

California Adult Education

California Annual Performance Report Federally Funded Workforce Investment Act Title II Programs



Program Year 2005
July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005

California Annual Performance Report
Federally Funded Workforce Investment Act
Title II Programs
Program Year 2005

Program Year 2005
July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005

CONTENTS

Overview	ii
Question 1: State Leadership Projects	1
Activities, programs, and projects supported with State Leadership Funds	1
Goal 1: Establish and implement professional development programs to improve the quality of instruction provided.	1
Activities	1
Outcomes	2
Goal 2: Provide technology assistance, including staff training, to eligible providers of adult education and literacy activities.	2
Activities	3
Outcomes	3
Goal 3: Provide technical assistance to eligible providers of adult education and literacy activities	3
Activities	3
Outcomes	4
Question 2: Core Indicators of Performance	4
Significant Findings at the State Level	4
Learner Performance	4
Enrollment	5
Pay for Performance	5
Data Quality	5
Significant Findings at the Local Program Level: Leveraging What Works	5
Program Management	5
Classroom Instruction and Management	6
Question 3: Collaboration	6
Integration of Title I and Title II Activities	6
Involvement with Local Workforce Investment Boards and One-Stops	7
Collaborative Arrangements with Other Agencies	7
Question 4: English Literacy and Civics Education (EL Civics) Grants	7
Successful Activities and Services	7
Number of Programs Funded, Learners Served, and Student Outcomes	8
Successful Strategies	9
The Impact of EL Civics	10
 Appendixes	
APPENDIX A: Data Tables for Workforce Investment Act Title II Funded Agencies	A-1
APPENDIX B: Summary of California Core Performance Results	A-3
APPENDIX C: Federal Tables	A-4
APPENDIX D: California Collaboration References	A-13
APPENDIX E: Collaboration Data for Workforce Investment Act Title II Funded Agencies	A-15
APPENDIX F: English Literacy and Civics Education Data Tables	A-18

OVERVIEW

This report is California's response to the four questions that the United States Department of Education, Division of Adult Education and Literacy, requires of all states and territories receiving federal funding from the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, Title II of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). Sources of information for the report include responses to the *2004-05 Survey of WIA Title II Programs in California* (an annual statewide survey) sent to all federally funded agencies in California in May 2005; local provider quantitative data submitted to comply with the federally mandated National Reporting System (NRS) requirements; summary notes from regional focus groups; concerns and issues expressed through listservs; and comments from interviews with field practitioners. Additional resources for English Literacy and Civics Education (EL Civics) data included reports and contact logs from EL Civics program specialists who provide technical assistance to local providers.

California bases its federal supplemental funding allocations on documented student performance and goal attainment in educational programs. All agencies collect the following information on all students for whom they receive federal supplemental funding:

- Demographic and program information
- Individual student progress and learning gains
- Other student outcomes, including attaining a General Education Development (GED) Certificate, attaining a high school diploma, obtaining employment, retaining employment, and entering postsecondary education or training

In 2004-05, California met or exceeded 7 of its 11 NRS Literacy Skill Level goals with overall performance exceeding the literacy performance goal. California also met or exceeded all student follow up performance goals. Supported by a comprehensive infrastructure for capacity building, adult education providers throughout the state continued to improve their ability to collect complete and accurate data in full alignment with NRS reporting requirements and data quality standards. Local adult education providers now have the capacity to use current data to analyze and leverage program strengths and to identify opportunities for program improvement, innovation, and reform.

In 2004-05, 304 agencies, an increase of 109 agencies over the past five years, received WIA, Sections 225, 231, and EL Civics funding to provide adult literacy instruction. These funded agencies included adult schools, community colleges, community-based organizations (including faith-based organizations), public libraries, state agencies, jails, county offices of education, a California State University, and a county/city government agency (see Appendix A).

QUESTION 1: STATE LEADERSHIP PROJECTS

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

Activities, programs, and projects supported with State Leadership Funds

The California Department of Education (CDE) contracts with four different agencies to fund State Leadership Projects: (1) California Adult Literacy Professional Development Project (CALPRO), (2) California Distance Learning Project (CDLP), (3) Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS), and the (4) Outreach and Technical Assistance Network (OTAN). These projects facilitate a collaborative approach in addressing the 11 activities set forth in the California State Plan and in the WIA legislation under Section 223 for adult education and literacy activities.

Meeting on a regular schedule with the CDE for coordination and planning, each of the projects has responsibility for providing professional development, training, and technical assistance — key goals identified as high priority needs for facilitating continuous program improvement — related to its individual identified focus area of accountability, technology, distance learning, or instructional leadership. Each of the projects disseminates best practices and products within its identified focus area. Representatives from the three Adult Education statewide professional organizations¹ work closely with the Leadership Projects and the CDE, including serving on advisory committees. Project staff members often present or co-present at regional and state conferences sponsored by these professional organizations. Through the Leadership Projects, the CDE also supports an extensive electronic network to distribute information on a wide range of adult education topics, including legislation, professional development, conference announcements, best practices, and useful products.

Listed below are successful Leadership Project activities that relate to the three key goals, along with summary notes identifying how the Leadership Projects addressed the goals in 2004-05.

Goal 1: Establish and implement professional development programs to improve the quality of instruction provided.

Activities: The projects provided professional development options in the areas of program management; accountability; and data collection, analysis, and use to all funded agencies throughout California via regional workshops and networking meetings, Webcasts, conference presentations, electronic downloads, and online and telephone technical support services. Project staff provided training and technical support for resource teachers and program coordinators in the topic areas of identifying and targeting instruction to student needs and goals, lesson planning, administration and interpretation of assessments, teaching strategies for multi-level classes, and effective instructional strategies. A central adult education professional reference library and depository libraries in ten regional resource centers supplemented and supported the various modes of delivery.

¹ Association of California School Administrators, California Council for Adult Education, California Adult Education Administrators' Association.

Outcomes

The following outcomes reflect continuous efforts by local agencies to implement systems that ensure the accuracy and completeness of their data. Concentrated efforts by the CDE further support program improvement and the enhancement of data- collection systems and procedures to document the improvement. (See Appendix A for data tables and Appendix C for Federal Tables.)

