

California Adult Education End-of-Year Progress Report to the Legislature



California Workforce Investment Act Title II Program Implementation

**Program Year 2006
July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006**

End-of-Year Progress Report to the California Legislature

Implementation of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Title II

Submitted by the
California Department of Education, Adult Education Office

FEBRUARY 2007

This report was prepared by the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS), Foundation for Educational Achievement, for the California Department of Education, Adult Education Office. The data in this report was collected during the 2005-2006 program year. CASAS activities are funded by a contract under Public Law 105-220 and are administered by the Adult Education Office.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
LIST OF ACRONYMS	3
PART I — IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT TITLE II	4
a. The makeup of 2005-06 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)	4
Funding and Applicants for Funding	4
Geographic Region by Provider Type	6
Agency Size by Provider Type	7
Agency Size by Geographic Region	8
Enrollment by Provider Type	10
b. The extent to which participating programs were able to meet planned performance targets	11
Benchmark Performance Highlights for WIA Title II Funded Agencies	11
Level Completion Highlights for NRS Eligible Learners in WIA Title II Funded Agencies ...	13
c. Program areas included in the performance targets of participating agencies	15
Enrollment by Instructional Programs	15
PART II — LEGISLATIVE INTENT CONSIDERATIONS	17
Background and Integrity of Current System	17
Issues the CDE has garnered and actively supported local providers in the use of WIA Title II through State Leadership Funds	18
Issue 1: Accountability	19
Issue 2: Evidence-Based Research	19
Issue 3: Small Agencies	19
Issue 4: Expansion of Instructional Delivery Options	20
Issue 5: Professional Development	20
Issue 6: Advisory Groups	20
Issue 7: State Leadership Projects	20
Issue 8: Use of Technology	21
Issue 9: Student Recruitment, Persistence, and Performance	21
Issue 10: Distance Learning	22
Issue 11: Targeted Technical Assistance to Low Performing Agencies	22
Legislative Recommendations for Improving Implementation of a Performance-Based Funding System	23
a. Evaluate whether any changes are necessary to improve the implementation of the performance-based funding system under WIA Title II	23
Recommendation 1: Data Match	23
Recommendation 2: Assessment for Adults with Disabilities	23
Recommendation 3: Collaboration with Workforce Investment Boards and One-Stop Centers	23
Recommendation 4: Collect and Report Data on All Apportionment-Funded Adult Education Programs	24

Recommendation 5: California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE)	24
b. Evaluate the feasibility of any future expansion of the performance-based funding system using state funds.....	24
Need to Develop a Common Data Dictionary	25
Need to Develop Standards and Assessments in Other Authorized Areas	25
Need to Provide Additional Funding and Technical Assistance to Support the Transition..	26
Appendix A Progress Measures	i
Appendix B Summary of California Core Performance Results from 1999-2006	iii
Appendix C Agency Tables by the CDE Geographic Region	iv
Table C1 CDE Geographic Regions and Counties	iv
Table C2 WIA Title II Applicants and Agencies Funded by the CDE Geographic Region for 2005-2006	iv
Table C3 Agencies by the CDE Geographic Region and Provider Type with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06.....	v
Table C4 Agencies by Size and the CDE Geographic Region with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06.....	v
Appendix D CASAS Skill Level Descriptors for ABE.....	vi
Appendix D CASAS Skill Level Descriptors for ESL	vii

Tables

Table 1	WIA Title II Applicants and Agencies Funded by Agency Type for 2005-06.....	5
Table 2	Number of WIA Title II Funded Agencies by Provider Type over Six-year Period.....	5
Table 3a	WIA Title II Applicants and Agencies Funded by Geographic Region for 2005-06.....	6
Table 3b	Agencies by Geographic Region and Provider Type with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06	7
Table 4a	Agencies by Size and Provider Type with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06.....	8
Table 4b	Agencies by Size and Geographic Region with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06	8
Table 4b1	Small-Sized Agencies by Geographic Region with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06	9
Table 4b2	Medium-Sized Agencies by Geographic Region with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06	9
Table 4b3	Large-Sized Agencies by Geographic Region with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06	10
Table 5	Enrollment by Provider Type for WIA Title II Funded Agencies over Six-Year Period	11
Table 6	Benchmarks By Program Type for WIA Title II Funded Agencies over Six-Year Period	12
Table 7	WIA Title II California Learner Enrollment with NRS Restrictions for 2005-06.....	13
Table 8	Level Completion for NRS Eligible Learners for 2005-06	14
Table 9	Core Follow-Up Outcome Achievement (PY 2005-06)	14
Table 10	Enrollment by Instructional Program for WIA Title II Learners over Six-Year Period	16
Table 11	Entry Instructional Level for WIA Title II Benchmark Eligible Learners for 2005-06	16

INTRODUCTION

The federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Title II, Adult Education and Family Literacy Act 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 2006-07 (Item 6110-156-0890 provision 3) requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to report on the implementation of the WIA Title II:

On or before March 1, 2007, 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 2005-06 represents the seventh 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 General Education Development (GED) certificate, 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 the student performance data to negotiate performance goals with the United States Department of Education (ED), Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) for eleven literacy levels within the program areas of Adult Basic Education (ABE), Adult Secondary Education (ASE), and English as a Second Language (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 General Education Development (GED) certificate 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. 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 2005-06, the WIA Title II program in California met or exceeded the performance goals for three of the eleven literacy levels: ESL beginning literacy, ESL beginning and ESL intermediate low. California met performance goals for one of the four core follow-up outcome measures, 'Retain job'. (For specific information, refer to Appendix B for the Summary of California Core Performance Results from 1999-2000 to 2005-06.)

In 2005-06, 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 ability 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 application for and receipt of WIA Title II federal funds by California. The 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 from welfare.

This report contains two parts. Part I addresses the current and past implementation of WIA Title II. Part II addresses legislative intent considerations with recommendations.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

Please refer to the list below for acronyms used in the report.

