

# California Adult Education

Table 6a Learning Gains—Other Learners

Year	Mean Pretest Score	Mean Learning Gain	N	Pretest	Post-Test	Test Pre to Post Level*	Mean Pretest Score	Mean Learning Gain	W
2003	193.5	5.4	1,934	31R	32R	=	193.5	5.4	100
2002	191.1	9.5	1,947	32R	31R	=	191.1	9.5	100
2001	201.9	13.7	1,934	31R	32R	+	201.9	13.7	100
2000	211.1	8.1	1,934	32R	31R	=	211.1	8.1	100
1999	221.0	10.0	1,934	33R	35R	+	221.0	10.0	100
1998	223.9	10.0	1,934	35R	36R	=	223.9	10.0	100

\* = - pre and post-test at the same functioning level  
+ - post-test is at the next highest functioning level  
CASAS 2003

## **Implementation of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Title II**

### **End-of-Year Progress Report to the Legislature**

**Program Year 2004**  
*July 1, 2003 – June 30, 2004*



Submitted by the California Department of Education, Adult Education Office

Implementation of the  
Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Title II

End-of-Year Progress  
Report to the Legislature

Program Year 2004  
July 1, 2003 – June 30, 2004

Submitted by the  
California Department of Education, Adult Education Office

February 2005

The ***Implementation of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA ) Title II End-of-Year Progress Report to the Legislature Program Year 2004*** was prepared by the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS), Foundation for Educational Achievement, for the Adult Education Office, California Department of Education. CASAS activities are funded by a contract under Public Law 105-220 and are administered by the Adult Education Office.

INTRODUCTION.....	1
<b>PART I — IMPLEMENTATION OF WIA TITLE II .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b><i>a. The makeup of 2003-04 adult education providers that applied for competitive grants under Title II and those that obtained grants, by size, geographic location, and type (school district, community colleges, community-based organizations, other local entities)</i></b>	<b>3</b>
Funding and Applicants for Funding .....	3
Geographic Region by Provider Type.....	5
Agency Size by Provider Type.....	6
Agency Size by Geographic Region .....	7
Enrollment by Provider Type.....	9
<b><i>b. The results on the extent to which participating programs were able to meet planned performance targets</i></b>	<b>10</b>
Benchmark Performance Highlights for WIA Title II Funded Agencies .....	11
Level Completion Highlights for NRS Eligible Learners in WIA Title II Funded Agencies.....	12
<b><i>c. Types of courses (ESL, ESL Citizenship, ABE, ASE) included in the performance targets of participating agencies</i></b>	<b>14</b>
Enrollment by Instructional Programs .....	14
<b>PART II — LEGISLATIVE INTENT CONSIDERATIONS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b><i>Background and Integrity of Current System</i></b>	<b>17</b>
<b><i>Issues CDE has garnered and actively supported for local providers in the use of WIA Title II State Leadership Funds</i></b>	<b>18</b>
Issue 1: Accountability .....	18
Issue 2: Evidence-Based Research.....	19
Issue 3: Small Agencies.....	19
Issue 4: Expansion of Instructional Delivery Options.....	19
Issue 5: Professional Development .....	19
Issue 6: Advisory Groups.....	20
<b><i>Legislative Recommendations for Improving Implementation of an Accountability-Based Funding System</i></b>	<b>20</b>
<b><i>(a) Evaluate whether any changes need to be made to improve the implementation of the accountability-based funding system under Title II</i></b>	<b>20</b>
Recommendation 1: Data Match .....	20
Recommendation 2: Assessment for Adults with Disabilities .....	20
Recommendation 3: Collaboration with Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) and One Stop Centers ..	20
Recommendation 4: Collect and Report Data on All Apportionment Funded Adult Education Programs.....	21
<b><i>(b) Evaluate the feasibility of any future expansion of the accountability-based funding system using state funds.</i></b>	<b>21</b>
Need to Develop Standards and Assessments in Other Authorized Areas.....	21
Need to Provide Additional Funding and Technical Assistance to Support the Transition.....	22
<b><i>Appendix A Progress Measures</i></b>	<b><i>i</i></b>
<b><i>Appendix B Summary of California Core Performance Results from 1999 - 2004</i></b>	<b><i>iii</i></b>
<b><i>Appendix C CASAS Skill Level Descriptors for ABE</i></b>	<b><i>v</i></b>
<b><i>Appendix D CASAS Skill Level Descriptors for ESL</i></b>	<b><i>vii</i></b>

## Tables

Table 1	WIA Title II Applicants and Agencies Funded by Agency Type (PY 2003-2004) .....	4
Table 2	Number of WIA Title II Funded Agencies by Provider Type Over Four-Year Period .....	4
Table 3a	WIA Title II Applicants and Agencies Funded by Geographic Region (PY 2003-2004) .....	5
Table 3b	Geographic Region by Provider Type – with WIA Title II Funding (PY 2003-2004) .....	6
Table 4a	Agency Size by Provider Type – with WIA Title II Funding (PY 2003-2004) .....	7
Table 4b	Agency Size by Geographic Region – with WIA Title II Funding (PY 2003-2004) .....	7
Table 4b1	Small-Sized Agencies by Geographic Region – with WIA Title II Funding .....	8
Table 4b2	Medium-Sized Agencies by Geographic Region – with WIA Title II Funding .....	8
Table 4b3	Large-Sized Agencies by Geographic Region – with WIA Title II Funding .....	8
Table 5	Enrollment by Provider Type – WIA Title II Funded Agencies Over Four-Year Period .....	10
Table 6	Benchmarks By Program Type – WIA Title II Funded Agencies Over Four-Year Period .....	11
Table 7	WIA Title II California Learner Enrollment with NRS Restrictions (PY 2003-2004) .....	12
Table 8	Level Completion for NRS Eligible Learners (PY 2003-2004) .....	13
Table 9	Core Follow-Up Outcome Achievement (PY 2003-2004) .....	14
Table 10	Enrollment by Instructional Program – Funded by WIA Title II Over Four-Year Period .....	15
Table 11	Entry Instructional Level for Benchmark Eligible Learners – WIA Title II (PY 2003-2004) .....	15

## INTRODUCTION

The federal Workforce Investment Act Title II, Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (WIA Title II) provides funding for states and territories to provide instruction in English as a Second Language (ESL), Adult Basic Education (ABE), and Adult Secondary Education (ASE) to adults in need of these literacy services. California State Budget Act language for fiscal year 2004-05 (Item 6110-156-0890 provision 3) requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to report on the implementation of WIA Title II, as follows:

*“On or before March 1, 2005, the State Department of Education shall report to the appropriate subcommittees of the Assembly Budget Committee and the Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee on the following aspects of Title II of the federal Workforce Investment Act:*

- (a) the makeup of those adult education providers that applied for competitive grants under Title II and those that obtained grants, by size, geographic location, and type (school district, community colleges, community-based organizations, other local entities);*
- (b) the extent to which participating programs were able to meet planned performance targets; and*
- (c) a breakdown of the types of courses (ESL, ESL citizenship, ABE, ASE) included in the performance targets of participating agencies.*

*It is the intent of the Legislature that the Legislature and State Department of Education utilize the information provided pursuant to this provision to (a) evaluate whether any changes need to be made to improve the implementation of the accountability-based funding system under Title II and (b) evaluate the feasibility of any future expansion of the accountability-based funding system using state funds.”*

Fiscal year 2003-04 represents the fifth year of WIA Title II implementation. Three major implementation goals were to (1) institute performance measures; (2) establish increased accountability requirements; and (3) implement quarterly data submission for all funded programs. WIA Title II multiyear grants are funded on a pay-for-performance basis. California’s federal funding allocation plan is based on documented student performance and goal attainment in educational programs. It requires all agencies to collect the following information on all students for whom they receive federal funding:

- Demographic and program information
- Individual student progress and learning gains in the literacy skill levels of reading, writing, and speaking the English language; numeracy; problem solving; English language acquisition; and other literacy skills
- Student outcomes, such as the completion of a GED, attainment of a high school diploma, and acquisition or retention of unsubsidized employment (see Appendix A for further information about data collection issues)

Each year California uses these data to negotiate performance goals with the United States Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education (USDE, OVAE) for the 12 literacy levels within the three program areas of ABE, ASE, and ESL and the four core follow-up outcome measures of (1) entered employment, (2) retained employment, (3) entered postsecondary education or training, and (4) attained a GED or high school diploma. The literacy level performance goals are based on the percentage of all enrollees who complete a literacy level within the program year (PY). The core follow-up outcome measures are based on the percentage of adult learners who identify specific goals for their enrollment and achieve their goals and exit from the program. In 2003-04, California's WIA Title II program met or exceeded the performance goals for 11 of the 12 literacy levels and exceeded the performance goals for all four core follow-up outcome measures. (For specific information, refer to Appendix B for the Summary of California Core Performance Results from 1999-2000 to 2003-04).