- California met or exceeded all 2004-05 NRS Data Quality Standards at the acceptable or superior quality level and had no areas identified as needing improvement.
- Submissions received in a timely manner increased from 79.8 percent in 2000-01 to 97 percent in 2004-05 indicating greater awareness and compliance with regulations resulting from training efforts.
- The number of funded agencies increased from 195 in 2000-01 to 304 in 2004-05, an increase of 109 agencies. The number of adult schools increased from 143 to 180, while the community-based organizations increased from 13 to 54. This is a direct result of CDE's efforts to improve the quality of instruction by recruiting quality literacy providers.
- Learners with Entry Records increased from 644,062 in 2000-01 to 848,220 in 2004-05, an increase of 31.7 percent. This increase is the result of an increase in literacy providers and training emphasis on quality program management.
- Since 2002-03², agencies have made efforts to ensure that entry records for all learners include a valid instructional level. Data for 2004-05 have documented a decrease in the number of learners without a valid instructional level, demonstrating that local agency efforts are making a difference.
- The number of students eligible to earn benchmarks through learning gains has increased from 468,994 in 2000-01 to 598,380, a 27.6 percent increase; however, benchmark payment points have increased from 193,416 in 2000-01 to 286,177 in 2004-05, an increase of 48.0 percent — nearly double the percent increase in the eligible student population. This increase shows greater numbers of learners having access to the curriculum, having a positive response to educational interventions, and being a positive sign of literacy achievement.

Additional outcomes reflect responses of the CDE and the Leadership Projects to meet programmatic and instructional needs identified by the field.

- A research-to-practice symposium (*A Meeting of the Minds*), attended by 300 adult literacy educators, provided sessions in which researchers presented their studies and participants brainstormed implications for policy, practice, and further research. This resulted in increased provider involvement in research-based professional development activities, e.g., study circles.
- Thirty teachers and administrators participated in training as study circle facilitators on the topic of learner persistence and then led study circles in their own agencies.

Goal 2: Provide technology assistance, including staff training, to eligible providers of adult education and literacy activities.

² Data for numbers of students without a valid instructional level were not collected in 2001-02.

Activities: The California Adult Education Technology Plan provided an online technology planning system, supported by telephone and e-mail training. Workshops focused on how to implement the technology planning process.

Outcomes

- One hundred eighty-eight agencies developed and submitted technology plans that focused on effective use of technology for program management and instructional improvement.
- One hundred percent of large WIA Title II agencies, 94 percent of medium size agencies, and 79 percent of small agencies reported increased use of computers and software to supplement classroom instruction.
- One hundred fifty-nine individuals received hands-on training in the integration of various types of technology into instruction and participated in 40 follow-up sessions for 1,099 adult educators.
- Teachers reported using student e-mail activities, class Web sites, lessons using PowerPoint, and lessons incorporating Internet search and use of online resources as well as new technologies (interactive white boards, handheld computers, portable keyboards, tablet PCs, and digital video).
- WIA funded agencies accessed and used a variety of online products and services developed and implemented by the CDE and the Leadership Projects, including online data submission, an online lesson plan builder, an online training registration system, a Web site dedicated to state EL Civics programs, and more.
- WIA funded agencies field-tested new computer-based testing (CBT) and computer-assisted testing (CAT) enabling any time assessment to facilitate learner advancement, certification, and transition to other programs.
- All WIA Title II agencies electronically submitted quarterly data in accordance with NRS quality standards guidelines.
- Local providers posed questions and shared information on effective practices for program improvement via hosted online Q&A boards with questions in 33 topic areas, and 31 listservs for adult education work groups with 1,321 members.
- A professional corps of technology mentors, located in urban and rural areas throughout the state, received training to facilitate effective use of technology in the classroom.
- Instructors and administrators participated in mentoring services providing distance-learning program design, plus just-in-time technical support services.
- Distance learning continues to increase as an instructional modality and improve the quality of delivery.

Goal 3: Provide technical assistance to eligible providers of adult education and literacy activities.

Activities: Leadership Project staff: (1) provided technical assistance to administrators, coordinators, and instructors via DVD, telephone, or e-mail with a focus on the development and maintenance of online databases, completion of online surveys, selection and use of appropriate curricula, test administration and scoring, data collection and analysis, and other technical support needs; (2) provided curriculum resource catalogs and assessment guidelines, processes, and procedures, including CBT and assessments appropriate for adults with disabilities; and (3) disseminated a wide range of video and computer-based commercial and local program-developed instructional materials.

Outcomes

- Agencies complied with data submission guidelines and requirements by submitting timely, online, clean NRS data, course approvals, applications, reports, and surveys.
- Agency staff reported increased effectiveness in the administration, scoring, and interpretation of assessment instruments including appraisals and pretests, and placement of learners into appropriate levels of instruction.
- Instructors reported that integration of commercial videos such as On Common Ground, Crossroads Café, GED Connection, and local program-developed lessons, videos, and computer software (developed using EL Civics mini-grants) are effective in targeting instruction to students' needs and goals.
- The availability and use of online resources continued to increase. Agency staff regularly registers for workshops, trainings, and conferences online and respond to online surveys. In 2001-02, the first year that the annual statewide WIA Title II survey was available for completion online, 100 of 135 agency respondents completed the survey online, while in 2004-05, 259 of 263 respondents completed it online.

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.

Significant Findings at the State Level

Learner Performance

In 2004-05, California WIA Title II agencies met or exceeded 10 of the 11, 2003-04 actual performance percentages; however, based on the 2004-05 negotiated goals, California met or exceeded 7 of the 11 negotiated goals. The NRS literacy skill level performance goals, renegotiated annually, have been increased each year over the last five years, with the greatest increase occurring in 2004-05 (a summary of the performance results for 2000-2001 through 2004-05 is located in Appendix B).

In 2004-05, 34.1 percent of all enrollees completed an instructional level (an increase of 4.4 percent from 2000-2001).

The CDE uses several methodologies for collecting literacy performance data and follow-up measures. These methodologies include the use of Tracking of Programs and Students (TOPSpro™), the CASAS student management information system for collecting standardized literacy skills performance data. Other methodologies include the use of data match to assist in verifying receipt of the GED Certificate, verification of receipt of high school diploma through a certified list of students awarded high school diplomas, and follow-up mail surveys to students to determine the outcomes of core measures related to postsecondary education and employment.

California state law prohibits the use of student Social Security numbers as a data match for employment-related student goals and student goals of entry into postsecondary education, unless required by federal law. As a result, it is not possible to capture a truly complete and accurate measure of core performance indicators. Data match would provide reliable and comprehensive information to reflect program success and to assist in targeting program improvement. The low rate of response (16 percent in 2004-05) from mail surveys sent to

students tells only a partial story, inadequately documenting the success of programs in California.

Enrollment

Numbers of learners with Entry Records increased from 644,062 in 2000-01 to 848,220 in 2004-05, an increase of 31.7 percent. However, learners who qualified for inclusion in the Federal Tables increased from 473,050 in 2000-01 to 591,893 in 2004-05, an increase of 25.1 percent (see Federal Tables in Appendix C). These increases reflect continuous efforts by local agencies to implement systems that ensure the accuracy and completeness of their data, and concentrated efforts by the CDE and CASAS to continue enhancing data collection systems and procedures to support this effort.