Acronym	Definition
ABE	Adult Basic Education
A.D.A	Average Daily Attendance
AEFLA	Adult Education and Family Literacy Act
ASE	Adult Secondary Education
CAHSEE	California High School Exit Exam
CALPRO	California Adult Literacy Professional Development Project
CASAS	Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System
CBOs	Community-based Organizations
CCC	California Conservation Corps
CDC	California Department of Corrections
CDLP	California Distance Learning Project
CYA	California Youth Authority
CCDs	Community College Districts
CDE	California Department of Education
COE	County Offices of Education
DDS	Department of Developmental Services
DQSC	Data Quality Standards Checklist
ED	United States Department of Education
EL Civics	English Literacy and Civics Education
ESL	English as a Second Language
ESL-Cit	ESL-Citizenship
GED	General Education Development
IRCA	Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986
K-12	Kindergarten through Grade Twelve
NRS	National Reporting System
OTAN	Outreach and Technical Assistance Network
OVAE	Office of Vocational and Adult Education
POWER	Providing Options for the Workplace, Education, and Rehabilitation
SCANS	Secretary's Commission for Achieving the Necessary Skills
TIMAC	Technology Integration Mentor Academy
USCIS	United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
USDE	United States Department of Education
VABE	Vocational Adult Basic Education
VESL	Vocational English as a Second Language
WIA Title II	Workforce Investment Act Title II, Adult Education and Family Literacy Act
WIB	Workforce Investment Boards

PART I — IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT TITLE II

a. The makeup of 2005-06 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

WIA Title II supports three general types of program funding:

1. Section 225 of WIA 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. This program area includes VABE.
 - ASE – Includes preparation for achieving a high school diploma or successfully passing the GED.
 - ESL – Assists learners in English language acquisition. This program area includes VESL.
2. Section 231 of WIA Title II
 - ABE including VABE
 - ASE
 - ESL including VESL
 - ESL-Citizenship – 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 2005-06, 300 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 300 agencies that applied for funding, 96.3 percent (289 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 for 2005-06

Agency Type	Applied for Funding	Received Funding	Received Funding
	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Adult Schools	179	177	98.9
Community-Based Organizations	50	47	94.0
Community College Districts	18	18	100.0
Library Literacy Programs	13	12	92.3
County Offices of Education	10	8	80.0
California Conservation Corps	1	1	100.0
Institutions (Section 225)	27	25	92.6
California State Universities	1	0	0.0
County/City Government*	1	1	100
Total	300	289	96.3

CASAS 2006
 Note: *Housing Authority of the city of Los Angeles (HACLA) Workforce Center

Adult schools comprised the majority of WIA Title II agencies that applied for and received funding. Other adult education providers include CBOs, community college districts, library literacy programs, COE, CCC, state and local institutions (Section 225), and (county/city government) 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 Six-Year Period

Agency Type	PY 2000-2001		PY 2001-02		PY 2002-03		PY 2003-04		PY 2004-05		PY 2005-06	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Adult Schools	143	73.2	150	67.2	163	63.1	174	59.7	180	59.2	177	61.3
Community-Based Organizations	13	6.7	24	10.8	43	16.7	54	18.6	54	17.8	47	16.3
Community College Districts	12	6.2	16	7.2	18	7.0	18	6.2	19	6.3	18	6.2
Library Literacy Programs	8	4.1	10	4.5	8	3.1	13	4.5	13	4.3	12	4.2
County Offices of Education	5	2.6	6	2.7	7	2.7	9	3.1	9	3.0	8	2.8
California Conservation Corps	1	0.5	1	0.4	1	0.4	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3
Institutions (Section 225)	13	6.7	16	7.2	17	6.6	22	7.6	26	8.5	25	8.6
California State Universities*	N/A	--	N/A	--	1	0.4	N/A	--	1	0.3	N/A	--
County/City Government**	N/A	--	N/A	--	N/A	--	N/A	--	1	0.3	1	0.3
Total	195	100.0	223	100.0	258	100.0	291	100.0	304	100.0	289	100.0

CASAS 2006
 Note: *San Diego State University **Housing Authority of the city of Los Angeles (HACLA) Workforce Center

Since the inception of WIA Title II, the number of funded agencies increased through 2004-05 by 55.9 percent to reach a total of 304 agencies. In 2005-06, only agencies who were funded in the previous year could reapply for WIA Title II funding and some agencies did not apply for refunding. There were 289 funded agencies in 2005-06. Of the 25 agencies receiving Section 225 funding to serve institutionalized adults, 22 were jail programs, and the remaining three were state agencies: CDC, DDS, and CYA.

Geographic Region by Provider Type

For purposes of this report, California is categorized into seven geographic regions. Four of the regions include the four largest urban areas of the State. The Balance of the State region includes the following counties: Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, El Dorado, Glenn, Humboldt, Imperial, Kings, Lake, Lassen, Madera, Marin, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Monterey, Napa, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Shasta, Solano, Sonoma, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, and Yolo. Table 3a reports agencies that applied for WIA Title II funding and those that received WIA Title II funding by geographic region for 2005-06. The CDE classifies California into 11 geographic regions. Refer to Appendix C table C1 for list of counties comprising each region. See Appendix C table C2 for number of agencies that applied and received WIA Title II funding by the 11 CDE geographic regions for 2005-06. Los Angeles area has the highest number of agencies and enrollment according to the CDE geographic regions.

Table 3a
WIA Title II Applicants and Agencies Funded by Geographic Region¹ for 2005-06

Geographic Region	Applied for	Received	Received
	Funding	Funding	Funding
	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Bay Area Region	57	53	93.0
Central Valley Region	27	25	92.6
Los Angeles Perimeter Region	46	46	100.0
Los Angeles County Region	52	52	100.0
San Diego Region	15	14	93.3
State Agencies	4	4	100.0
Balance of State	99	95	96.0
Total	300	289	96.3

CASAS 2006

Note: The State Agencies classification includes CCC, DDS, CDC, and CYA.

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. The geographic region with the highest number of agencies was the Balance of State region that encompasses the North Bay and Sacramento-Stockton areas with the rest of the regions mostly rural areas falling outside the main urban centers. Although 32.9 percent of agencies were in the Balance of State region, they account for only 12.2 percent of total student enrollment. Los Angeles County and its perimeter counties account for 33.9 percent of all agencies and 55.8 percent of student enrollment; these numbers are influenced by

¹ California Geographical Regions:

Balance of State: Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, El Dorado, Glenn, Humboldt, Imperial, Kings, Lake, Lassen, Madera, Marin, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Monterey, Napa, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Shasta, Solano, Sonoma, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Yolo Counties.

Bay Area Region: Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara Counties.

Central Valley Region: Fresno, Kern, Merced, Tulare. LA Perimeter Region: Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura Counties

Los Angeles County Region: Los Angeles County. San Diego Region: San Diego County. State Agencies: Sacramento

the Los Angeles Unified School District — the largest adult education provider in the state. The Bay Area region comprises 18.3 percent of all agencies and 15.1 percent of student enrollment. The majority of the funded CBOs are in the Bay Area region (34 percent) or Los Angeles County region and its perimeter counties (29.8 percent). The majority of community colleges are in the Los Angeles County region and its perimeter counties (55.6 percent). See Appendix C table C3 for applicant agencies that received WIA Title II funding by the 11 CDE geographic region and provider type.

