quarterly reports received from local providers.

In 2001-2002, California served 771,905¹ learners across a very large and diverse geographic area through 225 agencies that received Title II local assistance grant funding. These agencies included 150 adult schools—which served the majority of the learners— 16 community colleges, 26 community or faith-based organizations, 10 library literacy programs, 6 county offices of education, 13 jail programs, and 4 state agencies. (See Appendix A.)

California's current adult education state plan allocates federal supplemental funding to local agencies based upon documented student performance and goal attainment in educational programs. Agencies must collect data and provide documentation of student outcomes for this supplemental funding. Agencies are required to:

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

In 2000-2001, the outcomes of student learning gains, as measured by the number of earned "benchmarks," increased significantly: agencies earned 192,332 benchmarks, up from 116,973 earned in the previous year, 1999-2000. The benchmarks earned in 2001-2002 grew significantly again and reached 239,293. Also in 2001-2002, California continued to leverage results and met or exceeded all of its performance goals (See Appendix C, Table C.1, Core Performance Measures). Agencies implemented improved systems and were able to collect more complete and accurate data in full alignment with NRS reporting requirements and data quality standards. These data provide California educators with solid information on which to base program innovation and reform in support of continuous improvement.

¹ 526,955 met NRS reporting guidelines

QUESTION 1: STATE LEADERSHIP PROJECTS

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

California demonstrates a strong and dynamic long-term collaboration with the four state Leadership Projects. This has led to the development of a well-defined infrastructure that supports the delivery of quality adult education and literacy. These projects focus on the California goals of integrating a system of staff development, dissemination of information, assessment and documentation of learner outcomes, curriculum guidelines, and continuous program improvement that have resulted in significant increases in learner outcomes.

The California Department of Education (CDE) funds four State Leadership Projects to accomplish the goals of WIA Title II 225/231 and English Literacy and Civics Education (EL Civics) programs. The Leadership Projects employ a systems approach to meet state goals of: (1) supporting teaching excellence grounded in current research and practice, (2) documenting and reporting student progress and goal attainment, and (3) building capacity and promoting continuous improvement. The Projects are:

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

Each Leadership Project is responsible for providing professional development, training and technical assistance. Through the projects, CDE supports an extensive electronic network for distribution and dissemination of products and “best practices.”

GOALS OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE PLAN

The *California State Plan 1999-2004*, Chapter 12, clearly defines the Section 223 state leadership adult education and literacy activities. California continues to invest in creating a state infrastructure that systematically addresses each of the 11 federally identified types of leadership and builds local capacity through:

- Professional development for administrative, instructional, and support staff that fosters continuous program improvement
- Distance learning strategies that increase program flexibility and options for adult learners, with special focus on underserved and unserved populations
- A standardized accountability system that promotes rigorous data quality standards, documents and reports learner outcomes, and monitors program performance
- Communication linkages that disseminate best and promising practices based on research and proven performance

PRIORITY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

Responses from the “Professional Development” section of the annual statewide Survey of WIA/AEFLA Funded Programs identified the following priority professional development needs among adult education administrators, instructors, and support staff, each of which became the focus of leadership agency effort:

1. Priority Professional Development Needs for Administrators: accountability, assessment, TOPSpro system, data collection, data management and analysis
2. Priority Professional Development Needs for Instructors: effective use of technology in the classroom

3. Priority Professional Development Needs for Other Staff: assessment and data collection, CASAS test administration, TOPSpro system, use of test results

This survey is one of the tools used to assist CDE in developing activities, programs, and projects to meet the needs of the field.

SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STATE PLAN

Successful implementation and highlights of accomplishments, by State Leadership Projects, clearly demonstrate the depth of the impact on WIA, Title II, 225/231 and El Civics programs. In 2001-2002, the Leadership Projects accomplished the following:

CALPRO: Developed new training modules targeting GED 2002, Designing of Programs for Adults with Disabilities, and Differentiated Instruction; revised and updated existing program modules, as offered the Adult Education Leadership Institute; continued expansion, training, and networking support through the Regional Resource Centers.

