ED 349 441   CE 061 946

AUTHOR	Condelli, Larry; And Others
TITLE	Synthesis of State Quality Indicators for Adult Education Programs. Draft Report.
INSTITUTION	Pelavin Associates, Inc., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Feb 92
NOTE	140p.; For related documents, see CE 061 944-945.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; Adult Programs; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Federal Legislation; *Literacy Education; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	National Literacy Act 1991; *Quality Indicators

ABSTRACT

        As a preliminary to developing criteria to meet quality control requirements of the National Literacy Act of 1991, this report analyzes four areas where state education agencies examine program quality: local program monitoring to assess compliance or promote program improvement; criteria used to evaluate local program funding applications; program evaluations of state or local adult education programs and evaluations of projects designed to improve program quality; and explicit indicators of local program quality already in use by states. Data were gathered through a review of 46 monitoring instruments and 20 proposal review protocols, requests for proposals, or funding criteria. Following an introductory section describing the research methodology and aims of the study, the report is organized in five sections. Section 2 presents monitoring indicators, section 3 evaluation indicators, and section 4 funding indicators. Each section includes descriptions of documents reviewed and summaries of research methodology, of how the information is used, and of the general topics and quality indicators used in a majority of documents under review. The information is presented in tabular form by component area, topic area, indicator, and specific measure. Section 5 of the report describes explicit quality indicators used in seven states, and the final section lists quality indicators synthesized from all four sources. Appendixes, which make up half the document, present individual summaries of the program evaluation and state summaries of funding criteria. (KC)

SYNTHESIS OF STATE QUALITY INDICATORS FOR ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

DRAFT REPORT

Larry Condelli
Judy Koloski
Lenore Webb

Prepared for:

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Prepared by:

PELAVIN ASSOCIATES, INC.
2030 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 785-3308

February 1992

TABLE OF CONTENTS

i

LIST OF EXHIBITS

üÜ↓   4

SYNTHESIS OF STATE QUALITY INDICATORS
FOR ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

I. INTRODUCTION

The National Literacy Act of 1991 requires the states to develop indicators of program quality for adult education programs by July 1993. To assist states with this process, the Act also requires the Department of Education (ED) to develop by July 1992 model indicators of program quality as guidance to states. The indicators are to be developed through consultation with experts, educators and administrators of adult education. To meet this requirement, the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) will convene four working groups of individuals representing these constituencies who will prepare a preliminary list of indicators for OVAE to consider.

To assist the working groups, OVAE contracted with Pelavin Associates to conduct a background review and synthesis of indicators of program quality being used by state education agencies (SEAs) and researchers. This review will also assist OVAE and SEAs as they consider potential indicators. The purpose of this report is to provide a comprehensive picture of how states currently conceptualize and measure program quality and thereby empirically derive preliminary indicators as a starting point for the working groups. The . port examines four areas where SEAs explicitly or implicitly examine program quality:

- Local program monitoring or review conducted by the SEA to assess compliance or promote program improvement;

- Criteria used by SEAs to evaluate local program funding applications;

- Program evaluations of state or local adult education programs and evaluations of projects designed to improve program quality; and

- Explicit indicators of local program quality already in use by states.

Methodology

To conduct the review, Pelavin Associates obtained copies of state monitoring and evaluation instruments from the state or from the state's most recent plan for adult education submitted to OVAE. After reviewing these documents, we contacted by telephone each state director of adult education to obtain additional published information about criteria for funding and on the specific quality indicators the state uses to assess local programs. A total of 46 monitoring instruments and 20 proposal review protocols, requests for proposals (RFPs) or funding criteria were reviewed.

To identify program evaluations, we conducted a comprehensive review of evaluations conducted since 1984. For evaluations to be included in this review, the study had to examine the impact of adult education instruction, staff development or other components of adult education programs and include indicators of program quality. Through data base searches, state directors

of adult education and reference lists from a previous literature review Pelavin Associates conducted in Fall, 1991, we identified 27 evaluations for review.

To conduct the review, we first needed a definition of a "quality indicator." While there exists no standard definition, we defined indicators broadly as data or variables that represent program success in terms of efficient and effective operation. After review of several documents, however, we discovered that wide variation existed in the measures used to operationally define many indicators. For example, while there was wide agreement that the existence of a staff development component was an important indicator of program quality, there was general lack of agreement on how to define and measure quality staff development. Measures used included the existence of an inservice training requirement, hours of staff development time per staff member and staff input into staff development activities. Since we had no objective way to select which of these measures were most important, we included both the general indicator and the specific measures in our review.

Review of Material

Pelavin Associates abstracted the indicators of program quality within each monitoring instrument, funding protocol, and evaluation report. Each document was first reviewed to produce a list of the indicators and corresponding measures in the document. The indicators and measures were then organized by topic area within one of three component areas specified by OVAE:

- Program context -- needs, organization and structure of the program and characteristics of participants;

- Program process and content -- planning, curriculum and instruction, qualifications of staff, and materials and equipment; and

- Student outcomes -- retention, educational, personal and social gains and work experience.

Reviewers also maintained a tally of the number of documents that used each indicator. This procedure allowed us to summarize all of the indicators used, as well as to identify the most commonly used indicators for each type of document reviewed.

Organization of Report

The remainder of this report presents the quality indicators states use in determining local funding and in conducting program monitoring and evaluation. It also includes a section on explicit measures of quality used by states. Findings from each area are presented in separate sections. Section II presents monitoring indicators, Section III evaluation indicators and Section IV funding indicators. In these sections we first describe the documents reviewed and the methodology we used to obtain and review the documents. We next summarize the methodology the states or researchers use to obtain the information, followed by a summary of how the information is used. We then present a summary of the general topics and quality indicators used in a majority of documents under review. This information is presented in tabular form by component area specified by OVAE (context, process or outcomes) topic area, indicator, and

2

specific measure. The sections conclude with a detailed summary listing of all indicators and measures used by the documents, organized by OVAE's component areas.

Section V of the report describes explicit quality indicators used in seven states. We present a description of the indicators by state, how the state measures and uses them, and how these indicators are tied to local program funding.

In Section VI of this report, we present a list of quality indicators synthesized from all four sources. These indicators consistently appear in all attempts to measure the quality of adult education programs and thus represent current state consensus on indicators.

Appendix A presents individual summaries of the program evaluation and Appendix B provides state summaries of funding criteria.

II. QUALITY INDICATORS IN STATE PROGRAM MONITORING INSTRUMENTS

In all states, SEA staff visit local programs annually to assess program activities and operations. States refer to these visits as "monitoring" or "evaluation" of local programs and consider this activity a method of promoting program improvement. To conduct the review, states use a formal evaluation or monitoring instrument that specifies topic areas to consider, usually with specific sub-topics or indicators within each area. Pelavin Associates requested copies of the monitoring instruments currently in use from all states and received instruments from 46 states. In addition, we obtained further information on how monitoring visits were conducted and how the state used findings from the visit from the state director of adult education.

Methods of Conducting Monitoring

While a few states visit all programs at least annually, the majority of states visit from one-fifth to one-third of local programs each year. A single individual conducts the visit in many states, while some states use a team of evaluators that may include staff from other local programs or states, in addition to SEA staff. In some states, the local program staff completes a self-evaluation prior to the visit and the results of the two evaluations are compared. In other states, a short compliance visit is conducted annually and a more detailed visit is conducted every few years. The site visit lasts one or two days in most states, but is as long as a week in one state. In a few states, the review includes interviews with students and/or teachers or is supplemented with questionnaire data from students.

Development and format of state monitoring instruments. States developed the topic areas covered in their monitoring instruments through adaptation from four sources: Federal or state legislative requirements, state standards for K-12 programs, the Federal standards for program quality developed in 1983 by OVAE, and accepted practice and research. The monitoring instruments employ one of the following five formats to record information from local programs.

- **Open-ended questions.** The form lists topic areas or questions that the reviewer answers with written, open-ended narrative. Guidance on what to look for when addressing the topic is often included with the form. For example, one state's form includes the item "Staff development and network activities are carried out as described in the project application" and instructs the reviewer to look for whether staff development is available as described in the proposal. The reviewer responds to this item with a narrative on the program's staff development activities.

- **Yes/No response.** This type of monitoring instrument lists the topical area and the reviewer checks yes or no to indicate its presence or absence. For example, "Are there explicit learning outcomes for each student?" and "Are instructional methods tied to student's learning outcomes?" are answered this way on one state's form.

4

- <u>Scales</u>. The instrument uses three-, four- or five-point scales for each item to denote excellent, good, fair and poor or similar categories. Reviewers in one state, for example, respond to the item "Instructional contact hours are scheduled to fit student needs" by marking a single number, 1 - 5, to indicate "need major improvement" (1) to "excellent" (5). A few states use this approach without quantifying the categories.

- <u>Compliance with standards</u>. In this approach specific standards are listed on the form, often along with indicators of the standard. The reviewer records whether the standard was met in some states. In other states, reviewers record "exceeds standard," or "needs improvement". For example, in one state the reviewer checks whether or not the program complied with the standard, "Wherever possible, the agency shall coordinate its adult education program with other basic skills activities in the same region." In a second state, whether the program meets, exceeds or needs improvement with the standard, "Specific job descriptions have been provided to teachers and staff," is recorded on the monitoring instrument.

- <u>Combinations</u>. Several states combine two or more of these formats in their monitoring instruments. For example, one state uses the yes/no, scales and compliance formats.

Exhibit 1 presents a summary of the monitoring instrument formats and the number of states using each format.

Use of Monitoring Information

States treat monitoring visits like individual case studies of how local programs are operating. Information obtained by the monitoring instruments is not easily quantified or aggregated across programs and few states do so. In addition, many of the standards and ratings on the monitoring forms are not objectively defined and require considerable judgment from the reviewer.

The main purpose of program monitoring is to promote program improvement and identify technical assistance needs. The findings from the visit are also tied loosely to re-funding of local programs in most states. Following the visit the state prepares a report of the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The local program must address areas of concern within a certain time period or when re-applying for project funds. State directors reported that programs that did not satisfactorily address problems could be denied additional funds. This issue arises infrequently, however, since states work closely with local programs to correct problems and the local programs normally respond quickly to state concerns. In a few states, funding decisions are independent of program monitoring outcomes.

Summary of Indicators on State Monitoring Forms

While there were differences among states in the format of their monitoring instruments, there was greater consistency in what they measured and examined as part of monitoring. While there were some differences in organization and specificity of measures, the broad topical areas

5

EXHIBIT 1

State Monitoring Instrument Formats

Format	Number of States Using Format
Open-ended Questions Reviewer writes narrative description of observations	5
Yes/No Response Reviewer indicates presence or absence of indicator	12
Scale Degree of meeting standard indicated on three,- four, - or five-point scale	8
Compliance with Standard Reviewer indicates whether program met, exceeded, or needs to improve on standard or indicator	13
Combination Two or more of the above type of measures are used	8

6

and measures of program quality commonly reflected in the monitoring instruments fall into five areas:

- **Planning** (process, goals and relationship to program components)

- **Personnel Characteristics**

- **Program Capacity** (type of programming, instructional and other service providers, sites, and program management)

- **Curriculum/Instructional Methodology**

- **Services to the Disadvantaged**

As these topic areas lend themselves to easy reclassification within the three program areas specified by OVAE for quality indicators -- program context, process and outcomes -- the following summary is organized around these topics. Exhibit 2 summarizes the topic areas addressed in monitoring the instruments of at least half (23) of the states reviewed. The summary below provides greater detail on specific indicators and includes additional indicators that a significant minority of states (15 - 22) deemed important. For each topic area the general indicator is listed followed by measures used on the monitoring forms.

PROGRAM CONTEXT

Need for Program Services

- Program used a needs assessments to determine need for program services:

    a) availability and use of community-wide demographic data
    b) information on school and program dropouts, other adult education programs and job training program information
    c) annual documentation of needs
    d) services geared to reflect needs

Organization/Structure of the Program

- The locations of classes and nature of facilities are adequate:

    a) accessibility for handicapped
    b) accessibility to target population
    c) public transportation availability
    d) safety and comfort factors (cleanliness, lighting, etc.)
    e) spaces for storage, studying, intake and counseling
    f) types of programs offered (ABE/GED/employment related/ESL)
    g) location - urban, rural, suburban
    h) intake procedures

7

11

i)   availability of support services such as child care, transportation, and (asked by more than one-half of the instruments) availability of counseling services

j)   referrals to other agencies

EXHIBIT 2

Summary of Major Topics, Indicators and Measures Used in State Monitoring Instruments

Component	Topic	Indicator	Measure
Program Context	Need for program services	• Determination of program needs	• Needs assessment data • Community demographic data
	Program structure and organization	• Adequate variety of locations	• Location of programs • Accessibility to target population
		• Organized structure of the delivery system	• Safety and comfort measure of buildings • Organizational charts • Hierarchy and communication channels
	Recipients of program services	• Adequate enrollment levels	• Number of participants • Numbers by subpopulation
		• Adequately serving targeted populations	• Demographics of participants

EXHIBIT 2 (Continued)

**Summary of Major Topics, Indicators and
Measures Used in State Monitoring Instruments**

Component	Topic	Indicator	Measure
Program Process and Content	Input into planning process	• Use of an advisory committee	• Characteristics of advisory committee (number, organizations represented) • Regular meetings • Use of input
	Planning process	• Measurable goals and objectives	• Goals clearly delineated with measurable objectives • Goals consistent with needs • Goals consistent with state and federal plans
	Coordination	• Program coordinates with other programs	• Existence of coordination committee • Services coordinated with other agencies through referral, sharing of resources
	Program intake	• Appropriate recruitment methods	• Documented plan to recruit most in need, target populations • Methods used • Evaluation data on effectiveness of recruitment methods
	Evaluation	• Program has evaluation component	• Documented evaluation plan • Frequency of evaluation • Type of faculty, staff, students involved in evaluation
	Curriculum and instruction	• Course content is organized to meet student needs	• Availability of basic skills instruction • Availability of life coping skills instruction • Adult oriented instruction • Integrated with assessment • Organized, sequential instruction

15

16

EXHIBIT 2 (Continued)

Summary of Major Topics, Indicators and Measures Used in State Monitoring Instruments

Component	Topic	Indicator	Measure
		• Variety of appropriate instructional methods used	• Frequency and number of group, tutors, individualized computer assisted and other methods used
	Materials and equipment	• Adequate materials and equipment used	• Variety of materials available • Quantities and numbers available • Appropriate level for adults
	Staff qualifications	• Staff have appropriate training and experience	• Teacher degrees and certification • Years experienced in adult education • Membership in professional societies
	Staff responsibilities	• Appropriate duties assigned to staff • Staff understands responsibilities and program	• Management, support and instructional duties of staff • Job descriptions available • Frequency of staff meetings • Orientation activities held for new staff
	Staff development	• Existence of staff development component	• Content of staff development • Frequency of activities • Stated purpose and objectives to activity • Staff input into activities and evaluation of them

11

EXHIBIT 2 (Continued)

Summary of Major Topics, Indicators and
Measures Used in State Monitoring Instruments

Component	Topic	Indicator	Measure
Program Outcomes	Student retention	• Program has methods for maximizing retention	• Follow-up plan to contact leavers
	Educational gains	• Assessment and placement of students	• Tests of student progress • Test scores • Procedures for placement • Number of students in appropriate learning environment
		• Student progress and learning gains	• Test scores • Progress reports • Documentation of student progress toward their goals

12

- Description of the organizational structure of the local delivery system:

  a) formal organizational charts
  b) communication and hierarchy within district
  c) job descriptions and clerical support

- A minority of states asked about program scheduling:

  a) times of classes
  b) appropriateness of schedule
  c) flexibility of schedule

Participants

- Program enrollment levels and participation:

  a) enrollment numbers
  b) length of participation
  c) numbers by sub-population
  d) characteristics of the population served including demographic data, employment status, handicapped status, immigrants and numbers of high school dropouts