Table 3b
Agencies by Geographic Region and Provider Type with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06

Geographic Region	Adult Schools		CBO		Community Colleges		Library Literacy		COE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bay Area	31	17.5	16	34.0	1	5.5	0	0.0	2	25.0
Central Valley	21	11.9	2	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Los Angeles Perimeter	30	16.9	5	10.6	5	27.8	3	25.0	0	0.0
Los Angeles County	32	18.1	9	19.2	5	27.8	4	33.3	0	0.0
San Diego	8	4.5	3	6.4	2	11.1	1	8.3	0	0.0
State Agencies	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Balance of State	55	31.1	12	25.5	5	27.8	4	33.3	6	75.0
	177	100.0	47	100.0	18	100.0	12	100.0	8	100.0

Geographic Region	CCC		Institutions (Section 225)		County/City Government		Total Agencies		Total Enrollment	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bay Area	0	0.0	3	12.0	0	0.0	53	18.3	125,540	15.1
Central Valley	0	0.0	2	8.0	0	0.0	25	8.7	42,898	5.1
Los Angeles Perimeter	0	0.0	3	12.0	0	0.0	46	15.9	120,999	14.5
Los Angeles County	0	0.0	1	4.0	1	100.0	52	18.0	344,443	41.3
San Diego	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	4.8	46,414	5.6
State Agencies	1	100.0	3	12.0	0	0.0	4	1.4	51,565	6.2
Balance of State	0	0.0	13	52.0	0	0.0	95	32.9	101,765	12.2
	1	100.0	25	100.0	1	100.0	289	100.0	833,624	100.0

CASAS 2006

Note: The State Agencies classification includes CCC, DDS, CDC, and CYA.

Agency Size by Provider Type

Following the standard used for the last six years, agency size is divided 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 are within the medium category (58.5 percent), followed by small (35.6 percent), and large (5.9 percent). In terms of student enrollment, 49.5 percent of students are enrolled in medium-sized agencies, 48.3 percent in large agencies, and 2.1 percent in small agencies.

Provider types followed expected size patterns. Large agencies included only adult schools, community college districts, 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 college districts, and institutions (Section 225) were medium-sized (see Table 4a).

Table 4a
Agencies by Size and Provider Type with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06

Size	Adult Schools		CBO		Community Colleges		Library Literacy		COE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small	35	19.8	39	83.0	2	11.1	9	75.0	6	75.0
Medium	130	73.4	8	17.0	13	72.2	3	25.0	2	25.0
Large	12	6.8			3	16.7				
Total	177	100.0	47	100.0	18	100.0	12	100.0	8	100.0

Size	CCC		Institutions (Section 225)		County/City Government*		Total Agencies		Total Enrollment	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small			11	44.0	1	100.0	103	35.6	17,701	2.1
Medium	1	100.0	12	48.0			169	58.5	412,874	49.5
Large			2	8.0			17	5.9	403,049	48.3
Total	1	100.0	25	100.0	1	100.0	289	100.0	833,624	100.0

CASAS 2006

Note: *Housing Authority of the city of Los Angeles (HACLA) Workforce Center

Agency Size by Geographic Region

As shown in Table 4b, a large proportion (48.5 percent) of the 103 small agencies are in the Balance of State region consisting primarily of rural areas. 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 58.8 percent of the large agencies and 39.6 percent of the medium agencies. Small sized agencies in rural areas serve the needs of smaller, more rural populations that require access to instruction in remote areas. Medium and large agencies are providing service predominantly to urban and suburban populations. See Appendix C table C4 for agencies by size and 11 CDE geographic regions.

Table 4b
Agencies by Size and Geographic Region with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06

Geographic Region	Small		Medium		Large	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bay Area	16	15.5	33	19.5	4	23.5
Central Valley	11	10.7	12	7.1	2	11.8
Los Angeles Perimeter	9	8.7	36	21.3	1	5.9
Los Angeles County	12	11.7	34	20.1	6	35.3
San Diego County	5	4.9	7	4.1	2	11.8
State Agencies	0	0.0	3	1.8	1	5.9
Balance of State	50	48.5	44	26.0	1	5.9
Total	103	100.0	169	100.0	17	100.0

CASAS 2006

Tables 4b1, 4b2, and 4b3 display the trend data of agencies receiving WIA Title II funds over the last six program years (2000-2001 through 2005-06) for the three sizes of agencies. Over this period, there were 94 newly funded agencies added to the WIA Title II provider system. The addition of 53 newly funded small agencies accounted for over 56 percent of this growth. As shown in Table 4b1, the number of small agencies funded with WIA Title II resources increased to 118 in program year 2004-05. Some of these agencies were not funded in 2005-06.

**Table 4b1
Small-Sized Agencies by Geographic Region with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06**

Geographic Region	PY 2000-01		PY 2001-02		PY 2002-03		PY 2003-04		PY 2004-05		PY 2005-06	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<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	19	16.1	16	15.5
Central Valley	9	18.0	9	12.7	13	14.1	13	11.2	16	13.6	11	10.7
Los Angeles Perimeter	6	12.0	10	14.1	8	8.7	14	12.1	10	8.5	9	8.7
Los Angeles County	3	6.0	7	9.9	14	15.2	14	12.1	14	11.9	12	11.7
San Diego County	1	2.0	1	1.4	5	5.4	7	6.0	6	5.1	5	4.9
State Agencies	0	0.0	0	0.0	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	53	44.9	50	48.5
Total	50	100.0	71	100.0	92	100.0	116	100.0	118	100.0	103	100.0

CASAS 2006

Table 4b2 displays the additions and changes in the funding of medium-sized agencies. Overall, their growth was 43.2 percent higher in 2005-06 than in 2000-2001. Table 4b3 shows the small changes that took place during the same period for large agencies.

**Table 4b2
Medium-Sized Agencies by Geographic Region with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06**

Geographic Region	PY 2000-01		PY 2001-02		PY 2002-03		PY 2003-04		PY 2004-05		PY 2005-06	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<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	34	20.4	33	19.5
Central Valley	9	7.6	12	8.9	11	7.4	12	7.6	11	6.6	12	7.1
Los Angeles Perimeter	23	19.5	25	18.5	28	18.8	32	20.3	35	21.0	36	21.3
Los Angeles County	29	24.6	32	23.8	33	22.1	31	19.6	32	19.2	34	20.1
San Diego County	5	4.2	6	4.4	6	4.0	5	3.2	7	4.2	7	4.1
State Agencies	1	0.8	3	2.2	3	2.0	3	1.9	3	1.8	3	1.8
Balance of State	23	19.6	28	20.7	37	24.9	42	26.5	45	26.9	44	26.0
Total	118	100.0	135	100.0	149	100.0	158	100.0	167	100.0	169	100.0

CASAS 2006

As noted previously, over the past six 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 number of providers added to the delivery system did not proportionately increase the capacity to serve more students. The growth provided greater access to literacy and educational programs for students who might not otherwise be served. New small-sized agencies accounted for

49.5 percent of the overall increase in providers. There were two major increases in costs associated with growth: (1) greater expenditure of local assistance funds so these smaller agencies could participate in WIA Title II funding; and (2) the further dilution and strain on capped state leadership resources in providing these agencies with greater amounts of technical assistance and training. The additional technical assistance and training represents more services than those typically needed by ongoing agencies that have more staff and experience in delivering adult education and literacy services.