CDLP: Increased focus on the identification, creation, and dissemination of quality adult-appropriate multimedia learning materials for the multi-provider adult education delivery system in California.

CASAS: Provided comprehensive training and support in assessment, accountability, and data-driven continuous program improvement; developed new assessment instruments; deployed EL Civics program specialists to support funded agencies, and provided attendant training addressing the needs of EL Civics programs.

OTAN: Supported CDE's documentation of statewide technology needs and published a statewide technology plan. Provided an online system and a network of peer mentors to assist agencies with local technology planning and evaluation of the effectiveness of technology implementation.

IDENTIFIED NEEDS AND ADDITIONAL PROJECTS

Building capacity and creating quality programs has been the primary goal of the Leadership Projects over this past year. With CDE, the Leadership Projects identified new agencies, small agencies, community- and faith-based organizations as needing extensive support. The challenge is to maintain the same high level of support for on-going agencies and still assist the others to grow into quality providers. CDE leads the coordinated effort to expand programs to reach more of California's extensive and diverse population.

QUESTION 2: CORE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE

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

During the program year 2001-2002, California's WIA, Title II, program met or exceeded 100 percent of its performance goals. Gains documented for ABE and ESL learners at beginning literacy levels are particularly strong.

HIGHLIGHTS OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS (Charts and Tables in Appendix C)

- Adult Basic Education Program met or exceeded all core performance measures
- When considering all enrollees at all functioning educational levels, results show an increase over the previous year in learning gains achieved.
- A total of 40.6 percent of all enrollees progressed within a level.
- A total of 62.8 percent of all enrollees with paired data completed a level.
- Follow-up survey results show that 54.5 percent of enrollees who indicated their program goal to be obtaining employment achieved that objective.
- Follow-up survey results show that 85.7 percent of enrollees who indicated their program goal to be retaining employment achieved that objective.
- Follow-up survey results show that 60.4 percent of enrollees who indicated their program goal to be entering post-secondary education achieved that objective.

As seen in the table below, the federal tables include 68 percent of the 771,905 learners served by California adult educators in 2001-2002. The 526,955 learners who met the conditions for enumeration in the federal report include learners who had 12 or more hours of instruction, were not concurrently enrolled in a K-12 program, were not under the age of 16, and had a valid instructional program.

	2000-2001	2001-2002
Learners with Entry Records	644,062	771,905
Learners with less than 12 hours of instruction	154,492	190,507
Learners < 16 years old	2,678	4,096
Learners concurrently enrolled in HS/K-12	13,842	25,275
Learners without a valid instructional level	n/a	25,072
Learners included in Federal Tables	473,050	526,955
Learners included in Federal Tables without paired data	240,434	257,649
Learners included in Fed Tables with paired data	232,616	269,306
Number completed a level	140,532	169,007
Number progressing within a level (paired data)	68,257	74,409
Received GED or HS diploma	7,609	9,361
% with paired data	49.2%	51.1%
% completing a level	29.7%	32.1%
% completing a level (paired data)	60.4%	62.8%
Enrollment increase from prior year	3.7%	11.4%

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

Because California legislation does not allow a data match for employment-related goals, and goals of entry into post-secondary education, the ability to capture a more complete and accurate measure of core performance indicators is hindered. Data match would provide reliable and comprehensive information to accurately reflect program success and assist in targeting program improvement. Dependence on survey responses incurs a high cost and hinders CDE from obtaining concrete evidence documenting the success of California’s programs.

PAY FOR PERFORMANCE

Federal report data documents California's year-to-year success in significantly improving student learning gains. CDE began a full pay-for-performance system in 2001-02, with the 2000-01 year providing the baseline for determining continuous improvement. CDE uses learners' attainment of approved Core Performance Indicator benchmarks as the basis of funding for AEFLA 225/231 programs. Agencies can earn up to three benchmark payments per learner within the annual grant period. These three benchmarks result when a learner achieves the following:

- Makes a significant learning gain²
- Completes two instructional levels
- Receives a GED certificate or an adult high school diploma

In addition to the educational gains, agencies must report on three follow-up core outcome measures. These include follow-up measures on students who entered employment, retained employment, and obtained placement in post-secondary education or training. The follow-up measures include only those students who indicate these outcomes as primary or secondary goals. In 2001-2002, agencies submitted student follow-up survey data to document these three core performance outcomes.