- Enrollment numbers were compared to project goals, state rates and previous years' figures

- A minority of states recorded whether the program had student objectives/ individualized learning plans

PROGRAM PROCESS AND CONTENT

Program Planning and Content

- The program used an advisory committee to assist in planning:

  a) list of members
  b) target groups included
  c) broad based community representation
  d) ongoing input
  e) regular meetings; minutes available
  f) addresses future needs
  g) has an action plan
  h) students involved in planning and goal setting

13

- The program had goals and a plan that are:

  a) consistent with needs assessment
  b) consistent with program operations
  c) consistent with state and federal plan
  d) clearly written measurable objectives
  e) reviewed with staff, students, administrators
  f) annually revised

- The program coordinates with other related programs in the community:

  a) program has a coordinating committee
  b) coordination of services with employment and training programs, vocational/college programs, transportation and child care services, business, etc.
  c) use of volunteers

- Program has appropriate recruitment methods:

  a) student feedback on recruitment methods
  b) documented plan to recruit those most in need, evaluated annually
  c) encouraging non-traditional enrollment
  d) analysis of student data to determine if target population is being recruited
  e) use of multiple methods
  f) degree of satisfaction with community awareness, acceptance and support
  g) co-sponsored classes to facilitate recruitment
  h) working with other organizations to recruit
  i) who is involved in process
  j) evidence of materials to support recruitment efforts
  k) effort to follow-up with dropouts

- The program has an evaluation component:

  a) existence of an evaluation plan
  b) is a program evaluation done
  c) who is involved (faculty, students, staff)
  d) what is evaluated: staff, materials and methods
  e) how often is the evaluation done

- The program's record keeping is adequate:

  a) records properly kept
  b) types of records available

14

- Course content is organized and appropriate to meet learners' needs:

    a) availability of basic skills (pre-literacy and literacy programs)
    b) availability of life-coping skills program
    c) GED/ESL
    d) Career and employability instruction
    e) adult-oriented
    f) integration of community resources and assessment
    g) content organized and sequential
    h) specialized short courses, accelerated programs

- Description of the methods of instruction used:

    a) group, volunteer tutors, one-on-one, individualized, computer assisted, self-instruction, small group discussion, lectures, cooperative learning
    b) instruction shows evidence of planning
    c) variety of methods used/appropriate to learners

- Methods of instruction for disadvantaged learners:

    a) course of study appropriate
    b) special materials for disabled students
    c) materials appropriate for special populations (ESL, disabled)
    d) listing of materials by type, level and grouping

- Materials and equipment are adequate:

    a) variety and levels available
    b) A/V, computers available
    c) reflects occupational knowledge
    d) supports functional literacy
    e) appropriate for adults
    f) sufficiency of material
    g) relevant and up-to-date
    h) free of bias, multi-cultural
    i) who selects materials

- A minority of states asked additional questions relating to materials/equipment:

    a) use of supplementary resources
    b) instructor familiarity with materials
    c) access to library and library materials
    d) resources for outreach projects
    e) career guidance resources

15

- Program assigns appropriate duties and responsibilities to the programs' director/administrator:

  a)   program management
  b)   personnel
  c)   reporting

- Staff understand their jobs and role in the program:

  a)   staff have job descriptions
  b)   regularly scheduled staff meetings

- Staff understand and remain knowledgeable of the program:

  a)   orientation for new staff
  b)   regularly scheduled staff meetings

- Staff are qualified and have appropriate experience:

  a)   teachers with certification
  b)   teachers working toward certification
  c)   training of teachers
  d)   prior experience in adult education
  e)   certification in elementary/secondary education
  f)   bachelor's degree
  g)   membership in adult education profession society
  h)   educational level of aides
  i)   qualified staff required
  j)   appropriate salaries provided

- Program has a staff development component:

  a)   evidence of availability of staff development activities
  b)   content of staff development activities
  c)   input to staff development plan
  d)   effectiveness of staff development activities
  e)   goals and objectives of staff development plans
  f)   evaluation of staff development activity
  g)   ongoing staff meetings with updates of trends, issues
  h)   opportunities for professional growth
  i)   opportunities for off campus staff development

16

24

- A minority of states asked about additional knowledge and characteristics of staff:

  a)   creativity/communication skills
  b)   interesting and knowledgeable
  c)   good morale and enthusiasm
  d)   knowledge of content area
  e)   knowledge of support services
  f)   use of lesson plans
  g)   address individual needs

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Retention

- A minority of states ask about student follow-up:

  a)   evidence of provision for follow-up of leavers
  b)   evidence of provision for follow-up of completers
  c)   data used in program reviews
  d)   contacting of frequently absent students
  e)   identification of method of contact

Educational Gains

- Assessment and placement of students:

  a)   availability of diagnostic files
  b)   appropriateness of methods of student assessment
  c)   placement methods at enrollment
  d)   use of tests for GED and ESL students
  e)   factors to be considered for placement

- Student progress and learning gains:

  a)   progress reports including records kept, use of individual folders, use of records by students/staff
  b)   availability of testing, counseling, evaluations, diagnostic assessment
  c)   instruments used in assessment
  d)   student progress toward goals
  e)   progress testing occurring on regular basis
  f)   test results and scores

17

25

III. QUALITY INDICATORS FOUND IN PROGRAM EVALUATIONS CONDUCTED FOR ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Pelavin Associates conducted a comprehensive review of program evaluations of adult education programs to identify quality indicators researchers believed to be important in assessing program effectiveness. In this review we included studies that have been conducted since 1984 that have examined the impact of adult education instruction, staff development or other component of adult education programs; and that include indicators of program quality. Studies were identified through data base searches, state directors of adult education and reference lists from a previous literature review Pelavin Associates conducted in Fall 1991.

Our review identified 27 studies that evaluated or assessed evaluations of state programs overall, local programs, literacy projects, staff development projects, volunteer programs and workplace literacy programs. Evaluations of ABE, ESL, ASE and GED studies were included. Exhibit 3 presents a list of the studies included in our review. Topics evaluated in these documents included statewide evaluations of AE programs in terms of structure and function; follow-up surveys of students; promising practices in effective programming for adult education; state plan implementation strategies and the results of a learner outcome study of community-based literacy programs.

Methods of Conducting Evaluation

Most evaluation activities were conducted by the agency administering the program (SEAs or community colleges) although several states contracted with local universities or consulting firms for the evaluation activity. When the evaluation was carried out by the administering agency, state staff as well as peer administrators and teachers representing other local programs were involved. Most studies involved interviews with project staff and students. Follow-up studies of students included test scores, goal attainment and other outcome measures. In contrast with monitoring activities, most evaluations are not conducted annually.

Project Advisory Committees, project staff, state and local program directors, administrators and, in at least one instance, cooperating agencies provided input to evaluators on the selection of measures used in the evaluation.

The main purpose of most of the evaluations was to determine how effective the program was in following generally accepted strategies for good programming and determining the impact of the program on its participants.

Summary of Indicators Found in Adult Education Evaluation Activities

Indicators used in evaluations varied widely. This variation results from the differing purposes of the evaluations, as well as the priorities various administering agencies place on these elements.

EXHIBIT 3

Evaluation Studies Reviewed

Alamprese, J., Keltner, A., & Savage, K.L. (1988). The ESL Teacher Institute: Its Impact and Future. Sacramento, CA: Association of California School Administrators, Foundation for Educational Administration (ED 323 756).

Bonnet, D.G. (April 1988). "An Evaluation of Adult Literacy Efforts in Indiana." Submitted to the Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition. Indianapolis: D. Bonnet Associates.

Brewington, L.A. (1985). "Program Evaluation and Implementation Report. Adult Basic Education Program." Raleigh: North Carolina Commission of Indian Affairs (ED 267 938).

Evaluation and Training Institute. (1990). Evaluation of the Federal Four-Year Plan for Adult Education. First-Year Interim Report. Submitted to Adult Education Unit, California Department of Education. Los Angeles.

Fellenz, R.A., & Conti, G.J. (1984). Comprehensive Evaluation of the Statewide Texas Adult Basic Education Program: Evaluating a Human Enterprise. Prepared for the Texas Education Agency, Division of Adult and Community Education. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University (ED 260 213).

Fingeret, A., et al. (1985). North Carolina Adult Basic Education Instructional Program Evaluation, 1985. Raleigh: North Carolina State Department of Community Colleges (ED 269 622).

Fingeret, H.A., & Danim, S.T. (1991). "'They Really Put a Hurtin' on My Brain': Learning in Literacy Volunteers of New York City." Executive Summary. Durham, NC: Literacy South.

Formative Evaluation Research Associates. (1990, August). "Evaluation Proposal. Michigan Adult Literacy Initiative Project." Ann Arbor, MI.

Formative Evaluation Research Associates. (1990, August). "Evaluation Proposal. Staff Development Collaborative Project." Ann Arbor, MI.

Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education, Office of Adult Literacy Programs. (1991). A Follow-Up Study of Graduates in Georgia. Atlanta.

19

27

EXHIBIT 3 (Continued)

Evaluation Studies Reviewed

Goodman, R.L. (1989). A Final Report. July 1, 1988 to June 30, 1989. Project Quality. For the Conduct of Adult Education Program Evaluations in Illinois. Prepared in cooperation with the Illinois State Board of Education, Adult Education Section and Springfield Public School District No. 186, Lawrence Adult Education Center. Springfield, IL: Adult and Continuing Education Consultants, Inc.

Havlicek, L.L. (1990). "External Evaluation of the Kansas Adult Education Program for Fiscal Year 1990." Lawrence: University of Kansas.

Haley, W.J., & Hoover, W. (1985). Final Report. Follow Up and Impact Study of Adult Basic and Secondary Education Students. Harris County, TX: Harris County Department of Education and Southwest Educational Laboratory.

Hughes, D.M., & Brannon, Y.S. (1988). An Evaluation of Adult Basic Education Programs in North Carolina. Raleigh: Center For Urban Affairs and Community Services, North Carolina State University.

Iowa Department of Education. (1990). Assessment and Adult Basic Education: The Iowa Model. Des Moines.

Jackson, G. (1989). ACBE Evaluations of Community Based Literacy Programs (1988-89). Washington, D.C.: Association for Community Based Education.

Louisiana Department of Education, Bureau of Adult and Community Education. (1990). "Evaluation Report for 1989-90." Baton Rouge.

Mahaffy, J.E. (1990). Final Report: Adult Basic Education Student Follow-up Evaluation. Submitted to Adult Education and Literacy Programs, Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia, Washington.

Mahaffy, J.E. (1983). "Impact Evaluation of Adult Basic Education Program Outcomes." Helena: Montana State Office of Public Instruction, Division of Adult Education.

Mikulecky, L., & D'Adamo-Weinstein, L. (1990). "Workplace Literacy Program Evaluations." Paper presented to the Work in America Institute, Harvard Club, November 7, 1990.

National Adult Literacy Project. (1984). Guidebook for Effective Literacy Practice, 1983-1984. The Network, Inc., and Far West Laboratory.

28

EXHIBIT 3 (Continued)

Evaluation Studies Reviewed

Nelson, D., & Bringewatt, M. (1986). <u>Report on the Evaluation of Adult Refugee ESL Programs in Minnesota</u>. St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Education, Office of Community and Adult Basic Education.

Sherman, J.D., Kutner, M.A., Lancaster, M., Suitor, J.H., & Tan, A. (1991). <u>Evaluation of the Virgin Islands Adult Education Program</u>. Submitted to the Commissioner of Education, Virgin Islands Department of Education. Washington, D.C.: Pelavin Associates, Inc.

Sherron, R.H. (1986). <u>A Longitudinal Evaluation of Adult Basic Education in Virginia: 1970-1985</u>. Richmond: Virginia Department of Education (ED 276 853).

Smith-Burke, M.T., Parker, M., & Deegan, D. (1987). "Starting Over: Characteristics of Adult Literacy Learners." New York: Literacy Assistance Center.

Snow, E., & Bentley, N. (1988). <u>Adult Education in Texas Program Evaluation FY 1986-88</u>. Austin: Texas Education Agency.

Sticht, T.G. (1991). "Evaluating National Workplace Literacy Programs." El Cajon, CA: Applied Behavioral & Cognitive Sciences, Inc.

Our review identified over 60 measures of program quality, with some measures used in as many as 12 studies. Despite the wide variation, we identified four topics that were included in more than half of the evaluations:

- Characteristics of program participants;

- Community representation and involvement in program planning;

- Recruitment strategies; and

- Participant outcome measures.

The indicators were reclassified within the three program areas of program context, content and outcomes. Exhibit 4 summarizes the indicators used in at least five of the evaluation studies. The remainder of this section presents individual summaries of each study reviewed, providing a brief overview, indicators used and how the indicators were selected.

EXHIBIT 4

Summary of Common Quality Indicators
Found in Program Evaluations

Component	Topic	Indicator	Measure
Program Context	Recipients of program services	Characteristics of participants reflect target population	• Participant demographics • Participant goals
Program Planning and Content	Program intake	Recruitment strategies	• Types of recruitment/ orientation conducted
	Input in planning process	Community and student input in planning process	• Surveys of students, community groups
	Support services	Adequate support services available	• Type and amount of support service offered
	Assessment	Existence and adequacy of assessment component Use of assessment to individualize instruction	• Type of assessment methods • When assessment conducted
	Curriculum and instruction	Course content meets student needs Course content organized and follows adult learning principles	• Topics covered • Institutional methods used • Student surveys of whether curriculum met needs
	Materials and equipment	Prope. use of equipment and materials Materials appropriate for needs of learners	• Type and variety of materials and equipment used • Topic areas and level of materials
	Staff qualifications and responsibilities	Roles, duties of staff	• Descriptions of staff roles and responsibilities
	Staff development	Staff training Existence or adequacy of staff development component	• Training activities -- type and duration • Staff training available • Staff input into training • Staff resource needs

31

32

23

EXHIBIT 4 (Continued)

Summary of Common Quality Indicators
Found in Program Evaluations

Component	Topic	Indicator	Measure
Program Outcomes	• Student retention	• Students remain in program • Program methods for maximizing participation	• Class hours in program • Follow-up procedures
	• Educational gains	• Student learning gains	• Test scores
	• Personal and social goals	• Attainment of goals	• Student goals at entry and whether achieved

24

As part of our discussions with state directors of adult education on quality measures, we asked each director to describe his or her state's criteria for funding local programs and to provide us with a copy of protocols used by raters to evaluate proposals. We received the state rating protocol, application guidelines or request for proposals (RFP) from 15 states and obtained detailed information verbally from an additional five states.

Eleven of the states had formal review protocols with numeric rating scales. In these states, a review team assigns a numeric score to proposals and determines a cutoff point for funding. The remaining nine states reviewed funding requests using a list of topics and general guidelines for review. In addition to formal criteria, several states gave priority to programs that had received funding in the previous year and had performed satisfactorily. Most state directors reported that their state would be revising funding procedures in response to new requirements of the National Literacy Act.

Summary of Quality Indicators on State Funding Protocols

The criteria on state funding protocols can be considered indicators of program quality which states believe to be important for successful program operation. Pelavin Associates reviewed information from each of the 20 responding states and synthesized the topic areas, indicators and measures. The indicators were organized around two of the three topic areas (program context and process) specified by OVAE. State funding protocols did not include student outcome data.

From our review, it is clear that states evaluate proposals from local programs according to two main criteria: (1) good attention to good planning and program design in general, not necessarily specific to the Adult Education Act; and (2) in some instances, reflection of certain characteristics unique to the Adult Education Act, such as special services to lowest education levels, and target populations like the homeless and handicapped. The main topics addressed by the protocols include:

- Needs assessment

- Participants served, including target populations

- Program goals and objectives

- Location of classes

- Curriculum and instructional program

- Staff qualifications

- Coordination with related programs

- Evaluation plan

25

Our analysis identified 13 topics and indicators examined by state funding protocols. Exhibit 5 presents the indicators and measures found in at least one third (7) of the protocols or criteria. A summary of all indicators and measures used is listed below.