Table 4b3
Large-Sized Agencies by Geographic Region with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06

Geographic Region	PY 2000-01		PY 2001-02		PY 2002-03		PY 2003-04		PY 2004-05		PY 2005-06	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<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	4	21.1	4	23.5
Central Valley	1	7.1	1	5.9	1	5.9	1	5.9	2	10.5	2	11.8
Los Angeles Perimeter	2	14.3	2	11.8	2	11.8	2	11.8	2	10.5	1	5.9
Los Angeles County	5	35.7	6	35.2	6	35.2	5	29.4	7	36.8	6	35.3
San Diego County	2	14.3	2	11.8	2	11.8	3	17.6	2	10.5	2	11.8
State Agencies	0	0.0	1	5.9	1	5.9	1	5.9	1	5.3	1	5.9
Balance of State	1	7.2	1	5.9	1	5.9	1	5.9	1	5.3	1	5.9
Total	14	100.0	17	100.0	17	100.0	17	100.0	19	100.0	17	100.0

CASAS 2006

Enrollment by Provider Type

Table 5 reports the number of student enrollments by provider type. In 2005-06, there were 289 WIA Title II agencies enrolling 833,624 students, with adult schools serving the vast majority (79.3 percent) of the learners. The percentages of students enrolled by provider type are consistent with the percentages from prior years.

The NRS requires states to report student data to the ED for only those learners who meet certain criteria, including participation of 12 or more hours of instruction, are at least 16 years of age, are not concurrently enrolled in K-12, and have a valid instructional level. Application of this criterion reduces the number of student records reported to ED from 833,624 enrolled to 583,088 reported to the NRS. However, the primary focus of this report is the entire student database of 833,624 student entry records.

In 2005-06, learner enrollment in WIA Title II program decreased by 1.7 percent (14,596) compared to 2004-05. Adult school enrollment decreased by 25,876 (3.8 percent) and CBO by 2,073 (17.1 percent). Agencies experiencing the largest increases in enrollment were institutions 13,005 (21.4 percent) and the CCC 572 (101.8 percent). Over the six-year period displayed in Table 5, annual enrollments increased by 189,562, (29.4 percent) partially because of the increase in the number of providers as well as increase in student enrollment. CBOs made the most dramatic enrollment increase, followed by library literacy programs and institutions (Section 225). A downward trend in enrollment was detected among most provider types when compared to program year 2004-05. However Institutions, CCD, and COEs showed an increase in enrollment despite a slight decrease in the total number funded agencies.

**Table 5
Enrollment by Provider Type for WIA Title II Funded Agencies over Six-Year
Period**

Provider Type	PY 2000-01		PY 2001-02		PY 2002-03	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Adult Schools	529,920	82.3	640,182	82.9	673,836	82.6
Community-Based Organizations	2,272	0.4	4,255	0.6	7,821	1.0
Community College Districts	68,881	10.7	77,277	10.0	80,014	9.8
County Offices of Education	5,228	0.8	5,593	0.7	5,608	0.7
Library Literacy Programs	933	0.1	1,330	0.2	1,358	0.2
California Conservation Corps	1,751	0.3	2,700	0.3	2,250	0.3
California State Universities*	N/A	--	N/A	--	100	0.0
Institutions (Section 225)	35,077	5.4	40,568	5.3	44,323	5.4
County/City Government**	N/A	--	N/A	--	100	0.0
Total	644,062	100.0	771,905	100.0	815,410	100.0
Provider Type	PY 2003-04		PY 2004-05		PY 2005-06	
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%
Adult Schools	693,588	82.3	687,055	81.0	661,179	79.3
Community-Based Organizations	11,271	1.3	12,113	1.4	10,040	1.2
Community College Districts	76,647	9.1	79,172	9.3	79,313	9.5
County Offices of Education	5,740	0.7	5,177	0.6	5,263	0.6
Library Literacy Programs	2,865	0.3	3,168	0.4	2,889	0.3
California Conservation Corps	1,391	0.2	562	0.1	1,134	0.1
California State Universities*	N/A	--	74	0.0	N/A	--
Institutions (Section 225)	50,962	6.0	60,771	7.2	73,776	8.9
County/City Government**	N/A	--	128	0.0	30	0.0
Total	842,464	100.0	848,220	100.0	833,624	100.0

CASAS 2006

Note: *San Diego State University, **HACLA Workforce Center for PY 2005-06

b. The extent to which participating programs were able to meet planned performance targets

Benchmark Performance Highlights for WIA Title II Funded Agencies

Participating programs set the number of learners they expected to serve in their 2005-06 WIA Title II federal funding application. Programs used standardized and validated test instruments developed by CASAS to measure progress in student learning.

California measures and pays local providers for student 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 reported to

the CDE help determine future levels of federal local assistance funding to local agencies.

Along with the decrease in learner enrollment by 1.7 percent (14,596) in 2005-06 compared to 2004-05 program year, the benchmarks earned in the period decreased by 1.7 percent (4,948). The number of benchmarks achieved in WIA Title II 231/225 programs by providers increased by 55.7 percent from 2000-2001. The benchmarks achieved in the ASE program decreased by 16.9 percent from program year 2004-05. This may be due to the new requirement that all adult learners must pass the CAHSEE in order to receive a High School Diploma. ESL includes learners enrolled in EL Civics programs and the benchmarks earned by agencies dually funded for ABE 231 and EL Civics are accrued under the ESL program. Benchmarks achieved by agencies funded only for EL Civics are shown separately in Table 6. ESL benchmarks decreased slightly by less than 1 percent compared to 2004-05 program year. The decrease in ESL-Cit benchmarks over the six-year period was possibly because of a drop in enrollment by 65.5 percent from 2000-01. Please see page 15 under “Enrollment by Instructional Programs” for additional information on ESL-Cit enrollment. ABE continues to show the highest proportional gain over the six-year period, with a 7.7 percent increase in benchmarks from 2004-05.

