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

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

**Program Year 2008
July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008**

End-of-Year Progress Report to the California Legislature 2007-08

Implementation and Impact of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Title II Adult Education and Family Literacy Act

Submitted by the
California Department of Education, Adult Education Office

FEBRUARY 2009

CONTENTS

Tables

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 2007-08 (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, 2009, the State Department of Education shall report to the appropriate subcommittees of the Assembly Budget Committee, 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 WIA Title II and those that obtained grants, by size, geographic location, and type (school district, community colleges, community-based organizations (CBOs), 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 changes that may be necessary to improve the implementation of the accountability-based funding system under the WIA Title II; and (b) evaluate the feasibility of any future expansion of the accountability-based funding system using state funds.*

Fiscal year 2007-08 represents the ninth year of WIA Title II implementation. Two major implementation goals are to: (1) increase performance measures; (2) increase student success in transitions to postsecondary education and to the workforce. 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 educational program information

- Individual student progress and learning gains in the literacy skill levels of reading, writing, and speaking the English language, numeracy, English language acquisition; and other literacy skills.

- Student outcomes, including the completion of a General Education Development (GED) certificate, attainment of a high school diploma, acquisition or retention of unsubsidized employment, and entered postsecondary education or training (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 ABE, ASE and ESL, and the four core follow-up outcome measures of: (1) entered employment; (2) retained employment; (3) entered postsecondary education or training; and (4) attained a GED 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 after exiting the program. For specific information, refer to Appendix B for the Summary of California Core Performance Results from 2001 to 2008.

In 2007-08, the CDE served 855,021 students in its WIA, Title II: AEFLA program and a total of 1,239,449 students statewide. Actual performance increased by 2 percent to 33 percent level completion for all adult learners who enrolled in the WIA, Title II program, and 64 percent of all learners remained in a program a sufficient length of time to take both a pre and a post-test. English as a Second Language (ESL) is the largest program in adult education in California with 522,034 students. The overall performance in ESL exceeded the goals. Nearly 62 percent of learners who were pre- and post-tested completed an educational functioning level. Of those students who indicated these goals, 36 percent attained a GED certificate or secondary school diploma, 43 percent entered postsecondary training and 57 percent of students found employment.

In 2007-08, 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) 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.

Collecting these comprehensive data is a requirement for receipt of WIA Title II federal funds by California. The CDE and the adult education infrastructure currently do not have the resources and the authority to collect such comprehensive information on state apportioned adult education programs. Part I of this report addresses the implementation of WIA Title II. Part II discusses legislative intent considerations and recommendations.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

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

Acronym	Definition
ABE	Adult Basic Education
ADA	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 Systems
CBOs	Community-Based Organizations
CCC	California Conservation Corps
CCDs	Community College Districts
CDCR	California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
CDCR-DJJ	California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation-Division of Juvenile Justice
CDE	California Department of Education
COE	County Offices of Education
CYA	California Youth Authority
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
HS	High School
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
TOPSpro	Tracking of Programs and Students
USCIS	United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
VABE	Vocational Adult Basic Education
VESL	Vocational English as a Second Language
WIA Title II	Workforce Investment Act Title II
WIB	Workforce Investment Boards

PART I — IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT TITLE II

A. The makeup of 2007-08 adult education providers that applied for competitive grants under WIA 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 basic literacy skills, improve their employment opportunities, and work toward the attainment of a high school diploma. This program area includes Vocational Adult Basic Education (VABE).

    - ASE – Includes preparation for achieving a high school diploma or successfully passing the General Education Development (GED).

    - ESL – Assists learners in English language acquisition. This program area includes Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL).

2. Section 231 of WIA Title II

    - ABE including VABE

    - ASE

    - ESL including VESL

    - ESL-Citizenship (ESL-Cit) – Assists learners in English language acquisition with special emphasis on preparing learners to achieve United States 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 2007-08, 266 agencies applied and received 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. 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 2007-08, only agencies who were funded in 2004-05 could

reapply for WIA Title II funding. Adult schools comprised the majority of WIA Title II agencies that applied for and received funding. Other adult education providers include community based organizations (CBOs), community college districts (CCDs), library literacy programs, and county offices of education (COE). Section 225 includes state and local institutions, such as county jail education programs and state agencies serving institutionalized adults. Of the 21 agencies receiving Section 225 funding to serve institutionalized adults, 18 were jail programs, and the remaining three were state agencies: California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), CDCR-Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) and Department of Developmental Services (DDS).