Program Context

- Documentation of need for services

    -- Data on needs of population in service area (through needs assessment and/or demographic data)

- Targeting of services to special populations

    -- Specific populations targeted
    -- Services targeted to handicapped or other specific population

- Number and types of participants

    -- Number of participants to be served
    -- Number of participants to be served by demographics and incoming skill levels

- Location of facilities and scheduling of classes

    -- Flexible scheduling at different times and days
    -- Number of service sites
    -- Locations convenient to participants (in neighborhoods or readily accessible locations)

Program Process and Content

- Adequacy of facilities

    -- Facilities large enough and in good condition
    -- Facilities accessible to handicapped

- Availability of support services

    -- Child care available
    -- Transportation available
    -- Counseling and referral available

- Curriculum and quality of instruction

    -- Instruction related to student needs
    -- Instructional hours
    -- Student assessment to customize instruction
    -- Individual learning plans developed

26

EXHIBIT 5

Summary of Topics, Indicators and Measures
from State Funding Protocols and RFPs

Component	Topic	Indicator	Measure
Program Context	Needs assessment	• Documented need for program services	• Statistical data from surveys, Census
	Recipients of program services	• Special populations targeted	• Data from needs assessment
		• Adequate enrollment levels	• Percentages to be served by target population
			• Number of participants
	Organization of delivery system	• Variable location of service sites	• Count of service sites by location
		• Flexible scheduling	• Hours and days of operation

38

37

EXHIBIT 5 (Continued)

Summary of Topics, Indicators and Measures from State Funding Protocols and RFPs

Component	Topic	Indicator	Measure
Program Process and Content	Program Facilities	• Adequate facilities are used	• Type, size and condition of facility
	Support services	• Adequate support services available to participants (child care, transportation, counseling, referral)	• Number and type of support services offered
	Curriculum and instruction	• Curriculum meets student needs • Sufficient amount of instruction offered	• Individualized instruction offered • Hours of instruction offered
	Coordination	• Program coordinates with related providers	• Cross-referral to agencies • Funding from other agencies
	Planning Process	• Clear planning with measurable goals and objectives	• Delineation of measurable goals and objectives • Goals correspond to state goals
	Program Intake	• Recruitment methods focus on target populations	• Type and number of recruitment activities focusing on target populations
	Evaluation	• Program has adequate plan to evaluate itself	• Workable evaluation plan specified
	Staff qualifications and responsibilities	• Staff have appropriate qualifications	• Degrees, credentials, certificates of staff
		• Program has staff development component	• Number and type of staff development activities

28 of 35

40

28

- Life skills curriculum used
- Structured instructional program

- Coordination with related programs

  - Involvement of other programs through referrals, joint planning, shared resources
  - Funding from other programs
  - Employability focus included

- Clear planning with measurable goals and objectives

  - Measurable, attainable goals specified
  - Goals relate to state goals
  - Goals reflect needs of population
  - Goals reflect innovation and program expansion
  - Previous goals and objectives met

- Recruitment and outreach methods

  - Program promotion and recruitment to target population
  - Open entry/exit
  - Ability to recruit the disadvantaged
  - Met previous recruitment goals

- Tracking of participants

  - Accurate tracking and record keeping
  - Records able to document program impact

- Evaluation plan

  - Workable evaluation plan specified
  - Specific evaluation instrument specified

- Qualifications of staff

  - Evidence of staff qualifications (degree, certificate)
  - Existence of staff development activities
  - Volunteer staff used

In addition to these categories, the appropriateness of the budget and amount of local and additional resources for the program were included in all funding criteria examined. Appendix B presents a state-by-state summary of funding criteria.

29

41

V. EXPLICIT STATE QUALITY INDICATORS

Seven states have developed additional indicators of program quality beyond monitoring and funding requirements. These indicators explicitly define for local programs criteria or outcomes the SEA will use to assess local programs. Programs are held accountable for their performance on the indicators and in three states, program funding is -- or will be -- tied directly to the indicators. In five states, the indicators address student outcomes while indicators in two states focus on program content. Five of the states have -- or will develop -- quantitative measures of the indicators and one of these states (Massachusetts) is developing performance standards to judge local program performance. In the remaining two states (California and Michigan) the indicators are described qualitatively. Exhibit 6 summarizes the indicators for each state. Exhibit 7 summarizes the quantitative indicators for the five states that have them. The indicators used are described in greater detail for each state below.

ARKANSAS

In 1988 the Vocational and Technical Education Division of the SEA developed Effectiveness and Efficiency (E & E) criteria for adult education programs in response to the state board of education's concerns to improve program quality. The criteria measure enrollment, cost, use of staff and student outcomes. To be considered for funding, a program must meet the criteria and be certified "Effective and Efficient." The state makes this determination of all programs each March. Using the data the state maintains on computer for all programs, state staff assign a numeric score to each of the seven E & E criteria:

- Percent of eligible students served compared to the statewide rate;

- Percent eligible students enrolled compared to the statewide rate;

- Average cost per student instructional hour compared to the state average;

- Reasonable maintenance and operation costs;

- Efficient use of full-time staff;

- Percent of students attending 40 or more hours who advance (measured through grade level equivalent); and

- Number of students who pass GED Tests compared to the number who take the tests.

Each criteria is assigned from 10 to 16 points for a total score of 100. Programs must attain a minimum score of 75 to achieve E & E status. Specific scoring guidelines are provided for each item. For example, a program receives 12 points if the percent of eligible students enrolled equals 50 to 74 percent of the state rate and the maximum points, 16, if the percentage enrolled equals 150 percent or more of the state rate.

30

EXHIBIT 6

Quality Indicators and Measures Developed by States

State	Indicators and Measures	Method of Measurement	Relationship to Funding
ARKANSAS	*Enrollment* – Percent eligible served – Percent eligible enrolled *Cost* – Cost per instructional hour – Operation and maintenance costs *Staff* – Use of full-time staff in classroom and lab *Outcomes* – Percent students advancing – Number passing GED test	State staff develop numeric score for each item based on program performance compared to state average. Program must score a minimum of 75 out of 100.	Funding may be terminated if program fails to meet standards after two years.
CALIFORNIA	Model standards recently developed for ESL programs and standards for other programs under development. ESL standards include: *Program Standards* – Organized sequence of courses, goal-based curriculum – Assessment system *Curriculum Standards* – Targeted to meet student needs *Instruction* – Integrate language skills – Focus on Communication *Evaluation* – Ongoing assessment and monitoring of students *Testing standards* – Use of valid, reliable tests – Use of variety of assessment methods – Content includes real-life situations, high order skills, assesses multiple skills	Not yet determined, but partly through program monitoring.	Under consideration, but likely to be indirectly, through monitoring and refunding.

31

43

44

EXHIBIT 6 (Continued)

Quality Indicators and Measures Developed by States

State	Indicators and Measures	Method of Measurement	Relationship to Funding
MASSACHUSETTS	Standards currently under development will be in three areas: *Learner Participation* — Enrollment — Attendance *Goal Attainment* — Achievement of personal goals *Benchmarks* — Attainment of goal-related skills or competencies	Pilot tests to finalize measures, standards, and methods currently beginning. Local programs will report to state; separate standards will be set for different target populations.	Performance standards to be implemented in July 1993. Funding will be affected by ability to meet standards.
MICHIGAN	*Institutional Purpose* — Goals, objectives, mission *Organization and Administration* — Administrative procedures — Staff *Instructional Program* — Content — Meets student needs *Professional Staff* — Staff qualifications *Student Services* — Counseling and assessment services *Institutional Adaptability* — Program flexibility and innovation *Instructional Media* — Availability of diverse media *Financial Controls* — Budget and accounting *Facilities, Equipment, and Supplies* — Condition and adequacy *Evaluation* — Existence and use of evaluation	Program prepares annual report on compliance with indicators based on self-assessment using standard state form. The form uses primarily qualitative measures. As part of onsite monitoring, SEA compares report with own assessment.	Indirectly through refunding process. Program must address deficiencies in funding request for the next year.

45

46

EXHIBIT 6 (Continued)

Quality Indicators and Measures Developed by States

State	Indicators and Measures	Method of Measurement	Relationship to Funding
TENNESSEE	**Outcomes** — Competency level advancement (tied to grade levels)	Each county is given a target number of students that must move to the next competency level each year. Students are assessed through ABLE or Slosson tests.	Beginning in Program Year 1993, counties will have funding reduced if they fail to advance specified number of students.
Utah	**Educational Effectiveness** — Enrollment in each skill level — GED or high school diploma attainment — Clock hours — Clock hours of instruction **Target Populations** — Enrollment levels of target populations **Economic Impact** — Increase in job attainment/salary — Number on public assistance **Mastery Achievement** — Units of credit awarded **Social Impact** — Student attainment — Student self-confidence and satisfaction	Local programs report data annually using state automated management information system. All programs maintained records on computer.	Indirectly through monitoring and refunding.
VIRGINIA	**Recruitment** — Number enrolled **Staff Development** — Number of hours of staff development **Outcomes** — Student goal attainment	Instructor develops instructional plan specifying competencies designed to help student attain stated goal for attending. Instructor reports percentage of competencies or goals attained. Indicators are used currently as a pilot project with plans to implement statewide.	Performance on indicators will not affect funding.

48

41

Exhibit 7

Summary of Quality Indicators Currently Used or Planned by Five States[*]

Component	Topic	Indicator	Measure
Program Content	Recipients of program services	Increased enrollment levels	• Number enrolled • Percent of eligible population served • Enrollment numbers by target population
		Serving target populations	
	Level of service provided	Adequate attendance	• Clock hours attended
	Cost	Reasonable program costs	• Cost per instructional hour • Overhead and maintenance costs
Program Planning and Content	Staff qualifications	Staff development component	• Number of hours of staff development annually
		Effective use of staff	• Hours of scheduled instruction for full-time staff

[*]Arkansas, Massachusetts, Tennessee, Utah and Virginia.

43

50

34

Exhibit 7 (Continued)

Summary of Quality Indicators Currently Used or Planned by Five States

Component	Topic	Indicator	Measure
Outcomes	Educational gains	• Advancement of grade level • Attained competencies • Passed GED or attained high school diploma	• Standardized test scores • GED test scores • Number of students receiving high school diploma
	Personal and social goals	• Attainment of goals • Increased self confidence and satisfaction	• Student goals and entry and whether achieved • Student ratings
	Employment-related goals	• Job attainment • Salary increase • Reduction of use of public assistance	• Whether student obtained job • Salary before and after participation • Number on public assistance

35

52

51

A program that does not attain E & E status must initiate corrective action. The state notifies the program and arranges a meeting with the local administrator to explain deficiencies. The local program must submit a written improvement plan within one quarter that delineates improvement activities, goals and a timeline for improvement that does not exceed one year. The local education agency monitors improvement quarterly and if the program fails to achieve E & E status within one year, a second improvement plan must be developed. If E & E status is not achieved after the second year, the state may terminate funding of the program. To date, no program has been denied funding, although several programs have now failed to achieve E & E status for the third year and may be terminated this year.

The state director reports that only smaller, part-time programs have had serious difficulty achieving E & E status. He reported considerable support within the state for the criteria as a means of improving program quality.

CALIFORNIA

In 1988 the California Superintendent of Public Instruction established an adult education advisory committee to guide educational reform in the state's adult education program. The committee prepared a strategic plan that included recommendations to develop quality standards and performance measures to guide program development and evaluation. In response to the report, the Adult Education Unit of the State Department of Education has begun the process of developing standards and measures for ABE, ESL and ASE programs. The standards will be used (1) to identify items that can be used in checklists for program monitoring, (2) to guide development of inservice programs and teacher evaluation, and (3) to identify student outcomes to assess student achievement. The indicators will not be tied directly to local program funding, but compliance will be verified through program monitoring.

The state has recently completed development of standards for ESL programs with the assistance of a field-based ESL curriculum committee. The state's draft document Model Standards for Adult English-as-a-Second Language Programs divides the standards into three areas: general standards, which include program, curriculum, instruction and evaluation; proficiency levels, with seven levels defined; and ESL testing, which describes standards for ESL testing. Specific measures are not identified for each standard, but representative examples are presented to illustrate how the standard could be implemented and assessed. The model standards are summarized below.

General Standards

- Program Standards -- programs should have the following components:

  -- Articulated sequence of ESL courses
  -- Curriculum that identifies objectives for each course
  -- System to assess language proficiency

- Curriculum Standards -- the curriculum should have the following characteristics:

  -- Targeted to meet student needs

36

–– Teaches English by integrating vocabulary, grammatical structures and language functions
–– Considers student's lack of literacy ability

- Instruction –– instructional activities should have the following characteristics:

  –– Integrate the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing)
  –– Include language tasks that consist of meaningful interchanges
  –– Focus on acquisition of communication skills
  –– Focus on development of receptive skills prior to productive skills
  –– Use different grouping strategies to facilitate student-centered instruction
  –– Be varied to address different learning styles
  –– Integrate language and culture
  –– Allow development of language necessary to express higher thought
  –– Integrate language and critical thinking

- Evaluation –– the program's evaluation component characteristics should include:

  –– Placement into course level determined through variety of assessments
  –– Monitoring of student progress on a continual basis
  –– Assessment for exiting levels includes proficiency and achievement testing

Proficiency Levels

- Seven language proficiency levels are defined: Beginning literacy, low beginning, high beginning, low intermediate, high intermediate, low advanced and high advanced. For each proficiency level there is a description of student skills and course content.

- Course content describes what students will be able to do on completion for the four major language skills and identifies language functions and language forms for each level.

Testing Standards

- Program testing of students should be characterized by:

  –– Use of valid and reliable tests developed for non-native English speakers
  –– Interpretation based on adult ESL proficiency levels
  –– Use of tests to gain information that benefits students
  –– Providing students with multiple opportunities to demonstrate their abilities in more than one area
  –– Determination of proficiency through a variety of assessment measures
  –– Content that incorporates everyday, real-life situations and materials
  –– Allowing application of higher order thinking skills
  –– Administration to ensure fair and accurate results
  –– Standardized scoring procedures

37

ESL programs will begin using the standards within the next few years. The state is currently working on standards for ABE and ASE programs.

MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts has been planning and field testing its ABE Accountability System over the past four years and will be continuing development through June 1993. The process will culminate in a set of performance standards for ABE programs that assess (1) program focus or inputs and (2) learner focus or outcomes. The standards, to be implemented beginning in fiscal year 1994, will be set separately for different target populations and will be tied to local program funding.

The program focus or input standards will measure whether local programs are successful in translating their program goals into curriculum and instructional programs. These standards will be progress markers of the overall program. The learner focus or outcome standards will assess three areas:

- Learner participation, such as enrollment levels and attendance;

- Learner goal attainment -- whether the learner achieves the stated goal for ABE participation; and

- Benchmark measures toward goal attainment, including skills and competencies needed to attain the goal. The state is considering using CASAS to develop benchmarks and is also reviewing existing instructional materials to determine whether benchmarks may be developed from them.

Specific indicators and standards have not yet been selected, but will be finalized after a 16-month period of field tests has been completed. There are 10 components to the field tests, organized within three tiers as described below.

- Tier 1. The purpose of Tier 1 is to provide information for the development of specific indicators and performance standard levels. There are four component studies to this tier, each of which will be conducted through a pilot test involving 10 local programs: (1) a pilot test of protocols developed earlier that will measure participation, goal attainment and benchmarks for different learner populations; (2) a study of how local programs develop program goals, translate these goals into instruction and measure the success in meeting their goals; (3) a study to examine alternative assessment methods, such as portfolio assessment, and examine how this type of assessment information could be adapted to meet state reporting needs; and (4) an examination of how other education programs (not funded through the state ED or by JTPA) develop and measure program and learner goals.