In 2003-04 adult education providers throughout the state continued to improve their ability to collect complete and accurate data in full alignment with the National Reporting System (NRS) reporting requirements and data quality standards. Local adult education providers now have the capacity to use current data to analyze and leverage program strengths and to identify opportunities for program improvement, innovation, and reform.

The authority for collecting these comprehensive data comes from California's application for and receipt of WIA Title II federal funds. CDE and the adult education infrastructure currently do not have the resources nor the authority to collect such comprehensive information on state apportioned adult education programs except under current Budget Act Language in item 6110-156-0001 provision 4(f), (g), and (h); and this language restricts collection of data specifically for education and training services to welfare recipient students and those in transition off welfare.

This report is divided into two parts. Part I addresses the implementation of WIA Title II. Part II addresses legislative intent considerations with recommendations.

## **PART I — IMPLEMENTATION OF WIA TITLE II**

***a. The makeup of 2003-04 adult education providers that applied for competitive grants under Title II and those that obtained grants, by size, geographic location, and type (school district, community colleges, community-based organizations, other local entities)***

### **Funding and Applicants for Funding**

Title II supports three general types of program funding:

1. Section 225 of Title II for institutionalized adults
  - ABE – Provides education that enables learners to gain the basic literacy skills, improve their employment opportunities, and work toward the attainment of a high school diploma, including vocational ABE (VABE).
  - ASE – Includes preparation for achieving a high school diploma or successfully passing the test for General Educational Development (GED).
  - ESL – Assists learners in English language acquisition, including vocational ESL (VESL).
2. Section 231 of Title II
  - ABE including vocational ABE (VABE)
  - ASE
  - ESL including vocational ESL (VESL)
  - ESL-Citizenship (ESL-Cit) – Assists learners in English language acquisition with special emphasis on preparing learners to achieve U.S. citizenship
  - Family Literacy
3. English Literacy and Civics Education (EL Civics) of the Federal Omnibus Budget Act
  - ESL in the context of citizenship preparation and civic participation

In 2003-04, 308 agencies applied for federal funding under Section 225, Section 231, or EL Civics. Agencies serving students who were not institutionalized could apply for both Section 231 and EL Civics funds. Of the 308 agencies that applied for funding, 291 agencies received WIA Title II funding through Section 225, Section 231, or EL Civics and submitted complete year-end data (see Table 1).

**Table 1****WIA Title II Applicants and Agencies Funded by Agency Type (PY 2003-2004)**

Agency Type	Applied for Funding		Received Funding	
	N	%	N	%
Adult Schools	175		174	99.4
Community-Based Organizations	63		54	85.7
Community College Districts	19		18	94.7
Library Literacy Programs	16		13	81.3
County Offices of Education	9		9	100.0
California Conservation Corps	1		1	100.0
Institutions (Section 225)	25		22	88.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>308</b>		<b>291</b>	<b>94.5</b>

CASAS 2005

In PY 2003-04, CDE refined the delivery of technical assistance to local literacy applicants to provide better information in the application process. This resulted in an increase in the number of applications submitted and subsequently an increase in the number of agencies funded. Adult schools comprised the majority of WIA Title II agencies that applied and were funded. Other adult education providers include community-based organizations (CBOs), community colleges, library literacy programs, county offices of education (COE), California Conservation Corps (CCC), and state and local institutions (Section 225), which include county jail education programs and state agencies serving institutionalized adults.

**Table 2****Number of WIA Title II Funded Agencies by Provider Type Over Four-Year Period**

Agency Type	PY 2000-2001		PY 2001-2002		PY 2002-2003		PY 2003-2004	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adult Schools	143	73.2	150	67.2	163	63.1	174	59.7
Community-Based Organizations	13	6.7	24	10.8	43	16.7	54	18.6
Community College Districts	12	6.2	16	7.2	18	7.0	18	6.2
Library Literacy Programs	8	4.1	10	4.5	8	3.1	13	4.5
County Offices of Education	5	2.6	6	2.7	7	2.7	9	3.1
California Conservation Corps	1	0.5	1	0.4	1	0.4	1	0.3
California State Universities	N/A	0.0	N/A	0.0	1	0.4	N/A	0.0
Institutions (Section 225)	13	6.7	16	7.2	17	6.6	22	7.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>100.0</b>

CASAS 2005

The total number of funded agencies has steadily increased to 291 in 2003-04, (a 49 percent gain in the number of providers since 2000-01). Most provider types showed increases in the number of agencies that applied for and received funding over the last two program years. For the third consecutive program year, there was an increase in the number of CBOs. Of the 22 agencies receiving Section 225 funding to serve institutionalized adults, 19 were jail programs, (an increase of 5 new jail programs), and

the remaining 3 were state agencies: California Department of Corrections (CDC), Department of Developmental Services (DDS), and California Youth Authority (CYA). The goal continues to be one of increasing the number of providers to build capacity in reaching and serving low literacy learners.

### Geographic Region by Provider Type

For reporting purposes, California is categorized into seven regions: five separate geographical regions; a Balance of State region, which includes the more remote geographical areas of the state not included in the initial five regions; and a seventh category that includes funded state agencies providing services throughout the state. Table 3a reports agencies that applied for WIA Title II funding and those that received WIA Title II funding by geographic region for 2003-04.

**Table 3a**  
**WIA Title II Applicants and Agencies Funded by Geographic Region (PY 2003-2004)**

Geographic Region	Applied for Funding	Received Funding	%
	N	N	
Bay Area Region	63	58	92.1
Central Valley Region	27	26	96.3
Los Angeles Perimeter Region	50	48	96.0
Los Angeles County Region	56	50	89.3
San Diego Region	15	15	100.0
State Agencies	4	4	100.0
Balance of State	93	90	96.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>94.5</b>

CASAS 2005

Table 3b reports the number and percentage of applicant agencies that received WIA Title II funding by geographic region and provider type, and the number and percentage of learners enrolled in each geographic region category. Four regions had more providers approved for funding than in the prior year (Bay Area, Los Angeles Perimeter, Los Angeles County, and the Balance of the State); two regions had fewer providers approved for funding compared to 2002-03 (Central Valley and San Diego). There was no change in the number of state agencies funded during 2003-04.

The geographic region with the greatest percentage of agencies was the Balance of State region that encompasses mostly rural areas falling outside the main urban centers. Although 30.9 percent of agencies were in the Balance of State region, they account for only 12.2 percent of total student enrollment.

Excluding the Balance of State region, Los Angeles County, its perimeter counties, and the Bay Area dominate the California system in the number of agencies and the number of students enrolled. Los Angeles County and its perimeter counties account for 33.7 percent of all agencies and 56.7 percent of student enrollment; these numbers are influenced by the Los Angeles Unified School District — the largest adult education

provider in the state. The Bay Area region comprises 19.9 percent of all agencies and 16.9 percent of student enrollment.