Table 1
Number of WIA Title II Funded Agencies by Provider Type

Agency Type	2000-2001		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04	
	N	%	**N**	%	**N**	%	**N**	%
Adult Schools	143	73.2	150	67.2	163	63.1	174	59.7
Community-Based Organizations	13	6.7	24	10.8	43	16.7	54	18.6
Community College Districts	12	6.2	16	7.2	18	7.0	18	6.2
Library Literacy Programs	8	4.1	10	4.5	8	3.1	13	4.5
County Offices of Education	5	2.6	6	2.7	7	2.7	9	3.1
California Conservation Corps	1	0.5	1	0.4	1	0.4	1	0.3
Institutions (Section 225)	13	6.7	16	7.2	17	6.6	22	7.6
California State Universities*	N/A	--	N/A	--	1	0.4	N/A	--
County/City Government**	N/A	--	N/A	--	N/A	--	N/A	--
Total	**195**	**100.0**	**223**	**100.0**	**258**	**100.0**	**291**	**100.0**

Agency Type	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adult Schools	180	59.2	177	61.3	175	64.1	173	65.0
Community-Based Organizations	54	17.8	47	16.3	40	14.7	38	14.3
Community College Districts	19	6.3	18	6.2	18	6.6	17	6.4
Library Literacy Programs	13	4.3	12	4.2	11	4.0	10	3.8
County Offices of Education	9	3.0	8	2.8	8	2.9	7	2.6
California Conservation Corps	1	0.3	1	0.3	N/A	--	N/A	--
Institutions (Section 225)	26	8.5	25	8.6	21	7.7	21	7.9
California State Universities*	1	0.3	N/A	--	N/A	--	N/A	--
County/City Government**	1	0.3	1	0.3	N/A	--	N/A	--
Total	**304**	**100.0**	**289**	**100.0**	**273**	**100.0**	**266**	**100.0**

CASAS 2008

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

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 2a reports agencies that received WIA Title II funding and student enrollment in each geographic region for 2007-08.

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 2007-08. Los Angeles area has the highest number of agencies and enrollment according to the CDE geographic regions.

Table 2a
WIA Title II Agencies Funded by Geographic Region[1]

Geographic Region	Received Funding		Total Enrollment	
	N	%	N	%
Bay Area Region	50	18.8	122,967	14.4
Central Valley Region	23	8.6	43,769	5.1
Los Angeles Perimeter Region	43	16.2	127,445	14.9
Los Angeles County Region	49	18.4	338,994	39.6
San Diego Region	13	4.9	50,562	5.9
State Agencies	3	1.1	66,201	7.7
Balance of State	85	32.0	105,083	12.3
Total	**266**	**100.0**	**855,021**	**100.0**

CASAS 2008
Note: The State Agencies classification includes DDS, CDCR, and California Youth Authority (CYA).

Table 2b reports the number and percentage of applicant agencies that received WIA Title II funding by geographic region and provider type. Although 32 percent of agencies were in the Balance of State region, they accounted for only 12.3 percent of total student enrollment. Los Angeles County and its perimeter counties accounted for 34.6 percent of all agencies and 54.5 percent of student enrollment; these numbers are influenced by the Los Angeles Unified School District — the largest adult education provider in the state. The majority of the funded CBOs are in the Bay Area region (36.8 percent) or Los Angeles County region and its perimeter counties (23.7 percent). The majority of community colleges are in the Los Angeles County region and its perimeter counties (58.8 percent). See Appendix C Table C3 for applicant agencies that received WIA Title II funding by the 11 CDE geographic region and provider types.

---

[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

Table 2b
Agencies by Geographic Region and Provider Type with WIA Title II Funding

Geographic Region	Adult Schools		CBO		Community Colleges		Library Literacy	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bay Area	31	17.9	14	36.8	1	5.9		0.0
Central Valley	19	11.0	2	5.3		0.0		0.0
Los Angeles Perimeter	30	17.3	2	5.3	5	29.4	3	30.0
Los Angeles County	32	18.5	7	18.4	5	29.4	4	40.0
San Diego	8	4.6	3	7.9	2	11.8		0.0
State Agencies		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
Balance of State	53	30.6	10	26.3	4	23.5	3	30.0
	173	**100.0**	**38**	**100.0**	**17**	**100.0**	**10**	**100.0**

Geographic Region	COE		Institutions (Section 225)		Total Agencies		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bay Area	1	14.3	3	14.3	50	18.8	122,967	14.4
Central Valley	0	0.0	2	9.5	23	8.6	43,769	5.1
Los Angeles Perimeter	0	0.0	3	14.3	43	16.2	127,445	14.9
Los Angeles County	0	0.0	1	4.8	49	18.4	338,994	39.6
San Diego	0	0.0		0.0	13	4.9	50,562	5.9
State Agencies	0	0.0	3	14.3	3	1.1	66,201	7.7
Balance of State	6	85.7	9	42.9	85	32.0	105,083	12.3
	7	**100.0**	**21**	**100.0**	**266**	**100.0**	**855,021**	**100.0**

CASAS 2008

Note: The State Agencies classification includes CDDS, CDCR, and CDCR-DJJ.

