FY'10 Findings

Program #1	Program #2	Program #3
1. The review team noted at the time of the review, the *Student Inactive* report generated from ACES showed a large number of students that were inactive for over 90 days but were not exited from the system. The Missouri AEL State Assessment Policy states the following under Exit Information (page 19). The 90 day exit requirement is also a federal requirement in order to measure program performance. *Exit Date – The last month, day, and year the participant attended class. This date must be accurate. If the participant has not attended for 90 days, he/she should be exited from the program* .The program is required to submit an action plan which describes and includes program procedures that will be implemented to ensure that exiting of students not active after 90 days is done in a timely manner.	1. The review team reviewed performance data for the period of Fiscal Year 2008 to the time of the onsite review. The review team noted that the number of students served in a Department of Corrections (DOC) facility class site constitutes over 38% of the overall students served in the program. While program performance data overall is at or above state and federal benchmarks, further analysis of the data showed that when pulling out the data from the DOC class, the non-DOC, or public class sites showed only a combined 33% progression rate. This rate is 9 points below the average federal target rate. It is required that the program analyzes this non-DOC data and submits a plan of action to improve the low progression rates at all non-DOC class sites.	1. Post-test rates for the program were below the state benchmark of 55% through the review period. The post-test rate was 36% in Fiscal Year 2008 and 42% in Fiscal Year 2009. The rate for Fiscal Year 2010 at the time of the review was 18%. The program must submit a plan describing what steps will be taken to improve post-test rates, including a program-wide policy for post testing procedures 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.

2. The following is an excerpt from the *Missouri Local AEL Director's Guide* page 5-1. A "Public Folder" is the folder the teacher and student use to keep track of the student's day-to-day activities and progress. This folder is usually located in the classroom for easy access to the student when they come to class. These files may include: • The student's Progress Plan • Test information/results (social security numbers should be removed or blacked out if included in this documentation) • Lessons/homework that has been assigned and homework that has been completed • Other pertinent information about class activities such as classroom guidelines and referral information about other programs etc. Because these folders are publicly accessible, there should be no personal information about the student in them. During class visits the review team found personal information about students in these public student folders, specifically social security numbers being used on test results as student identifiers. The program is required to examine each student's "public folder" and delete/redact any personal student information. The program must submit a description how it will ensure that personal student information will not be included or used on any document kept in the student's public folder, particularly social security numbers.	2. Missouri's federal performance targets are negotiated each year with the US Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE). Overall academic level attainments were below the federal target through the period reviewed. The attainments for Fiscal Year 2008 were 17 points below federal targets. In Fiscal Year 2009, total level attainments were 13 points below federal targets. At the time of the review academics level attainments were 26 points below the federal targets. The program is required to submit a plan that describes what steps will be taken to improve the overall academic level attainments.

3. In the 2009 Adult Education & Literacy Grant, 2.3.1.F (page 5) the follow addresses advisory committees. To ensure coordination and collaboration at the local level, each grantor must have an advisory committee. Collaborative partners within the advisory committee may include, but are not limited to: 1. Representatives of public libraries; 2. Workforce Investment Act (WIA) local entities; 3. Even Start/Family Literacy programs; 4. Volunteer literacy groups; 5. Public schools; 6. Caring Communities programs; and 7. Local welfare, social services, and economic development staff. The review team noted the program does not have an established advisory committee. The program is required to submit a plan of action on the establishment and operation of the advisory committee prior to the end of the current fiscal year.	3. The review team noted at the time of the review, the *Student Inactive* report generated from ACES showed a large number of students that were inactive for over 90 days but were not exited from the system. The Missouri AEL State Assessment Policy states the following under Exit Information (page 19). Exit Date – The last month, day, and year the participant attended class. This date must be accurate. If the participant has not attended for 90 days, he/she should be exited from the program. The 90 day exit requirement is also a federal requirement in order to measure program performance. The program is required to submit an action plan which describes and includes program procedures that will be implemented to ensure that exiting of students not active after 90 days is done in a timely manner.