Pay for Performance

Federal report data document California's continued success in significantly improving student learning gains. The CDE began a full pay-for-performance system in 2000-2001 for WIA Title II using learners' attainment of approved Core Performance Indicator benchmarks as the basis of funding. Agencies can earn up to three benchmark payments per learner within the annual grant period. These three pay points result when a learner: (1) makes a significant learning gain;³ (2) completes two instructional levels; and (3) receives a GED certificate or an adult high school diploma. Benchmark payment points have increased from 193,416 in 2000-2001 to 286,177 in 2004-05, an increase of 48.0 percent. Adult Basic Education (ABE) has increased by 69.0 percent, English as a Second Language (ESL) by 45.7 percent, and Adult Secondary Education (ASE) by 47.3 percent during this same period. Pay for performance provides an ongoing incentive to agencies to continually improve the way they deliver curriculum, assess student progress, and manage data.

Data Quality

California has made data quality a top priority. The CDE provides training and technical assistance to agency staff to increase their understanding of accountability requirements and to improve data collection. Agencies submit data to CDE on a quarterly basis, permitting quarterly analysis and early identification of problems with incomplete or inaccurate data. Survey results and review of data submitted to the CDE indicate that this effort has resulted in more complete and accurate data collection across the state, but there is a need for continued training and support among all agencies toward continuous improvement in this area. Agencies acknowledge that federal requirements make it crucial for them to assign dedicated staff to manage assessment, data collection, and data analysis effectively at the local level.

At the state level, this ongoing commitment to the systematization and continuous improvement of data quality has positioned California to respond positively to all standards in the NRS State Data Quality Standards Checklist. California met or exceeded all standards at the acceptable or superior quality level, and had no areas identified as needing improvement.

Significant Findings at the Local Program Level: Leveraging What Works

Program Management

Responses to the annual survey of WIA Title II, Sections 225 and 231 programs in California indicate that local providers are leveraging the use of data more effectively, to a greater extent,

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

and in a greater variety of ways, at the program and classroom level. Respondents to the survey indicated that they now use data at the program level to inform and provide feedback to staff, determine program improvement priorities, and determine staff development needs.

Survey responses document that the strategy of providing a coordinator in charge of assessment was the most effective strategy agencies used, with 77.4 percent of respondents identifying it as a very effective strategy. Reassigning or adding staff to data collection and accountability responsibilities and setting up data quality control processes were also very effective strategies with 70.1 and 68.6 percent of agency respondents identifying these strategies as very effective.

Agencies continue to refine and improve methods to track students, report outcomes, and analyze data. More than 85 percent of agencies provide targeted training and professional development for all staff, while almost 80 percent collaborate with other agencies.

More than 60 percent of respondents report that they now use data to communicate with governing bodies and other stakeholders (e.g., school board, legislators, and other decision makers).

Classroom Instruction and Management

At the classroom level, instructors are using data to empower students, encourage learner accountability through the sharing of assessment results, augment student options, and provide program flexibility through the development of individualized educational plans. More than 89 percent of the agencies used data with students to identify student needs, target instruction, monitor progress and attainment of goals, and inform students about their progress.

Instructors use student needs assessments, program attendance and persistence information, and TOPSpro™ student and class reports of test results to drive and improve instruction, to adjust and improve curriculum, and to select materials and modes of presentation. Students use individual and class reports and feedback to make informed choices regarding their own educational progress and to collaborate with instructors in determining instructional content, program focus, and learning objectives.

QUESTION 3: COLLABORATION

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

Integration of Title I and Title II Activities

The goal of the Title II CDE Partnership with the Title I California Workforce Investment Board (CWIB) is to facilitate a collaborative effort throughout the state among the 50 local area workforce boards, the 243 One-Stops, and the 304 WIA Title II literacy providers that will maximize the resources of each.

A part-time CDE consultant, funded through Title II, facilitates linkages between the CDE, representing the interests of adult education, and the CWIB. A CDE Web site containing

resource documents and links to related Web sites supports collaboration among agencies (see Appendix D for a complete list of reference materials). The CDE does not fund One-Stops directly; therefore, there is no way to estimate the amount of Title II funds used to support activities and services provided through the One-Stop delivery system.

Involvement with Local Workforce Investment Boards and One-Stops

The 2004-05 WIA Title II statewide survey requested the 304 WIA Title II providers, serving the state's 848,220 students, to provide information related to their collaboration with Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) and One-Stop systems. Seventy percent of the 261 agencies responding noted that they interacted with their local One-Stops. When asked to define that interaction, 84.8 percent reported receiving or providing student referrals, and 53.8 percent indicated they provided classes or training for their local One-Stops.

When asked about involvement with their local WIB, approximately 60 percent indicated some type of involvement. When asked to indicate the ways in which their agency interacted with their local WIB, more than 40 percent of the agencies stated: (1) they had a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with their local WIB; (2) a consortium represented them; and/or (3) members of their staff attended WIB meetings (see Appendix E for related graphs).

Collaborative Arrangements with Other Agencies

Local providers indicated involvement in a variety of other collaborative arrangements that offer direct benefits to their learners. More than 50 percent of the agencies cited partnerships with: (1) government, military or law enforcement agencies; (2) children's services agencies; (3) local community businesses or agencies; and/or (4) other educational institutions.

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

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

Successful Activities and Services

EL Civics continues to have a positive impact on the delivery of English language instruction in California. Local agencies have taken advantage of the resources provided through the CDE and the four Leadership Projects to assist in developing their EL Civics programs. Regional networking meetings and the availability of EL Civics program specialists have been the most frequently mentioned resources that agencies have found beneficial. Program specialists have worked closely with the CDE adult education program consultants to provide comprehensive professional development and capacity-building technical assistance that address compliance, program implementation, and continuous improvement issues. The EL Civics Web site provides local agencies with easy and immediate access to EL Civics curriculum, materials, and information — including alignment of the CASAS Quick Search materials guide to EL Civics objectives. Agency staff members report that the assistance provided by OTAN in developing and implementing technology plans is especially beneficial to their agencies. Not only has staff become proficient in the use of technology, but students also have benefited as they have learned to use technology as a conduit to access and increase their involvement in community activities.

Beginning in 2003, the CDE, in collaboration with the state Leadership Projects, has supported enhanced EL Civics program development and implementation through:

- The development, maintenance, and regular updating of an EL Civics Web site—a dynamic, interactive site that provides a single online location for all California EL Civics information. The Web site allows access to a standardized database of 46 pre-approved Civic Participation objectives with accompanying language and literacy objectives and additional assessment plans. Using the Web site in its interactive mode, local providers can electronically select, and customize if desired, their own program objectives based on the identified needs and goals of their students. The centralized EL Civics Web site facilitates and streamlines communication among the funded agencies, the CDE regional consultants, and the regional EL Civics Program Specialists.
- Training and technical assistance in multiple modes on all aspects of implementing the EL Civics program—from needs assessment, additional assessments, and accountability to the evaluation and application of student learning in real life contexts. This process allows agency staff to attend regularly scheduled regional training workshops and networking meetings, access Web-based training and other online resources, and use on-site training modules in VHS and DVD formats.