Agency Size by Provider Type

Following the standard used for the last nine 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 (64.7 percent), followed by small (29.7 percent), and large (5.6 percent). In terms of student enrollment, 52 percent of students are enrolled in medium-sized agencies, 46.4 percent in large agencies, and 1.6 percent in small agencies.

Provider types followed expected size patterns. Large agencies included only adult schools, CCDs, and two institution programs. CBOs and library literacy programs were almost exclusively small agencies, as were the majority of COE programs. The majority of adult schools, CCDs, and institutions (Section 225) were medium-sized (see Table 3a).

Table 3a
Agencies by Size and Provider Type

Size	Adult Schools		CBO		Community Colleges		Library Literacy	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small	29	16.8	32	84.2	1	5.9	7	70.0
Medium	134	77.5	6	15.8	13	76.5	3	30.0
Large	10	5.8		0.0	3	17.6	0	0.0
Total	**173**	**100.0**	**38**	**100.0**	**17**	**100.0**	**10**	**100.0**

Size	COE		Institutions (Section 225)		Total Agencies		Total Enrollment	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small	4	57.1	6	28.6	79	29.7	13,535	1.6
Medium	3	42.9	13	61.9	172	64.7	444,974	52.0
Large	0	0.0	2	9.5	15	5.6	396,512	46.4
Total	**7**	**100.0**	**21**	**100.0**	**266**	**100.0**	**855,021**	**100.0**

CASAS 2008

Agency Size by Geographic Region

As shown in Table 3b, a large proportion (44.3 percent) of the 79 small agencies is 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 (perimeter and county) and Bay Area regions have 66.7 percent of the large agencies and 58 percent of the medium agencies. Small 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 3b
Agencies by Size and Geographic Region

Geographic Region	Small		Medium		Large	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bay Area	16	20.3	30	17.4	4	26.7
Central Valley	8	10.1	14	8.1	1	6.7
Los Angeles Perimeter	6	7.6	35	20.3	2	13.3
Los Angeles County	10	12.7	35	20.3	4	26.7
San Diego County	4	5.1	7	4.1	2	13.3
State Agencies		0.0	2	1.2	1	6.7
Balance of State	35	44.3	49	28.5	1	6.7
Total	**79**	**100.0**	**172**	**100.0**	**15**	**100.0**

CASAS 2008

Enrollment by Provider Type

Table 4 reports the number of student enrollments by provider type. In 2007-08, there were 266 WIA Title II funded agencies enrolled 855,021 students, with adult schools serving 78 percent of the learners. The percentages of students enrolled by provider type were consistent with the percentages from prior years.

Table 4
Enrollment by Provider Type for WIA Title II Funded Agencies over Eight-Year Period

Provider Type	2000-2001		2001-02		2002-03		2003-04	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adult Schools	529,920	82.3	640,182	82.9	673,836	82.6	693,588	82.3
Community-Based Organizations	2,272	0.4	4,255	0.6	7,821	1.0	11,271	1.3
Community College Districts	68,881	10.7	77,277	10.0	80,014	9.8	76,647	9.1
County Offices of Education	5,228	0.8	5,593	0.7	5,608	0.7	5,740	0.7
Library Literacy Programs	933	0.1	1,330	0.2	1358	0.2	2,865	0.3
California Conservation Corps	1,751	0.3	2,700	0.3	2,250	0.3	1,391	0.2
California State Universities*	N/A	--	N/A	--	100	0.0	N/A	--
Institutions (Section 225)	35,077	5.4	40,568	5.3	44,323	5.4	50,962	6.0
County/City Government**	N/A	--	N/A	--	100	0.0	N/A	0.0
Total	**644,062**	**100.0**	**771,905**	**100.0**	**815,410**	**100.0**	**842,464**	**100.0**

Provider Type	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adult Schools	687,055	81.0	661,179	79.3	662,635	78.8	666,935	78.0
Community-Based Organizations	12,113	1.4	10,040	1.2	8,035	1.0	7,737	0.9
Community College Districts	79,172	9.3	79,313	9.5	82,441	9.8	82,841	9.7
County Offices of Education	5,177	0.6	5,263	0.6	4,986	0.6	5,685	0.7
Library Literacy Programs	3,168	0.4	2,889	0.3	2,369	0.3	2,424	0.3
California Conservation Corps	562	0.1	1,134	0.1	N/A	--	N/A	--
California State Universities*	74	0.0	N/A	--	N/A	--	N/A	--
Institutions (Section 225)	60,771	7.2	73,776	8.9	80,724	9.6	89,399	10.5
County/City Government**	128	0.0	30	0.0	N/A	--	N/A	--
Total	**848,220**	**100.0**	**833,624**	**100.0**	**841,190**	**100.0**	**855,021**	**100.0**

CASAS 2008

*Note: *San Diego State University, **HACLA Workforce Center*

The NRS requires states to report student data to the USDE 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 kindergarten through twelfth grade (K-12), and have a valid instructional level. Application of this criterion reduces the number of student records reported to USDE from 855,021 enrolled to 602,837 reported to the NRS. However, the primary focus of this report is the entire student database of 855,021 student entry records.