Table 6
Benchmarks By Program Type for WIA Title II Funded Agencies over Six-Year Period

Program Type	PY 2000-2001		PY 2001-02		PY 2002-03		PY 2003-04		PY 2004-05		PY 2005-06	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ABE	10,114	5.6	22,515	9.5	22,795	8.5	26,844	9.4	31,815	11.1	34,260	12.1
ESL	141,374	78.0	183,081	76.9	194,988	72.8	216,757	75.9	216,475	75.3	214,881	76.1
EL-Civics Only**					*		1,030	0.4	1,153	0.4	1,496	0.5
ESL-Citizenship	4,100	2.3	4,015	1.7	4,967	1.9	642	0.2	961	0.3	1,077	0.4
ASE	25,767	14.2	28,539	12.0	45,011	16.8	40,183	14.1	36,926	12.9	30,668	10.9
Total	181,355	100.0	238,150	100.0	267,761	100.0	285,456	100.0	287,330	100.0	282,382	100.0

CASAS 2006

Note: * The ESL figure included EL Civics in 2002-03, **Includes Benchmarks (significant gain and completion of two instructional levels) achieved by Agencies only funded for EL-Civics

In addition to the three core indicators of performance for benchmarks (significant gains in CASAS test scores, completion of two instructional levels, and completion of the GED or attainment of a high school diploma), California assesses EL Civics students using performance-based additional assessments created to measure student attainment of civic objectives and standardized assessment for Citizenship preparation. EL Civics continues to have a positive impact on the delivery of English language instruction. The design and implementation of EL Civics programs provides an opportunity for EL Civics students to apply what they have learned in the classroom and make a positive impact in their lives and in their communities.

EL Civics students, who comprise 36 percent of all WIA Title II students who qualified for NRS reporting, outperformed WIA Title II students in four major areas: (1) percentage of students who qualified for inclusion in the Federal Tables, (2) percentage

of students who took pre- and post-tests, (3) percentage of students who completed an instructional level, and (4) percentage of students who advanced one or more instructional levels.

Table 7 outlines the student records included in the original federal database and the subsequent criteria required to conform to the NRS for adult education. As mentioned previously, the NRS requires that states restrict the student data reported to the ED to only those learners who met the NRS criterion. Applying this criterion reduces the number of student records reported to ED from 833,624 enrolled to 583,088 reported to the NRS.

Table 7
WIA Title II California Learner Enrollment with NRS Restrictions for 2005-06

	<u>N</u>
Total WIA Title II Learners with Entry Records	833,624
<u>NRS Criteria</u>	
Learners with fewer than 12 hours of instruction	187,513
Learners <16 years old	6,649
Learners concurrently enrolled in HS/K-12	43,215
Learners without a valid instructional level	13,159
Learners included in NRS Federal Tables	583,088

CASAS 2006

As shown in Table 7, of the 833,624 learners, 69.9 percent met the NRS criteria. Of the total number (583,088) of NRS eligible learners, 54 percent or 314,931, continued in program and were administered a post test. Paired test data are a prerequisite to determine if learners achieved positive results from any of two types of benchmarks: significant gains (three to five scale point gains on CASAS pretests and post-tests) within a NRS Educational Functioning Level, and completing a NRS Educational Functioning Level.

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 table lists the corresponding CASAS test scores to assist in interpreting each educational functioning level (see Appendix D for the CASAS Skill Level Descriptors for ABE and CASAS Skill Level Descriptors for ESL).

As shown on Table 8, approximately one-third (33.9 percent) of learners completed at least one educational functioning level. In the core indicators of performance for 2005-06, California's WIA Title II program met or exceeded the performance goals for three of

the eleven literacy levels and met performance goals for one of the 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 2005-06.

**Table 8
Level Completion for NRS Eligible Learners for 2005-06**

NRS Educational Functioning Level	CASAS Test Score Equivalent	Performance Goal	% Completed Level	Difference
ABE Beginning Literacy	≤ 200	25.0	24.2	-0.8
ABE Beginning Basic	201-210	42.0	41.4	-0.6
ABE Intermediate Low	211-220	38.0	33.5	-4.5
ABE Intermediate High	221-235	31.0	27.4	-3.6
ASE Low	236-245	26.0	21.5	-4.5
ASE High	246+	30.0	24.8	-5.2
ESL Beginning Literacy	≤ 180	36.0	40.1	4.1
ESL Beginning	181-200	32.0	34.3	2.3
ESL Intermediate Low	201-210	43.0	43.3	0.3
ESL Intermediate High	211-220	44.0	42.3	-1.7
ESL Low Advanced	221-235	24.0	21.7	-2.3
ESL High Advanced	236-245	NA	19.7	NA
Total		NA	33.9	NA

CASAS 2006

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.

**Table 9
Core Follow-Up Outcome Achievement (PY 2005-06)**

Core Follow-up Outcome Measures	Participants with Main or Secondary Goal	Participants Included in Survey or Data Match	Participants Responding to Survey or Data Match	Response or Data Match Rate	Participants Achieving Outcome	Weighted Percent Achieving Outcome
	N	N	N	%	N	%
Includes performance for all Four Quarters						
Entered Employment	11,798	10,319	1,667	16%	984	59%
Retained Employment	8,317	7,349	956	13%	842	88%
Obtained a GED or High School Diploma	38,621	N/A	37,641	97%	9,962	26%
Entered Postsecondary Education or Training	12,401	10,789	1,700	16%	804	47%

CASAS 2006

California uses a Student Follow-Up Survey to track results for those learners who entered employment, retained employment, and entered postsecondary education or training. Response rates ranged between 14.8 percent and 16.2 percent. These rates,

although representing a relatively small proportion of those learners who participated in the survey, 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, California uses a data match. In 2005-06, data match results revealed that 4,578 learners accomplished their goal of attaining a GED certificate while an additional 5,384 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, 26.5 percent accomplished their goal.

c. Program areas included in the performance targets of participating agencies

When applying for WIA Title II funds, adult education providers must assess learner needs to determine the necessary program offerings for their respective service areas. Providers have the option of implementing programs in ABE, ESL (which includes learners enrolled in EL Civics programs), ESL-Cit, 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 learners in need of basic literacy instruction. These low-level learners score at or below what educators typically expect of eighth grade students in the K-12 system with regard to reading, mathematics or listening tests.

Enrollment by Instructional Programs

As in previous years, ESL programs served the vast majority (64.6 percent) of adult learners in California for 2005-06. ASE programs comprised the next highest student enrollment (21.2 percent), followed by ABE (13.6 percent), and ESL-Cit (0.5 percent). Table 10 shows that this distribution is consistent with prior years, although ABE and ASE programs served a slightly higher proportion of the total learners, and ESL programs served a slightly lower proportion (64.6 percent in 2005-06 compared to 67.8 percent in 2000-2001).