**Table 3b**

**Geographic Region by Provider Type – with WIA Title II Funding (PY 2003-2004)**

Geographic Region	Adult Schools		CBO		Community Colleges		Library Literacy		COE	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
	Bay Area	32	18.4	19	35.2	1	5.6	0	0.0	2
Central Valley	20	11.5	4	7.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Los Angeles Perimeter	28	16.1	8	14.8	5	27.8	3	23.1	0	0.0
Los Angeles County	31	17.8	10	18.5	4	22.2	4	30.8	0	0.0
San Diego	8	4.6	4	7.4	2	11.1	1	7.7	0	0.0
State Agencies	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Balance of State	55	31.6	9	16.7	6	33.3	5	38.4	7	77.8
	<b>174</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Geographic Region	CCC		Institutions (Section 225)		Total Agencies		Total Enrollment	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Bay Area	0	0.0	4	18.2	58	19.9	142,696	16.9
Central Valley	0	0.0	2	9.1	26	8.9	38,507	4.6
Los Angeles Perimeter	0	0.0	4	18.2	48	16.5	121,285	14.4
Los Angeles County	0	0.0	1	4.5	50	17.2	355,544	42.3
San Diego	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	5.2	44,046	5.2
State Agencies	1	100.0	3	13.6	4	1.4	37,426	4.4
Balance of State	0	0.0	8	36.4	90	30.9	102,960	12.2
	<b>1</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>842,464</b>	<b>100.0</b>

CASAS 2005

\*Note: The state agencies classification is included for footing purposes and includes CCC, DDS, CDC, and CYA.

The majority of the funded CBOs are in the Bay Area region (35.2 percent) or Los Angeles County region (33.3 percent), while the highest percentage of community colleges is in the Los Angeles County region and its perimeter counties (50.0 percent).

**Agency Size by Provider Type**

Following the convention used for the last five years, agency size falls into three broad-based categories: small (500 annual enrollments or less); medium (501 to 8,000 enrollments); and large (greater than 8,000 enrollments). Overall, the highest proportion of agencies fell within the medium category (54.3 percent), followed by small (39.9 percent), and large (5.8 percent). In terms of student enrollment, 50.1 percent of students enrolled in medium-sized agencies, 47.8 percent in large agencies, and 2.1 percent in small agencies.

Provider types followed expected size patterns. Large agencies included only adult schools, community colleges, and one institution program (CDC). CBOs and library literacy programs were almost exclusively small agencies, as were the majority of COE

programs. The majority of adult schools, community colleges, and institutions (Section 225) were medium-sized (see Table 4a).

**Table 4a**  
**Agency Size by Provider Type – with WIA Title II Funding (PY 2003-2004)**

Size	Adult Schools		CBO		Community Colleges		Library Literacy	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small	35	20.1	50	92.6	4	22.2	11	84.6
Medium	126	72.4	4	7.4	11	61.1	2	15.4
Large	13	7.5	0	0.0	3	16.7	0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Size	COE		CCC		Institutions (Section 225)		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small	6	66.7	0	0.0	10	45.5	116	39.9
Medium	3	33.3	1	100.0	11	50.0	158	54.3
Large	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5	17	5.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>100.0</b>

CASAS 2005

### Agency Size by Geographic Region

As shown in Table 4b, a large proportion (40.5 percent) of the 116 small agencies are located in the Balance of State region consisting of rural areas outside the major cities.

**Table 4b**  
**Agency Size by Geographic Region – with WIA Title II Funding (PY 2003-2004)**

Geographic Region	Small		Medium		Large	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bay Area	21	18.1	33	20.9	4	23.5
Central Valley	13	11.2	12	7.6	1	5.9
Los Angeles Perimeter	14	12.1	32	20.3	2	11.8
Los Angeles County	14	12.1	31	19.6	5	29.4
San Diego County	7	6.0	5	3.2	3	17.6
State Agencies	0	0.0	3	1.9	1	5.9
Balance of State	47	40.5	42	26.5	1	5.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100.0</b>

CASAS 2005

Medium and large agencies are more commonly found in close proximity to large metropolitan areas, concentrated especially in the Los Angeles and Bay Area regions. The Los Angeles County and Bay Area regions have 52.9 percent of the large agencies and 40.5 percent of the medium agencies. Smaller agencies in rural areas serve the needs of smaller, more rural populations that require access to instruction in remote areas; whereas, medium and large agencies are providing service predominantly to urban and suburban populations.

Tables 4b1; 4b2; 4b3 display the trend data of agencies receiving WIA Title II funds over the last four program years (PY 2000-2001 through PY 2003-04) for the three sizes of agencies. Over this period, there were 96 newly funded agencies added to the WIA Title II provider system. The addition of 66 newly funded small agencies accounted for more than two-thirds of this growth. As shown in Table 4b1, the number of small agencies funded with WIA Title II resources increased 132 percent over the 4-year period (50 agencies in PY 2000-2001 to 116 in PY 2003-04). Almost a third (31.8 percent) of this gain was made by the Balance of State region alone.

**Table 4b1**  
**Small-Sized Agencies by Geographic Region – with WIA Title II Funding**

Geographic Region	PY 2000-2001		PY 2001-2002		PY 2002-2003		PY 2003-2004	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Bay Area	5	10.0	12	16.9	15	16.3	21	18.1
Central Valley	9	18.0	9	12.7	13	14.1	13	11.2
Los Angeles Perimeter	6	12.0	10	14.1	8	8.7	14	12.1
Los Angeles County	3	6.0	7	9.9	14	15.2	14	12.1
San Diego County	1	2.0	1	1.4	5	5.4	7	6.0
State Agencies	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Balance of State	26	52.0	32	45.0	37	40.3	47	40.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>100.0</b>

CASAS 2005

**Table 4b2**  
**Medium-Sized Agencies by Geographic Region –with WIA Title II Funding**

Geographic Region	PY 2000-2001		PY 2001-2002		PY 2002-2003		PY 2003-2004	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Bay Area	28	23.7	29	21.5	31	20.8	33	20.9
Central Valley	9	7.6	12	8.9	11	7.4	12	7.6
Los Angeles Perimeter	23	19.5	25	18.5	28	18.8	32	20.3
Los Angeles County	29	24.6	32	23.8	33	22.1	31	19.6
San Diego County	5	4.2	6	4.4	6	4.0	5	3.2
State Agencies	1	0.8	3	2.2	3	2.0	3	1.9
Balance of State	23	19.6	28	20.7	37	24.9	42	26.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100.0</b>

CASAS 2005

Table 4b2 displays the additions and changes in the funding of medium-sized agencies. Overall their growth was about a third (33.9 percent) higher in 2003-04 than in 2000-2001. The small changes that took place during the same period for large agencies are shown in Table 4b3.

**Table 4b3**  
**Large-Sized Agencies by Geographic Region – with WIA Title II Funding**

Geographic Region	PY 2000-2001		PY 2001-2002		PY 2002-2003		PY 2003-2004	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Bay Area	3	21.4	4	23.5	4	23.5	4	23.5
Central Valley	1	7.1	1	5.9	1	5.9	1	5.9
Los Angeles Perimeter	2	14.3	2	11.8	2	11.8	2	11.8
Los Angeles County	5	35.7	6	35.2	6	35.2	5	29.4
San Diego County	2	14.3	2	11.8	2	11.8	3	17.6
State Agencies	0	0.0	1	5.9	1	5.9	1	5.9
Balance of State	1	7.2	1	5.9	1	5.9	1	5.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100.0</b>

CASAS 2005

As noted previously, over the past four years, there was a substantial increase in the number of WIA Title II funded agencies with a greater inclusion of small providers statewide and increases in small-sized providers in the more rural and remote geographical regions of the state. However, the growth in the total number of providers added to the delivery system (67.2 percent increase), did not proportionately increase the capacity to serve more students, rather it provided greater access to literacy and educational programs for students who might not otherwise be served — new small providers accounted for 69.2 percent of the overall increase in providers. There were two major increases in costs associated with growth: (1) greater amounts of local assistance funds were expended so that these smaller agencies could participate in WIA Title II funding; and, (2) capped state leadership resources were further diluted and strained in providing these agencies with greater amounts of technical assistance and training than typically was needed by ongoing agencies having more staff and experience in delivering adult education and literacy services.