Over the eight-year period displayed in Table 4, annual enrollments increased by 210,959 (32.7 percent), partially because of the increase in the number of providers as well as an increase in student enrollment. In 2007-08 overall enrollment increased compared to program year 2006-07 and despite a slight decrease in the total number funded agencies compared to 2006-07.

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

Benchmark Performance Highlights for WIA Title II Agencies

Progress for student learners is measured using standardized and validated test instruments developed by CASAS. California measures and pays local providers when students accomplish specific learning gains and attain a high school diploma or GED. California uses three core indicators of performance for benchmarks: (1) significant gains in CASAS test scores; (2) completion of two instructional levels; and (3) successful completion of the GED test or attainment of a high school diploma, including the passage of the CAHSEE. Table 5 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 slight increase in learner enrollment in 2007-08, the benchmarks earned also increased by 3.8 percent (10,974). The number of benchmarks achieved in WIA Title II 231/225 programs has steadily increased since the inception of WIA Title II except for 2005-06. 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 5. Please see page 15 under "Enrollment by Instructional Programs" for additional information on ESL-Cit enrollment. ABE continues to show steady increase in benchmarks attained over the seven-year period with increase in enrollment.

Table 5
Benchmarks by Program Type over Seven-Year Period

Program Type	2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ABE	22,515	9.5	22,795	8.5	26,844	9.4	31,815	11.1	34,260	12.1	36,945	12.9	39,524	13.3
ESL	183,081	76.9	194,988	72.8	216,757	75.9	216,475	75.3	214,881	76.1	213,099	74.2	210,164	70.5
EL-Civics Only**			*		1,030	0.4	1,153	0.4	1,496	0.5	1,677	0.6	1,600	0.5
ESL-Citizenship	4,015	1.7	4,967	1.9	642	0.2	961	0.3	1,077	0.4	1,052	0.4	1,503	0.5
ASE	28,539	12.0	45,011	16.8	40,183	14.1	36,926	12.9	30,668	10.9	34,394	12.0	45,350	15.2
Total	**238,150**	**100.0**	**267,761**	**100.0**	**285,456**	**100.0**	**287,330**	**100.0**	**282,382**	**100.0**	**287,167**	**100.0**	**298,141**	**100.0**

CASAS 2008

*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, California assesses EL Civics students using performance-based additional assessments that measure student attainment of civic objectives as well as standardized assessments 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 learn in the classroom to positive impact in their lives and communities.

EL Civics students, who comprise 36.6 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 6 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 USDE to only those learners who met the NRS criterion. Applying this criterion reduces the number of student records reported to USDE from 855,021 enrolled to 602,837 reported to the NRS.

Table 6
WIA Title II California Learner Enrollment with NRS Restrictions for 2007-08

	N
Total WIA Title II Learners with Entry Records	855,021
NRS Criteria	
Learners with fewer than 12 hours of instruction	181,333
Learners <16 years old	5,891
Learners concurrently enrolled in High School (HS)	47,676
Learners without a valid instructional level	17,284
Learners included in NRS Federal Tables	**602,837**

CASAS 2008

As shown in Table 6, of the 855,021 learners, 70.5 percent met the NRS criteria. Of the total number (602,837) of NRS eligible learners, 56.2 percent or 338,738, continued in the 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 reports submitted to the NRS, student performance is measured through completion of federally defined instructional levels. See Table 7 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 7, nearly 35 percent of learners completed at least one educational functioning level. In the core indicators of performance for 2007-08, California's WIA Title II program met or exceeded the performance goals for four of the eleven literacy

levels and met performance goals for three of the four core follow-up outcome measures. For specific information, refer to Appendix B for the Summary of California Core Performance Results from 2001 to 2008.

Table 7
Level Completion for NRS Eligible Learners for 2007-08

NRS Educational Functioning Level	CASAS Test Score Equivalent	Performance Goal	% Completed Level	Difference
ABE Beginning Literacy	≤ 200	25.0	26.4	1.4
ABE Beginning Basic	201-210	43.0	39.0	-4.0
ABE Intermediate Low	211-220	36.0	35.3	-0.7
ABE Intermediate High	221-235	31.0	25.6	-5.4
ASE Low	236-245	25.0	16.9	-8.1
ASE High	246+	--	25.2	
ESL Beginning Literacy	≤ 180	41.0	41.6	0.6
ESL Beginning Low	181-190	35.0	31.1	-3.9
ESL Beginning High	191-200	36.0	47.2	11.2
ESL Intermediate Low	201-210	44.0	44.2	0.2
ESL Intermediate High	211-220	44.0	41.6	-2.4
ESL Advanced	221-235	23.0	19.8	-3.2
Total		**NA**	**34.7**	**NA**

CASAS 2008

Note: The level completion results in this table are based on learners qualifying for the NRS Federal Tables (see Table 6).