DATA COLLECTION INTEGRITY

California places a high importance on quality data. CDE provides both technical assistance and training to support agencies in understanding accountability and improving data collection. However, a greater level of training and support is necessary to build this capacity among the increasing number of smaller agencies that CDE encouraged to participate in the education of the state's diverse adult population.

At the state level, this ongoing commitment to the systematization and continuous improvement of data quality has positioned California well in readiness to respond to the recently released NRS State Data Quality Standards. However, these federal requirements will make even more crucial the assignment of dedicated staff at the local level to improve assessment, data collection, and data analysis at all levels. This will strain even further the already inadequate percentage of funding allowed for program administration.

While accountability requirements place significant burdens on resources, especially in smaller agencies, the majority of local program providers now appreciate having the ability to document and track student program progress and success, as well as having the potential to target effective program improvement and increase responsiveness to learners' needs.

EXPANDING WHAT WORKS

Program Management at the State Level

Responses to the 2001-2002 survey of WIA/AEFLA funded programs indicate local providers embrace the benefits and necessity of data-driven continuous improvement. There is also evidence of on-going refinement of methods for tracking students, reporting outcomes and analyzing information. Of the strategies tried, the greatest percentage of survey respondents found these to be the most effective: dedicating staff for assessment purposes, including data collection and accountability; and assigning a CASAS liaison. In addition, the greatest number of agencies (89.2 percent) identified "pre-slugging of TOPSpro forms" to streamline data collection as a highly effective strategy.

² A 5-point CASAS scale score gain for learners with a pre-test score of 210 or below, or a 3-point gain at post-test for learners with a pre-test score of 211 or higher

Program Management at the Classroom Level

At the classroom level, instructors are using data to increase student empowerment and encourage learner accountability through the sharing of assessment results, and to augment student options and program flexibility through the development of individualized educational plans.

Instructors use student needs assessments, retention and attendance information, and test results to inform changes in curriculum and in choice of materials, subject matter, and mode of presentation. Students use individual and class feedback to make informed choices regarding their own educational progress and to collaborate with faculty in determining instructional content. The most effective classroom-level strategy identified in the survey was the targeting of instruction to students' needs and goals.

In summary, the increase in learning gains achieved this year, coupled with data-driven program improvement, has emphasized and reinforced the four pillars of educational reform: achievement and increased accountability for results, flexibility and local control, expanded options for students, and the leveraging of proven instructional practices. The reported results validate California's investment in development of a statewide infrastructure to continuously build capacity.

QUESTION 3: COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION

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

INTEGRATION AND COLLABORATION

Collaborative Arrangements

Local providers engage in a variety of collaborative arrangements that are of direct benefit to their learners. Agencies that are providing ABE, ESL, and GED/ASE literacy programs often form collaborative arrangements with other schools or school districts and employment and training agencies. In addition, there are effective collaboration arrangements established by literacy programs and businesses. A growing use of the local one-stops as the focal point offers a common ground that provides clients the opportunity to build employment and literacy skills and obtain jobs. In some adult education programs, local school districts and CBOs have co-located classes at the One-Stop site. Also, Family Literacy programs offered at schools and libraries collaborate with early childhood educational programs to provide childcare for adult learners to remove one of the main attendance barriers.

A majority of the EL Civics funded programs report productive relationships with government and community service agencies that provide social services, health, childcare, and housing services, as well as with other federal and state-funded educational programs, such as Community Based English Tutoring (CBET), Head Start, and Even Start Family Literacy.

