FY' 09 Findings

Program #4	Program #5	Program #6
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 30% in Fiscal Year 2006 increasing to 40% in Fiscal Year 2007. The post-test rate for Fiscal Year 2008 was 38%. The rate for Fiscal Year 2009 at the time of the review was 28%. The review team noted the program does have a program wide post-test policy that has been in place since Fiscal Year 2007. The program must submit a plan describing what steps will be taken to address the post-test policy and other strategies to improve post-test rates. 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 38% in Fiscal Year 2006 decreasing to 34% in Fiscal Year 2007. The post-test rate for Fiscal Year 2008 was 44%. The rate for Fiscal Year 2009 (as of October 10th) was 31%. The review team noted the program does have a program wide post-test policy. We do recommend the program be sure the policy is in writing in the program staff handbook and that the policy 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.	1. Overall AEL level attainments for Fiscal Year 2006 were 25 points above federal targets. In Fiscal Year 2007, total level attainments were 18 points below federal targets. Fiscal Year 2008 total level attainments were to 25 points below federal targets. Fiscal Year 2009 level attainments are 35 points below federal targets (as of 2/9/2009). The data reflects a trend of decreased level attainments in the program through the period reviewed. Please 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. Possible areas to address which may affect level attainments may include but are not limited to; instructional strategies, assessment policies for pretesting and post testing, consistent progress plans used with students, monitoring of progress rates (See #4 in Comments section), and teacher accountability for level attainments.

2. Overall progress rate for Fiscal Year 2006 were 26 points below federal targets. In Fiscal Year 2007, the rate was 27 points below federal targets. Fiscal Year 2008 progress rate were 18 points below federal targets. The progress rate for Fiscal Year 2009 at the time of the review was 23 points below the 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. The program is also asked to review and discuss Quality Indicator #4 – student progress planning process and Quality Indicator #5 - curriculum and instruction process to look for ways of improving the progress rate.	2. Overall AEL level attainments for Fiscal Year 2006 were 55 points above federal targets. In Fiscal Year 2007, total level attainments were 100 points below federal targets. Fiscal Year 2008 total level attainments were improved to 50 points below federal targets. While improvement has been shown the program is still well below the federal targets. Please 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.	2. Class observations shown no identifiable or consistent progress plan used with students. Page 6-11 of the *Local AEL Program Director's Guide* has the following. An important requirement and component of instruction in adult education is the development of a progress plan for each student. This plan should be based on the results of the assessment and the goals set by the student. This plan has several purposes. It shows documentation that the student is working on the appropriate materials, shows proof the teachers are monitoring the student's activities and are adjusting the progress plans according to the student's progress and most importantly, it gives the student a planned course of action to meet their needs. This process has shown to increase the chance of persistence by giving the student a plan of action and a visual tool to see they are making progress and reaching their goals on a daily basis and ultimately helps the program to increase progression rates. Please submit a plan of action that will ensure the use of progress plans in all classes and the plans are link to assessment results.

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 19%. This was 29 points below the federal target. The percentage was 20% in Fiscal Year 2007. This was 12 points below the federal target and was 11% in Fiscal Year 2008. This percent was 25 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. Since more than 5% of overall enrollments are identified as English as a Second Language (ESL) students, a review of academic targets are reviewed. Overall ESL level attainments for Fiscal Year 2006 were 37 points above federal targets. In Fiscal Year 2007, total level attainments were 81 points below federal targets. Fiscal Year 2008 total level attainments were improved to 75 points below federal targets. While improvement has been shown the program is still well below the federal targets. Please 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.
4. The review team noted that based on the *Totally Summarized* ACES report for Fiscal Year 2009 that at the time of the visit 1,911 students had been entered into the system. Of that only 176 students had been exited. The *Inactive Student Report* generated from ACES shows several hundred students who have been inactive for 90 days. Federal guidelines require that a student is to be considered "exited" if they are inactive over 90 days. The program is required to submit a plan of action that will ensure the *Inactive Student Report* is being monitored on a monthly basis and the process to be put into place to ensure that students are exited in a timely manner.	4. Review of progress plans showed the program has no identifiable process for linking the CASAS assessment results to classroom instruction. The recommended tool for this process is the CASAS "Class Profile Sheet" which can be found in the publisher's administrative manual. The program is required to submit a plan that describes how assessments of ESL students will be linked to classroom instruction.

5. The AEL program currently provides financial support and generates program data from the a local community-based organization. The State AEL office considers this as a situation a subgrant. Since the program is providing financial support to the subgrantee and data generated from the services provided by subgrantee are used by the AEL program to identify performance levels, the program must execute a signed, written agreement with subgrantee outlining expectations of both parties' responsibilities, a detailed budget of expected expenditures to be paid to subgrantee in the fiscal year, and other language as required in the Fiscal Year 2009 Grant Application on Sub-granting (see 2.5.4 and 2.8.9 of the application). This agreement will help to ensure proper AEL procedures are being executed and current and accurate data is being generated by NALA. The program is required provide a copy of this agreement to the State AEL office.
6. During a review of grant compliance, it was noted that the number of ABE, ASE and ESL students identified in the recent grant application are significantly different than the actual number served in each category in the previous three years. The program is required to submit a plan for assessing the needs of the communities served to better identify the number of students to be served in each category.