The ABE program shows a continual increase in student enrollment over the six-year period. ABE enrollment increased by 7.2 percent compared to 2004-05. ESL and ASE enrollment decreased by 2.3 and 5.2 percent respectively from 2004-05. The ABE program accounted for the largest proportional increase in student enrollment (62.2 percent) since 2000-2001, followed by ASE (42.6 percent) and ESL (23.3 percent). The ESL program accounted for the largest total increase in enrollment since 2000-2001. ESL-Cit experienced the largest drop in enrollment (-65.5 percent) from 13,060 in 2000-2001 to 4,508 in 2005-06. This decrease in ESL-Cit enrollment may be attributed to a number of factors including the completion of the naturalization process for those who qualified and sought legal residency under the IRCA, a decrease in demand for the citizenship programs as more learners switched to basic ESL or EL Civics programs to meet their immediate language literacy needs, and changes in the USCIS regulations

that make it more difficult for those seeking citizenship. Additionally, some agencies have switched from using the Section 231 funds for ESL-Cit activities to the EL Civics grant that started in February 2001. Since 2003-04, enrollment in ESL- Cit has slightly increased from 2,775 to 4,508 in 2005-06.

Table 10
Enrollment by Instructional Program for WIA Title II Learners over Six-Year Period

Instructional Program	PY 2000-2001		PY 2001-02		PY 2002-03		PY 2003-04		PY 2004-05		PY 2005-06	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ABE	70,063	10.9	86,895	11.3	98,995	12.1	103,290	12.3	105,960	12.5	113,610	13.6
ESL	436,810	67.8	521,170	67.5	531,649	65.2	559,582	66.4	551,118	65.0	538,480	64.6
ESL-Citizenship	13,060	2.0	13,537	1.8	14,965	1.8	2,775	0.3	4,309	0.5	4,508	0.5
ASE	124,104	19.3	150,303	19.5	169,701	20.8	176,817	21.0	186,833	22.0	177,026	21.2
Total	644,037	100.0	771,905	100.0	815,310	100.0	842,464	100.0	848,220	100.0	833,624	100.0

Note: 208,910 learners who were enrolled in ESL also enrolled in EL Civics in PY 2005-06.

Table 11 presents information about the instructional levels of those learners enrolled in ABE, ESL, ESL-Cit, and ASE programs, which can be summarized as follows:

- The majority (58.7 percent) of ABE learners who were eligible to earn benchmarks entered programs at the intermediate instructional levels (CASAS scores from 211 through 235). In addition, 31.3 percent of learners entered at beginning instructional levels (CASAS scores 210 or less).
- The highest percentage of ESL learners entered programs at the ESL beginning and low intermediate instructional levels (31.6 and 29.8 percent, respectively), CASAS scores from 181 through 210.
- The majority (64.8 percent) of ASE learners entered programs predominantly at the advanced instructional levels (CASAS scores 236 and higher).

Table 11
Entry Instructional Level for WIA Title II Benchmark Eligible Learners for 2005-06

Instructional Level	ABE		ESL		ESL-Cit		ASE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Beginning Literacy	11,381	14.0	25,381	6.1	141	4.3	617	0.7
ABE Beginning Basic/ ESL Beginning	14,113	17.3	131,404	31.6	976	30.1	2,520	3.0
Intermediate Low	17,471	21.4	123,881	29.8	1,105	34.1	6,210	7.5
Intermediate High	30,389	37.3	62,843	15.1	495	15.3	19,787	23.9
ASE Low/ESL Adv. Low	5,837	7.2	63,936	15.4	457	14.1	35,796	43.3
ASE High/ESL Adv. High	2,340	2.9	8,144	2.0	71	2.2	17,793	21.5
Total	81,531	100.0	415,589	100.0	3,245	100.0	82,723	100.0

CASAS 2006

Note: Table 11 includes those learners with an instructional level based on pretest scores and reported instructor evaluation. Learners without a valid instructional level are not included.

PART II — LEGISLATIVE INTENT CONSIDERATIONS

Background and Integrity of Current System

California adopted a 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 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 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 ED to evaluate and report the results of its federally funded adult education program through the WIA Title II. 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 CASAS 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 2005-06, the sixth year under WIA Title II performance-based accountability requirements, the 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 now must submit data on a quarterly basis. This allows a more comprehensive review of the data, using the DSQC prior to the final year-end submission, which results in greater data accuracy.

As mentioned in previous reports, even with the steadily improving progress in data collection, barriers still inhibit 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, reported student reluctance to disclose demographic information, and institutional fear of unfavorable comparison to peers.

Funded agencies have taken positive steps to address these concerns:

- Agencies are providing more timely 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, establishing 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 submit data 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 have assisted students in setting their short- and long-term goals.

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

The 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, a Web-based data archival/retrieval and communications system, and staff development. The CDE actively elicits adult education field input regarding services and processes the local literacy agencies need to provide quality instruction. Specifically, the CDE continues to respond positively to the following recommendations.

Issue 1: Accountability

Recommendation: The CDE should 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

Recommendation: The CDE should provide support and resources to ensure that evidence-based adult learning strategies inform instruction to:

- 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

Recommendation: The CDE should 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

Recommendation: The CDE should provide incentives to serve unserved, under-served, and “hard to reach” adults, including institutionalized adults by:

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

Issue 5: Professional Development

Recommendation: The CDE should 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 options for the delivery of instruction
- Use data and assessment results to facilitate lesson planning and target instruction to the identified needs and goals of learners
- Implement California Promising Practices, Programs of Excellence, and Model Standards criteria

Issue 6: Advisory Groups

Recommendation: The CDE should 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.

Issue 7: State Leadership Projects

Currently there are four State Leadership Projects that provide resources to WIA Title II funded agencies — CALPRO, CASAS, CDLP, and OTAN. To attain continuous program improvement goals, agencies will need to increase use of the services provided by the four State Leadership Projects. Responses to the 2005-06 WIA Title II Survey indicated that many agencies, especially small, rural, agencies, are unaware of many of the resources available to them through one or more of the Leadership Projects. This may be due to the major challenges faced by small agencies such as high staff turnover and multiple projects assigned to one staff member.

Recommendation: The CDE should continue to support the four State Leaderships Projects in providing targeted training and technical assistance, improving and expanding outreach, and facilitating the use of project resources to all WIA Title II agencies, especially for (1) agencies that did not meet state negotiated performance goals, (2) agencies located in remote areas of the state, and (3) small agencies.

Issue 8: Use of Technology

Although most agencies now have computers available to support both staff and students, technology implemented at the agency level, may not be accessible to all classes and programs. Larger agencies reported providing computer access and other forms of technology more often than medium-sized or small agencies. Instructors' responses indicate they still rely heavily on traditional audio-visual resources (overhead projectors, video and audio cassettes and CDs).