Local programs leverage multiple funding streams and integrate multiple resources to provide seamless services to a diverse adult population. The strategies used by these programs impressed the USDE/DAEL team that conducted the Federal WIA, Title II, Coordinated Compliance Review in California in July 2001. The team cited these programs as national models that demonstrate ways in which AEFLA can be a driving force in identifying comprehensive sets of resources available to meet the diverse needs of adult learners.

TITLE I AND TITLE II INTEGRATION

CDE continues to work with its WIA Title I partners to support an effective integration of Title I and Title II activities. CDE is represented on the California Workforce Investment Board (CALWIB), giving education a voice in policy creation and decisions. This board, which is now under the new California Department of Labor, also includes the Employment Development Department. The goal is to build on local provider model programs and practices to develop a comprehensive high quality workforce development system throughout California. Differences between the objectives of AEFLA (which focus on providing basic learning skills including literacy skills instruction to those most in need) and the objectives of the One-Stop system (which focus on post-secondary training and employability outcomes) will require increased effort to align.

The 2001-2002 Annual Survey of WIA/AEFLA, Title II, Funded Programs in California provides substantial evidence of effective collaborations between adult education providers and One-Stop centers: 57.6 percent of the respondents reported some level of involvement with their local One-Stops. Most collaborations are in large urban communities and are carryovers from previously successful JTPA partnerships. Both providers and One-Stop staff are discovering the mutual benefits of combining literacy and employment skills as the most successful ingredients for long-term employability.

In addition to collaborative arrangements with local One-Stops, effective partnerships included CalWORKS³, Even Start, local businesses and other government agencies, and adult education programs. The major reasons cited for the effectiveness of these partnerships was that they expanded or enhanced options to provide students services that overcome barriers for attendance and employment. Other reasons cited were that they promoted the coordination, rather than duplication, of services and were a catalyst for sharing information and issues across agencies.

The 2001-02 annual survey shows the extensive integration of both local One-Stops and adult education agencies. Over 24 percent of survey respondents indicated that they offered classes and provided literacy assessments in conjunction with One-Stops, often at the One-Stop facility, and that they considered this type of collaboration effective. Career fairs, orientations, employer workshops, vocational assessment, and evaluation of learning disabilities extended the list of successful collaborative activities. Only 18 percent of survey respondents reported little or no involvement with One-Stops.

Over 55 percent of the survey respondents reported some degree of active engagement with one or more of the 50 local WIBs. Referrals comprised the most frequently reported type of direct interaction. Others reported WIB participation, such as attendance at meetings, board representation, or active membership. Only 12.6 percent of respondents reported little or no interaction with their local WIB.

CDE does not fund One Stops directly; One Stops are funded directly by WIA Title I. While there is no current mechanism for estimating the amount of Title II funds supporting activities and services provided through the One Stop delivery system, there is some collaboration and “in-kind” support provided by Title II agencies that exceeds any dollar value that can be directly documented.

³ CalWORKS – California Work, Opportunity, and Responsibility to Kids – is California’s effort to move public assistance recipients from welfare to work.

QUESTION 4: EL CIVICS GRANTS

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

PROGRAM GOAL

EL Civics programs in California immerse English language learners in education, work, and civic opportunities and assist them to become active and informed parents, workers, and community members. In these programs, the learners improve their English language skills while they gain a better understanding of how to navigate the education, workplace, and government systems in real-life contexts in their communities.

NUMBERS OF PROGRAMS AND CONTEXTS

In 2001-2002, 66 local agencies reported serving 33,953 students under the EL Civics grant authorized by USDE, under WIA, Title II. Local agencies applied to CDE for funding in one or more of the following categories:

Local Assistance Grants

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

Leadership and Capacity-Building Activities

- *Resource Development Mini-Grants:* support the development of original civics education resources and instructional materials.

SUCCESSFUL ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES

CDE used its Leadership Projects to ensure the implementation of quality EL Civics programs in California. This infrastructure supports funded agencies to meet NRS data quality and accountability standards; responds to the diverse needs and objectives of the learners enrolled; increases learning options and program flexibility; identifies, promotes, and leverages effective program and classroom strategies; and increases student learning outcomes.