- Tier 2. Tier 2 will study existing state reporting systems to determine how well they match data requirements that will arise from Tier 1. There are three component studies comprising this tier. These studies will examine: (1) the utility of existing evaluation instruments used by the state ED to collect data; 10 programs will be examined to make this analysis; (2) a survey of teachers will be

38

conducted to assess the effectiveness of using elements developed by the state's System of Adult Basic Education Support (SABES) to assess program effectiveness; and (3) a survey of 250 adult learners will identify factors learners believe are important in assessing their goal attainment.

- Tier 3. The third tier assesses the state's own accountability in achieving its goals. The three component studies of this tier include a self evaluation of the state ED to determine how well it supports the development of a diverse network of high quality ABE programs, a review of evaluation systems used in other countries and a state "report card" of progress made in developing an ABE accountability system. The state ED will survey the opinions of executives and heads of relevant state agencies to make this assessment.

Local programs that will participate in the field tests will receive substantial additional funding to conduct the study. The state is currently in the process of selecting field sites.

MICHIGAN

Michigan's quality standards serve as the basis for its program monitoring. However, the state differs from other states by requiring programs to address the standards explicitly in two ways. First, local education agencies must certify to the state annually that the local plan for adult education incorporates the quality standards. Second, each program must submit an annual report of how it is complying with the state standards. The program develops the report after conducting a self-evaluation using a standard form, which has items that reflect the quality standards. As part of its on-site monitoring visit, the state review team compares the information in the compliance report with its own observations. The 10 quality standards do not specify quantitative measures but are stated narratively as summarized below:

- Institutional purpose -- explicit program goals, objectives and mission statement;

- Organization, administration and control -- professional staff and efficient administration;

- Instructional program -- designed to meet student needs and goals, including employment needs;

- Professional staff -- including quality teachers and other staff;

- Student personnel services -- including assessment and counseling;

- Institutional adaptability -- the program is able to change, adapt and innovate to be more responsive to its students;

- Instructional media program -- provides a wide range of media for staff and students;

- Financial support and control -- the program has sufficient funds and financial controls;

39

- <u>Facilities, equipment and supplies</u> -- are of high quality and meet program and learner needs; and

- <u>Evaluation</u> -- the program uses evaluative information for program improvement.

In addition, each program must have a plan for retention, follow-up and placement of students and report on its activities in these areas as part of the compliance report. Compliance to the standards is not tied directly to funding. However, the program must address resolution of any problems in its next funding application.

Michigan's quality standards will be substantially revised this year in response to the state's Quality Incentives Act. This new law is aimed at promoting school improvement and requires K-12 programs, as well as adult education programs, to (1) develop a school improvement plan, (2) implement outcome-based curriculum, (3) use accredited facilities and (4) submit an annual report to the state on progress in implementing these areas. Programs have until September to develop a school improvement model. After that time, the SEA will reorganize the indicators around the topic areas addressed by the Act (school improvement, curriculum and accreditation) and develop new quality indicators where needed, such as to measure progress toward school improvement strategies and to incorporate the current retention, placement and follow-up requirements into a specific standard.

TENNESSEE

Tennessee has established a goal of achieving a 90 percent literacy rate by 2000. To help meet this challenge, the SEA in Tennessee has established three competency levels for ABE, defined loosely along grade levels (0 - 4, 5 - 8, 9 - 12). A set of proficiencies is established for each level as measured by the ABLE or Slosson tests. A student may enter ABE at any level and progresses to the next level after meeting the proficiencies defined for the level. Students receive a certificate after completing each level and progress until passing the GED Tests. They then may continue their education by moving into an ASE instructional program.

Tennessee's delivery system is county-based, with each county having a local adult education director, advisory board and at least one fiscal agent. All ABE funding is awarded to the fiscal agent, which is then responsible for coordinating ABE programs in the county. To achieve the state literacy goal, the state establishes a fixed number of graduates annually for each county, based on the number of people in the county with less than a high school education. The ABE programs in the county must graduate at least 90 percent of this number of students. Beginning in program year 1993, funding to the county will be reduced if the county fails to achieve its graduation target.

UTAH

Utah's director of adult education developed a set of program quality indicators that were first implemented in 1990. All local programs must report to the state a total of 32 quantitative measures in five topic areas through the statewide management information system. Programs maintain individual student records on this computer system, which facilitates the annual data collection. The list below summarizes the measures.

(1) Educational Effectiveness

- Increased enrollment

  -- Number of students enrolled in each of four literacy levels
  -- Number of students passing GED, obtained GED certificates, graduating high school or entering another education and training program

- Outcome achievement

  -- Average number of clock hours per student
  -- Units of credit awarded

(2) Target Populations

- Increased enrollment of target populations

  -- Enrollment of: racial/ethnic educationally disadvantaged, rural and urban residents, limited English speakers, immigrants, correctional or institutionalized adults, older adults, homeless, handicapped, public housing residents

(3) Economic Impact

- Improved employment-related outcomes

  -- Number of enrollees who obtain a job, increase salary and removed from public assistance

(4) Mastery Achievements

- Increased outcome achievements

  -- Number of units of credit awarded to students by four skill levels

(5) Social Impact

- Increased personal achievements

  -- Number of students with enhanced self-confidence and personal satisfaction

  -- Number of students who leave after and before completing educational objectives

  -- Number of students used as volunteers in the program

41

Due to the state's automated data base, programs have not had difficulty reporting these measures to the state.

The state director reports that the most meaningful outcome measure is the unit of credit awarded. These credits are awarded to a student upon demonstrated competency in skills defined in the program's curriculum. Since the definition is objective, awarding of a credit represents attainment of an objectively defined skill.

Local program performance on the indicators is not tied directly to funding but is evaluated as part of the state monitoring visit. If a program is performing poorly on any measure, the issue is discussed with program staff and corrective action planned. A pattern of poor performance could affect future funding if the cause was believed to be under the program's control. However, this problem has never occurred to date.

VIRGINIA

Virginia is in the process of developing quality indicators and is currently conducting a pilot project testing indicators of administration and instruction. After the pilot project is completed, the state plans to implement the indicators throughout the state over the next few years. Three indicators have been defined:

- Recruitment -- whether the program met its recruitment targets;

- Staff development -- a minimum of 10 hours of staff development activity for each staff member; and

- Student goal attainment -- whether students achieved their goals for attending the program.

On intake into the program, the instructor determines the student's goals and then develops an instructional plan that will enable the student to achieve these goals. For example, if the student enrolled in the program to learn to help his or her child with homework, the instructor asks the student to bring samples of the homework to class. The teacher would then review the skills required to complete the homework and would design an instructional plan to teach the student these skills. These skills are then specified in an individual learning plan and the teacher determines the degree to which the goal is attained by the percentage of the skills the student learns.

Similarly, if the student's goal is to get a job, the student selects the job and the teacher determines the skills the student would need to obtain it. The teacher then develops an instructional plan to teach these skills and again measures goal attainment by the percentage of skills learned.

The instructor is responsible for determination of student goals, criteria for attainment and actual goal attainment. The determination is made on an individual basis and there are no statewide standards for determining attainment.

42

Virginia has no plans to tie these measures to program funding. The state director believes linking funding to the indicators may cause programs to selectively screen participants at enrollment and "cream" the more qualified students. In addition, programs may be more likely to provide inaccurate data if funding was at stake. To avoid these problems, no program will be penalized due to poor performance on the indicators, although the state would try to improve problems through consultation and assistance.

43

VI. Synthesis of Quality Indicators Used By SEAs and Program Evaluation

In this section, we present a summary of quality indicators used by SEAs and in program evaluation. To compile this list, we synthesized the indicators presented in Exhibits 2, 4, 5, and 7. These indicators appear consistently in each of the three areas where states currently assess quality -- local monitoring, program funding, and evaluation -- and several of the indicators are already used explicitly by five states (see Exhibit 7). The list also includes measures of quality frequently used by outside researchers evaluating aspects of adult education programs. The list can thus be considered an empirically derived consensus of SEAs on appropriate quality indicators for adult education programs.

The list organizes the indicators within the three component areas specified by OVAE. In each component area, the topic is first listed, followed by specific indicators for each topic. Within the program process and content area, indicators are divided into four topic areas: program planning, program content, staff qualifications and responsibilities, and curriculum and materials.

44

SAMPLE QUALITY INDICATORS
FOR ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS
USED BY SEAs AND IN PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

PROGRAM CONTEXT

1. **Documented Need for Program Services**

   A.   Number and demographics of target populations in need

   B.   Literacy levels in community

   C.   High school drop-outs in community

   D.   Employment-related skill needs of community

2. **Organization and Structure of Delivery System**

   A.   Number of projects

   B.   Variety of locations and settings of projects

   C.   Varied types of projects (e.g., ESL, GED)

   D.   Flexible scheduling

3. **Characteristics of Participants**

   A.   Number and demographics of participants

   B.   Number and demographics of participants by skill level

   C.   Number and demographics of participants by program type

   D.   Number and demographics of participants by program setting

45

PROGRAM PROCESS AND CONTENT

I. PROGRAM PLANNING

1. **Community and Staff Input in Program Development**

    A. Existence and use of an advisory board

    B. Program holds public hearings

    C. Use of staff input

    D. Other sources consulted (e.g., employers, staff, CBOs, evaluations, program performance reviews)

2. **Coordination Activities**

    A. Existence of coordination arrangements (formal or informal agreements, agencies involved -- number and type)

    B. Type of coordinated activities: referrals; share staff and/or facilities; joint planning and budgeting

3. **Written Operational Plan**

    A. Existence of a plan

    B. Measurable goals and objectives specified

    C. Specific program goals and objectives specified consistent with state plan

    D. Plan development process includes broad input and is open to change

II. PROGRAM CONTENT

1. **Recruitment**

    A. Recruitment methods used

    B. Special populations targeted

    C. Program outreach and publicity activities

63

2.   Program Intake Procedures

    A.   Entry policies

    B.   Incoming assessment procedures

    C.   Development of individual learning plans

3.   **Ongoing Assessment Methods**

    A.   Procedures for monitoring student progress and learning gains

    B.   Procedures for monitoring student progress toward goals

4.   **Support Services**

    A.   Type of support services offered (e.g., counseling, transportation, child care)

    B.   Adequacy of services for meeting student needs

5.   **Evaluation**

    A.   Student, community and staff evaluation of program activities

III. STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1.   **Characteristics of Staff**

    A.   Demographics

    B.   Educational background, credentials, experience

    C.   Number of staff

    D.   Staff retention

2.   **Staff Responsibilities**

    A.   Duties of staff appropriate for position

    B.   Staff commitment (e.g., full or part-time, additional duties)

3.   **Staff Development**

    A.   Existence of staff development component:

          1. When provided (pre- or in-service)
          2. Content, topics covered
          3. Duration
          4. Sequential training
          5. Staff compensation for attendance

    B.   Evaluation of staff development activities:

          1. Systematic needs assessment for content
          2. Evaluation of activities by staff
          3. Staff participation in development

4.   **Use of Volunteer Staff**

    A.   Duties of volunteers

    B.   Volunteer training

5.   **Evaluation of Staff Performance**

    A. Methods for evaluating staff

IV. CURRICULUM AND MATERIALS

1.   **Type of Curriculum and Instruction Used**

    A.   Instructional methods meet student needs (sequential, individual, competency-based)

    B.   Topical emphasis relevant to adult learners

    C.   Instructional technique (e.g, peer teaching, small group)

    D.   Amount of instruction offered

    E.   Organized sequence of courses used

    F.   Individualized instruction based on assessment

2. **Materials and Equipment Used**

    A.   Adequate materials used:

        1. Appropriate for student abilities
        2. Appropriate for student interests and needs
        3. Reflect diverse socioeconomic and cultural background of learners

    B.   Adequate equipment used:

        1. Appropriate to meet program and learner needs
        2. Sufficient amount to meet program and learner needs

3. **Selection and Evaluation of Materials Equipment**

    A.   Method used to select and evaluate equipment and materials (e.g., instructor and student input)

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

1. **Retention and Follow-up Methods**

    A.   Hours of instruction received

    B.   Participation rates for population subgroups

    C.   Methods for contacting program leavers

    D.   Exit interviews conducted

2. **Educational Gains**

    A.   Grade level advancement

    B.   Competencies attained

    C.   GED or high school graduation attained

3. **Employment**

    A.   Attained new employment

    B.   Improved current employment

C.   Improved income

D.   Attained employment-related skills

E.   Receiving public assistance

4.   **Personal and Social Goal Achievement**

A.   Achieved personal goals for participation

B.   Improved self-esteem and self-confidence

67

APPENDIX A

EVALUATION SUMMARIES

66

Evaluation Overview

This study provides an evaluation of the 1986-87 Institute, a staff development program for preparing beginning and experienced California instructors to use ESL techniques and materials. The purpose of the evaluation was to learn about the Institute's impact on (1) improving instructors' skills in utilizing ESL techniques; (2) instructors' capacity to use competency-based adult education (CBAE) classroom management methods; (3) instructors' abilities to use sequential steps in specific ESL techniques (e.g., listening, speaking, and reading); and (4) instructors' and trainers' perceptions about their own skill development through systematic training and reinforcement.

Measures of Program Quality

Program Process and Content

- Evidence that instructors demonstrate eight ESL techniques: role play, focused listening, early production, reading, drills, language generating, dialogues, and pair practice. Examples of teacher application of the techniques include the following:

  -Use lesson plans to conduct lessons
  -Use competency objectives to focus lessons
  -Set up situation by asking questions, providing visuals, relating it to previously studied curriculum, eliciting ideas or experiences from students
  -Prepare students to understand the language they would hear
  -Provide tasks that require students to demonstrate comprehension; provide examples for tasks
  -Provide materials to guide students in listening (e.g., realia, visuals, print)
  -Present language with normal speed, intonation, stress and volume; provide comprehensible input through visuals, realia, gestures and body movement
  -Provide feedback to learners on the accuracy of their listening. pronunciation
  -Provide context for new vocabulary
  -Model expected dialogue/responses before asking students to respond
  -Move from whole group to small group or individual practice
  -Give students opportunity to apply language to their lives
  -Assess individual progress
  -Move around room to listen and provide assistance to individual pairs

- Criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the ESL Institute training:
  -Clear presentation of objectives
  -Effective use of audio and visual aids,
  -Teacher perceptions of understanding of concepts, preparedness to apply concepts

52

Additional indicators recommended by the evaluation team included:

- Refinement of training design and content

- A transfer process that can be used to prepare adult education providers for participation in the Institute

- Reinforcement activities for enhancing skill building and skill retention of Institute participants

Participant Outcomes

- Extent to which students participate in classroom activity

- Extent to which students complete classroom activity

Selection of Measures

Three instruments were used to document participants' mastery and implementation of Institute training techniques: ESL Institute feedback forms, classroom observation form, and the Teaching Improvement Process. Interviews were also conducted with teachers whose classrooms were observed. Observers used the Institute's feedback forms for eight of 11 ESL techniques to document participants' abilities to perform the techniques. Classroom observation forms were also used to document instructor techniques, and the Teaching Improvement Process (TIP) was used to record instructors' implementation of CBAE management strategies.

California
Evaluation of the First Year Implementation
of Its Four Year ABE Plan

Evaluation Overview

This report outlines the results of an evaluation of the 1989-93 California State Plan for Adult Basic Education, conducted by the Evaluation and Training Institute, Los Angeles, California. The purposes of the study were to conduct a formative and summative evaluation of the implementation of the four major goals of the ABE State Plan:

- Improving access to users;
- Improving accountability;
- Improving program quality and responsiveness; and
- Improving planning and coordination.

Seven major evaluation activities were conducted in the first year:

- Formation of an Evaluation Advisory Committee;

- Development of a matrix of adult education programs;

- On-site peer review of 10 Section 321 grant recipients;

- Written survey of all Section 321 and 326 grant recipients;

- Telephone interviews with members of AE Steering Committee and 353 grant recipients;

- Analyses of local assistance grant achievement data; and

- Case study of state level activities.

Measures of Program Quality

Program quality in this instance reflects the implementation of the four goals noted above.