Recommendation: The CDE should support and promote the expansion and use of resources available, for identifying and using current and new technology, at both the program and classroom levels, by:

- Providing training in techniques for integrating computers and other technologies into instruction
- Providing technical training for instructors and other staff, specifically those in small and isolated agencies
- Increase implementation of the OTAN Technology Mentor Project
- Promoting partnerships and strategies to ensure all students have access to computers

Issue 9: Student Recruitment, Persistence, and Performance

Students are experiencing greater success rates in agencies that are implementing student needs assessments, program orientation, attainable goals, and targeted instruction and providing timely feedback on the outcomes of these activities to instructors and students. The year 2005-06 was marked by a downward trend in student enrollment after a steady increase for the previous five years from 1999 to 2005. In addition, California WIA Title II agencies met fewer State goals for the NRS functional levels and Core performance goals in 2005-06.

Recommendation: The CDE should identify, define, set standards, and disseminate information at both the program management and instructional levels related to strategies that promote student recruitment, persistence and attainment of goal. Strategies should include:

- Developing outreach activities to increase enrollment. Continuing research on the effectiveness of managed enrollment
- Implementing student orientation and goal setting activities
- Administering pre tests upon enrollment and post tests to students who have sufficient instructional hours
- Providing timely student test results and TOPSpro reports to instructors to develop and/or improve curriculum and instruction, monitor student progress and attainment of goal

Issue 10: Distance Learning

State legislation permits California adult schools to spend up to 5% of their apportionment on non-traditional educational approaches. The CDLP assists agencies in providing distance learning options to their adult learners. The flexibility of distance learning is designed to provide instructional strategies that increase learner access, participation, persistence, and learning success.

Recommendation: The CDE should continue to support improvement and a broader use of distance learning strategies for all agencies. The CDE should continue to work with the CDLP to document the benefits of distance learning including leveraging technology to provide increased access to learning opportunities.

Issue 11: Targeted Technical Assistance to Low Performing Agencies

Agencies that consistently perform at low levels often exhibit problems related to the collection, management, and use of data. These agencies require additional support to insure that: (1) all necessary demographic and participation data is being collected and reported, (2) students are being pre and post-tested, (3) student goals are appropriately assigned and the outcomes are documented.

Recommendation: The CDE should continue to provide targeted technical assistance to low performing agencies. Agencies that consistently fail to achieve California state goals for the NRS functional levels and core performance should be identified. Based on analyses of processes and procedures, specific reasons for their poor performance should be determined. These reasons should serve as guides for developing program improvement plans.

Legislative Recommendations for Improving Implementation of a Performance-Based Funding System

a. Evaluate whether any changes are necessary to improve the implementation of the performance-based funding system under WIA Title II

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

Recommendation 1: Data Match

Provide authority, resources, and policy 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 systems for adults with disabilities that provide a continuum of assessments with a long-term outcome of employability. Support 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 including Power.

Recommendation 3: Collaboration with Workforce Investment Boards and One-Stop Centers

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

- Offer basic skills and literacy instruction in combination with job training to adults most in need (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.

In recent years the Legislature has required, through language in the California Budget Act, the need to have substantial data about the role of local education agencies in providing services to clients. Local providers were required to annually collect and report to the CDE 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 students nor all authorized program areas of adult education.

Recommendation 5: California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE)

The first school year for full implementation of the CAHSEE was 2005-06. Survey respondents, especially those from large urban programs, indicated that they were anticipating needs for additional: 1) class offerings, 2) targeted professional development, especially for instructors, 3) curriculum revision and instructional materials, especially in the area of mathematics, and 4) program services including counseling, registration, and orientation. Strategy should include:

- Providing funding resources and support for agencies experiencing the impact of the implementation of the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE), addressing the needs of program management as well as instructors and both concurrently enrolled high school and adult school students seeking to earn a high school diploma
- Supporting the development of a CASAS readiness assessment to assist instructors in preparing learners to take the CAHSEE exam

b. Evaluate the feasibility of any future expansion of the performance-based funding system using state funds.

The statewide system of adult education financed with state 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-Cit, and ASE (high school subjects, and GED preparation). The possibility of extending the pay-for-performance model to all state-funded programs offering instruction in other, non-literacy-based areas requires careful consideration of the following:

Need to Develop a Common Data Dictionary

Without common definitions for data elements related to student level participation (enrollment, attendance, progress, completion) and student outcomes (attainment of diplomas and certificates, post secondary education and training, employment, wages), meaningful information on return on investment becomes nearly impossible. The CDE, in collaboration with the community colleges and other stakeholders, should actively implement the provision of AB 1319 to begin addressing the issues of creating a common data dictionary for collection of student level data in adult and continuing education programs under the jurisdiction of the California State Department of Education and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

Need to Develop Standards and Assessments in Other Authorized Areas

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

Program content standards are undergoing an update or are in development for five of the ten state-authorized areas: ABE, ESL, ASE, Parent Education, and Older Adults programs. The 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.

Developing standardized assessments for the current federal program began 25 years ago. California uses CASAS standardized assessments 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 requires sufficient funding. The literacy-based program areas of ABE, ESL, ESL-Cit, 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. However, these assessment models may not be as appropriate for the other state-authorized adult

education program areas such as Career and Technical 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

ABE, ESL, and ASE programs currently have an adequate infrastructure to address the issues associated with transition to 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 includes 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 are more significant for small adult education programs. During the last six years, larger 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. It is often difficult for small agencies to hire enough staff and to provide training for their staff. In addition, small agencies frequently do not have adequate technology infrastructure, and other resources to support the data requirements that 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 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.

The CDE is committed to maintaining and developing educational systems that document the success of learners enrolled in all authorized program areas. This includes investigation of 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 the program is running smoothly before it is possible to make assumptions regarding what works and what does not. In the past six years, the 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 Title All

2005-06 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 aligns with the NRS that the ED uses to report performance of adult education programs to the Congress of the United States.

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 correlated to the 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 (See Appendices C and D) 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 Title II Success Measures

The WIA Title II 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: WIA Title II 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 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
- Attainment of the GED or attainment of a high school diploma