CDE contracted seasoned field practitioners—"program specialists"—to assist local providers to develop and improve their EL Civics programs. They work within an assigned region to provide training and assistance to the EL Civics agencies within that region via technical workshops, site visits, telephone and e-mail contact, and regional networking meetings. The specialists form a team with CDE adult education consultant staff to provide intensive local assistance in implementing federal and state accountability requirements including: refining student performance objectives; implementing processes for collecting and reporting valid student outcome data; and identifying, developing, and implementing appropriate additional assessment strategies. Program specialists also assist CDE by reviewing summary reports and products from mini-grant resource development projects, and disseminating information related to EL Civics-focused, research-based resources for assessment and instruction.

Adult schools, community colleges, library literacy programs, community-based organizations, and county offices of education implemented a variety of innovative EL Civics projects in 2001-02. The

majority of these agencies reported the most effective activities included increasing and facilitating access to community resources; student field trips to local community agencies, and collaboration with other agencies that provide support, training, or other services. They cited the following program characteristics as crucial in attaining positive outcomes:

- Target students' identified needs and goals, and apply to their daily lives
- Prepare students to interact in their communities
- Provide an additional learning modality

MEASURING AND REPORTING LEARNER AND PROGRAM OUTCOMES

CDE required all funded agencies to use the CASAS assessment and data collection system to document student outcomes and benchmark attainment. Additionally, given the innovative nature of California's EL Civics program design, funded local agencies had to (1) identify priority civics objectives for program participants; (2) describe the criteria used to measure, document, and report the learner's performance; (3) develop additional strategies to assess attainment of priority civics objectives that cannot be measured by paper and pencil tests, and (4) explain how the information they gathered would be used to improve program design and instructional practice. Additionally, the reporting process required local agency staff to reflect on, analyze, and evaluate local project activities during each reporting period. This process yields valuable information related to trends, needs, and opportunities for increasing program effectiveness. Agencies responding to the annual survey commented that while the quarterly reporting requirements placed great demands on their limited resources, the reporting process provided an opportunity to review strengths and weaknesses, make adjustments if needed, and identify both successful administrative and instructional strategies. Agencies also acknowledged excellent performance results and indicated that civic participation increased the relevance and importance of education in students' lives.

USDE originally granted EL Civics funding on a one-year basis. However, with the extension of federal funding over a two- or three-year period, California plans to initiate several longitudinal studies to identify effective practices in local programs. Through research and evaluation studies to be conducted through the CASAS leadership project, CDE plans to study:

- The extent to which programs achieve their proposed civics participation and language and literacy skill objectives
- The impact of involvement in civic participation activities on students' daily lives
- The feasibility of large-scale implementation of additional, multiple measures of assessment directly related to EL Civics objectives
- The effects of involvement in civics participation activities on student retention, learning gains, and goal attainment

LEVERAGING THE FINDINGS FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

During the initial funding period for EL Civics, California agencies were primarily in a program development mode. Local agencies have implemented a variety of program and instructional strategies while documenting, measuring, and reporting their findings. To enhance program development and implementation in 2002-03, CDE and CASAS, with the assistance of program specialists, have agreed to begin work to link EL Civics assessment to competencies and instructional materials that focus on learners' goals. This work will initially focus on collecting and analyzing data collected through two means:

- Identifying EL Civics priority objectives, with the intent of developing a bank of "most often selected" objectives and the additional assessments developed to assess attainment of these objectives

- Documenting and evaluating the use of additional assessments, including the types of assessment being used, the types of performance assessments being used, the numbers of agencies using each type of assessment, the processes used for administration and scoring, and the assessment results

CDE recognizes the need to address the realities of small agencies, rural agencies, and agencies providing non-traditional programs. CDE involves CASAS in identifying and evaluating alternative implementation strategies, determining effective program strategies, and sharing these proven strategies with the adult education community of providers. CDE is dedicated to continuously improve the EL Civics program and enhance the overall program quality of ESL programs in California.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
NUMBER OF FUNDED AGENCIES BY TYPE