Program Context

- Increasing access through expansion of open entry/open exit competency-based education services to alternative modes of delivery;

- Expansion of ABE programs to serve those whose primary language is English, with incentive funding available; and

- More equitable access to funding throughout the state.

54

71

Program Process and Content

- Expanded recruitment efforts;

- Interagency involvement in outreach, referrals;

- Improved coordination among literacy-related and basic skills service providers;

- Expand key stakeholders in planning and oversight of programs; and

- Expanded staff development activities.

Program Outcomes

- Use of CASAS system for pre- and post-testing.

Funding Criteria

The Department provided a 25 percent increase in rate structure per hour to encourage increasing services to ABE students who speak English as their primary language, thus comprising 15 to 20 percent of the total numbers of people served.

Evaluation Overview

This report profiles a 1989 study of GED graduates to determine what effect passing the GED Tests had on the participants' lives. The study focused on outcomes relating to employment, further education, personal satisfaction, and family well being. Other social and economic factors were examined, including respondents' expectations before and after passing the test, future plans, income changes, and changes in confidence level. One thousand students were randomly selected from a pool of over 10,000; 33 percent responded to the 19-item survey. Data were analyzed by grade completion, race or ethnicity, age, and gender. Of those surveyed, 99 had completed the 10th grade, 85 completed the 11th grade.

Measures of Program Quality

Program Context

- Demographic characteristics of participants;
- Motivation for taking tests;
- Employment status before taking test; and
- Expectations and future plans of program participants.

Program Process and Content

- Recruitment strategies; and
- Type of preparation for test.

Program Outcomes

- Occupational status after receiving GED;
- Income level after receiving GED;
- Effects on respondents' self-confidence; and
- Perception of family and social status after receiving GED.

No discussion is offered as to methodology or rationale for selection of these criteria.

Evaluation Overview

This report provides a descriptive analysis of **Project Quality**, the evaluation process used in Illinois. Eighteen programs received on-site evaluations conducted by peer adult educators under the leadership of an experienced adult education program evaluator. The evaluation process consisted of a review of written material provided by program administrators; self-assessment instruments which were provided to program administrators, teachers, and cooperating agencies; data from the Area Planning Councils; and the on-site visits. As part of the process, sites requesting funding for the following year are required to indicate how they are responding to the evaluation recommendations for program improvement which were provided. The adequacy of the program's response is considered by the State in providing for continued funding of the program.

Measures of Program Quality

The bulk of the activities examined fell into the area of program process and content.

Program Process and Content

- Program Planning and Content
    Long-range program planning
    Interagency planning with other social service providers
    Increased student follow-up mechanisms

- Qualifications of Personnel
    Full-time directors/instructional staff
    Support services for director
    Availability of staff development activities
    Needs assessment for staff development activities

There was no discussion as to the selection of these criteria for review.

57

74

Evaluation Overview

Under the direction of the Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition, an evaluation was conducted to assess the status of adult literacy programming in Indiana, evaluate the impact of the Literacy Coalition, and develop a database of literacy providers. With funds from a Gannett Foundation grant, the Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition established an evaluation task force in 1987 to develop an evaluation design. A second task force guided further development and implementation of the design. Three surveys were conducted for the study: a provider survey of 116 ABE programs, volunteer organizations, private industry councils, and vocational technical colleges (representing a 96 percent response rate); an anonymous survey sent to provider respondents two months later (58 providers responded, or 50 percent); and a local coalition survey conducted by telephone to all 27 literacy coalitions in the state. The study also involved visits to providers and local coalitions in 10 communities and observations of state coalition functions.

Measures of Program Quality

Program Context

- Developing plan for adult literacy;

- Census data and estimates of functional illiterates, high school non-completers;

- Types of organizations providing literacy services (e.g., ABE programs, volunteer organizations, private industry councils, vocational technical colleges) and number of learners served by each organization;

- Program longevity;

- Provider support for and active involvement in local literacy coalitions;

- Enrollment of learners by reading level, sex, age, ethnicity, employment status (current levels and changes);

- Program funding sources (e.g., Federal, state, local/public, private);

- Availability of materials and technical assistance to providers;

- Promoting public awareness of literacy (e.g., hotline, newsletters, recognition programs, promote research, speakers' bureau); and

- Percent of target population served.

75

Program Process and Content

Program Promotion/Coordination

- Literacy providers form partnerships with other organizations that share responsibilities of literacy programming (vary by type of organization, nature of partnership);

- Fund-raising efforts;

- Provider choice of priorities (e.g., publicity, instructional materials, tutor training, more paid staff);

Staffing

- Staffing configuration (e.g., number of part-time staff vs. full-time staff; paid staff vs. volunteers; staff positions such as administrators, teachers, counselors, paraprofessionals);

- Volunteer referral/recruitment/activation;

- Volunteer activities and characteristics (e.g., responsibilities, training and support, demographics);

Program Operation and Services

- Program response to learner demand (need for waiting list);

- Program accessibility such as schedule (e.g., open-entry, open-exit schedule; hours of operation) and location (e.g., type of site, convenience to learner and instructor);

- Instructional facilities;

- Availability of support services such as transportation, child care, and counseling services;

- Collaboration with private businesses to provide on-site workplace literacy instruction;

Instruction

- Time spent in literacy instruction (contact hours, homework);

- Instructional approach (e.g., one-to-one tutoring, small group instruction, learning center, classroom instruction);

59

76

- Instructional materials and methods (e.g., workbooks, computers, basal readers: phonics, language experience); and

- Testing (availability, function, type of testing).

Participant/Program Outcomes

- Learner retention;

- Literacy instruction more accessible to learners;

- Improved quality of instruction;

- More learners enroll "who otherwise would not have";

- More volunteers participate "who otherwise would not have";

- In-kind resources are committed to literacy efforts; and

- Private funds are raised for literacy.

Selection of Measures

The focus of the surveys and the evaluation in general was on the level of involvement of literacy providers in literacy coalitions to promote literacy statewide. The lengthy list of measures above provide a descriptive look at literacy programs in the state rather than a prescriptive approach for determining quality indicators. However, a few of these items were highlighted as important indicators of the positive impact of literacy efforts: increases in enrollment, use of one-to-one volunteer tutoring, program participation in literacy coalitions, and providers' awareness and use of promotional services (e.g., publications, referrals, conferences).

The process for the selection of these indicators does not appear to have been a structured one. Evaluation designers utilized information from Census data, the evaluation task force, and interviews with literacy coalition members and provider staff.

Iowa
Adult Basic Education Assessment

Evaluation Overview

The state of Iowa undertook a statewide assessment to:

(1)   Identify all the assessment procedures and practices being utilized by the ABE program;

(2)   Identify the target populations served;

(3)   Identify major assessment outcomes cross-referenced by target populations;

(4)   Develop a taxonomy of major assessment categories; and

(5)   Recommend additional assessment procedures or practices to be utilized on a statewide basis.

Measures of Program Quality

The concept of assessment focused on student progress, achievement or learning outcomes, but success is based on what the learner's goals are -- what he or she wants to know.

The following were the major assessment categories identified and supported by the state's ABE program:

(1)   Testing to include norm-referenced, teacher-made tests and criterion-referenced tests;

(2)   Student goal-setting performance measures which include anecdotal records, follow-up procedures, and pre/post assessment procedures; and

(3)   Other performance measures such as personal observations, role playing, oral presentations, writing assessment, video feedback, and life simulation scenarios.

Selection of Measures

It was determined that, for pre- and post-assessment on standardized tests, either the TABE or ABLE be utilized.

Evaluation Overview

This evaluation of the Kansas adult education program examined existing evaluation and reporting systems used by the state's local programs, summarizing and assessing the kinds of data they collect, and developing a comprehensive system for evaluating adult education programs in Kansas. The primary objective of the evaluation was to make recommendations for evaluation procedures to be used in the succeeding three years. Evaluators contacted local program directors through a written survey, a presentation at a statewide meeting, letters requesting program information and providing status updates of the evaluation, and follow-up phone calls. Through these channels, evaluators obtained summary descriptive statistics from 12 local programs (e.g., program description, test scores), as well as survey responses from 36 of 57 state directors (63 percent).

Measures of Program Quality

Program Context

- Presence of a state advisory council for adult education;

- Information on local area, e.g., industry, economy, employment;

- Categorization data on program participants (e.g., ESL, institutionalized, homeless, unemployed);

Program Process and Content

- Personal contact with schools and social agencies;

- Common evaluation and reporting system across local programs;

- Needs assessment, statement of priorities established under the state plan;

- Use of placement or diagnostic tests (e.g., WRAT, TABE, GED Practice Tests) at entry, periodically throughout the year, and at exit;

- Statewide, standardized assessment instrument;

- Proper test administration and scoring;

- Program operates in a convenient location for students;

- Curriculum planning documentation;

- Program implementation data (e.g., number of open-entry centers, number of classes taught, number of students per class, number of hours per class);

62

- Computer capacity (for administration or instruction) at ABE/GED centers;

- Provide counseling to participants; and

- Follow-up when a client stops coming to the program.

Participant Outcomes

- Post-test achievement;

- Work-related outcomes;

- Increased student proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, listening, computation, problem solving;

- Reduced dependency on welfare;

- Entering training programs such as vocational education and JTPA;

- Student reporting on objectives met;

- Student feedback to teachers and counselors reflecting students' perception of how effective program has been to them;

- Information from program leavers and graduates relating to adequacy of instruction and their ability to pursue further education and training;

- Feedback from individuals and organizations (including employers) who have an interest in continuation of adult education programs; and

- Award scholarship or certificate to GED high scorer or graduate.

Selection of Measures

The measures of program quality, which appeared in the survey of directors and an information form that each director completed for his or her program, are drawn largely from items listed in the annual performance report. The state director for ABE and GED compiled a list of questions, as did some local program directors.

80

Evaluation Overview

Sixty-six local adult education programs were evaluated during 1989-90 by the supervisory staff of the Bureau of Adult and Community Education of the Louisiana Department of Education. Evaluation (data collection) questionnaires were designed to elicit information on characteristics of the program, with specific focus on the issues of recruitment, cooperating agencies, and staffing.

Measures of Program Quality

Program Context

- Types of programs; and

- Location and scheduling.

Program Process and Content

- Recruitment strategies;

- Outreach efforts;

- Cooperative agreements with other public agencies;

- Involvement of the private sector in recruitment strategies;

- Support services including child care and transportation;

- Staff characteristics:
    Full- or part-time
    Certified in adult education
    Professional qualifications
    Staff development activities
    Evaluation of teachers

- Instructional methodologies:
    Individualized instruction, and
    Diagnostic profiles of students.

There is no discussion as to why these measures were examined.

64

Evaluation Overview

At the request of the Adult Extended Learning Services of the Michigan Department of Education, Formative Evaluation Research Associates (FERA) conducted an evaluation of the Michigan Adult Literacy Initiative (MALI) Project. MALI, organized into 14 regions, coordinates statewide activities aimed at reducing adult functional illiteracy. The primary purpose of the evaluation was to determine the "overall effectiveness of the project in increasing the literacy rates of adults in Michigan." The evaluation also addressed questions related to building community awareness, training tutors, developing successful programs, and organizing MALI.

Measures of Program Quality

Program Context

- Number of students and tutors involved in literacy programs; and

- Reputation of program among local agencies and organizations.

Program Process and Content

- Pattern of volunteer involvement in the program;

- Effect of the program on student progress;

- Ratio of staff to tutor/student matches; and

- Effect of student ability on tutor performance and retention.

Participant Outcomes

- Student perceptions of success from participation in a program;

- Number of students attaining their goals;

- Impact of tutorial on attitudes of families and employers;

- Impact of services on local community;

- Extent to which "tutors make a difference" at ABE sites; and

- Impact of tutorial on student self-esteem.

65

Selection of Measures

Measures were selected based on data collected from the following sources: (1) a review of documented data from each region; (2) interviews with the statewide coordinator of SDC and regional facilitators; (3) interviews with groups of literacy tutors, ABE instructors, employers, and students in three local sites; (4) creation of exit and follow-up interview forms to be used by volunteers to collect student information; (5) interviews with administrators of three local literacy programs; and (6) creation of a computer-based management information system to monitor tutors and students across the state. Information for the evaluation design was also based on input from regional facilitators and the state director of adult education and his staff.

83

Staff Development Collaborative Project
Michigan

Evaluation Overview

At the request of the Adult Extended Learning Services of the Michigan Department of Education, Formative Evaluation Research Associates (FERA) conducted an evaluation of the state's Staff Development Collaborative (SDC). The primary goal was to determine whether participants achieved objects of the staff development activity and whether participants are using what they learned three to six months after training. Evaluation methodology included interviews with the statewide coordinator and all regional facilitators; analysis of the SDC workshop evaluation database in the State Department of Education; a mail survey of participating and nonparticipating adult educators; and a mail survey of a sample of participating and nonparticipating school districts.

Measures of Program Quality

Program Context

- Administrator perceptions of the value of staff development and the SDC

Program Process and Content

- External linkages to school districts and teachers (e.g., financial and philosophical support from school system, adult educator networking); and

- Professional development content
  Meeting professional development needs of adult educators
  Effectiveness of workshops in meeting needs
  Participant exposure to current trends, models, materials
  Realistic goals and objectives of workshops
  Participant perceptions that the workshop was helpful three or six months later.

Selection of Measures

FERA met with SDC regional facilitators to ask about their activities, goals, and evaluation questions. Responses from the facilitators were used to design the evaluation.

Evaluation Overview

The Minnesota Department of Education commissioned an evaluation of the state's 18 adult refugee ESL programs funded in 1985-86 through the Minnesota Refugee Program Office of the Department of Human Services. The purpose of the evaluation was to define and measure the effectiveness of the 18 refugee programs, identify successful classroom practices, and make recommendations for future decision making and planning. Sources of information used to conduct the evaluation were the Refugee Program Office's data system and information from participants and service providers. Data collection and evaluation design activities included the following: (1) six design meetings with the Adult Refugee Coordinator at the Department of Education; (2) a review of project files and relevant literature; (3) a preliminary meeting with project coordinators; three structured meetings with representatives of the State Refugee Program Office and the Department of Education; (4) site visits to 16 of the 18 programs, including interviews with more than 50 teachers; (5) five student focus groups, with input from more than 50 students; (7) a focus group with teachers; (8) and a review of demographic and program data from the Refugee Program Office.

Measures of Program Quality

Evaluators identified a number of contextual and method factors that appeared to be most important to program effectiveness. The degree of emphasis varies somewhat depending on student performance levels.

Program Process and Content

- Attract new refugees who have never attended ESL classes in the agency's community (e.g., relax enrollment regulations, use culturally comfortable setting, arrange for transportation, actively coordinate with sponsoring and resettlement agencies;

- Support retention of students through support services (e.g., transportation, child care, ability to address crisis resettlement problems, translation services, bilingual staff, access to other bilingual resources);

- Hire and support excellent teachers; provide opportunities for training, workshops, idea and materials exchanges;

- Recruit program coordinators with leadership skills, and strengthen the coordinator's role;

- Promote coordination with other agencies;

- Structure programs that can adjust to students' individual, educational needs (e.g., open enrollment, classroom aides and volunteers, in-home tutors);

68

- Maximize instructional time and pace (e.g., better retention with daily classes, three to four hours; limit classes to 20 students, preferably 10);

- Organize classes by student performance levels;

- Address student expectations in classroom design and process (e.g., discuss personal goals, use written materials for homework, use books and organize materials that give students a sense of ownership and progress);

- Actively involve students in classroom activities; reduce teacher-directed activities as a class progresses; increase individualized attention as needed;

- Teach students to learn (e.g., develop study skills, problem solving, encourage questioning);

- Use relevant issues as teaching tools (e.g., discuss homeland, offer field trips, discuss job opportunities);

- Encourage and enhance learning outside of the classroom (e.g., assign homework, practice);

- Involve students in their educational goals and the design of classes; and

- Balance use of appropriate materials (e.g., use brief conversation in dictation, grammar, memorization, oral recitation).