Appendix B Summary of California Core Performance Results from 1999-2006

	1999-2000		2000-2001		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06	
Entering Educational Functional Level	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)	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	25.0	25.1	25.0	24.2
ABE Beginning Basic	20.0	17.7	22.0	33.2	24.0	36.4	26.0	36.4	28.0	41.1	37.0	43.0	42.0	41.4
ABE Intermediate Low	20.0	18.0	22.0	34.5	24.0	37.7	26.0	38.1	28.0	33.8	39.0	37.6	38.0	33.5
ABE Intermediate High	22.0	13.7	24.0	29.3	26.0	29.9	26.0	29.6	28.0	29.3	30.0	30.4	31.0	27.4
ASE Low	NA	1.7	14.0	13.6	15.0	25.4	15.0	24.6	17.0	22.1	32.0	24.7	26.0	21.5
ASE High	7.0	18.5	8.0	26.9	9.0	28.3	11.0	30.5	13.0	29.3	31.0	26.2	30.0	24.8
ESL Beginning Literacy	18.0	14.1	20.0	30.6	22.0	32.2	24.0	33.6	26.0	35.4	34.0	38.7	36.0	40.1
ESL Beginning	20.0	12.5	22.0	26.7	24.0	28.4	24.0	30.2	26.0	31.1	31.0	32.6	32.0	34.3
ESL Intermediate Low	22.0	27.2	24.0	37.0	26.0	39.8	28.0	40.6	30.0	42.4	41.0	42.9	43.0	43.3
ESL Intermediate High	22.0	30.0	24.0	39.7	26.0	43.0	28.0	42.8	30.0	43.3	43.0	43.0	44.0	42.3
ESL Advanced Low	18.0	13.0	20.0	21.7	22.0	22.7	22.0	22.6	24.0	22.6	25.0	22.2	24.0	21.7
ESL Advanced High	N/A	18.1	N/A	17.7	N/A	19.3	N/A	18.8	N/A	18.3	N/A	17.7	N/A	19.7
Core Follow-Up Outcome Measures	N	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
GED/HS Completion	12,000	14,399	8.0	26.7	9.0	31.7	11.0	27.6	13.0	28.8	30.0	27.9	30.0	26.5
Entered Employment	10,000	11,068	9.0	17.8	10.0	54.5	11.0	54.4	13.0	54.6	56.0	50.2	55.0	49.9
Retained Employment	18,000	25,877	11.0	34.3	12.0	85.7	13.0	81.9	15.0	82.4	83.0	87.0	83.0	91.4
Entered Postsecondary Education	23,000	392	6.0	11.7	7.0	60.4	8.0	53.5	10.0	54.9	56.0	57.2	55.0	47.3

CASAS 2006

Appendix C Agency Tables by the CDE Geographic Region

Table C1 CDE Geographic Regions and Counties

CDE Geographic Regions	Counties
Northcoast (1)	Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Solano, Sonoma
Northeastern (2)	Butte, Glenn, Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity
Capitol (3)	Alpine, Colusa, El Dorado, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Sierra, Sutter, Yolo, Yuba
Bay Area (4)	Alameda, Marin, San Francisco
South Bay (5)	Contra Costa, Monterey, San Benito, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz
Delta Sierra (6)	Amador, Calaveras, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tuolumne
Central Valley (7)	Fresno, Inyo, Kings, Mono, Tulare
Costa del Sur (8)	Kern, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura
Southern (9)	Imperial, Orange, San Diego
Rims (10)	Riverside, San Bernardino
Los Angeles (11)	Los Angeles

CASAS 2006

Table C2 WIA Title II Applicants and Agencies Funded by the CDE Geographic Region for 2005-2006

CDE Geographic Region	Applied for Funding	Received Funding	Received Funding	Total Enrollment	
	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Northcoast (1)	18	17	94.4	15,660	1.9
Northeastern (2)	17	16	94.1	4,623	0.6
Capitol (3)	24	23	95.8	33,584	4.0
Bay Area (4)	29	27	93.1	53,847	6.5
South Bay (5)	44	41	93.2	91,410	11.0
Delta Sierra (6)	14	14	100.0	21,481	2.6
Central Valley (7)	22	20	90.9	29,078	3.5
Costa del Sur (8)	13	13	100.0	27,811	3.3
Southern (9)	36	35	97.2	110,997	13.3
Rims (10)	27	27	100.0	49,125	5.9
Los Angeles (11)	52	52	100.0	344,443	41.3
State Agencies	4	4	100.0	51,565	6.2
Total	300	289	96.3	833,624	100.0

CASAS 2006

Table C3 Agencies by the CDE Geographic Region and Provider Type with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06

Geographic Region	Adult Schools	CBO	Community Colleges	Library Literacy	COE	CCC	Institutions (Section 225)	County/City Government
	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>
Northcoast (1)	10	3	1	2			1	
Northeastern (2)	8	2	1	1	3		1	
Capitol (3)	12	2	1	1	2		5	
Bay Area (4)	12	12	1		1		1	
South Bay (5)	30	7			1		3	
Delta Sierra (6)	10	1					3	
Central Valley (7)	17	1			1		1	
Costa del Sur (8)	7	3	2				1	
Southern (9)	20	4	5	2			4	
Rims (10)	19	3	2	2			1	
Los Angeles (11)	32	9	5	4			1	1
State Agencies						1	3	
Total	177	47	18	12	8	1	25	1

CASAS 2006

Table C4 Agencies by Size and the CDE Geographic Region with WIA Title II Funding for 2005-06

CDE Geographic Region	Small		Medium		Large			
	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%	<u>N</u>	%		
Northcoast (1)	8	7.8	9	5.3				
Northeastern (2)	14	13.6	2	1.2				
Capitol (3)	10	9.7	12	7.1	1	5.9		
Bay Area (4)	12	11.7	13	7.7	2	11.8		
South Bay (5)	12	11.7	27	16.0	2	11.8		
Delta Sierra (6)	5	4.9	9	5.3				
Central Valley (7)	9	8.7	10	5.9	1	5.9		
Costa del Sur (8)	4	3.9	8	4.7	1	5.9		
Southern (9)	11	10.7	21	12.4	3	17.6		
Rims (10)	6	5.8	21	12.4				
Los Angeles (11)	12	11.7	34	20.1	6	35.3		
State Agencies			3	1.8	1	5.9		
Total			103	100.0	169	100.0	17	100.0

CASAS 2006

Appendix D CASAS Skill Level Descriptors for ABE

Scale Scores	CASAS Level	Descriptors
250	E	Advanced Adult Secondary 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.
245		
240	D	Adult Secondary 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.
235		
230	C	Advanced Basic Skills 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.
225		
220		
215		
210	B	Intermediate Basic Skills 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.
205		Beginning Basic Skills 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.
200		
190	A	Beginning Literacy/Pre-Beginning 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.
180		
150		

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
250 245	E	<p>Proficient Skills 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>
240 235	D	<p>Adult Secondary 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>
230 225 220	C	<p>Advanced ESL 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>
215 210 205 200	B	<p>High Intermediate ESL 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> <p>Low Intermediate ESL SPL 4 Listening/Speaking: Can satisfy basic survival needs and very routine social demands. Understands simple learned phrases easily and some new simple phrases containing familiar vocabulary, spoken slowly with frequent repetition. Reading/Writing: Can read and interpret simple material on familiar topics. Able to read and interpret simple directions, schedules, signs, maps, and menus. Can fill out forms requiring basic personal information and write short, simple notes and messages based on familiar situations. Employability: Can handle entry-level jobs that involve some simple oral and written communication but in which tasks can also be demonstrated and/or clarified orally.</p>
190 180 150	A	<p>High Beginning ESL 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> <p>Low Beginning ESL 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>Beginning Literacy/Pre-Beginning ESL 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.