4. A review of the tracking of certification requirements revealed the program is tracking professional development hours being earned by certified staff, however the program is not monitoring and documenting that new AEL teachers are participating in a two-year mentoring program. The review team also noted that annual performance-based teacher evaluations were not being conducted for all certified staff. Both of these are requirement for continued AEL teacher certification. The program is required to submit a plan of action describing how the mentoring and evaluations requirements will be implemented and what process will be used to track all certification requirements.	4. The review team noted the Appraisal form for the CASAS Assessment is not being used with students during the pre-test process. The use of the Appraisal form is a required element of the assessment process. The Missouri AEL State Assessment Policy says the following (page 11). All assessments must be administered by teachers who are AEL certified and have participated in training for the assessments they will administer. Anyone scoring the assessments must also have proper training conducted by a certified teacher who has gone through such training. For TABE, the Locator test must be used to determine the appropriate TABE level test that will be administered. For CASAS, the Appraisal test must be used to determine the appropriate CASAS level test to be administered. The program is required to develop and submit written procedures and policies that establish a pre-test process for students that includes the use of the Appraisal to determine the appropriate CASAS level test to administer to the student. It is highly recommended that the program contact the AEL Professional Development Center and schedule a CASAS training workshop for the Program Director and all certified staff as soon as possible in order to use the CASAS assessment system properly.

5. The review team noted test booklets were in public student folders. This is a major security breach based on the publisher's guidelines for assessment material security. The program is required to submit a plan that describes what action(s) the director will take to ensure all security measures are followed pertaining to assessment materials.	5. A review of the program's compliance with AEL teacher certification requirements noted that the AEL program did not have an established mentoring program for certified staff that hold an initial AEL Teaching Certificate, as required for continued certification. In the *Missouri Local AEL Program Director's Guide* , number 17 of the Missouri Program Standards (page 2-3) states. Each AEL program must establish a two-year mentoring program for all new AEL certified teachers (required for re-certification). Page 2-22 of the Missouri Local AEL Program Director's Guide also state the requirement for mentoring. The local AEL program must establish a two-year mentoring program for all new AEL certified teachers. Current AEL certification policy requires all new teachers to participate in a two-year mentoring program in order to be eligible for certification upgrade. The program is required to submit a plan of action describing what steps will be taken to establish a mentoring program for those teachers required to complete one. The program may use the mentoring guidelines found on the State AEL web site but are not required to. The plan must include how the program will monitor and document the completion of the process.

6. The review team noted there was no consistency in the use of progress plans in the classrooms. Different forms were found that were identified as progress plans and many of the plans were either not filled out or did not show evidence of being used as monitoring tools for student progress. The program is required to submit a plan of action that will address the consistent use of a progress plan to be used by all classes and what the director's role will be in monitoring the use of the plan by all classes	6. The review team was informed that the program does have an established advisory committee; however the director noted the committee is not active. The program is required to submit a plan of action on the re-establishment and operation of the advisory committee prior to the end of the current fiscal year. In the 2009 Adult Education & Literacy Grant, 2.3.1.F (page 5) the follow addresses advisory committees. To ensure coordination and collaboration at the local level, each grantor must have an advisory committee. Collaborative partners within the advisory committee may include, but are not limited to: 1. Representatives of public libraries; 2. Workforce Investment Act (WIA) local entities; 3. Even Start/Family Literacy programs; 4. Volunteer literacy groups; 5. Public schools; 6. Caring Communities programs; and 7. Local welfare, social services, and economic development staff.
	7. The review team noted assessment test booklets were located in an unlocked file cabinet in one of the classroom visited. This is a major security risk based on the publisher's guidelines for materials security. The program is required to submit a plan of action that tells what the director will do to ensure all security measures are followed pertaining to assessment materials.