Provider Type	2001-2002		2000-2001		1999-2000	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Adult School	150	66.7	143	73.3	135	71.1
Community College	16	7.1	12	6.2	15	7.9
Community-Based Organization	26	11.6	13	6.7	13	6.8
Library	10	4.4	8	4.1	10	5.3
State Agency	4	1.8	4	2.1	5	2.6
Jail Programs	13	5.8	9	4.6	9	4.7
County Office of Education	6	2.7	6	3.1	3	1.6
Total	225	100	195	100	190	100

Adult schools continue to be the major provider of educational services in California's WIA, Title II, program, although the number of CBOs funded, doubled – from 13 agencies in 2000-2001 to 26 agencies in 2001-2002.

APPENDIX B
SECTION 223 ACTIVITIES ADDRESSED BY STATE PROJECTS

The four State Leadership Projects (CASAS, CDLP, OTAN, and CALPRO) address each of the 11 activities listed under Section 223 for adult education and literacy:

Activity	CASAS	CDLP	OTAN	CALPRO
1. Professional development for instruction	Continuing		Continuing	New
2. Technical Assistance	Continuing		New	New
3. Technology Assistance	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	
4. Regional Resource Centers	Continuing		Continuing	Continuing
5. Monitoring and evaluation	Continuing			
6. Incentives for programs and performance	Continuing	New	Continuing	Continuing
7. Developing and disseminating curricula	Continuing	Continuing	New	New
8. Other activities of statewide significance	Continuing		Continuing	New
9. Coordination with support services	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
10. Linkages with employers and skills training	Continuing			Continuing
11. Linkage with post-secondary	New	New	New	New

APPENDIX C
CORE PERFORMANCE MEASURES INFORMATION

Core Performance Measures 1999-2002

Table C.1

Entering Educational Functioning Level	CA 1999-2000 Performance Goal	CA 1999-2000 Performance (against all enrollees)	CA 1999-2000 Performance (against enrollees with pre- & post-test results)	CA 2000-2001 Performance Goal	CA 2000-2001 Performance (against all enrollees)	CA 2000-2001 Performance (against enrollees with pre- & post-test results)	CA 2001-2002 Performance Goal	CA 2001-2002 Performance (against all enrollees)	CA 2001-2002 Performance (against enrollees with pre- & post-test results)
ABE Beginning Literacy	13%	13.0%	45.2%	15.0%	22.6%	51.7%	17.0%	25.7%	52.4%
ABE Beginning Basic	20%	17.7%	57.5%	22.0%	33.2%	71.3%	24.0%	36.4%	74.0%
ABE Intermediate Low	20%	18.0%	65.7%	22.0%	34.5%	71.2%	24.0%	37.7%	73.6%
ABE Intermediate High	22%	13.7%	32.4%	24.0%	29.3%	54.0%	26.0%	29.9%	52.7%
ASE Low	NA	1.7%	21.7%	14.0%	13.6%	55.3%	15.0%	25.4%	78.7%
ASE High*	7%	18.5%	14,399	8.0%	26.9%	66.8%	9.0%	28.3%	68.0%
ESL Beginning Literacy	18%	14.1%	71.6%	20.0%	30.6%	88.1%	22.0%	32.2%	88.0%
ESL Beginning	20%	12.5%	58.0%	22.0%	26.7%	65.9%	24.0%	28.4%	67.2%
ESL Intermediate Low	22%	27.2%	54.5%	24.0%	37.0%	64.2%	26.0%	39.8%	66.6%
ESL Intermediate High	22%	30.0%	65.9%	24.0%	39.7%	68.9%	26.0%	43.0%	70.6%
ESL Advanced Low	18%	13.0%	25.7%	20.0%	21.7%	35.6%	22.0%	22.7%	36.1%
ESL Advanced High	NA	18.1%	35.8%	NA	17.7%	36.8%	NA	19.3%	38.0%
	CA 1999-2000 Performance Goal	CA 1999-2000 Performance (Students w/ Education or Employment Goal)	CA 1999-2000 Performance (Total Students)*	CA 2000-2001 Performance Goal	CA 2000-2001 Performance (against all enrollees)*	CA 2000-2001 Performance (against enrollees with pre- & post-test results)	CA 2001-2002 Performance Goal	CA 2001-2002 Performance (against all enrollees)**	CA 2001-2002 Performance (against enrollees with pre- & post-test results)
Entered Employment	10,000	11,068	33,599	9.0%	17.8%	N/A	10.0%	54.5%	N/A
Retained Employment	18,000	25,877	55,256	11.0%	34.3%	N/A	12.0%	85.7%	N/A
Entered Postsecondary Education	23,000	392	8,287	6.0%	11.7%	N/A	7.0%	60.4%	N/A