### Enrollment by Provider Type

Table 5 reports the number of student enrollments by provider type. In PY 2003-04, there were 291 WIA Title II agencies enrolling 842,464 students with adult schools serving the vast majority (82.3 percent) of the learners. The percentages of students enrolled by provider type are consistent with the percentages from prior years. One noticeable provider type trend was the 296 percent increase in enrollment for CBOs over the 4-year period.

The NRS requires that the student data reported by the states to the United States Department of Education (USDE) are restricted to only those learners who met certain criteria, including 12 or more hours of instruction, at least 16 years of age, not concurrently enrolled in K-12, and possessing a valid instructional level. Applying this criterion reduces the number of student records reported to USDE from 842,464 enrolled to 591,574 reported to the NRS. However, the primary focus of this report is the entire student database of 842,464 Student Entry Records.

In 2003-04, providers enrolled an additional 27,154 students over the previous year, an increase of 3.3 percent. Agencies experiencing the largest proportional increases in enrollment were CBOs (44.0 percent), institutions (Section 225) (15.0 percent), and adult schools (2.9 percent). Adult schools accounted for the majority (72.7 percent) of the 27,154 increase in student enrollment. The CCC continued to show a decrease in enrollment in 2003-04 compared to 2000-2001 (-20.6 percent).

**Table 5**  
**Enrollment by Provider Type – WIA Title II Funded Agencies Over Four-Year Period**

Provider Type	PY 2000-2001		PY 2001-2002		PY 2002-2003		PY 2003-2004	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adult Schools	529,920	82.3	640,182	82.9	673,836	82.6	693,588	82.3
Community-Based Organizations	2,272	0.4	4,255	0.6	7,821	1.0	11,271	1.3
Community College Districts	68,881	10.7	77,277	10.0	80,014	9.8	76,647	9.1
County Offices of Education	5,228	0.8	5,593	0.7	5,608	0.7	5,740	0.7
Library Literacy Programs	933	0.1	1,330	0.2	1,358	0.2	2,865	0.3
California Conservation Corps	1,751	0.3	2,700	0.3	2,250	0.3	1,391	0.2
California State Universities	N/A	0.0	N/A	0.0	100	0.0	N/A	0.0
Institutions (Section 225)	35,077	5.4	40,568	5.3	44,323	5.4	50,962	6.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>644,062</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>771,905</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>815,310</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>842,464</b>	<b>100.0</b>

CASAS 2005

Over the 4-year period shown on Table 5, annual enrollments increased by 198,402, (30.8 percent). The most dramatic enrollment percent increase was made by the CBOs with a 296 percent increase over their 2000-2001 enrollments, followed by library literacy programs at 107 percent. Community colleges and county offices of education made lesser enrollment percent gains at 11.3 and 9.8 percent, respectively. Adult schools made a 30.9 percent gain and institutions (Section 225) attained a 45.3 percent increase.

**b. The results on the extent to which participating programs were able to meet planned performance targets**

Participating programs set the number of learners that they expected to serve in their 2003-04 WIA Title II federal funding application. Progress in student learning was measured on standardized and validated test instruments developed by the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS).

California measures and pays local providers for their students' accomplishment of specific learning gains and high school diploma or GED attainment through "benchmarks." California uses three core indicators of performance for benchmarks: (1) significant gains in CASAS test scores; (2) completion of two instructional levels; and (3) completion of the GED or attainment of a high school diploma. Table 6 shows aggregated benchmark attainment reported by program type. Benchmarks are reported to CDE and help determine future levels of federal local assistance funding to local agencies.

Performance is on the rise with a 156.8 percent increase in the number of benchmarks achieved by providers from 2000-2001 to 2003-04. The highest proportional gain over the 4-year period was ABE, with a 165.4 percent increase in benchmarks. The only instructional program not to experience an increase in number of benchmarks was the ESL Citizenship program that decreased 84 percent. The decrease in ESL-Citizenship benchmarks was possibly due to the completion of the naturalization process for those who qualified and were seeking legal residency under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA), a decrease in demand for the citizenship programs as more learners switched to basic ESL programs to meet their immediate language literacy needs, and changes in the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) regulations that make it more difficult for those seeking citizenship. However, a more salient factor was in the implementation of an enhanced funding source, (EL Civics), that drew enrollments away from the ESL-Citizenship program by offering instruction in citizenship, civic participation, as well as English language development. The resulting benchmarks earned in EL Civics did not accrue under ESL-Citizenship, but rather accrued under the ESL program that had a 53.3 percent gain in benchmarks over the 4-year period.

**Table 6**  
**Benchmarks By Program Type – WIA Title II Funded Agencies Over Four-Year Period**


Program Type	PY 2000-2001		PY 2001-2002		PY 2002-2003		PY 2003-2004	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ABE	10,114	5.6	22,515	9.5	22,795	8.5	26,844	9.4
ESL	141,374	78.0	183,081	76.9	194,988	72.8	216,757	76.2
ESL-Citizenship	4,100	2.3	4,015	1.7	4,967	1.9	642	0.2
ASE	25,767	14.2	28,539	12.0	45,011	16.8	40,183	14.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>181,355</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>238,150</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>267,761</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>284,426</b>	<b>100.0</b>

CASAS 2005

### **Benchmark Performance Highlights for WIA Title II Funded Agencies**

Table 7 outlines the student records included in the original federal database and the subsequent criteria that are followed to conform to the NRS for adult education. As mentioned previously, the NRS requires that the student data reported by the states to the United States Department of Education are restricted to only those learners who met this criterion. Applying this criterion reduces the number of student records reported to USDE from 842,464 enrolled to 591,574 reported to the NRS. The primary focus of this report, however, is the entire student database of 842,464 Student Entry Records.

**Table 7**  
**WIA Title II California Learner Enrollment with NRS Restrictions (PY 2003-2004)**

		<b>N</b>
Total WIA Title II Learners with Entry Records		<b>842,464</b>
<u>NRS Criteria</u>		
Learners with fewer than 12 hours of instruction		189,171
Learners < 16 years old		5,164
Learners concurrently enrolled in HS/K-12		39,380
Learners without a valid instructional level		17,175
<b>Learners included in NRS Federal Tables</b>		<b>591,574</b>

CASAS 2005

- 1) Of the 842,464 learners, 70.2 percent met the NRS criteria.
- 2) Of the total number of NRS eligible learners (591,574), 52.6 percent or 310,945, remained in their programs long enough to take both a pretest and a post-test. Paired test data were a prerequisite for determining if learners achieved positive results from any of two types of benchmarks: significant gains (three to five scale point gains on CASAS pre- and posttests) within a NRS Educational Functioning Level and completing NRS Educational Functioning Levels.

### **Level Completion Highlights for NRS Eligible Learners in WIA Title II Funded Agencies**

In reports submitted to the NRS, student performance is measured through completion of federally defined instructional levels. See Table 8 for performance goals and achievement at each NRS educational functioning level. The corresponding CASAS test scores are listed to assist in interpreting each educational functioning level (see Appendix C for the CASAS Skill Level Descriptors for ABE and CASAS Skill Level Descriptors for ESL).

As shown on Table 8, almost one-third (33.1 percent) of learners completed at least one educational functioning level. In the core indicators of performance for 2003-04, California's WIA Title II program met or exceeded 11 of 12 literacy level-completion performance goals with overall performance exceeding the literacy performance goal.