Selection of Measures

Outcome data on student progress and language level correlation was unavailable. Evaluators found that teachers and students had difficulty articulating what elements made their programs successful. Evaluators also indicated that system design problems were more significant than method selection in determining the effectiveness of ESL instruction. However, in the absence of outcome data, evaluators relied on classroom observations and interviews with teachers and students.

69

Impact Evaluation of Adult Basic Education Program Outcomes
Montana

Evaluation Overview

The study of ABE participants in Montana involved a research and evaluation component, including a review of research studies that have examined student outcomes and voluntary interviews with ABE students. The primary purpose of the study was to describe the qualitative (e.g., improved self-concept) and quantitative (e.g., financial gain) effects ABE programs have on participants' lives. Based on a random sample of nine of the state's 19 ABE programs, 516 ABE participants were interviewed (328 former students and 188 current students). Data were collected at program sites by trained teams of interviewers in half-hour interviews with each student. Data from these interviews were later used to assess and evaluate program impact on students' lives.

Study findings indicated that the vast majority of both current and former students who were interviewed felt that participation in the ABE program had a "major, positive impact" on the improvement of their basic skills and selected applied knowledge areas, and increased the likelihood of their participation in community activities and their children's education. Whereas interview responses suggest that there may be an <u>association</u> between participation in ABE and positive changes in their students' lives, interview data are not sufficient to conclude that ABE programs <u>caused</u> these changes.

Program Context

- Characteristics of former vs. current students (e.g., sex, age, ethnicity, residence, number of children, educational attainment); and

- Reason for attending ABE programs.

Program Process and Content

- Student perceptions of best features of ABE programs (e.g., self-paced instruction, freedom for personal growth, learning basic skills, program structure, teachers);

- Student perceptions of worst features of ABE programs (e.g., individual personal problems, single program component, individual classroom experiences); and

- Student suggestions for program improvements (e.g., improve teaching, individual concerns, improve classes).

Participant Outcomes

Changes in Skills, Knowledge Areas, Personal Life

- Achievement of personal goals;

- Improvement in basic skill areas (e.g., math, reading, writing, and communication);

70

- Improvement in basic knowledge areas (e.g., how to find and keep a job, knowledge of your rights and responsibilities as a citizen, knowledge of health care);

- Involvement in community activities (e.g., use of library, vote in elections, outside reading, participate in community organizations);

- Involvement in formal education of their children (e.g., attend parent meetings at school, talk with teachers or principals about their children);

- Overall change in basic skills, knowledge, and community involvement; related to basic skills improvement, self-awareness and personal growth, and relationships with teachers and staff;

- Enrollment or intention to enroll in other educational programs while attending, or after terminating from, ABE programs;

- Status (enrollment, completion, termination) in other educational programs such as college, vocational/technical school, GED preparation;

- Impact of ABE program attendance on participation in other educational programs;

- Changes in personal life (e.g., sense of satisfaction with life, getting along with other people, level of self-confidence, way you feel about yourself); and

- Changes in relationship with children and children's social and educational development.

Financial Gains

- Receipt of/dependence on government financial assistance;

- Employment status and employment income;

- Family income, condition of family finances;

- Program cost per student hour of instruction;

- Hours of ABE program instruction; and

- Ratio of net income changes for individual students and families to ABE program costs.

71

88

Selection of Measures

Outcome measures were based on findings from the research literature and input from a project advisory committee, which consisted of program administrators from the sample programs and administrators from several other programs. These measures were analyzed based on student answers to a structured interview instrument that included questions in the following areas: reasons for attendance, educational impact, skills acquired, personal changes, program evaluation, economic benefits, and demographic information.

89

Evaluation Overview

This mostly qualitative evaluation study, conducted in 1990, assesses the impact of student participation in the Literacy Volunteers of New York City (LVNYC) program. Program data were collected primarily through open-ended focus group interviews, individual interviews, and observation. Additional data that were collected included program documents, students' demographic information, standardized test scores, and writing samples. Program literature included the tutor training manual, student advocate guidelines, past internal and external evaluations, data forms, and minutes of the Student Committee meetings. Evaluation staff interviewed 102 students (65 in focus groups and 37 by phone). Ten students were selected from the focus groups to serve as case studies. Twenty tutors were interviewed, 16 staff members were interviewed, and 20 observations were conducted at the LVNYC during tutor training, pre-enrollment sessions, instruction, and at an annual program-wide event. Students were asked to describe how they came to the program, their goals, and changes they had seen in themselves. The evaluation examined student changes in three general areas: literacy skills; self-concept, attitudes and beliefs related to literacy development; and involvement in literacy tasks outside the program.

Measures of Program Quality

Program Context

- Prior schooling experiences of students; and

- Student goals, motivations for enrolling (commitment to children, further education, employment-related reasons).

Program Process and Content

- Student-centered learning that enhances students' literacy skills and impacts their self-esteem

> Help students move from a text-based to a knowledge-based approach to reading
> Extensive use of writing for instruction and personal reflection
> Use of group instruction
> Students identify their goals, choose reading materials, write on topics reflecting their interests and goals
> Commitment to student leadership development
> Programs celebrate students' reading and writing

In addition to what evaluators found in the program, several elements were recommended for program effectiveness:

- Systems of tutor support to decrease attrition and enhance effectiveness of instruction;

73

- Program policy addressing students' rights in relation to tutor changes imposed by Center directors; student handbook explaining students' rights ;

- System for regular in-service staff development;

- Aggressive steps to establish cultural diversity of staff and volunteers; include cross-cultural communication as part of tutor training;

- Counseling in a variety of formats;

- Program support for students' use of skills outside the program (e.g., encourage classmates to accompany one another on outings such as grocery shopping, job hunting, bank transactions);

- Student involvement in decisions about instructional groups and tutor assignments; and

- Ongoing assessment, evaluation, and program development; involve stakeholder groups in process; develop center, personal, and central records (relying on alternative assessment model using portfolios).

Participant Outcomes

- **Activities outside program**
  Personal reading and writing at home
  Read to oneself in public (e.g., posters, signs, labels)
  Represent program to media
  Fill in job application
  Open a new bank account
  Formal correspondence
  Paying bills
  Shop for groceries

  Activities inside program

- Personal reading and writing in tutoring group;

- Read feedback from fellow students at a celebration, read to visitors in front of tutoring group;

- Results on standardized tests;

- Assist in junior training and student orientation; and

- Practice filling in applications in tutoring group.

74

91

Selection of Measures

Measures were based on the LVNYC program philosophy, research literature on qualities of learner-centered programs, and many student-generated criteria. Criteria that were selected were based on a qualitative approach to examining indicators of student change and improvement.

75

Starting Over: Characteristics of Adult Literacy Learners
Literacy Assistance Center, New York City

Evaluation Overview

This case study followed three studies of adult literacy learners in New York City that were commissioned by the Literacy Assistance Center in 1986 for the New York City Adult Literacy Initiative. The purpose of the study was to provide more detailed, descriptive information about the educational and life histories of native-born and native-English speaking adults who read below a 5th grade reading equivalency. The first phase of the study was a ase study consisting of one-hour structured interviews of a sample of adult education students in New York City literacy programs. Fifty-eight individuals were interviewed; data from 32 of these students were included in the analysis. Study staff also utilized an analysis of a city-wide database of student characteristics. Phase II of the study was to build on these interviews through an ethnographic follow-up.

Six research questions guided the study:

1. How do adults find out about literacy programs?
2. How easy or difficult is it to gain entry?
3. What makes adults decide to attend?
4. What factors influence attendance/dropout rates?
5. What is the background of participants?
6. Significant events in participants' lives, how do they relate to educational situations?

Measures of Program Quality

Within the six broad areas, interview questions covered the following topics:

- Life situation (current residence, reading and writing experiences outside of program, community involvement);

- Past life and educational experiences (previous schools, when left school, awareness of literacy abilities in past, parents' and siblings' educational experiences/literacy, reading materials in the home, language spoken in the home);

- Program participation (reasons for attendance, how they heard about the program, difficulties in getting to class, help with schoolwork, participation in choosing what to learn, indicators of making progress/meeting goals, changes in life since enrolling in adult education program);

- Job history (current employment status, previous jobs held, opportunity to get a better job, ability to handle reading or writing tasks on the job, future job plans).

Selection of Measures

Interview questions were based on a review of the research literature. The six basic areas covered in the interview questions were chosen to elicit specific information about the characteristics of adult literacy students, centered around three areas: student motivation for enrolling in adult programs, personal and professional goals, and reasons for continuing or leaving programs. The study provides implications for ways in which programs can effectively respond to the needs and perceptions of adult learners and issues related to student recruitment and retention.

77

Evaluation Overview

The North Carolina Department of Community Colleges awarded a grant to the North Carolina Commission of Indian Affairs in 1983 to increase Indian participation in ABE programs in four counties. An evaluation was conducted to determine the effectiveness of local programs in increasing Indian participation. A total of 135 Indian adults were recruited in these programs, 120 more than anticipated for the year. The retention rate for the project was more than 50 percent.

Measures of Program Quality

Program Context

- Participant background (e.g., family status, sex, receive public assistance, family income, last school and grade attended)

Program Process and Content

- Recruitment program that targets a specific group;

- Utilize Indian instructors and aides;

- Locate classes away from community colleges; based on belief that Indian ABE students would be uncomfortable in a school setting, gather more support from classmates they know;

- Recruiter/counselor met with each participant to identify personal, educational, and career goals, and planned field trips to make students aware of employment opportunities available in the community; and

- Strong support system and encouragement between students, teachers, and recruiter/counselors.

Participant Outcomes

- Student goals and objectives;

- Retention rate;

- Obtain high school equivalency;

- Increase in participant job readiness and marketability;

- Participant recruitment of family or friends to attend ABE classes;

78

- Enrollment in a community college vocational program; and

- Obtain job.

Selection of Measures

Indicators of quality appeared on the application/intake form filled out by participants and a worksheet on which they listed goals and objectives. It appears that many of the indicators are pulled from typical intake information or outcomes associated with student goals. The report does not indicate how the Commission on Indian Affairs determined what recruitment and retention efforts worked best for Indian students.

Evaluation Overview

A team of researchers led by Hanna Fingeret conducted an extensive evaluation of North Carolina's ABE programs using a multi-site case study model (adapted from Stake's responsive evaluation). The study included a literature review of outcome and impact studies, a feasibility study, a survey, on-site and telephone interviews, and collection of local and state program data. Initially, a statewide survey was conducted to determine whether or not there was support for a large scale evaluation; 296 of 511 "stakeholders" identified by local program directors responded to the survey. Evaluation staff asked the survey respondents to respond to evaluation designs. The original design was to collect existing numerical data describing demographic characteristics of ABE students, participants' progress and length of participation in the program, and recruitment and follow-up data. In fall 1983, a feasibility study was conducted to test design and develop interview/observation protocols. For the case study, six teams collected information from taped interviews with 166 participants and staff from six programs chosen to represent rural and urban areas and demographic and racial mixes of students. Interviewers collected program documents and records in addition to observation and interview data. A large part of the report is a narrative of anecdotes from interviews with students and instructors.

Evaluation staff tried to ensure the validity and reliability of data through several measures: use of multiple researchers working independently; use of local observers to sit on site teams; multiple interviews with students from the same classroom; combining interviewing and observation of instructors; and independent researcher data analysis of individual sites compared with team member's site analysis and principal investigator's cross-site analysis.

Measures of Program Quality

Program Context

- Structure of state ABE system: funding and record keeping emphasis, isolation vs. autonomy, identification of problems, leadership;

- Student characteristics (prior schooling, employment, life experiences, goals, life cycle stage) and their relationship to goals;

- Program administrators' perspectives on purpose of ABE, administrative philosophy, program models, linkages, sites and facilities, recruiting, program expansion;

- Instructors' background (how they got involved in ABE, education, professional development and learning on the job, perspectives on student motivations and background, perspectives on purposes of ABE); and

- Reasons for enrolling in programs (educational vs. employment reasons).

Program Process and Content

- Instructors' perspectives on their responsibilities (e.g., creating personal relationships with students, meeting individual emotional and psychological needs, "keeping" students, helping students meet individual goals);

- Resource constraints (administrators' perspectives on hiring instructors, instructors' status, procuring instructional resources, availability of instructor training);

- How success is defined by students, instructors, and administrators;

- Collection of quantitative program data (e.g., follow-up data on participants);

- Instructional approaches for reading that focus on meaning and context; and

- Use of interactive instructional approaches (rather than bottom-up, top-down, subskill).

Participant Outcomes

- Boost in self-concept, self-confidence;

- Definition of success or completion;

- Students tended to stay longer when the teacher considered how and what they wanted to learn;

- Reading and writing skills; and

- Increase in employment.

Selection of Measures

A number of issues emerged from the case study analysis: the need for a clear definition of success or completion of ABE; the lack of ABE program identity (lack of distinction between ABE and GED students); lack of teacher training; and lack of useful quantitative data, especially lack of follow-up data. Researchers noted that the research and evaluations tend to focus on individual outcomes instead of trying to understand the interaction between the program, student, and environment. An impact and outcome focus fails to get at how adults participate, remain, or leave programs. Qualitative or naturalistic research methods (e.g., interviews and observations) are more appropriate for responsive evaluations.

Evaluation Overview

This report profiles the procedures and findings of an evaluation of the ABE program of the North Carolina Community College system conducted by the Center for Urban Affairs and Community Services of North Carolina State University. The focus of the study was to provide basic descriptive information on the following features of ABE programs: program funding, program administration, educational and support services, instructional methods and materials, suggestions for the improvement of service delivery, and overall assessments of the ABE program. ABE directors, instructors, and students were surveyed in questionnaires designed in conjunction with the North Carolina Department of Community Colleges. Overall recommendations from administrators and teachers included a need for better methodology and resources devoted to recruitment and program publicity; retention activities; increased staff development activities for instructors and higher pay levels; reduced class sizes; and more flexibility in funding formulas. Student recommendations also supported reduced class size, more individualized instruction, increased program publicity, and increased support services such as child care and transportation.

Measures of Program Quality

Three surveys that were utilized reflected different aspects of the program.

Program Context

- Funding and program expenditures;

- Types of educational services offered;

- Location and scheduling of services provided;

- Support services offered; and

- Student demographics.

Program Process and Content

- Types of instruction provided;

- Program staffing;

- Staff development activities including in-service and pre-service;

- Teaching hours per year;

- Types of instructional materials; and

- Effectiveness of various program components.

Participant Outcomes

- Reasons for enrollment;

- Specific ABE services needed;

- Assessment of program effectiveness; and

- Need for support services (transportation and child care).

Evaluation Overview

This statewide evaluation of adult education programs in Texas examines "the extent to which provisions of the Texas State Plan for Adult Education Plan for Fiscal Years 1986-88 have been met." The study involved three activities: (1) an analysis of extant individual program data from documents such as program applications, annual performance reports, rules, regulations, and the TEA monitoring instrument; (2) mail surveys and interviews with students, teachers, program administrators, and representatives of linkage organizations; and (3) a summary report. About half of the state's 63 program directors responded, as did 595 teachers from 54 cooperatives. A stratified sample of adult education students was developed based on enrollment size of cooperatives, geographic location, and level of class (ABE, ESL, GED); 1,461 students responded.

Students were surveyed to elicit their perceptions of teacher availability for conferences, instructional materials being used, skills being acquired, and objectives being met. Questions on the teacher survey examined types of instructional materials and assessments used, extent of the use of volunteers in classrooms, type of technical assistance received, awareness and use of information from special projects, and perceived program strengths and weaknesses. Leaders of community linkage organizations were interviewed to determine the extent of their cooperation with adult education programs. Program directors were interviewed to determine their use of special project information, extent and quality of technical assistance and sta development received from TEA, and their perceptions of strengths and weaknesses of local programs.

Measures of Program Quality

Program Context

- State staff provide leadership in local program management and planning (e.g., train local program administrators in the development of long-range and annual program plans, help them develop appropriate program goals and policy; and

- Statewide network of information and referral for organizations interested in literacy programs.