Number of Programs Funded, Learners Served, and Student Outcomes

In 2004-05, the CDE funded 207 agencies to provide EL Civics educational services to 200,863 adult learners—20 agencies and 29,590 students more than the previous year. Of the 207 EL Civics funded agencies, 19 agencies received funding for EL Civics only, and 188 received funding for both EL Civics and WIA Title II, Section 231. EL Civics agencies in California have two options for program implementation: Civic Participation and Citizenship Preparation. Agencies could apply for funding for one or both of these options. Of the 200,863 EL Civics students, Citizenship Preparation had 25,105 student enrollees and Civic Participation had 179,474 student enrollees⁴. Adult schools served the majority of these EL Civics enrollees (nearly 80 percent) followed by community colleges, community-based organizations, and library literacy programs.

The table below compares data from EL Civics learners with all WIA Title II learners, including EL Civics learners. (See Appendix F for additional EL Civics information.)

Learners in 2004-05	EL Civics		WIA Title II*	
	N	%	N	%
Completed entry records	200,863	N/A	848,220	N/A
Qualified for Federal Table 4**	195,862	97.5%	591,893	69.8%
Qualified for Federal Table 4B (persisters)	121,047	N/A	320,504	N/A
Completed an instructional level***	76,987	63.6%	201,584	63.0%
Advanced more than one level***	49,745	41.1%	123,315	38.5%

*Including EL Civics

**Percentages calculated on numbers of learners who completed entry records

***Percentages calculated on learners qualified for Federal Table 4B

CASAS 2005

In addition to CASAS pre- and post-tests, Citizenship Preparation students may take the written CASAS Government and History for Citizenship test and the oral CASAS Citizenship

⁴ Numbers of students enrolled in Civic Participation and Citizenship Preparation programs will not add up to the total number of EL Civics students because of dual enrollment of some students in both programs.

Interview Test. Of the 11,913 Citizenship Preparation learners who took the government and history test, 81.6 percent (9,719) passed, and 62.5 percent (7,448) passed and earned a payment point. Of the 4,197 Citizenship Preparation learners who took the oral CASAS Citizenship Interview Test, 70.5 percent (2,957) passed and 54.2 percent (2,276) passed and earned a payment point.

California EL Civics Civic Participation programs assess students using performance-based additional assessments created to measure student attainment of civic objectives. The 188 agencies with Civic Participation programs may select from a list of 46 pre-approved civic objectives or may develop new civic objectives, with accompanying language and literacy objectives, to meet learner needs. For example, an agency may choose the civic objective of “access the health care system and be able to interact with the providers.” This objective has 19 corresponding language and literacy objectives (such as “develop a list of questions to ask community health care providers” or “describe symptoms of an illness using body-part identification nouns and descriptive adjectives”). Agencies select and teach the language and literacy objectives that best fit their students’ needs and that will enable students to attain the civic objective.

Civic objectives used in California Civic Participation programs must meet the following criteria:

- Integrate English language and literacy instruction into civics education
- Focus on content that helps students understand the government and history of the United States, understand their rights and responsibilities as citizens, and participate effectively in the education, employment, and civic opportunities this country has to offer
- Integrate active participation of the learners in community activities

Learners passed 119,983 (83.2 percent) of the 144,181 Civic Participation additional performance-based assessments taken.

Successful Strategies

The design and implementation of EL Civics in California provides an opportunity for EL Civics students to apply what they have learned in the classroom and make a positive impact on their lives and in their communities. The following examples illustrate ways in which students have made successful transitions from classroom activities to community action.

- EL Civics students at one adult school job-shadow local supervisors from their county Board of Supervisors. Students spend time in the supervisors’ offices learning about a supervisor’s duties and responsibilities, sit in the Board Chambers with the supervisors as they hold the open session of their weekly board meeting, and accompany supervisors to the podium when they make public commendations. Students from the class who are not shadowing a supervisor attend sessions in Chambers to watch county government in action. In the past three years, 15 students have been able to shadow a supervisor, and another 100 have attended sessions. These students have learned that they have the right to participate in local decisions and the power to help shape how their local government operates.
- For the past three years at another adult school, EL Civics students, with a focus of accessing the resources available in the community, created a Directory of Community Services highlighting the neighborhood non-profit agencies and local government

departments designed to provide community assistance. Students then organized a Community Resource Fair, open to the public, which many of the agencies listed in the Directory attended. The May 2005 fair showcased 55 community agencies with 1,250 students and community members participating. A comment made by one student involved in the project: sums up the benefits to the students and the community: "It's easier to find a solution to a problem. I know the people are able to help me. I'm able to help my neighbors with any problem through the community resources."

- A third adult school is training EL Civics students to become community change agents in dispelling the myths and fears that the Hispanic community has about navigating the health care system. Students learn to use the health care system themselves and then to present that information to others. One student has already received an offer of employment, several others have spoken at local organizations, and all students will serve as mentors to other students.
- A fourth adult school class studied disaster preparedness, what constitutes an emergency, and the appropriate actions to take in reporting a crisis. The class then trained 22 other ESL classes, ultimately training more than 1,100 students last year. Because of their involvement at school, four students made presentations in their community, with one student providing disaster preparedness training at his apartment complex and another at his church. One student is now serving on the local Community Advisory Committee.

The Impact of EL Civics

Agencies are investing major amounts of time, talent, and other resources into making the EL Civics program highly successful and valued by students. In a recent statewide survey, 198 of the 207 funded EL Civics agencies reported that the most significant benefit of the program was increased student confidence when interacting in the classrooms and the community. The two quotes below, the first from an adult school administrator and the second from a community college ESL/EL Civics coordinator, reflect the positive impact the EL Civics program is having in California.

"I continue to believe that EL Civics has brought a significant change in the quality of instruction and learning to our program. Basing instruction on student needs, using authentic materials and designing lessons on student projects and community involvement has brought new energy and excitement to our program and increased our visibility within the community. It is a win/win for everyone involved."

"EL Civics funding has allowed us to develop curriculum and assessments tied to our priority outcomes for 7 levels of instruction. Through this project, our instructors are able to meaningfully integrate assessment with instruction and develop performance assessments that address student needs in their roles as workers, parents, life long learners, and community members. I can't think of another funding initiative that has provided such meaningful program results."