The NRS requires core follow-up outcome measures of student performance as shown in Table 8. 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 8
Core Follow-Up Outcome Achievement 2007-08

Core Follow-up Outcome Measures	Participants with Main or Secondary Goal N	Participants Included in Survey or Data Match N	Participants Responding to Survey or Data Match N	Response or Data Match Rate %	Participants Achieving Outcome N	Weighted Percent Achieving Outcome %
Entered Employment	10,911	9,546	1,532	16%	872	57%
Retained Employment	7,382	6,450	1172	18%	1089	93%
Obtained a GED or High School Diploma	34,113	N/A	32,994	97%	11,951	36%
Entered Postsecondary Education or Training	6,778	5,660	1,034	18%	438	42%

CASAS 2008

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 13 percent and 18 percent. The CDE has implemented new policies starting 2008-09 program year to improve the Core

Performance Follow-Up Measures survey. In addition to mail, agencies can now e-mail the survey or administer the surveys via telephone. These additional options will likely increase the rate of response from learners.

California uses a data match for learners indicating their goal for enrolling in an adult literacy program is to obtain a GED or high school diploma. In 2007-08, data match results revealed that 6,316 learners accomplished their goal of attaining a GED certificate while an additional 5,635 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, 36 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

ESL programs served 61 percent of adult learners in California for 2007-08. ASE programs comprised the next highest student enrollment (23 percent), followed by ABE (15.3 percent), and ESL-Cit (0.7 percent). Table 9 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 (61 percent in 2007-08 compared to 67.5 percent in 2001-02).

The ABE program shows a continual increase in student enrollment from 2000-2001 to 2007-08. ESL enrollment decreased slightly from 2006-07. ESL-Cit experienced the largest drop in enrollment from 14,965 in 2002-03 to 2,775 in 2003-04. 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 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986, 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 United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) regulations that make it more difficult for those seeking citizenship. Additionally, some agencies have switched from using the Section 231 funds for ESL-Cit activities to the EL Civics grant that started in February 2001.

Table 9
Enrollment by Instructional Program for WIA Title II Learners

Instructional Program	PY 2002-03		PY 2003-04		PY 2004-05		PY 2005-06		PY 2006-07		PY 2007-08	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ABE	98,995	12.1	103,290	12.3	105,960	12.5	113,610	13.6	118,865	14.1	130,710	15.3
ESL	531,649	65.2	559,582	66.4	551,118	65.0	538,480	64.6	535,284	63.6	522,034	61.1
ESL-Citizenship	14,965	1.8	2,775	0.3	4,309	0.5	4,508	0.5	6,047	0.7	5,871	0.7
ASE	169,701	20.8	176,817	21.0	186,833	22.0	177,026	21.2	180,994	21.5	196,406	23.0
Total	**815,310**	**100.0**	**842,464**	**100.0**	**848,220**	**100.0**	**833,624**	**100.0**	**841,190**	**100.0**	**855,021**	**100.0**

CASAS 2008

Table 10 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 (60.8 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, 28.6 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 high and low intermediate instructional levels (18.5 and 32.7 percent, respectively), CASAS scores from 191 through 210.

- The majority (62.5 percent) of ASE learners entered programs predominantly at the advanced instructional levels (CASAS scores 236 and higher).

Table 10
Entry Instructional Level for WIA Title II Benchmark Eligible Learners for 2007-08

Instructional Level	ABE		ESL		ESL-Cit		ASE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Beginning Literacy	12,402	12.9	20,590	5.1	182	4.2	905	0.9
ABE Beginning Basic/ ESL Beginning Low	15,056	15.7	44,792	11.1	682	15.6	2,694	2.7
ESL Beginning High	N/A	--	74,656	18.5	752	17.2	N/A	--
Intermediate Low	20,204	21.0	132,390	32.7	1,552	35.5	7,294	7.4
Intermediate High	38,215	39.8	66,183	16.4	657	15.0	25,831	26.3
ASE Low/ESL Advanced	6,808	7.1	65,673	16.2	548	12.5	40,634	41.4
ASE High	3,406	3.5	N/A	--	N/A	--	20,731	21.1
Total	**96,091**	**100.0**	**404,284**	**100.0**	**4,373**	**100.0**	**98,089**	**100.0**

CASAS 2008
Note: Table 10 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 to reliably measure the relevant skills and knowledge adults need to work and actively participate in the socioeconomic mainstream of California.

California complies and aligns with the federal NRS by attaining the highest rating possible, a rating of superior on the federal Data Quality Standards Checklist (DQSC). The DQSC provides criteria to judge the integrity and veracity of state and local implementation of the NRS. The NRS is the nationwide accountability system of the USDE to evaluate and report the results of its 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 to meet the NRS reporting requirements, including appraisals, achievement tests, certification tests, and student follow-up surveys. In addition to CASAS standardized tests, local programs also use additional assessment tools, such as agency-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 2007-08, the eighth 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 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 are providing more timely student-level feedback to instructors.