Program Process and Content

- Utilize alternative learning strategies that emphasize individualizing instruction for "the least educated most in need";

- Use standardized curriculum with specific guidelines, scope, and sequence, particularly competency based;

- Staff development

> Priorities based on program needs as identified by needs assessment from staff, students, administrators
> Coordinate training with higher education institutions

84

Disseminate teaching ideas to teachers through channel such as newsletters, teacher-made materials, catalog resources

- <u>Sufficient funding</u> to purchase instructional materials, pay teachers, provide adequate number of classes to meet demand, provide adequate facilities;

- <u>Instruction</u>

  Incorporate computer-assisted instruction
  Emphasize survival language in ESL, while also meeting needs of higher level students
  Provide pre-vocational skills/job training
  Incorporate daily life experiences into reading and math objectives
  Teachers provide individual assistance, vary instructional methods to meet the needs of individuals and the number of individuals
  Use of group activities and allowance for students to study at their own pace in chosen subject areas
  Friendly, relaxed classroom atmosphere
  Use latest, most effective strategies in whole language acquisition

- <u>Instructional materials</u> (e.g., should be current and varied; availability of individualized study materials, multilevel materials; use of audio-visual equipment);

- Offer <u>counseling services</u>, including personal counseling and assistance/guidance for students to move from one educational level to another;

- Develop or expand <u>community linkages</u> with public and private organizations (e.g., industry, public schools, community resources) to maximize outreach through referrals, providing space for classes, and providing volunteers and resources;

- Use <u>volunteers</u> to provide individualized (especially one-to-one) instruction; encourage volunteer efforts; provide technical assistance to local programs to help them recruit, screen, train, place, and retain volunteers;

- <u>Assessment</u> should be ongoing and should guide instruction;

- Programming should be geared to <u>special adult populations</u> (e.g., institutionalized, physically disabled, older adults, mentally retarded);

- Monitor and evaluate local adult education programs to improve programs; and

- <u>Program management</u> (e.g., utilize automated management information system; train new directors to maintain program quality).

Participant Outcomes

- Pride in achievement;

85

102

- Awareness of, interacting successfully in, the community;

- Helping children with school work and activities;

- Motivation, desire to learn;

- Improvement in academic skills (e.g., reading, writing, communication);

- Goals met;

- Seek further schooling;

- Obtain job/better job; and

- Attain citizenship.

Selection of Measures

Evaluation questions were developed for each of nine broad goals identified in the state plan. Specific questions in each goal area were developed by examining extant data in annual performance reports and monitoring guides (which provided a framework for expectations of local programs), and analysis of program applications.

Comprehensive Evaluation of the Statewide Texas Adult Basic
Education Program

Evaluation Overview

This summative and formative evaluation was conducted to assess the effectiveness and impact of the ABE program in Texas and to plan for and suggest improvements. Extensive surveys, open-ended interviews, and on-site observations were conducted to gather data from teachers, students, administrators, state agency personnel, advisory board members, and linkage agencies. A random sample of 350 of the state's 1,800 teachers was surveyed; each teacher was also given six questionnaires to distribute to current and former adult education students; and questionnaires were mailed to a random sample of more than 1,100 community agencies expected to link services with ABE programs. A "naturalistic" evaluation design was developed to be sensitive to the students' views of the program and their reasons for participation.

Measures of Program Quality

Program Context

- Program identification of the hard-to-reach and their major needs and interests; and

- Student characteristics (age, race, sex, program enrollment, educational background, family background).

Program Process and Content

- Program understanding of "stopping out" by students; mechanisms that make it easy for students to return to a program;

- Staff input into program planning;

- Linkages/programmatic ties with other community agencies, especially those serving the same clientele;

- Quality of teaching (e.g., teacher competence in subject matter, turnover rate of teachers, teacher personality traits that enable them to relate to students, dedication and commitment of teaching staff);

- Teacher benefits and recognition (e.g., salary, health insurance, career ladders, recognition of tenure);

- Pre-service and ongoing staff development activities that stress methods useful in working with a mature learner and increased competencies in relating to the adult;

- Recognition of and training for teacher aides;

- Variety of program offerings to meet local needs/priorities; and

87

- Strong supporting relationship with a strong supportive teacher; see adult education as a "human enterprise".

Participant Outcomes

- Increased self-confidence

Selection of Measures

Data collected for the evaluation varied depending on the group interviewed or surveyed. A two-part questionnaire for administrators asked about demographic information on local programs, planning, management, recruitment, instructional staff, linkages, and the instructional program. The teacher questionnaire consisted of 36 items in the areas of personal background, curriculum formation, classroom operations, students, materials, evaluation, facilities, and staff development; the teacher interview protocol contained similar topics, as well as instructional staff, students, planning, management, and linkages. The student questionnaires and interviews contained items related to reasons for participation, personal gains from the program, self-description, and assessments of the instructional staff, facilities, and program. The community agency questionnaire focused on class offerings, perceptions of the need for a local ABE program, extent of past cooperation, evaluation of the success of the local program, and suggestions for improved ABE services to the community in the future.

Evaluation Overview

This report profiles a study completed in 1985 to assess the impact of adult education programs on the lives of completers of a GED or Adult Secondary Diploma, utilizing a sample of 1,000 students who had completed their studies three years earlier (1981). The study examined the impact of these programs on students' lives in four major areas: economic/employment-related issues; responsibility and community involvement; further education; and personal growth. Surveys were returned by 955 students in all areas of the state. A 35-question survey was utilized as well as some case study analysis. This study reflected very favorably on the Texas Adult Education Program. Among some of the conclusions reached: (1) completion of an adult high school or GED Diploma program seemed to enable individuals to find employment and increase earnings; (2) for individuals desiring employment, the adult education experience enabled those with jobs to retain them and assisted most of those who were unemployed to find employment; (3) adult education seems to foster good citizenship, community involvement, and increased parental involvement in children's education; (4) most participants felt they had accomplished their goals in coming to the program.

Measures of Program Quality

This study focused on program outcomes.

Program Outcomes

- Employment Issues
  Pre/post employment/unemployment
  Change in occupational categories (utilized DOT categories)
  Salary changes
  Activities related to employment: use of want ads, increased responsibility, promotions

- Individual Responsibility/Community Involvement
  Voting
  Driver's license
  Citizenship

- Educational Issues
  Involvement in children's education
  Aspirations for children
  Education plans and achievement of adults including training programs

- Personal Growth
  Increased confidence
  Involvement in current events

89

- Program Evaluation
  Program's ability to satisfy needs of students

Selection of Measures

The topics and surveys were developed by an Advisory Committee consisting of a cross section of 27 adult educators from the state and six program staff. This committee included adult education teachers, co-op directors, Regional Service Center personnel, Community College staff, Texas Educational Agency staff, university consultants, and professional research and statistical specialists.

90

107

Evaluation Overview

The work of this evaluation was organized around four areas: program organization and structure, program operation and costs, program participants, and program outcomes. The study involved the following activities: (1) interviews with program administrators and program staff to learn more about the program's objectives, organization, and services; (2) on-site observation of instruction at a sample of program sites; (3) collection of data on program participants, the extent of program participation, and program outcomes; (4) collection of data on program costs; (5) an analysis of program services and program costs; and (6) preparation of a final report that includes recommendations to improve the organization and financing of the adult education program.

A sample of eight schools was chosen for the analysis of the organization and structure of adult education programs, based on availability of all adult education components (ABE, ESL, GED, continuing education), diversity of program size, and representation from all three islands. A survey was sent to program coordinators at each of the eight schools. Information from the surveys was aggregated and analyzed to describe similarities and differences in programs' structure and organization. Data on participant characteristics were extracted from student records at the eight schools and entered into an individual student record database for analysis.

Measures of Program Quality

Program Context

- Characteristics of program participants (age, gender, race, employment status, and citizenship).

Program Process and Content

- Formal program planning process;

- Implementation of a management information system to facilitate program planning and evaluation;

- Program schedules;

- Hours of instruction;

- Student recruitment;

- Number of program staff; teacher/student ratio;

- Education and experience of program staff;

- Methods of class instruction/teaching strategies (e.g., lecture, small group, individualized, computer-assisted instruction);

91

- Curriculum materials;

- Other support services provided by the program;

- Linkages with vocational education and JTPA programs to coordinate basic education with vocational education and job training; and

- Program revenues and expenditures (salaries, fringe benefits, travel, supplies, materials, and equipment).

Participant Outcomes

- Student participation/attendance (measured by hours of attendance); and

- Student academic performance (measured by gains on TABE and completion of GED Tests).

Selection of Measures

Student attendance and academic performance were the two primary indicators chosen to evaluate program success. Students' hours of participation were determined based on class attendance records. Students with permanent record files were matched with students appearing on the class attendance records; these data were entered into a computer database and merged with data from permanent records for analysis. Gains in educational achievement were measured by comparing the test scores on the TABE for all students with both pretest and posttest data on their cumulative record files.

Characteristics of participants were drawn from program records of adults participating in the eight sample schools. Information on program costs was obtained from the survey of program coordinators and budget records provided by adult education coordinators from two of the islands.

92

109

Evaluation Overview

Virginia Commonwealth University conducted a longitudinal, statewide evaluation of ABE programs in Virginia, comparing data collected in 1970, 1978, and 1985. The primary objectives of the evaluation were to appoint a statewide ABE evaluation advisory committee, design and implement a statewide program evaluation, conduct a representative statewide assessment of each school district's ABE students, and conduct a computer analysis of statewide data that were collected. The data from the 1985 evaluation were collected through survey instruments mailed to all state department ABE personnel, local ABE supervisors, learning center coordinators, and ABE counselors, as well as a random sample of paraprofessional ABE personnel, teachers, and students (the overall return was 81 percent). The primarily summative evaluation was modeled after Stake's evaluation design. Instruments used in the study included questionnaires, interview guides, data check sheets, and data summary sheets for each population studied. Evaluation staff, ABE staff, and students participated in the evaluation process.

A long list of recommendations came out of the evaluation, but the consensus of questionnaire and interview responses was that programs made "remarkable progress" despite limited funding. State and local programs are continuing to respond to many of these recommendations. The study is one of few longitudinal studies in adult education and provides a useful documentation of evaluation methodology.

Measures of Program Quality

A selected listing of indicators is as follows:

Program Context

- Procedure for identifying and ranking state funding needs;

- Monitoring procedures and criteria (e.g., periodic ABE supervisor visits to special projects; criteria for assessing satisfactory/unsatisfactory progress; use of separate standardized evaluation design for use with teacher-training activities and special projects);

- Ongoing contact with the public school system to identify high school dropouts for recruitment in ABE programs;

- Establishment of a statewide adult education resource center/clearinghouse to provide technical assistance in student evaluation, materials, equipment selection, program research and evaluation, and other instructional and student services; and

- Characteristics of program participants: age distribution, marital status, racial distribution, income level, home ownership, urbanicity, employment status, mobility, educational attainment, parents' educational attainment, native language, length of time separated from school prior to ABE enrollment, access to transportation, reasons for leaving public school.

Program Process and Content

- State department and local program collaboration in conducting needs assessments to determine interest and demand for the program, especially in non-participating school divisions;

Program Promotion

- Existence of local advisory committee;

- Acceptance and support from the local community (e.g., local school district);

- Cooperation with local community agencies;

- Aggressive recruitment efforts, such as use of community resources and mass media publicity (radio, television); assignment of recruitment duties to specific personnel; targeting populations least served;

Staffing/Training

- Aggressive hiring of blacks and women in supervisory positions (aids student curriculum relevance, recruitment, and retention);

- Requirements for personnel: availability/encouragement of certification endorsement for adult education personnel; master's degree in adult education for full-time ABE personnel; nine hours of graduate coursework in adult education for part-time personnel; endorsement in guidance and/or master's degree for ABE counselors (as conditions of continued ABE employment);

- Full-time teaching positions;

- Employment of support personnel, aides, and counselors to conduct testing, counseling, keep track of student records;

- Annual, statewide staff training plan;

- Availability of a variety of training activities (e.g., independent study, formal courses, workshops, retreats, small group training kits); local ABE supervisors fund and conduct local orientation and training sessions regularly; local program participation in cluster training and regional workshops;

- In-service training on testing and counseling techniques;

- Regularly scheduled staff meetings; regular contact between teachers and supervisors;

94

111

Assessment/Support Services

- Measurement of entry and exit competency levels of students;

- Availability of student personnel services--such as counseling, individual testing, placement, and follow-up--to complement instruction and aid retention;

Program Location/Schedule/Facilities

- Location of classes in adult settings such as community colleges and secondary and vocational-technical schools, rather than elementary schools;

- Classroom facilities include adequate storage space, cabinets, closets; designated private areas for interviewing and counseling;

- Program schedule with summer classes to promote continuity; flexible hours to accommodate student schedules;

- Close awareness of student attendance patterns so that schedules can be changed if needed;

Instruction

- Emphasis on small group instruction rather than lecture format; use of audio-visual presentations and aids, field trips;

- Supplementary instruction on learning skills such as note taking, listening, study habits, learning strategies;

- Opportunity for students to receive literacy and job skills training in the same location or in close proximity; encourage on-site workplace literacy programs;

- Use of adult instructional materials and methods;

Participant Outcomes

- Gains in daily/weekly attendance;

- Reading and math achievement (changes in grade level in relation to time on task; depends in part on student educational level, e.g., beginning reading takes more instructional time than reading improvement);

- Changes in student perceptions of subject difficulty (e.g., reading was ranked as less difficult in 1985 than in 1970, indicating that reading materials and instruction may have improved);

- Current and overall student progress (as rated by program personnel);

95

- Follow-up on participants who are absent frequently or who leave the program.

Selection of Measures

The majority of indicators listed above summarize recommendations for improving ABE programs, based on changes in population characteristics, ABE personnel and student perceptions, and program characteristics charted over the course of the evaluation. Some indicators also represent descriptive data that provide a context for participant needs and program services. The evaluation report provides numerous tables with comparative data on these and other characteristics of programs, teachers, and participants. The significance of many of these indicators, or their relationship to program quality, is unclear.

96

Evaluation Overview

This report profiles an evaluation of participation in Federally funded ABE and GED programs in Washington in 1989. The purpose of the study, which was begun in 1990, was to "provide a descriptive, qualitative analysis of student participation outcomes." The focus of the study was not to evaluate ABE and GED programs, but to examine what effect program participants' said the programs had on their lives. ABE and GED teachers were trained to conduct interviews with a sample of former students from 16 of the state's community college-based ABE programs. Students were identified from a stratified random sample (by race and rurality) of students in the ABE population (not including ESL students) who had completed a minimum of 12 program contact hours; were enrolled in an adult education program during the 1989 quarter but not in the spring quarter of 1989; and left the program for any reason other than injury or illness. Initially, 386 students were targeted for interviews; 293 were eventually included. The overwhelming majority of students who were interviewed indicated that most areas of their lives, particularly in personal growth and development, had improved since they began attending an adult education program.

Measures of Program Quality

Four major areas related to participation outcomes were examined: motivation and achievement, job preparation, personal and family benefits, and program evaluation. Approximately 80 questions were asked related to student goals and outcomes in these areas.

Program Context

● Motivation to attend ABE classes

Program Process and Content

● Student perception of quality of ABE/GED program

Participant Outcomes

● Achieving educational and personal goals;

● Improving reading, math, writing, spelling;

● Improving confidence in ability to use basic skills;

● Obtaining a GED/high school diploma;

● Enrollment in a college or apprenticeship/job training program;

● Competence in basic communication skills;

97

- Competence in functional life skills;

- Increased self-esteem;

- Obtaining a job;

- Increasing earnings/job performance;

- Obtaining a better job;

- Reduction in receipt of public assistance;

- Increased reading of books, magazines, newspapers;

- Generally improved quality of, and satisfaction with, life; and

- Involvement in the community.