The positive impact of EL Civics has the CDE looking into the possibility of expanding the structure of the EL Civics program to other California adult education funding areas.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A
Data Tables for Workforce Investment Act Title II Funded Agencies

Number of WIA II Funded Agencies by Provider Type

Provider Type	2000-2001		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adult Schools	143	73.2	150	66.6	163	63.1	174	59.7	180	59.2
Community Colleges	12	6.2	16	7.1	18	7.0	18	6.2	19	6.3
Community-Based Organizations	13	6.7	26	11.6	43	16.7	54	18.6	54	17.8
Libraries	8	4.1	10	4.4	8	3.1	13	4.5	13	4.3
State Agencies	4	2.1	4	1.8	4	1.6	4	1.4	4	1.3
Jail Programs *	9	4.6	13	5.8	14	5.4	19	6.5	23	7.6
County Offices of Education	6	3.1	6	2.7	7	2.7	9	3.1	9	3.0
CSU**	-	-	-	-	1	0.4	-	-	1	0.3
County/City Government***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.3
Total	195	100.0	225	100.0	258	100.0	291	100.0	304	100.0

* Includes section 225 funded programs at Alameda County Library, Stanislaus Literacy Center & Tri-Valley Regional Occupational Program

** California State University

*** Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) Workforce Center

CASAS 2005

WIA II Student Enrollment by Provider Type (learners who qualified for Federal Tables)

Provider Type	2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adult Schools	419,491	79.6	446,955	79.1	467,526	79.0	458,572	77.5
Community Colleges	66,556	12.6	70,182	12.4	67,564	11.4	69,176	11.7
Community-Based Organizations	3,298	0.6	6,105	1.1	8,300	1.4	9,308	1.6
Libraries	1,049	0.2	1,216	0.2	2,000	0.3	1,983	0.3
State Agencies	26,233	5	29,099	5.1	31,605	5.3	36,798	6.2
Jail Programs *	7,360	1.4	8,367	1.5	11,050	1.9	12,260	2.1
County Offices of Education	2,968	0.6	3,309	0.6	3,529	0.6	3,650	0.6
CSU**	-	-	78	-	-	-	60	0.0
County/City Government***	-	-	-	-	-	-	86	0.0
Total	526,955	100.0	565,311	100.0	591,574	100.0	591,893	100.0

* Includes section 225 funded programs at Alameda County Library, Stanislaus Literacy Center & Tri-Valley Regional Occupational Program

** California State University

*** HACLA Workforce Center

CASAS 2005

English Literacy and Civics Education Enrollment by Provider Type (learners qualified for Federal Tables)

Provider Type	2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adult Schools	78,568	91.3	133,840	80.6	156,123	79.7
Community Colleges	4,009	4.7	27,111	16.3	34,094	17.4
Community-Based Organizations	2,858	3.3	3,880	2.3	4,045	2.1
Libraries	196	0.2	761	0.5	898	0.5
County Offices of Education	341	0.4	455	0.3	564	0.3
State University	78	0.1	-	-	60	0.0
County/City Government*	-	-	-	-	78	0.0
Total	86,050	100.0	166,047	100.0	195,862	100.0

* HACLA Workforce Center

CASAS 2005

APPENDIX A (con't)
Data Tables for Workforce Investment Act Title II Funded Agencies

Five-Years of WIA II Learners Entering Program but Dropped from Federal Tables

Number of Learners Entering Program and Hierarchically Dropped from Federal Table Inclusion	2000-2001	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Learners with Entry Records	644,062	771,905	815,310	842,464	848,220
Learners with Less than 12 hours of instruction	154,492	190,507	191,349	189,171	194,674
Learners < 16 years	2,678	4,096	3,944	5,164	5,770
Learners concurrently enrolled in HS/K12	13,842	25,275	31,245	39,380	41,949
Learners without a valid instructional level	N/A	25,072	23,461	17,175	13,934
Total Number of Learners Included in Federal Tables	473,050	526,955	565,311	591,574	591,893

CASAS 2005

National Reporting System Core Performance Learning Gains Data Submission Timeliness for WIA Title II Funded Agencies

	Number of Agencies					% Submitted by First Deadline (08/15)				
	2000-2001	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2000-2001	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04*	2004-05
Small	66	71	92	116	118	68.2	84.5	87.0	80.2	89.8
Medium	127	135	150	158	167	85.8	94.8	98.0	95.6	100.0
Large	15	17	17	17	19	80.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total	208	223	259	291	304	79.8	91.9	94.2	89.7	96.1

*First Deadline for 2003-2004 was August 16th.

CASAS 2005

Annual Payment Points Earned by WIA II Funded Agencies 2001-02 to 2004-05

Year	Total Population Selected for Payment Points	Total Number of Payment Points*
2001-02	542,425	239,293
2002-03	564,192	267,761
2003-04	601,835	284,426
2004-05	598,380	286,177

* Includes payment points earned in all programs except Student Outcome Datasets (SODs) in English Literacy and Civics Education.

CASAS 2005

APPENDIX B
Summary of California Core Performance Results

Summary of California Core Performance Indicators for Literacy Goals from 2000-2004										
Entering Educational Functional Level	2000-2001		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
	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	15.0	22.6	17.0	25.7	20.0	21.2	22.0	23.3	25.0	25.1
ABE Beginning Basic	22.0	33.2	24.0	36.4	26.0	36.4	28.0	41.1	37.0	43.0
ABE Intermediate Low	22.0	34.5	24.0	37.7	26.0	38.1	28.0	33.8	39.0	37.6
ABE Intermediate High	24.0	29.3	26.0	29.9	26.0	29.6	28.0	29.3	30.0	30.4
ASE Low	14.0	13.6	15.0	25.4	15.0	24.6	17.0	22.1	32.0	24.7
ASE High	8.0	26.9	9.0	28.3	11.0	30.5	13.0	29.3	31.0	26.2
ESL Beginning Literacy	20.0	30.6	22.0	32.2	24.0	33.6	26.0	35.4	34.0	38.7
ESL Beginning	22.0	26.7	24.0	28.4	24.0	30.2	26.0	31.1	31.0	32.6
ESL Intermediate Low	24.0	37.0	26.0	39.8	28.0	40.6	30.0	42.4	41.0	42.9
ESL Intermediate High	24.0	39.7	26.0	43.0	28.0	42.8	30.0	43.3	43.0	43.0
ESL Advanced Low	20.0	21.7	22.0	22.7	22.0	22.6	24.0	22.6	25.0	22.2
ESL Advanced High	N/A	17.7	N/A	19.3	N/A	18.8	N/A	18.3	N/A	17.7
Core Follow-Up Outcome Measures										
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
GED/HS Completion	8.0	26.7	9.0	31.7	11.0	27.6	13.0	28.8	30.0	27.9
Entered Employment	9.0	17.8	10.0	54.5	11.0	54.4	13.0	54.6	55.0	50.2
Retained Employment	11.0	34.3	12.0	85.7	13.0	81.9	15.0	82.4	83.0	87.0
Entered Postsecondary Education	6.0	11.7	7.0	60.4	8.0	53.5	10.0	54.9	55.0	57.2