**Table 8**  
**Level Completion for NRS Eligible Learners (PY 2003-2004)**

<b>NRS Educational Functioning Level</b>	<b>CASAS Test Score Equivalent</b>	<b>Performance Goal</b>	<b>% Completed Level</b>	<b>Difference</b>
ABE Beginning Literacy	≤ 200	22.0	23.3	1.3
ABE Beginning Basic	201-210	28.0	41.1	13.1
ABE Intermediate Low	211-220	28.0	33.8	5.8
ABE Intermediate High	221-235	28.0	29.3	1.3
ASE Low	236-245	17.0	22.1	5.1
ASE High	246+	13.0	29.3	16.3
ESL Beginning Literacy	≤ 180	26.0	35.4	9.4
ESL Beginning	181-200	26.0	31.1	5.1
ESL Intermediate Low	201-210	30.0	42.4	12.4
ESL Intermediate High	211-220	30.0	43.3	13.3
ESL Low Advanced	221-235	24.0	22.6	-1.4
ESL High Advanced	236-245	NA	18.3	NA
<b>Total</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>33.1</b>	<b>NA</b>

CASAS 2005

Note: The level completion results in this table are based on learners qualifying for the NRS Federal Tables (see Table 7).

The NRS requires core follow-up outcome measures of student performance as shown in Table 9. These outcomes are reported for those learners who had one of the following four goals: (1) enter employment; (2) retain employment; (3) enter postsecondary education or training; or (4) attain a diploma of high school graduation or GED certificate; and left their instructional program.

- The Student Follow-Up Survey provides results for those who entered employment, retained employment, and entered postsecondary education or training. Response rates ranged between 13.3 percent and 16.8 percent. These rates, although representing a relatively small proportion of those learners who were surveyed, were lower than rates achieved in 2002-03 (17.1 to 19.0 percent), but still an improvement from the rates achieved in 2001-02, which ranged from 9.4 to 10.3 percent.
- For learners indicating their goal for enrolling in an adult literacy program was to obtain a GED or High School Diploma, data match results revealed that 5849 learners accomplished their goal of attaining a GED Certificate while an additional 6621 learners achieved their goal of earning a high school diploma. Of those learners indicating their goal was to earn a GED Certificate or High School Diploma, 28.8 percent accomplished their goal.

**Table 9**  
**Core Follow-Up Outcome Achievement (PY 2003-2004)**

<b>Core Follow-up Outcome Measures</b>	<b>Participants with Main or Secondary Goal</b>	<b>Participants Included in Survey or Data Match</b>	<b>Participants Responding to Survey or Data Match</b>	<b>Response or Data Match Rate</b>	<b>Participants Achieving Outcome</b>	<b>Weighted Percent Achieving Outcome</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Entered Employment	15,709	13,851	2,313	16.7	1,288	54.6
Retained Employment	9,137	7,974	1,058	13.3	865	82.4
Obtained a GED or High School Diploma	47,892	N/A	43,255	90.3	12,470	28.8
Entered Postsecondary Education or Training	14,730	12,841	2,162	16.8	1,022	54.9

CASAS 2005

**c. Types of courses (ESL, ESL Citizenship, ABE, ASE) included in the performance targets of participating agencies**

When applying for WIA Title II funds, adult education providers must assess learner needs to determine what programs are needed in their respective service areas. They have the option of implementing programs in ABE, ESL (which includes learners enrolled in EL Civics programs), ESL-Citizenship, or ASE. The California State Plan for adult education limits ASE funding to ten percent of the overall federal allotment for local assistance because of the great number of low-literacy learners in need of basic literacy instruction. These low-level learners, upon program entry, perform (on tests) at or below what educators typically expect of eighth grade students in the K-12 system.

**Enrollment by Instructional Programs**

ESL programs served the vast majority (66.4 percent) of adult learners in California for 2003-04. ASE programs comprised the next highest student enrollment (21.0 percent), followed by ABE (12.3 percent), and ESL-Citizenship (0.3 percent). Table 10 shows that this distribution is consistent with that of prior years, although ABE and ASE programs served a slightly higher proportion of the total learners, and ESL programs served a slightly lower proportion (65.3 percent in 2003-04 compared to 67.5 percent in 2001-02).

Three of the instructional programs showed increases in student enrollment with ABE and ASE showing similar increases (4.3 percent and 5.3 percent, respectively). The ABE program accounted for the largest proportion of the total increase in student enrollment (47.4 percent) since 2000-2001, followed by ASE (42.5 percent) and ESL (28.1 percent). ESL-Citizenship enrollment experienced the only enrollment decrease at -78.8 percent. This decrease in ESL-Citizenship enrollment was possibly due to the completion of the naturalization process for those who qualified and were seeking legal residency under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA), a decrease in demand for the citizenship programs as more learners switched to basic ESL programs to meet their immediate language literacy needs, and changes in the U.S. Citizenship

and Immigration Services (USCIS) regulations that make it more difficult for those seeking citizenship. Additionally, some agencies have switched from using the Section 231 funds for ESL-Citizenship activities to the English Literacy and Civics Education (EL Civics) grant that started in February 2001.

**Table 10**  
**Enrollment by Instructional Program – Funded by WIA Title II Over Four-Year Period**

Instructional Program	PY 2000-2001		PY 2001-2002		PY 2002-2003		PY 2003-2004	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
ABE	70,063	10.9	86,895	11.3	98,995	12.1	103,290	12.3
ESL	436,810	67.8	521,170	67.5	531,649	65.2	559,582	66.4
ESL-Citizenship	13,060	2.0	13,537	1.8	14,965	1.8	2,775	0.3
ASE	124,104	19.3	150,303	19.5	169,701	20.8	176,817	21.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>644,037</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>771,905</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>815,310</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>842,464</b>	<b>100.0</b>

CASAS 2005

Note: \* 166,047 learners who were enrolled in ESL also enrolled in EL Civics.

Table 11 presents information about the instructional levels of those learners enrolled in ABE, ESL, ESL-Citizenship, and ASE programs.

- The majority (60.2 percent) of Adult Basic Education (ABE) learners who were eligible to earn benchmarks entered programs at the intermediate instructional levels (CASAS scores from 211 through 235). In addition, 32.2 percent of learners entered at beginning instructional levels (CASAS scores 210 or less).
- The highest percentage of English as a Second Language (ESL) and ESL-Citizenship learners (31.5 and 29.4 percent, respectively) entered programs at the ESL beginning and low intermediate instructional levels (CASAS scores from 181 through 210).
- The majority (66.1 percent) of Adult Secondary Education (ASE) learners entered programs predominantly at the advanced instructional levels (CASAS scores 236 and higher).

**Table 11**  
**Entry Instructional Level for Benchmark Eligible Learners – WIA Title II (PY 2003-2004)\***

Instructional Level	ABE		ESL		ESL-Citizenship		ASE	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Beginning Literacy	9,391	15.2	26,337	6.3	82	4.3	788	0.9
ABE Beg Basic/ESL Beg	10,521	17	132,587	31.5	639	33.6	2,763	3.2
Intermediate Low	13,534	21.9	123,711	29.4	596	31.4	6,059	7.0
Intermediate High	23,683	38.3	66,041	15.7	331	17.4	19,963	22.9
ASE Low/ESL Adv Low	3,549	5.7	69,818	16.6	234	12.3	41,243	47.3
ASE High/ESL Adv High	1,181	1.9	2,358	0.6	18	0.9	16,312	18.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>61,859</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>420,852</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1,900</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>87,128</b>	<b>100.0</b>

CASAS 2005

\*Note: Table 11 includes those learners with an instructional level based on pretest scores and reported instructor evaluation. Learners not having a valid instructional level are not included.



## **PART II — LEGISLATIVE INTENT CONSIDERATIONS**

### ***Background and Integrity of Current System***

California has adopted an accountability-based, performance-based system to allocate and manage WIA Title II funds for the delivery of quality adult education and literacy programs. This system requires the use of a secured standardized assessment system that reliably measures relevant skills and knowledge that adults need to work and actively participate in the socioeconomic mainstream of California.