- Agencies have piloted strategies to improve student persistence, implemented managed enrollment, and have assisted students in setting their short- and long-term goals.

Implementation and Impact of WIA Title II

- CDE is developing a statewide ABE Initiative to address program improvement strategies in California ABE funded programs and classrooms. One focus of the ABE Initiative is student transitions into postsecondary programs and the workforce.

- CALPRO provided more than 190 professional development trainers with 430 professional development offerings for adult educators to enhance instruction and promote continuous program improvement. Representatives from more than

90 agencies were trained by CALPRO to conduct site-based study circles on learner persistence and research-based adult reading instruction.

- CASAS provided 341 statewide regional and online trainings serving 3,354 local agency participants.

- OTAN provided 25 technology integration workshops in conferences that were attended by six hundred sixty-one people. Three hundred sixteen people attended 78 online technology workshops, and 361 attended 30 hands-on technology workshops.

- The Technology Integration Mentor Academy (TIMAC) provided technology integration and mentor training to 30 local teachers.

- During the 2007-08 program year, 11 regional TOPSpro user groups across the state conducted meetings to discuss data and software-related issues. Separate regional network meetings facilitated by CASAS were held to provide better access for small and rural agencies. These Web-based and in-person meetings allowed the field to discuss strategies to improve program and instruction, as well as challenges to student enrollment, persistence, and goal setting.

- Ninety-nine percent of WIA Title II agencies submitted all 2007-08 end-of-year deliverables complete and on time. CDE staff and CASAS program specialists provided targeted technical assistance to agencies with data compliance and low-performance issues.

- New policies were implemented to improve the data collection system for core performance goals of employment and entering postsecondary education and training. Agencies may e-mail the Core Performance Follow-Up Measures survey or administer the surveys via telephone with the goal of increasing the rate of survey response.

- EL Civics continued 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 three Leadership Projects to develop their EL Civics programs. The CASAS EL Civics Web site provides a single online location for all California EL Civics information. Agencies have immediate access to EL Civics online curriculum and resources.

- In recognition of the common reporting needs of WIA Title I and Title II funded programs, the CDE initiated a pilot program with a core group of adult schools and their One-Stop agency partners to streamline assessment and reporting processes, help coordinate data sharing, facilitate the referral and tracking of clients between agencies, and document outcomes. The ultimate goal of the pilot initiative is to identify "best practices" that will help all WIA partners provide more seamless service to adult learners and job seekers in California and transition them successfully to jobs.

Issues addressed by the CDE and local providers regarding the use of WIA Title II 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 feedback and suggestions regarding services and processes the local literacy agencies need to provide quality instruction. Specifically, the CDE continues to respond positively in addressing the following issues:

Issue 1: Expansion of Instructional Delivery Options and Use of Technology

To provide comprehensive educational options at a time of limited resources, it is necessary for the CDE to promote and support the use of technology and other delivery options to reach as many learners as possible. Although most agencies now have computers available for staff and student use, technology implemented at the agency level may not be accessible to all classes and programs. It is important for the CDE to help expand the technological and distance learning options for WIA Title II agencies in the hopes to provide access to under-served adult learners.

Recommendation: The CDE should offer incentives for providing services to unserved, under-served, and "hard to reach" adults, including institutionalized adult learners. The CDE should promote the expansion of resources available for adult education providers, and support the use of technological tools at both the program and classroom levels. This can be done by:

- Increasing learning options and alternatives to the traditional classroom setting

- Identifying effective methods for reaching under-served populations, including the effective use of technology and innovative program grants

- 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

- Increasing implementation of the OTAN Technology Mentor Project

- Supporting the identification of Promising Practices to serve as models for other programs

Issue 2: Student Recruitment, Persistence, and Performance

Students experience greater success rates in agencies that implement student needs assessments, program orientations, goal-setting procedures, targeted instruction and timely feedback on learning outcomes. In 2007-08 the California WIA Title II agencies met four of the eleven state goals for the NRS Educational Functional Levels. California also exceeded state goals for the core follow-up measures of obtaining a GED or secondary school diploma, entering employment and retaining employment.

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

- Developing outreach activities to increase enrollment

- Continuing 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 Tracking of Programs and Students (TOPSpro) reports to instructors in order to develop and/or improve curriculum and instruction, monitor student progress and attainment of goal

Issue 3: Evidence-Based Research

Recommendation: The CDE should provide support and resources to ensure that evidence-based adult learning strategies inform instruction. This should be done in order to:

- Identify additional sources of funding for implementing practitioner-based research studies related to adult literacy

- Identify and disseminate information about effective programs and practices

Issue 4: Accountability

Recommendation: The CDE should continue to provide technical assistance and resources to local agencies, in order for them to:

- Understand and accurately 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 5: Distance Learning

State legislation permits California adult schools to spend up to five percent of their apportionment on non-traditional educational approaches. The Innovations Project 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 Innovations Project to document the benefits of distance learning including leveraging technology to provide increased access to learning opportunities.