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

** These performance results were obtained from a 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.

CASAS 2005

APPENDIX C Federal Tables

Index

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

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

Federal Table 3: Participants by Program Type and Age

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

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

Federal Table 5: Core Follow-up Outcome Achievement

Federal Table 6: Participant Status and Program Enrollment

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

STATE: California

Table 1

PY 2004-2005

Participants by Entering Educational Functioning Level, Ethnicity and Sex

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

Entering Educational Functioning Level (A)	American Indian or Alaskan Native		Asian		Black or African American		Hispanic or Latino		Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		White		Total (N)
	Male (B)	Female (C)	Male (D)	Female (E)	Male (F)	Female (G)	Male (H)	Female (I)	Male (J)	Female (K)	Male (L)	Female (M)	
ABE Beginning Literacy	123	80	228	163	1,594	609	2,556	1,244	120	56	2,457	1,524	10,754
ABE Beginning Basic Education	234	145	271	200	2,428	1,056	4,611	2,509	196	122	1,635	876	14,283
ABE Intermediate Low	329	321	458	445	3,040	1,679	5,970	4,704	354	250	2,534	1,761	21,845
ABE Intermediate High	777	734	1,161	1,026	5,705	3,029	13,381	11,271	909	661	7,029	4,421	50,104
ABE Subtotal	1,463	1,280	2,118	1,834	12,767	6,373	26,518	19,728	1,579	1,089	13,655	8,582	96,986
ASE Low	532	467	1,073	1,244	3,299	2,530	11,848	11,653	844	644	6,044	4,869	45,047
ASE High	251	193	513	504	1,403	1,058	5,023	4,715	362	220	3,991	2,603	20,836
ASE Subtotal	783	660	1,586	1,748	4,702	3,588	16,871	16,368	1,206	864	10,035	7,472	65,883
ESL Beginning Literacy	179	205	1,537	3,368	82	185	8,886	9,651	29	43	345	575	25,085
ESL Beginning	1,214	1,106	6,260	13,098	350	599	49,124	55,067	156	219	2,070	3,519	132,782
ESL Intermediate Low	1,112	1,174	6,178	13,249	286	427	43,542	54,775	211	288	2,009	3,863	127,114
ESL Intermediate High	565	452	4,042	9,280	187	281	19,888	26,837	149	257	1,207	2,519	65,664
ESL Low Advanced	572	446	4,310	10,329	189	262	20,754	26,969	169	306	1,400	3,366	69,072
ESL High Advanced	56	58	795	1,872	29	34	2,522	2,930	27	54	270	660	9,307
ESL Subtotal	3,698	3,441	23,122	51,196	1,123	1,788	144,716	176,229	741	1,167	7,301	14,502	429,024
Total	5,944	5,381	26,826	54,778	18,592	11,749	188,105	212,325	3,526	3,120	30,991	30,556	591,893

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

**See attached definitions for educational functioning levels.

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

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

Table 2
Participants by Age, Ethnicity and Sex

PY 2004-2005

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

Age Group (A)	American Indian or Alaskan Native		Asian		Black or African American		Hispanic or Latino		Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		White		Total (N)
	Male (B)	Female (C)	Male (D)	Female (E)	Male (F)	Female (G)	Male (H)	Female (I)	Male (J)	Female (K)	Male (L)	Female (M)	
16-18	633	485	1,687	1,374	2,973	2,259	19,008	13,527	812	468	4,505	3,245	50,976
19-24	1,977	1,201	4,169	5,401	4,376	2,868	60,160	42,205	1,183	790	6,690	5,717	136,737
25-44	2,671	2,815	10,216	25,767	7,856	4,915	89,944	121,375	1,110	1,187	12,661	12,204	292,721
45-59	567	726	6,009	14,588	2,999	1,397	15,339	28,951	303	485	4,938	5,806	82,108
60 and Older	96	154	4,745	7,648	388	310	3,654	6,267	118	190	2,197	3,584	29,351
Total	5,944	5,381	26,826	54,778	18,592	11,749	188,105	212,325	3,526	3,120	30,991	30,556	591,893

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

Table 3

PY 2004-2005

Participants by Program Type and Age

Enter the number of participants by program type and age.

Program Type (A)	16-18 (B)	19-24 (C)	25-44 (D)	45-59 (E)	60 and Older (F)	Total (G)
Adult Basic Education	15,892	25,800	41,225	11,942	2,127	96,986
Adult Secondary Education	17,334	20,101	22,132	5,005	1,311	65,883
English-as-a-Second Language	17,750	90,836	229,364	65,161	25,913	429,024
Total	50,976	136,737	292,721	82,108	29,351	591,893

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

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

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

Table 4

PY 2004-2005

Educational Gains and Attendance by Educational Functioning Level

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

Entering Educational Functioning Level (A)	Total Number Enrolled (B)	Total Attendance Hours (C)	Number Completed Level (D)	Number who Completed a Level and Advanced One or More Levels (E)	Number Separated Before Completed (F)	Number Remaining within Level (G)	Percentage Completing Level (H)
ABE Beginning Literacy	10,754	4,384,617	2,702	1,594	2,300	5,752	25.13%
ABE Beginning Basic Education	14,283	2,330,606	6,142	3,567	4,242	3,899	43.00%
ABE Intermediate Low	21,845	3,164,131	8,215	3,956	7,671	5,959	37.61%
ABE Intermediate High	50,104	6,867,261	15,221	6,154	18,054	16,829	30.38%
ASE Low	45,047	4,469,353	11,114	2,788	16,655	17,278	24.67%
ASE High*	20,836	2,102,906	5,468	894	7,000	8,368	26.24%
ESL Beginning Literacy	25,085	2,590,294	9,714	7,095	7,226	8,145	38.72%
ESL Beginning	132,782	14,470,498	43,229	30,631	39,423	50,130	32.56%
ESL Intermediate Low	127,114	17,636,560	54,584	37,189	30,418	42,112	42.94%
ESL Intermediate High	65,664	9,908,625	28,225	18,559	15,929	21,510	42.98%
ESL Low Advanced	69,072	10,893,640	15,322	9,833	20,394	33,356	22.18%
ESL High Advanced	9,307	1,281,503	1,648	1,055	3,072	4,587	17.71%
Total	591,893	80,099,994	201,584	123,315	172,384	217,925	34.06%

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 4B (Optional—This table for use in program year beginning July 1, 2004)