California complies and aligns with the NRS by attaining the highest rating possible, a rating of superior on the federal Data Quality Standards Checklist (DQSC). The DQSC provides criteria to judge the integrity and veracity of state and local implementation of the NRS. The NRS is the nationwide accountability system of the USDE to evaluate and report the results of its adult education program federally funded through the WIA. The NRS identifies acceptable student measures that allow assessment of the impact of adult education instruction; methodologies to use for collecting the measures; forms and procedures to use in the collecting and reporting of student performance; and provides training and technical assistance to assist states in collecting the measures.

CASAS provides a range of standardized tests and resources including appraisals, achievement tests, certification tests, and student follow-up surveys to meet the NRS reporting requirements. In addition to state standardized tests, local programs also use additional assessment tools, such as locally developed tests, including performance based assessment tools, informal interviews, checklists, vocational aptitude batteries, job-related skill demonstrations, or industry certification.

Accountability systems used for high-stakes purposes, such as determining the program funds an agency will receive, must address several issues simultaneously:

1. Appropriate student placements
2. Appropriate standardized tests to measure student learning that accommodate the open entry/open exit format of adult education programs
3. Proper test administration and security procedures
4. Adequate teacher preparation and training
5. Sound instructional practices
6. Appropriate program guidelines and standards for instruction
7. Extensive professional development
8. Adequate funding
9. Technology support

In 2003-04, the fifth year under WIA Title II performance-based accountability requirements, CDE and CASAS made further refinements to the year-end data collection. Procedures such as the benchmark verification process and data integrity checks were critical to achieve timely data collection and resulted in a more comprehensive data set for the State of California. In addition, agencies are now

required to submit data on a quarterly basis. This allows a more comprehensive review of the data, using the DQSC prior to the final year-end submission, that results in greater data accuracy.

As mentioned in previous reports, even with the great progress in data collection, barriers still exist for the collection of accurate and complete data for all learners. These barriers include technology and infrastructure challenges, difficulty in providing necessary professional development to staff and administration, and purported student reluctance to disclose demographic information.

Funded agencies have taken positive steps to address these concerns:

- Agencies are providing timelier student-level feedback to instructors.
- Agencies have implemented changes to the testing process by testing more frequently, using designated testing centers, increasing the use of test information as an assessment tool to guide classroom activity, setting up testing and make-up testing schedules, and providing test results in a timelier manner.
- Agencies have increased adherence to the more stringent data collection system through strategies such as the addition or reassignment of staff to data collection and the appointment of data collection coordinators.
- Agencies are helping their staff to understand that having the most complete data possible is important not only for accountability reasons, but also for direct program improvement.
- Agencies have piloted strategies to improve student persistence, implemented managed enrollment, and set short- and long-term goals.

### ***Issues CDE has garnered and actively supported for local providers in the use of WIA Title II State Leadership Funds***

CDE has continued to use the State Leadership Fund portion of WIA Title II to develop and maintain its strong infrastructure of assessment, accountability, curriculum development, Web-based data archival/retrieval and communications system, and staff development. CDE actively elicits from the adult education field the kinds of services and processes that they, the local literacy agencies, need to provide quality instruction. Specifically, the field recommended and CDE continues to positively respond to the recommendations below. These recommendations are for the administration of the federal local assistance funds and allocation of tasks and fiscal resources for federal state leadership responsibilities.

#### **Issue 1: Accountability**

Continue to provide technical assistance and resources to assist local agencies to use agency data to:

- Understand and implement accountability requirements.
- Assign dedicated staff at the local level for assessment, data collection, and data analysis (quality assurance specialist).
- Provide adequate resources to ensure the collection of accurate data to comply with federal quality standards and certification requirements.

- Use local data to inform instruction and improve student learning gains and outcomes.
- Use local data to facilitate continuous program improvement.

### **Issue 2: Evidence-Based Research**

Provide support and resources to ensure that evidence-based adult learning strategies inform instruction:

- Evaluate the feasibility of adapting K-12 research study findings for use in adult education programs.
- Identify additional sources of funding for implementing practitioner-based research studies related to adult literacy.
- Identify and disseminate effective programs and practices.

### **Issue 3: Small Agencies**

Continue to provide resources and support to assist small agencies in building capacity to:

- Develop local systems and infrastructures to meet accountability requirements.
- Promote interagency informal networks and formal consortiums to leverage experience and resources.
- Facilitate continuous program improvement.

### **Issue 4: Expansion of Instructional Delivery Options**

Provide incentives to serve unserved, under-served, and “hard to reach” adults, including institutionalized adults, as follows:

- Increase learning options and alternatives to the traditional classroom setting.
- Identify effective methods for reaching the “hard to reach” including the effective use of technology and innovative program grants.
- Support the identification of Promising Practices and Programs of Excellence.

### **Issue 5: Professional Development**

Continue to provide opportunities and delivery options for professional staff development to:

- Understand and implement data collection and accountability requirements.
- Implement effective staff development mentoring to support the instructional delivery options.
- Use data/assessment results to facilitate lesson planning and target instruction to learners’ identified needs and goals.
- Implement Promising Practices, California Programs of Excellence and Model Programs Standards criteria.

## **Issue 6: Advisory Groups**

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

### ***Legislative Recommendations for Improving Implementation of an Accountability-Based Funding System***

#### ***(a) Evaluate whether any changes need to be made to improve the implementation of the accountability-based funding system under Title II***

The following legislative recommendations for improving implementation of an accountability-based funding system are derived from field-based surveys, regional focus groups, data review groups, and a field evaluation team.

#### **Recommendation 1: Data Match**

Provide authority, resources, and positions to implement a data match system for adult education programs 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 targeted program improvement for outcomes directly related to employment.
- Supports effective state level policy decisions.

#### **Recommendation 2: Assessment for Adults with Disabilities**

Continue to refine and expand appropriate assessment system(s) for adults with disabilities, such as POWER, that provide a continuum of assessments with a long-term outcome of employability, supporting the re-setting of outcome measures for Department of Mental Health and Department of Developmental Services clients to ensure the future eligibility of this population for adult education services.

#### **Recommendation 3: Collaboration with Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) and One Stop Centers**

Provide resources and support to increase and strengthen the collaborations of local literacy providers and employment-related agencies:

- Provide basic skills and literacy instruction in combination with job training to adults most in need (both employed and unemployed).
- Identify and share information related to effective programs and program practices.
- Identify models of effective collaboration.
- Provide incentives for strengthening local collaborations.

#### **Recommendation 4: Collect and Report Data on All Apportionment Funded Adult Education Programs**

Provide authority and resources to implement a data collection and reporting system for adult education programs in California to capture salient program and learner background and outcome information.

Through annual Budget Act language for the past several years, the California Legislature has expressed the need to have good information about the role of local education agencies in providing services to its clients. Local providers were to collect and report to CDE on an annual basis information that would include (1) program funding levels and sources; (2) characteristics of participants; and (3) pupil and program outcomes. However the Legislature restricted the scope of data collection to include information "...specifically for education and training services to welfare recipient students and those in transition off of welfare..." [California State Budget Act Language item 6110-156-0001 provision 4(f), (g), (h)]. Therefore, this Budget Act language does not apply to all authorized program areas of adult education.

#### ***(b) Evaluate the feasibility of any future expansion of the accountability-based funding system using state funds.***

The statewide system of adult education financed with public funds, offered both through adult schools and some community colleges, provides instruction in ten authorized areas. The pay-for-performance model in California's adult education delivery system is currently used only for federally funded literacy-based programs, including ABE, ESL, ESL-Citizenship, and ASE (High School subjects, and GED preparation). There are a number of issues to consider before extending the pay-for-performance model to all state-funded programs that provide instruction in other, non-literacy based areas, as follows:

#### **Need to Develop Standards and Assessments in Other Authorized Areas**

Before extending the federal pay-for-performance model to state-funded adult education programs, CDE and the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges must develop, test, and validate content standards, performance standards, and assessments for all program areas.

