FY' 09 Findings

Program #1	Program #2	Program #3
1. Progress rate is the percentage of students with 12 plus hours and pre-tested who advanced one level attainment based on the National Reporting System (NRS) designated levels. The progress rate for Fiscal Year 2006 as 40%. In Fiscal Year 2007 the progress rate declined to 32%. Fiscal Year 2008 the progress rate was 27%. Fiscal Year 2009 progress rate at the time of the review were 19%. The data reflects a trend of decreased progress rate in the program through the period reviewed. Please submit a plan of action that describes what steps will be taken to improve the overall progress rate for the program to meet the yearly federal targets.	1. Post-test rates for the program are below the state bench mark of 55% through the period. The post-test rate was 48% in Fiscal Year 2006 decreasing to 37% in Fiscal Year 2007. The post-test rate for Fiscal Year 2008 was 30%. The rate for Fiscal Year 2009 at the time of the review was 40%. The review team noted the program does not have a formalized post-test policy in place. This policy is vital to ensure consistent processes are used to increase the opportunity to provide the student with a post-test. The program must submit a plan describing what steps will be taken to improve post-test rates and how the policy will be implemented and monitored. You may review "Improving an AEL Program" Section 2 of the *AEL Local Program Director's Guide* for suggestions.	1. Program data was reviewed for the Fiscal Years of 2006 to 2009. Post-test rates for the program are below the state bench mark of 55% through the period. The post-test rate was 37% in Fiscal Year 2006 decreasing to 32% in Fiscal Year 2007. The post-test rate for Fiscal Year 2008 was 36%. The rate for Fiscal Year 2009 at the time of the review was 38%. The review team noted the program does have a program wide post-test policy. We recommend that the policy be included in the staff handbook and is monitored and enforced. The program must submit a plan describing what steps will be taken to improve post-test rates. You may review "Improving an AEL Program" Section 2 of the *AEL Local Program Director's Guide* for suggestions.

2. The review team noted the program does not have an established advisory committee. Page 2-13 of the Missouri Local AEL Program Director's Guide has the following about Program Advisory Committees. An important step in the implementation of the program is the organization of an advisory committee on AEL. The local provider shall appoint a local advisory committee prior to the approval of a program in AEL. The local advisory committee should consist of people who are genuinely interested in AEL. The program is required to submit a plan of action on the establishment of an advisory committee. The program should review additional information in the Local AEL Program Director's Guide on what the committee should consist of and a timeline for when the committee will be established and meet.	2. Overall progress rate for Fiscal Year 2006 were 2 points below federal targets. In Fiscal Year 2007, the rate was 15 points below federal targets. Fiscal Year 2008 progress rate were 19 points below federal targets. The program is required to submit a plan that describes what steps will be taken to improve the overall progress rate for the program to meet the yearly federal targets.	2. Overall progress rate for Fiscal Year 2006 were 13 points below federal targets. In Fiscal Year 2007, the rate was 19 points below federal targets. Fiscal Year 2008 progress rate were 27 points below federal targets. The program is required to submit a plan that describes what steps will be taken to improve the overall level attainments for the program to meet the yearly federal targets.

3. The review team was not able to find evidence that the CASAS test results were being linked to ESL instruction. This is a vital component to the educational process and may be contributing to the low level of progress being shown. There was also some indication the CASAS Appraisal tool was not being used in all ESL classes. The program is strongly encouraged to use this tool to identify what CASAS tests to administer. The review team was also informed that the CASAS Assessment tests were not being administered according to the publisher's guidelines. The program must submit a plan of action describing what steps will be taken to ensure the CASAS test results are linked to ESL instruction and the publisher's guidelines are being followed. Our office understands there is a CASAS training being scheduled through by the Missouri Adult Education & Literacy Professional Development Center (MAEL PDC) at your program and we encourage all ESL staff to attend.	3. GED goal attainment is based on criteria established by the National Reporting System (see Core Outcome Measure # 4 on page 4-6 of the *Local AEL Program Director's Guide*). The program's GED goal attainment percentage for fiscal year 2006 was 26%. This was 22 points below the federal target. The percentage was 14% in Fiscal Year 2007. This was 18 points below the federal target and was 8% in Fiscal Year 2008. This percent was 28 points below the federal target. The program is required to submit a plan of action that describes what steps will be taken to improve the percentage of GED attainments to meet federal targets.	3. The program has a class site at _____. This site is designed to serve Latino residents of the community in need of English as a Second Language (ESL) services. The review team observed the program is identifying the students served at this class site as AEL students in ACES. The students are given a TABE test to determine pre-test and post-test scores. Students who meet the criteria for ESL services must be identified as such in ACES and based on state policy must be given a CASAS assessment to determine educational need. The program is required to submit a plan describing how students will be indentified appropriately based on services needed and what steps will be taken to ensure the instructor(s) who are providing ESL services have an adequate understanding of the CASAS assessment process and how the program will ensure the proper assessment tool is being given.

4. Programs are required to enter data into the Adult Computerized Enrollment System (ACES) in a timely manner. Currently our office asks this to be completed at least quarterly. The review team noted that student hours of attendance for the entire program year were placed into ACES during the month of March. This has impacted the ability to monitor students who are more than 90 days inactive. These students are required by federal policy to be exited from the ACES system. It was also discover that at the time of the review 208 students had been entered into ACES and 4 students had been exited. Page 4-15 of the *Local AEL Program Director's Guide* states, *Missouri AEL service providers will submit participant enrollment and assessment data to DESE at least quarterly* . The program is required to submit a plan of action that will establish data entry guidelines and ensure that student hours are entered in a timely manner and for the proper months the student attended classes. The program is also encouraged to send all staff involved with data entry and data management to attend the next available data entry training offered by either the State AEL office or the Missouri Adult Education & Literacy Professional Development Center (MAEL PDC).	4. The review team noted the program does not have an established advisory committee. Page 2-13 of the Missouri Local AEL Program Director's Guide has the following about Program Advisory Committees. An important step in the implementation of the program is the organization of an advisory committee on AEL. The local provider shall appoint a local advisory committee prior to the approval of a program in AEL. The local advisory committee should consist of people who are genuinely interested in AEL. Advisory committees can be helpful in recruiting students, finding suitable classroom facilities, assisting with surveying needs of the community, providing support services, promoting the program, promoting interagency cooperation, and developing funding strategies.The program is required to submit a plan of action on the establishment of an advisory committee. The program should review additional information in the Local AEL Program Director's Guide on what the committee should consist of and a timeline for when the committee will be established and meet. The program is also encouraged to review and discuss Indicator #9 – on-going needs assessment process.