PY 2004-2005

Educational Gains and Attendance for Pre- and Posttested Participants

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

Entering Educational Functioning Level (A)	Total Number Enrolled Pre- and Posttested (B)	Total Attendance Hours (C)	Number Completed Level (D)	Number who Completed a Level and Advanced One or More Levels (E)	Number Separated Before Completed (F)	Number Remaining within Level (G)	Percentage Completing Level (H)
ABE Beginning Literacy	6,079	2,897,530	2,702	1,594	359	3,018	44.45%
ABE Beginning Basic Education	7,669	1,668,264	6,142	3,567	573	954	80.09%
ABE Intermediate Low	10,878	2,211,045	8,215	3,956	1,190	1,473	75.52%
ABE Intermediate High	28,193	5,090,217	15,221	6,154	5,282	7,690	53.99%
ASE Low	14,596	2,216,452	11,114	2,788	1,279	2,203	76.14%
ASE High*	8,253	1,160,025	5,468	894	960	1,825	66.25%
ESL Beginning Literacy	11,066	1,863,416	9,714	7,095	344	1,008	87.78%
ESL Beginning	63,388	10,836,624	43,229	30,631	5,561	14,598	68.20%
ESL Intermediate Low	79,464	14,758,192	54,584	37,189	7,263	17,617	68.69%
ESL Intermediate High	41,400	8,358,034	28,225	18,559	4,054	9,121	68.18%
ESL Low Advanced	44,819	9,262,173	15,322	9,833	8,248	21,249	34.19%
ESL High Advanced	4,699	926,249	1,648	1,055	889	2,162	35.07%
Total	320,504	61,248,221	201,584	123,315	36,002	82,918	62.90%

Include in this table only students who are both pre- and posttested.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 5 – Program Year 2004-2005

Core Follow-up Outcome Achievement

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

Core Follow-up Outcome Measures	Number of Participants with Main or Secondary Goal	Number of Participants Included in Survey (Sampled and Universe)	Number of Participants Responding to Survey or Used for Data Matching	Response Rate or Percent Available for Match	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome	Weighted Average Percent Achieving Outcome
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)
Entered Employment*	14,006	12,621	2,234	18%	1,245	50%
Retained Employment**	9,365	8,491	973	11%	837	87%
Obtained a GED or Secondary School Diploma***	47,903	N/A	45,929	96%	13,015	28%
Entered Postsecondary Education or Training****	14,338	12,795	2,287	18%	1,211	57%

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

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

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

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

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

Table 6 **PY 2004-2005**
Participant Status and Program Enrollment

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

Participant Status on Entry into the Program (A)	Number (B)
Disabled	9,640
Employed	216,334
Unemployed	182,638
Not in the Labor Force	90,358
On Public Assistance	28,114
Living in Rural Areas*	Not Collected
Program Type	
In Family Literacy Programs**	17,379
In Workplace Literacy Programs**	4,957
In Programs for the Homeless**	1,258
In Programs for Work-based Project Learners**	0
Institutional Programs	
In Correctional Facilities	47,170
In Community Correctional Programs	452
In Other Institutional Settings	Not Collected
Secondary Status Measures (Optional)	
Low Income	4,733
Displaced Homemaker	1,635
Single Parent	18,876
Dislocated Worker	1,450
Learning Disabled Adults	Not Collected

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

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

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

Table 7

PY 2004-2005

Adult Education Personnel by Function and Job Status

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

Function (A)	Adult Education Personnel		Unpaid Volunteers (D)
	Total Number of Part-time Personnel (B)	Total Number of Full-time Personnel (C)	
State-level Administrative/ Supervisory/Ancillary Services	0	34	0
Local-level Administrative/ Supervisory/Ancillary Services	496	962	186
Local Teachers	9,161	3,059	743
Local Counselors	160	186	7
Local Paraprofessionals	1,311	642	395

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

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

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

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

**APPENDIX D
California Collaboration References**



Suggestions for Successful Partnerships

The following tables provide descriptions of suggested practices and partnering information for adult education agencies working with One Stops.

I. Basics of Good Partnerships	Responsible Partner
Description of adult education services and programs are included in core service materials within and at One Stop service delivery points. Materials are updated regularly and reflect changes in available services. One Stop staff assures distribution of materials.	Adult Education and One Stop
Computer kiosks include links to adult education Internet sites when available.	One Stop Information Technology Staff
Adult education provides an orientation to One Stop staff regarding literacy programs.	Adult Education
One Stop descriptions of core and intensive services include adult education programs.	One Stop
One Stop staff refers participants to adult education for literacy programs.	One Stop Case Managers
Adult education staff refers students to One Stop for career services.	Adult Education Counselors and Staff
Adult education staff refers students to One Stop partners (unemployment insurance, vocational rehabilitation, county social services, etc.)	Adult Education Counselors
II. Suggested Best Practices	Responsible Partner
Adult education and the Local Work Investment Board (LWIB) develop and sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) covering both literacy and, when available, vocational programs. The MOU delineates roles and responsibilities and establishes measurable outcomes and deliverables.	LWIB and Adult Education
Adult education and One Stop staff meet regularly (no less than once per quarter) to keep lines of communication open.	Staff of both Adult Education and One Stop
One Stop partners (Vocational Rehabilitation, Unemployment, etc.) and support service providers (behavioral health, child care, etc.) refer participants to adult education when appropriate.	One Stop and Support Agency Counselors or Case Managers
Adult education vocational programs submit applications to be listed on the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL). Adult education, One Stop operator, and local board explore solutions to ETPL barriers.	Adult Education and LWIB
Adult education staff is co-located at the One Stop sites and One Stop staff is co-located at local adult education sites.	One Stop Operator
Classes are co-located at the One Stop when space is available and enrollment is sufficient to be cost-effective for the adult education provider.	One Stop and Adult Education

APPENDIX D (con't)
California Collaboration References

III. Emerging Practices	Responsible Partner
Title II funded agencies within an LWIB region develop a coalition to work collaboratively as a continuum of service.	All Title II Funded Agencies
The Title II regional or local coalition refers and enrolls students to the most appropriate adult education provider within the coalition that most closely meets the individual student needs (i.e., specialized program, class time, location easiest for student to attend, etc.).	Adult Education Counselors
The adult education Title II coalition works closely with business partners to identify literacy and vocational needs of the current and emerging workforce.	Adult Education Coalition
The locally developed Title II coalition, representing all Title II programs in the local area or region, collectively enters into a single MOU with local WIB.	Adult Education Coalition and LWIB
The Title II coalition has a representative seated on the LWIB.	Adult Education Coalition and LWIB
Adult education site hosts a One Stop site on the adult education campus.	Adult Education and One Stop Operator

Workforce Investment Act Titles I & II Partnership

Reports and guidelines regarding the partnership between adult education and the workforce development system.

Resource documents and links to related Web sites

[Adult Education One Stop Survey Report](#) (PDF; Outside Source)

This report is located on the OTAN Web site and provides complete text of the adult education survey of One Stop partnerships, including an executive summary, data, respondent recommendations, and policy considerations.

[California Workforce Investment Board](#)

This is a link to the California Workforce Investment Board (CWIB) with updated information on policy issues.

[Frequently Asked Questions](#)

This document provides background information on the relationship between WIA Title II and the One Stop system.