Program content standards are being updated or developed for five of the ten state-authorized areas: ABE, ESL, ASE, Parent Education, and Older Adults programs. CDE and the Chancellor's Office have convened statewide advisory groups to review and refine these existing program standards for the inclusion of appropriate performance standards. Such program and performance standards provide the framework for standardized measurement of student progress. To extend the federal accountability system to the other five program areas, such frameworks must also be in place. The development and subsequent implementation of appropriate adult relevant and validated tests to assess learner achievement relies on the thoughtful development of these frameworks. CDE and the Chancellor's Office recognize the need to convene additional advisory groups to develop both program and performance standards for the

other five authorized areas that align, where appropriate, to the standards adopted by the State Board of Education for students in kindergarten through grade twelve.

Developing standardized assessments for the current federal program began 25 years ago. Those assessments are part of CASAS that is used to meet federal reporting requirements. Developing a similar set of standardized tests, normed on an adult population similar to that currently served by adult education programs, for the other state-funded program areas is only possible with sufficient funding. The literacy-based program areas of ABE, ESL, ESL-Citizenship, and ASE, currently included in the pay-for-performance model, lend themselves well to standardized assessments such as multiple-choice tests, writing assessments, and oral interview assessments. These assessment models, however, may not be as appropriate for the other state-authorized adult education program areas such as Vocational Education, Parent Education, Adults with Disabilities, Older Adults, Health and Safety, and Home Economics. Rather, these program areas would benefit from the use of portfolio or other performance-based assessments or industry-accepted certifications. While current standardized multiple-choice item measurement models have effective use at the classroom level to inform instruction and learning, there are few standardized, adult-normed models for interpreting, recording, and reporting portfolio or performance-based assessment data. It will take substantial resources, time, and field cooperation to develop, test, and validate such standardized measures, and to norm the assessments to appropriate adult populations.

### **Need to Provide Additional Funding and Technical Assistance to Support the Transition**

The current programs of ABE, ESL, and ASE currently have an adequate infrastructure to address the issues associated with transition to a state supported pay-for-performance funding structure; however, additional program areas will require additional funding and technical assistance to support the transition. The pay-for-performance system requires additional resources to support a technology and management infrastructure to meet data requirements, which include testing and tracking all students all year in all classes. In addition, adult education administrators and teachers in the other program areas will require training on the standards, standards-based instruction, and assessments.

These issues intensify in small adult education programs. During the last four years, larger local agencies have been able to respond to the new federal accountability-based funding system, but the smaller agencies, particularly those with 100 or fewer average daily attendance (a.d.a.) units, have had greater difficulty. These smaller agencies often do not have sufficient and trained personnel, adequate technology infrastructure, or the other resources to support the data requirements, which include testing and tracking student progress.

California's adult education community has responded to the challenge of educational reform, as evidenced by the successful implementation of the pay-for-performance

model currently operating for federally supported literacy-based program areas. For these specific program areas, educational standards are set, assessments designed, staff trained, and programs federally funded based on student achievement. To transfer these reforms to all adult education program areas will require additional funding, work, resources, and adequate development and transition time.

*CDE is committed to maintain and develop educational systems that document the success of learners enrolled in all authorized program areas. This includes further investigating the feasibility of building on the successes of the current federal accountability-based supplemental funding system and applying it to the state-funded adult education program. However, this commitment rests on the premise that the implementation of the federal model is complete and a program is running smoothly before making assumptions regarding what works and what does not. In the past five years, CDE has made great progress to meet this goal. However, planning for expansion of the model should be thoughtful and strategic, with adequate funding to support product and staff development. Without this, agencies across the state will be unable to meet the expanded accountability requirements and to earn the funding to support the education of those adults needing a variety of instructional services across the state.*



Implementation of the Workforce Investment Act  
(WIA) Title II

2003-04 End-of-Year  
Progress Report to the California Legislature

**APPENDIX**



## **Appendix A**

### **Progress Measures**

#### **What metric is used to measure success in federal adult education programs?**

CASAS tests, used nationally, are the standard measures for determining student success. CASAS measures also connect with the current National Reporting System (NRS) that the USDE uses to report performance of adult education programs to Congress.

In the CASAS system, raw scores (the number of items correctly answered on a test) convert to scale scores using the CASAS scale score conversion chart provided for each test. The use of scale scores enables comparison of scores on different tests and provides a common metric to relate CASAS test scores to basic skill level descriptions.

CASAS has developed more than 180 assessment instruments that measure and document improvement in English literacy, reading, writing, listening, speaking, problem solving, and numeracy on a common national reporting scale. These instruments correlate to learner skill levels, measure learner improvement within each level, and document level completion.

#### **CASAS Competencies**

The CASAS Competencies include more than 300 competency statements that have been correlated to the Secretary's Commission for Achieving the Necessary Skills (SCANS) Competencies identified by the U.S. Department of Labor. The competencies, updated and revalidated annually by the CASAS National Consortium, help instructors and learners apply teaching and learning in real-world contexts.

#### **CASAS National Skills Level Descriptors**

CASAS National Skill Level Descriptors identify skills for ABE and ESL learners from beginning literacy to advanced adult secondary levels. The five levels show a continuum of employability and life skills from A (Beginning Literacy) to E (Advanced Adult Secondary). Student Performance Level (SPL) designations correlate to ESL levels.

#### **WIA Success Measures**

The Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Title II, Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA) requires all eligible agencies to establish and meet performance measures that include core indicators of performance and additional, optional performance measures (Section 212). The core indicators must include:

- Demonstrated improvements in literacy skills in reading, writing and speaking the English language, numeracy, problem-solving, English language acquisition, and other literacy skills (Note: Section 203 defines "literacy" as an individual's ability to read, write, and speak in English; to compute; and to solve problems at levels of proficiency necessary to function on the job, in the family of the individual, and in society).

- Placement in, retention in, or completion of, postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment or career advancement.
- Receipt of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent.

The California Adult Education State Plan (section 5.1) defines the usage of performance measures by eligible providers to meet the requirements in Section 212 of the AEFLA:

- Student goal attainment and demonstrated student improvements in literacy levels within a program area
- Student completion of a program level
- Student advancement to higher program levels

Other performance measures:

- Receipt of a secondary school diploma or its equivalent (GED)
- Placement in postsecondary education, training, or unsubsidized employment
- Career advancement

Section 5.3 of the state plan responds to the requirement in AEFLA to establish expected levels of performance for each of the core indicators. California currently uses the following three core indicators of performance benchmarks:

- Significant gains in CASAS scores
  - A 5-point gain or greater from pretest scores for persons at the 210 level or below
  - A 3-point gain or greater from pretest scores for persons at the 211 level or above
- Completion of two instructional levels
- Completion of the GED or completion of a high school diploma

**Appendix B Summary of California Core Performance Results from 1999 - 2004**

Entering Educational Functional Level	1999-2000		2000-01		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04	
	Performance Goal	Performance (Against all Enrollees)	Performance Goal	Performance (Against all Enrollees)	Performance Goal	Performance (Against all Enrollees)	Performance Goal	Performance (Against all Enrollees)	Performance Goal	Performance (Against all Enrollees)
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
ABE Beginning Literacy	13.0	13.0	15.0	22.6	17.0	25.7	20.0	21.2	22.0	23.3
ABE Beginning Basic	20.0	17.7	22.0	33.2	24.0	36.4	26.0	36.4	28.0	41.1
ABE Intermediate Low	20.0	18.0	22.0	34.5	24.0	37.7	26.0	38.1	28.0	33.8
ABE Intermediate High	22.0	13.7	24.0	29.3	26.0	29.9	26.0	29.6	28.0	29.3
ASE Low	NA	1.7	14.0	13.6	15.0	25.4	15.0	24.6	17.0	22.1
ASE High	7.0	18.5	8.0	26.9	9.0	28.3	11.0	30.5	13.0	29.3
ESL Beginning Literacy	18.0	14.1	20.0	30.6	22.0	32.2	24.0	33.6	26.0	35.4
ESL Beginning	20.0	12.5	22.0	26.7	24.0	28.4	24.0	30.2	26.0	31.1
ESL Intermediate Low	22.0	27.2	24.0	37.0	26.0	39.8	28.0	40.6	30.0	42.4
ESL Intermediate High	22.0	30.0	24.0	39.7	26.0	43.0	28.0	42.8	30.0	43.3
ESL Advanced Low	18.0	13.0	20.0	21.7	22.0	22.7	22.0	22.6	24.0	22.6
ESL Advanced High	N/A	18.1	N/A	17.7	N/A	19.3	N/A	18.8	N/A	18.3
<b>Core Follow-Up Outcome Measures</b>										
	<b><u>N</u></b>	<b><u>N</u></b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
GED/HS Completion	12,000	21,056	8.0	26.7	9.0	31.7	11.0	27.6	13.0	28.8
Entered Employment	10,000	33,599	9.0	17.8	10.0	54.5	11.0	54.4	13.0	54.6
Retained Employment	18,000	55,256	11.0	34.3	12.0	85.7	13.0	81.9	15.0	82.4
Entered Postsecondary Education	23,000	8,287	6.0	11.7	7.0	60.4	8.0	53.5	10.0	54.9