Issue 6: State Leadership Projects and Professional Development

Currently there are three State Leadership Projects that provide resources to WIA Title II funded agencies — California Adult Literacy Professional Development Project (CALPRO), CASAS, and Outreach and Technical Assistance Network (OTAN). To attain continuous program improvement goals, agencies will need to increase their use of services provided by the State Leadership Projects. A key role of the State Leadership Projects is to provide professional development opportunities for WIA Title II administrators, staff, and instructors crucial to the improvement of program management and instruction.

Recommendation: The CDE should continue to support the three State Leadership 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. This is especially important for: (1) agencies that did not meet state negotiated performance goals; (2) agencies located in remote areas of the state; and (3) small agencies.

The CDE should also 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

Issue 7: 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. The identified reasons should serve as guides for developing program improvement plans. The CDE should also continue to provide resources to support small and rural agencies and assist them in capacity building. This can be achieved by:

- Developing local systems and infrastructures to meet accountability requirements

- Promoting interagency informal networks and formal consortiums to leverage experience and resources

- Facilitating continuous program improvement

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

A. 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). California's current performance-based funding system does not align the state and federal programs and does not provide consistent accountability requirements for both programs. 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 current funding, data and accountability systems.

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 increased 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 eight 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 (ADA) units, have had greater difficulty. It is often difficult for small agencies to hire enough staff and to provide staff training. In addition, small agencies frequently do not have an adequate technology infrastructure or 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 requires a feasibility study of creating an aligned funding and accountability system for both state and federal adult education programs. 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 eight 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.

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.

B. Evaluate changes that may be 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

Continue to develop 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: 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 3: California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE)

The CAHSEE was fully implemented in 2006-07. Survey respondents in 2007-08, especially those from large urban programs, indicated that they needed 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:

- Continue supporting agencies experiencing the impact of the implementation of the 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

- Continue supporting the development and dissemination of a CASAS readiness assessment to assist instructors in preparing learners to take the CAHSEE exam

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 as well as 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: 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 (DDS) the clients to ensure the future eligibility of this population for adult education services including Power Assessment.

Implementation and Impact of the Workforce Investment Act Title II

2007-08 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 align with the National Reporting System (NRS) that the US Department of Education 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 100 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 360 competency statements correlated to the Secretary's Commission on Achieving the Necessary Skills (SCANS) Competencies identified by the United States Department of Labor. The competencies, updated and revalidated periodically 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 Appendixes D and E) identify skills for ABE, ASE, and ESL learners from beginning literacy to advanced adult secondary levels. The levels show a continuum of employability and life skills from A (beginning literacy) to E (advanced adult secondary). CASAS levels correspond to all NRS Levels. 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 Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (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 2001-08

Entering Educational Functional Level	2001-02 Performance Goal %	2001-02 Performance (Against all Enrollees) %	2002-03 Performance Goal %	2002-03 Performance (Against all Enrollees) %	2003-04 Performance Goal %	2003-04 Performance (Against all Enrollees) %	2004-05 Performance Goal %	2004-05 Performance (Against all Enrollees) %	2005-06 Performance Goal %	2005-06 Performance (Against all Enrollees) %	2006-07 Performance Goal %	2006-07 Performance (Against all Enrollees) %	2007-08 Performance Goal %	2007-08 Performance (Against all Enrollees) %
ABE Beginning Literacy	17.0	25.7	20.0	21.2	22.0	23.3	25.0	25.1	25.0	24.2	26.0	27.3	25.0	26.4
ABE Beginning Basic	24.0	36.4	26.0	36.4	28.0	41.1	37.0	43.0	42.0	41.4	44.0	40.0	43.0	39.0
ABE Intermediate Low	24.0	37.7	26.0	38.1	28.0	33.8	39.0	37.6	38.0	33.5	38.0	34.1	36.0	35.3
ABE Intermediate High	26.0	29.9	26.0	29.6	28.0	29.3	30.0	30.4	31.0	27.4	31.0	25.8	31.0	25.6
ASE Low	15.0	25.4	15.0	24.6	17.0	22.1	32.0	24.7	26.0	21.5	26.0	15.4	25.0	16.9
ASE High	9.0	28.3	11.0	30.5	13.0	29.3	31.0	26.2	30.0	24.8	27.0	25.2	--	25.2
ESL Beginning Literacy	22.0	32.2	24.0	33.6	26.0	35.4	34.0	38.7	36.0	40.1	40.0	41.0	41.0	41.6
ESL Low Beginning	24.0	28.4	24.0	30.2	26.0	31.1	31.0	32.6	32.0	34.3	34.0	29.7	35.0	31.1
ESL High Beginning	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	34.0	47.3	36.0	47.2
ESL Intermediate Low	26.0	39.8	28.0	40.6	30.0	42.4	41.0	42.9	43.0	43.3	44.0	43.5	44.0	44.2
ESL Intermediate High	26.0	43.0	28.0	42.8	30.0	43.3	43.0	43.0	44.0	42.3	44.0	42.0	44.0	41.6
ESL Advanced	22.0	22.7	22.0	22.6	24.0	22.6	25.0	22.2	24.0	21.7	23.0	19.1	23.0	19.8
Core Follow-Up Outcome Measures	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
GED/HS Completion	9.0	31.7	11.0	27.6	13.0	28.8	30.0	27.9	30.0	26.5	30.0	32.4	30.0	36.2
Entered Employment	10.0	54.5	11.0	54.4	13.0	54.6	56.0	50.2	55.0	49.9	56.0	52.7	53.0	56.9
Retained Employment	12.0	85.7	13.0	81.9	15.0	82.4	83.0	87.0	83.0	91.4	88.0	92.0	91.0	92.9
Entered Postsecondary Education	7.0	60.4	8.0	53.5	10.0	54.9	56.0	57.2	55.0	47.3	58.0	47.8	57.0	42.4