[Developing a Memorandum of Understanding \(MOU\)](#)

This is a summary of guidelines from the U.S. Department of Education regarding the establishment of MOUs between Title II agencies and local Workforce Investment Boards.

[Suggestions for Successful Partnerships](#)

This document provides a description of suggested practices for adult education agencies working with One Stops.

[Information Bulletin](#) (PDF; Outside Source)

This bulletin is provided by the Employment Development Department (EDD) and conveys information from the CWIB and California Department of Education (CDE) regarding adult education and literacy providers.

[Correspondence from CWIB Chairman](#) (PDF; Outside Source)

This is a letter from Lawrence Gottlieb, Chairperson, CWIB, supporting the role of literacy in the Workforce Investment system and supporting partnerships between adult education and One Stops.


[One Stop Information](#)

This is a link to EDD's description of the One Stop system, including county-by-county lists of One Stop locations.


APPENDIX E

Collaboration Data for Workforce Investment Act Title II Funded Agencies
 (Excerpt from responses to the 2004-05 Survey of WIA Title II Programs in California)



Ways Agencies Interacted with Local One-Stop Centers in 2004-05
 (Percent of All Respondents)




Effectiveness of Agency Interactions with Local One-Stop Center in 2004-05
 (Percent of All Respondents)



APPENDIX E (con't)
Collaboration Data for Workforce Investment Act Title II Funded Agencies



APPENDIX E (con't)
Collaboration Data for Workforce Investment Act Title II Funded Agencies



APPENDIX F
English Literacy Civics Education Data Tables

2004-05 EL Civics Agency Enrollment by Provider Type

EL Civics Provider Type	2004-05 Civic Participation Enrollment*		2004-05 Citizenship Preparation Enrollment*		Total EL Civics Agencies N
	N	%	N	%	
	Adult Schools	143,655	80.04	20,022	
Community Colleges	31,840	17.74	2,857	11.38	16
Community-based Organizations	2,902	1.62	1,623	6.46	39
Libraries	471	0.26	470	1.87	6
County Offices of Education	462	0.26	133	0.53	6
CSU**	60	0.03	-	-	1
County/City Government***	84	0.05	-	-	1
Total	179,474	100.0	25,105	100.0	207

*Some students were enrolled in both Civic Participation and Citizenship Preparation classes.

** California State University

***HACLA Workforce Center

CASAS 2005

2004-05 EL Civics Agency Enrollment by Funding Type

Funding Type	Civic Participation Total Enrollment		Citizenship Preparation Total Enrollment		Total EL Civics Agencies N
	N	%	N	%	
	Citizenship Preparation Only	-	-	545	
Civic Participation Only	539	0.3	-	-	8
Citizenship Preparation and 231	-	-	7,109	28.3	16
Civic Participation and 231	39,108	21.8	-	-	45
Citizenship Preparation and Civic Participation	1,251	0.7	359	1.4	8
Civic Participation, Citizenship Preparation, and 231	138,576	77.2	17,092	68.1	127
Total	179,474	100.0	25,105	100.0	207

CASAS 2005

EL Civics Data Highlights 2004-05

Number of agencies funded for EL Civics	207
Received EL Civics funding only	19
Received EL Civics and 231 funding	188
Funded for Civic Participation only	8
Funded for Civic Participation and 231	45
Funded for Citizenship Preparation only	3
Funded for Citizenship Preparation and 231	16
Funded for Civic Participation and Citizenship Preparation	8
Funded for Civics Participation, Citizenship Preparation and 231	127
Total EL Civics learner enrollment (unduplicated)	200,863
Total EL Civics learners who qualified for the Federal Tables	195,862
Total Civic Participation learner enrollment*	179,474
Total Citizenship Preparation learner enrollment*	25,105
Total EL Civics learners with pre- and post-tests	121,047
Total EL Civics learners completing an instructional level	76,987
Total EL Civics learners who advanced one or more levels	49,745
Number of Additional Assessments administered	144,181
Number passed (85.5%)	119,183

*Some students were enrolled in both Civic Participation and Citizenship Preparation classes.

CASAS 2005

APPENDIX F (con't)
English Literacy Civics Education Data Tables

The Ten Most Used Civic Objectives (CO) and Additional Assessment Plans in 2004-05

CO #	Additional Assessment Plan Description	Total Agencies Selected	Total Assessments Administered	Total Learners Passed	Total Learners Passed %
28	Access the health care system and be able to interact with the providers.	95	18,212	15,744	86.45
33	Identify and access employment and training resources needed to apply for a job.	93	22,803	17,842	78.24
13	Interact with educational institutions including schools for children and schools or agencies with programs for adult learners.	56	7,151	6,303	88.14
1	Identify/evaluate/compare financial service options in the community.	45	5,748	4,995	86.90
40	Respond correctly to questions about the history and government of the United States in order to be successful in the naturalization process.	33	10,792	8,669	80.33
24	Describe ways, such as neighborhood watch, to prevent personal accidents and avoid becoming a crime victim.	32	8,237	7,425	90.14
4	Describe methods and procedures to obtain housing and related services including low-cost community housing.	31	8,170	7,091	86.79
14	Identify educational opportunities and research education/training required to achieve a personal goal.	27	10,451	8,227	78.72
11	Research and describe the cultural backgrounds that reflect the local cross-cultural society.	27	6,116	5,228	85.48
15	Demonstrate basic knowledge and awareness of the emergency services available in the community and ways to contact and use emergency services and legal assistance agencies.	27	3,871	2,413	62.34

CASAS 2005

Comparison of The Ten Most Used Civic Objectives (CO) and Additional Assessment Plans in 2003-04 and 2004-05

2003-04					2004-05				
CO #	Total Agencies Selected	Total Assessments Administered	Total Learners Passed	Total Learners Passed %	CO #	Total Agencies Selected	Total Assessments Administered	Total Learners Passed	Total Learners Passed %
33	79	15,435	12,237	79.3	28	95	18,212	15,744	86.45
28	78	13,293	11,541	86.8	33	93	22,803	17,842	78.24
13	40	3,422	3,020	88.3	13	56	7,151	6,303	88.14
14	30	8,055	6,176	76.7	1	45	5,748	4,995	86.9
4	30	5,635	5,126	91	40	33	10,792	8,669	80.33
46*	30	3,758	3,536	94.1	24	32	8,237	7,425	90.14
1	30	3,648	3,324	91.1	4	31	8,170	7,091	86.79
15	27	3,922	3,385	86.3	14	27	10,451	8,227	78.72
23	26	2,947	2,468	83.7	11	27	6,116	5,228	85.48
12	24	4,216	3,602	85.4	15	27	3,871	2,413	62.34

* Objective 46 in 2003-04 was the designated number for all agency created civic objectives.

CASAS 2005