CASAS 2004



## Appendix C CASAS Skill Level Descriptors for ABE

Scale Scores	CASAS Level	Descriptors
250 — 245 — 240 — 235 — 230 — 225 — 220 — 215 — 210 — 205 — 200 — 190 — 180 — 150 —	<b>E</b>	<p><b>Advanced Adult Secondary</b> With some assistance, persons at this level are able to interpret technical information, more complex manuals, and material safety data sheets (MSDS). Can comprehend some college textbooks and apprenticeship manuals.</p>
	<b>D</b>	<p><b>Adult Secondary</b> Can read and follow multi-step directions; read and interpret common legal forms and manuals; use math in business, such as calculating discounts; create and use tables and graphs; communicate personal opinion in written form; write an accident or incident report. Can integrate information from multiple texts, charts, and graphs as well as evaluate and organize information. Can perform tasks that involve oral and written instructions in both familiar and unfamiliar situations.</p>
	<b>C</b>	<p><b>Advanced Basic Skills</b> Can handle most routine reading, writing, and computational tasks related to their life roles. Can interpret routine charts, graphs, and labels; read and interpret a simple handbook for employees; interpret a payroll stub; complete an order form and do calculations; compute tips; reconcile a bank statement; fill out medical information forms and job applications. Can follow multi-step diagrams and written instructions; maintain a family budget; and write a simple accident or incident report. Can handle jobs and job training situations that involve following oral and simple written instructions and diagrams. Persons at the upper end of this score range are able to begin GED preparation.</p>
	<b>B</b>	<p><b>Intermediate Basic Skills</b> Can handle basic reading, writing, and computational tasks related to life roles. Can read and interpret simplified and some authentic materials on familiar topics. Can interpret simple charts, graphs, and labels; interpret a basic payroll stub; follow basic written instructions and diagrams. Can complete a simple order form and do calculations; fill out basic medical information forms and basic job applications; follow basic oral and written instructions and diagrams. Can handle jobs and/or job training that involve following basic oral or written instructions and diagrams if they can be clarified orally.</p> <p><b>Beginning Basic Skills</b> Can fill out simple forms requiring basic personal information, write a simple list or telephone message, calculate a single simple operation when numbers are given, and make simple change. Can read and interpret simple sentences on familiar topics. Can read and interpret simple directions, signs, maps, and simple menus. Can handle entry level jobs that involve some simple written communication.</p>
	<b>A</b>	<p><b>Beginning Literacy/Pre-Beginning</b> Very limited ability to read or write. Persons at the upper end of this score range can read and write numbers and letters and simple words and phrases related to immediate needs. Can provide very basic personal identification in written form such as on job applications. Can handle routine entry level jobs that require only basic written communication.</p>

Note: This chart provides general skill descriptors by level. Level descriptors for reading, math and listening correspond to scale scores on tests in those specific skill areas.



## Appendix D CASAS Skill Level Descriptors for ESL

Scale Scores	CASAS Level	Descriptors
250	<b>E</b>	<p><b>Proficient Skills</b>                      SPL 8 Listening/Speaking: Can participate effectively in social and familiar work situations; can understand and participate in practical and social conversations and in technical discussions in own field. Reading/Writing: Can handle most reading and writing tasks related to life roles; can read and interpret most non-simplified materials; can interpret routine charts, graphs, and labels; fill out medical information forms and job applications. Employability: Can meet work demands with confidence, interact with the public, and follow written instructions in work manuals.</p>
245		
240	<b>D</b>	<p><b>Adult Secondary</b>                      SPL 7 Listening/Speaking: Can function independently in survival and social and work situations; can clarify general meaning and communicate on the telephone on familiar topics. Reading/Writing: Can read and interpret non-simplified materials on everyday subjects; can interpret routine charts, graphs, and labels; fill out medical information forms and job applications; and write an accident or incident report. Employability: Understands routine work-related conversations. Can handle work that involves following oral and simple written instructions and interact with the public. Can perform reading and writing tasks, such as most logs, reports, and forms, with reasonable accuracy to meet work needs.</p>
235		
230	<b>C</b>	<p><b>Advanced ESL</b>                      SPL 6 Listening/Speaking: Can satisfy most survival needs and social demands. Has some ability to understand and communicate on the telephone on familiar topics. Can participate in conversations on a variety of topics. Reading/Writing: Can read and interpret simplified and some non-simplified materials on familiar topics. Can interpret simple charts, graphs, and labels; interpret a payroll stub; and complete a simple order form; fill out medical information forms and job applications. Can write short personal notes and letters and make simple log entries. Employability: Can handle jobs and job training situations that involve following oral and simple written instructions and multi-step diagrams and limited public contact. Can read a simple employee handbook. Persons at the upper end of this score range are able to begin GED preparation.</p>
225		
220		
215		
210	<b>B</b>	<p><b>High Intermediate ESL</b>                      SPL 5 Listening/Speaking: Can satisfy basic survival needs and limited social demands; can follow oral directions in familiar contexts. Has limited ability to understand on the telephone. Understands learned phrases easily and new phrases containing familiar vocabulary. Reading/Writing: Can read and interpret simplified and some authentic material on familiar subjects. Can write messages or notes related to basic needs. Can fill out basic medical forms and job applications. Employability: Can handle jobs and/or training that involve following basic oral and written instructions and diagrams if they can be clarified orally.</p>
205		
200		
190	<b>A</b>	<p><b>High Beginning ESL</b>                      SPL 3 Listening/Speaking: Functions with some difficulty in situations related to immediate needs; may have some simple oral communication abilities using basic learned phrases and sentences. Reading/Writing: Reads and writes letters and numbers and a limited number of basic sight words and simple phrases related to immediate needs. Can write basic personal information on simplified forms. Employability: Can handle routine entry-level jobs that involve only the most basic oral or written communication in English and in which all tasks can be demonstrated.</p>
180		
170		
160		
150		
		<p><b>Low Beginning ESL</b>                      SPL 2 Listening/Speaking: Functions in a very limited way in situations related to immediate needs; asks and responds to basic learned phrases spoken slowly and repeated often. Reading/Writing: Recognizes and writes letters and numbers and reads and understands common sight words. Can write own name and address. Employability: Can handle only routine entry-level jobs that do not require oral or written communication in English and in which all tasks are easily demonstrated.</p>
		<p><b>Beginning Literacy/Pre-Beginning ESL</b>                      SPL 0-1 Listening/Speaking: Functions minimally, if at all, in English. Communicates only through gestures and a few isolated words. Reading/Writing: May not be literate in any language. Employability: Can handle very routine entry-level jobs that do not require oral or written communication in English and in which all tasks are easily demonstrated. Employment choices would be extremely limited.</p>

Note: This chart provides general skill descriptors by level. Level descriptors for reading, math and listening correspond to scale scores on tests in those specific skill areas.