CASAS 2008

* Performance is based on all enrollees who received twelve or more hours of instruction

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 2008

Table C2 WIA Title II Applicants and Agencies Funded by the CDE Geographic Region for 2007-08

CDE Geographic Region	Received Funding		Total Enrollment	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Northcoast (1)	16	6.0	15,629	1.8
Northeastern (2)	13	4.9	4,229	0.5
Capitol (3)	21	7.9	36,685	4.3
Bay Area (4)	25	9.4	51,248	6.0
South Bay (5)	38	14.3	91,070	10.7
Delta Sierra (6)	12	4.5	19,753	2.3
Central Valley (7)	20	7.5	30,969	3.6
Costa del Sur (8)	12	4.5	27,765	3.2
Southern (9)	32	12.0	118,541	13.9
Rims (10)	25	9.4	53,937	6.3
Los Angeles (11)	49	18.4	338,994	39.6
State Agencies	3	1.1	66,201	7.7
Total	**266**	**100.0**	**855,021**	**100.0**

CASAS 2008

Table C3 Agencies by the CDE Geographic Region and Provider Type with WIA Title II Funding for 2007-08

Geographic Region	Adult Schools	CBO	Community Colleges	Library Literacy	COE	Institutions (Section 225)
Northcoast (1)	10	2	1			1
Northeastern (2)	7	1	1	2	3	1
Capitol (3)	12	2		1	2	4
Bay Area (4)	12	11	1			1
South Bay (5)	29	6		1	1	2
Delta Sierra (6)	9	1				2
Central Valley (7)	16	1			1	2
Costa del Sur (8)	7	2	2			1
Southern (9)	20	4	5			2
Rims (10)	19	1	2	2		1
Los Angeles (11)	32	7	5	4		1
State Agencies	--	--	--	--	--	3
Total	**173**	**38**	**17**	**10**	**7**	**21**

CASAS 2008

Table C4 Agencies by Size and the CDE Geographic Region with WIA Title II Funding for 2007-08

CDE Geographic Region	Small		Medium		Large	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Northcoast (1)	7	8.9	9	5.2		
Northeastern (2)	10	12.7	3	1.7		
Capitol (3)	6	7.6	14	8.1	1	6.7
Bay Area (4)	12	15.2	11	6.4	2	13.3
South Bay (5)	10	12.7	26	15.1	2	13.3
Delta Sierra (6)	4	5.1	8	4.7		
Central Valley (7)	8	10.1	12	7.0		0.0
Costa del Sur (8)	1	1.3	10	5.8	1	6.7
Southern (9)	7	8.9	21	12.2	4	26.7
Rims (10)	4	5.1	21	12.2		
Los Angeles (11)	10	12.7	35	20.3	4	26.7
State Agencies	--		2	1.2	1	6.7
Total	**79**	**100.0**	**172**	**100.0**	**15**	**100.0**

CASAS 2008

Appendix D CASAS Skill Level Descriptors for ABE and ASE

Scale Scores	CASAS Level	Descriptors
250 — 245 —	**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.
240 — 235 —	**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.
230 — 225 — 220 —	**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.
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 — 200 —		**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.
190 — 180 — 150 —	**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.

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 E CASAS Skill Level Descriptors for ESL

Scale Scores	CASAS Level	Descriptors
250 / 245	**E**	**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.
240 / 235	**D**	**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.
230 / 225 / 220	**C**	**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.
215 / 210	**B**	**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.
205 / 200		**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.
190	**A**	**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.
180		**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.
150		**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.

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.