* These numerical performance values were reported by either the student or local educational official.

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

Responses from the 2001-2002 WIA Survey Questions on Core Performance Measures⁴

1. What are some of the challenges you anticipate in collecting this information?

Table C.2

Challenge	N	%*
Transience/mobility of student population	94	74
Lack of student response	31	24
Time/cost to collect information	19	14
Staff required to collect information	15	11
Privacy issues/Reluctance to share information	10	7

* total number of responses to this question: 127

Most agencies cited multiple challenges. The difficulty of maintaining accurate contact information due to the transience of the student population presents the most severe challenge to the majority of agencies. Lack of response by students to mail surveys and other methods of data collection also presented a major obstacle. In addition, the expense of this follow-up poses a problem for many agencies: for example, the claims on staff time and costs of postage required to engage in collecting the information are often prohibitive. With a rate of return on any given parameter of 10.3 percent or less (see results), it is difficult to justify the effort.

2. What kinds of assistance would you need in order to collect this information?

Table C.3

Type of Assistance	N	%*
Additional staff	42	36
Additional funding	25	21
Improved systems/database	12	10
A proven model to follow	7	6
Student cooperation	6	5
Data match	5	4

* total responses to this question: 116

Again, most respondents cited more than one form of assistance desired. A total of 36 percent of respondents felt additional staff dedicated to the data collection task would have the greatest impact. Twenty-one percent suggested a general increase in funding. Several large agencies specifically referred to the advantage other states have in employing data match.

⁴ Less than five responses to any question were not included in the tables; some questions generated multiple responses and, therefore, the N may add up to more than the total responses given.

3. How will you use the information from the student follow up surveys?

Table C.4

How core performance data will be used	<u>N</u>	%*
Assess program performance	34	33
Guide curriculum choice/development	20	19
Program improvement/development	22	21
Satisfy reporting requirements	10	9
Don't know/can't/won't/too soon to tell	9	8
Recruitment/marketing	8	7

* total number of responses to this question: 102

For most respondents, this answer was hypothetical, and conditional upon a marked improvement of response rate or the ability to use data match in the future.

4a. Please provide one example of a student follow-up strategy used in your agency that you have found to be particularly effective.

Table C.5

Effective follow-up strategy	<u>N</u>	%*
Telephone contact	30	27
No follow-up strategy	14	12
Students fill out form in class/on site	9	8
Mail survey/postcard	9	8
Depend on students to volunteer information	6	5

* total responses to this question: 109

Again, it is important to view these answers in the context of the low rate of response experienced.

APPENDIX D
2001-2002 NRS Federal Tables

Table 1	Participants by Entering Educational Functioning Level, Ethnicity, and Sex
Table 2	Participants by Age, Ethnicity, and Sex
Table 3	Participants by Program Type and Age
Table 4	Educational Gains and Attendance by Educational Functioning Level
Table 4B	Educational Gains and Attendance for Pre- and Post-tested Participants
Table 5	Core Follow-up Outcome Achievement
Table 6	Participant Status and Program Enrollment
Table 7	Adult Education Personnel by Function and Job Status