Selection of Measures

Desired outcome measures were included in a structured interview instrument, which was developed by project staff, a project advisory committee, and the Washington State Supervisor of Adult Education and Literacy Programs. The evaluation report does not specify how the specific outcome measures were determined, although it appears that, within the four general categories mentioned above, interview designers relied on general assumptions about the relationship between education and personal benefits and the impact of basic communication skills and functional life skills on seeking and finding employment; an interest in learning what motivated adults to enroll in adult education programs and continue their education; and a belief that participants have a "unique perspective on the relative strengths and weaknesses of education programs."

98

Evaluation Overview

The Association for Community Based Education (ACBE) conducted in-depth longitudinal evaluations of nine community-based adult literacy programs. The purpose of the evaluations was to "expand knowledge about community based adult literacy programs" and to "produce rigorous evidence" of the impacts these programs have on participants. In spring 1987, programs were chosen from about 450 literacy providers. ACBE mailed mini-grant announcements to each of these providers, but received only seven applications; of these, three were usable. An additional 14 applications were solicited, using a "convenience sample" reflecting variety in geographical region, racial/ethnic groups, urban vs. rural, years in operation, number served, tutorial vs. group instruction, and curriculum materials used. Each of the final nine programs involved was awarded a $3,000 mini-grant for participation in a year of preliminary activities that began in the fall of 1987, and each was awarded a $5,000 mini-grant for participating in the evaluation the following year.

Measures of Program Quality

Evaluators, with input from the nine programs, selected 10 participant outcomes for measurement:

(1) Reading skills
(2) Writing skills
(3) Math skills
(4) Oral language skills (ESL)
(5) Reading activities outside of class/tutoring
(6) Writing activities outside of class
(7) Fostering of children's intellectual and academic development
(8) Community activities and contributions
(9) Self-esteem
(10) Self-determination

Selection of Measures

ACBE conducted an extensive search to find instruments to measure these 10 outcomes. Staff considered 17 criteria for selecting instruments, including: reliability, validity, suitability for group administration to non-readers and non-writers, content that was familiar and interesting to adults, and relative quickness and ease in administering. Evaluation staff found suitable instruments for only five outcomes; ACBE staff/consultants developed five more. Programs selected four to seven outcomes to measure at their sites. Examples of instruments that were chosen include:

- Adult Basic Learning Examination (ABLE) for reading comprehension and math;

- SRA Reading Index for reading comprehension;

- California Achievement Tests (CAT) for writing skills;

99

- Basic English Skills Test (BEST) for oral English proficiency of ESL learners; and

- Culture-Free Self Esteem Inventory.

ACBE developed instruments to measure outcomes for which well-developed or widely used instruments were either unavailable or insufficient for the purposes of the study. These outcomes were outside reading and writing activities, fostering children's academic and intellectual development, community involvement, and self-determination. ACBE staff visited programs three times (fall, winter, spring) and measured outcomes each time (pre- mid-, and post-tests). Outcomes varied at the different sites.

ACBE conducted an analysis to find predictors of dropout and gains, but found no strong predictors. The report suggests the following activities for future evaluations: refine and extend ACBE "psychometric" process; use case studies or ethnographic studies also; give technical and financial assistance to local programs so staff can develop and implement their own evaluation process and so learners can develop/use self-assessment and participatory research processes.

·

Evaluation Overview

The national study examined literacy programs in six settings: states and LEAs, employment and training, community based, corrections, military, and postsecondary. A total of 335 programs were nominated to be studied, based on programs known for success in recruitment, retention, and "results"; and based on a "holistic programmatic view" of eight program components. The survey design involved mailing a letter, survey, checklist of materials, envelope, stamps, and postcard to each nominee (225 of 335 were returned and 213 were analyzed on computer). The survey contained questions about program statistics, learner demographics, program operations, program components, retention, indicators of success, and instructional materials.

Measures of Program Quality

Programs are considered to be effective when they operate by some or all of the following principles or mechanisms:

Program Context

- Clarity about the overall goal and philosophy of instruction; defined program goals and objectives;

Program Process and Content

- Goals are developed for every program component to determine effectiveness in meeting them;

- Utilize targeted radio and TV advertisements;

- Intake--program staff help potential learners determine if a program is well-suited to their goals; important to personalize and individualize the process, motivate students, clarify needs and goals, make appropriate placements, and put them at ease; careful diagnosis of individual learner needs and development of individually tailored learning plans;

- Learning objectives are tied to instructional methods, materials, and assessment strategies;

- Procedures are in place for making students' goals a benchmark of success (translate into concrete skills, areas of knowledge, curricular strategies); testing procedure or instrument appropriate to verification of students' goals and combined with other means of assessment;

- Programs provide frequent feedback to learners on progress and carefully document the process;

101

- Instruction utilizes relevant, meaningful materials;

- Evaluation--evaluate program effectiveness frequently in meeting goals in each of the component areas and use data to improve the program; develop evaluation expertise; design formative and summative evaluation instruments to measure program goals; create and implement unified system for collecting, analyzing, and using data for program improvement; and

- Counseling--develop personal relationship with adults, use different counseling options, explore alternative support systems, train staff in counseling techniques; all staff play a part: trained counselors, support staff, teachers, other students; important to ask how structure of counseling delivery suits learner needs.

Participant Outcomes

- Intended learning outcomes and standards for judging success in achieving those outcomes are explicit; and

- Follow-up--short- and long-term follow-up needs to involve: good rapport with students so staff know what is going on in their lives; updated, accurate files on students to help facilitate tracking of students; long-term follow-up procedure geared toward getting information about program's long-term impact on students.

Selection of Measures

Measures of program effectiveness were culled from survey responses and interviews at selected sites. The measures were categorized into eight broad program components:

- Recruitment;

- Orientation (present potential participant with overview of educational tracks, counseling, support systems, choice of instructors or classes, special program features, instructional modes, flexible scheduling, materials, locations);

- Counseling;

- Diagnostic testing;

- Instructional methods and materials;

- Assessment of learners;

- Follow-up; and

- Program evaluation (formal record keeping and internal monitoring of program operation).

119

Evaluation Overview

Sticht's paper expands on evaluation issues outlined in the rules and regulations for the National Workplace Literacy Program (NWLP). The paper summarizes the Federal Regulations criteria for well-designed workplace literacy programs and provides a framework with which programs can use these criteria to "meet the requirements of the rules and regulations governing the NWLP so that the Department of Education can determine the value of programs."

Measures of Program Quality

Program Context

- Defines roles of partners; demonstrates active participation of all partners; and

- Targets adults with inadequate skills aimed at new employment, career advancement, or increased productivity.

Program Process and Content

- Documents/demonstrates need for workplace literacy program;

- Defines/outlines activities, measurable objectives based on overall goals;

- Collects data that can be used for program improvement, data that shows cost benefits;

- Provides training through an educational agency;

- Uses curriculum materials designed for adults that reflect the needs of the workplace;

- Measures literacy abilities through and pre- and post-assessment; measurement of literacy abilities should reflect content of what is being taught;

- Utilizes and provide evidence of experienced, qualified staff; and

- Shows strong relationship between skills taught and literacy requirements of actual jobs.

Participant Outcomes

- Improved workforce literacy abilities and improved productivity

  Converse better with co-workers
  Read and write job materials better
  Know more about the job, workplace, community

103

Perform job tasks better
Get to work on time more
Make use of employee benefits more appropriately
Contribute more to team efforts
Job retention
Job advancement

Selection of Measures

Criteria for well-designed workplace literacy programs are drawn from the regulations for the NWLP. These criteria are used to illustrate how criteria for evaluating proposals for the NWLP can be used to report evaluations of programs. Evaluators are cautioned when trying to link literacy development and job productivity. Sticht indicates, "Unless a direct relationship to some indicator of productivity can be demonstrated in the design of the program, the program developer should not promise to improve that aspect of job productivity." However, literacy developments may have an indirect effect; for example, if access to education programs helps to boost employee morale, indicators of productivity such as increased attendance, less tardiness, and improved teamwork may improve.

Evaluation Overview

In this draft paper presented to the Work in America Institute in 1990, Mikulecky and D'Adamo-Weinstein provide a review of recent evaluations of workplace literacy projects. Evaluations of a variety of manufacturing, military, and hospital programs are profiled, including Polaroid, Planters Peanuts, R.J. Reynolds, the U.S. Navy, Rockwell International, Onan Corporation, Texas Instruments, and Philadelphia Hospital and Health Care. The evaluation designs vary, but reveal that evaluation data on program effectiveness are limited, and information on cost effectiveness is unavailable.

Measures of Program Quality

Program Process and Content

- Company support for workplace literacy programs;

- Demand expressed for workplace literacy programs: number of employees enrolled, waiting to enroll; and

- Flexibility in modifying decisions to meet student needs.

Participant Outcomes

- Obtain a GED diploma;

- Pre- and post-test scores on reading skills;

- Anecdotal reports of participant progress, informal feedback from participants, employers, instructors, supervisors;

- Improved union-management relations;

- Ability to summarize job materials in their own words;

- Becoming eligible for promotion; and

- Becoming "better citizens of the community."

In addition to these elements pulled from the evaluations, the review notes goals, resources, and learning methods where programs have revealed inadequacies:

- Evaluation feedback during the planning stages of a workplace literacy program so that planners and participants can clarify goals;

- Sufficient learner time to practice literacy, accomplish goals;

105

122

- Hiring instructors with knowledge of basic skills instruction, as well as some knowledge or expertise about workplace literacy program development;

- Providing feedback on learner accomplishments; and

- Availability of materials (or resources to develop them) that match the workplace literacy goals.

Selection of Measures

Mikulecky and D'Adamo note that a variety of workplace literacy program reports cite their programs as being "exemplary" or "effective," but for the most part lack the data to support such assessments. Instead, most evidence for participant gains in these evaluations is based on anecdotal reports from workers, supervisors, and instructors. Examples of tests used to measure participant gains include the TABE, ABLE, instructor tests, and employment performance tests. Noting the absence of outcome data, the authors present a model for programs to provide summative and formative evaluation, evidence of goal attainment, and evaluation feedback through interviews, analysis of memos and planning documents, and program observations.

APPENDIX B

FUNDING CRITERIA SUMMARIES

Summary of Process

Alaska utilizes a numerical rating system to review applications for ABE/JOBS Coordinated Funding as well as for its teacher training programs for regular ABE/JOBS programs and those in correctional institutions. LEAs, postsecondary institutions, CBOs and private training organizations (including profit making) are eligible recipients for funding.

Criteria Reviewed

Needs Assessment

- Documented need
- Use of supporting demographic data

Program Activities

- Numbers of students, sites, hours of instruction*
- ABE program requirements (80 percent of students must have skill levels below 8th grade upon entry)

Instructional Design

- Life coping curriculum
- Services to handicapped

Assessment/counseling services

- Child care and transportation availability

Recruitment and Retention Strategies

- Open entry/open exit programming

Coordination of Programming Services

- Letters of agreement outlining coordinated services, not just letters of support
- Broad based advisory councils/citizen planning sessions
- JOBS services support

*Not necessary in teacher training applications

125

Summary of Process

Arizona gives first priority for funding to programs which have had projects in operation in the previous year and have met all their project objectives; second priority goes to programs which have been in operation but have met minimum project requirements; and a third priority focuses on expansion of new programs. Project funding is based on $150 per student enrolled for 125 hours of instruction. Cost effectiveness is an important criteria for program funding. Projects are reviewed by the Adult Education Project Review Committee. Federal funds are primarily used to support least educated populations and programs with a minimum of 20 students per class. Funding is also available to programs which enroll less than 20 per class, but these programs are a second priority. All activities described in the proposal must be supportive of the Arizona State Plan for Adult Education.

Criteria Reviewed

Meets State and Federal Rules and Regulations

Needs Assessment

- Provides activities to meet needs of local populations
- Supports State plan objectives
- Reaches least educated, most in need

Coordination and Multiple Funding Support

- Demonstrates resource sharing with JTPA, Title XX
- Business and other governmental agencies
- Focus on employability skills

Outreach Efforts

- Promotional program appropriate to population
- Flexible scheduling and convenient locations
- Availability of child care services

Program Activities

- Student tracking system

Evaluation System for Teacher and Students

109

Staff Development Plan

- Required Adult Education Certificate for teachers

Budget Feasibility

127

Colorado
Evaluation of ABE Proposals

Summary of Process

Colorado utilizes a formal proposal review process which recommends full funding, partial funding or disapproval. Maximum points accrued: 100.

Criteria Reviewed

Needs Assessment (10 points)

- Focus on special populations
- Multiple service sites
- Statistical data provided

Instructional Program (30 points)

- Identification of structure (homebound, tutorial, class)
- Measurable and attainable goals supportive of State Plan
- Objectives support needs assessment
- Evaluation instruments described and appropriate to program objectives
- Goals reflect improvement, expansion and innovation

Program Plans Relating to Administrative Structure (10 points)

- Staff development
- Recruitment of volunteers
- Accurate record keeping

Staff Development Activities (15 points)

- Plans for pre- and in-service training of professionals and volunteers

Outreach Efforts (10 points)

- Promotional system
- Flexible scheduling and appropriate locations

Cooperative Arrangements (15 points)

- Evidence of planning, support and commitment from cooperating agencies

Budget including Supplemental Funding (5 points)

Previous Experience of Applicant (5 points)

111

128

Summary of Process

Delaware has developed a numerical rating scale which staff of the State Education Agency utilizes to determine funding eligibility. Preference is given to those applicants who have demonstrated or can demonstrate a capability to recruit, train and serve educationally disadvantaged adults. Criteria reflect issues of need, capability and commitment to serve most in need, program design, effectiveness of applicant in providing services, community coordination and evaluative processes.

Criteria Reviewed

Assessment of Need (5 points)

Measurable Objectives Relating to Priority Areas of Service (5 points)

Personnel Qualifications (10 points)

Staff Development Plan (10 points)

Recruitment Plan (15 points)

- Numbers of students to be served
- Ability to recruit educationally disadvantaged
- Met recruitment goals from previous year

Instructional Program (15 points)

- Use of student learning plan
- Use of diagnostic/prescriptive approach
- 100 hours plus student instruction
- Use of appropriate assessment system

Retention Plan (15 points)

Coordination Activities (10 points)

Student Outcomes/Evaluation Plan (10 points)

Budget Plan (5 points)

112

Criteria for Funding of ABE/ASE Programs

Summary of Process

Applications for program funding are reviewed by state personnel staff and members of the State Advisory Council. An evaluation checklist is included in the Iowa State Plan. No information as to rationale for these criteria or value attached to each was included.

Criteria Reviewed

- Staff development activities
- Facilities and locations of programs
- Hours of services
- Progress in meeting objectives and expanding on them from year to year

113

Kansas
Criteria for Evaluation of ABE Program Applications

Summary of Process

A formal checklist is utilized with yes/no columns. No relative values are indicated for these criteria, nor is there indication of the rationale for selecting these criteria.

Criteria Reviewed

Needs Assessment Data

- Program emphasis: ABE/ASE/training related
- Targeted areas: rural, urban, high unemployment
- Handicapped, homeless, etc.

Program Activities

- Flexible schedules
- Convenient locations
- Availability of support services
- Reflects State adult education priorities

Program Implementation

- Activities geared to identified needs
- Goals and objectives that support expansion of services

Program Planning

- Ongoing consultation and coordination with other agencies in planning, service delivery

Resources

- Adequacy of other sources of support to meet program requirements

Summary of Process

Maine provides a worksheet with values attached to various areas of the project proposal for review. No indication is given as to who does the reviewing, or rationale for criteria selected. Total numerical value to be attained in 100 points; no cutoff is provided.

Criteria Reviewed

Needs Assessment (10 points)

- Use of demographic information
- Attention to special needs (instructional services and support services to support client population)

Program Planning/Cooperative Arrangements (8 points)

- Clear planning process
- Demonstrated involvement of other agencies
- Relationship of ABE to other social services

Program Objectives (50 points)

- Clear, measurable objectives
- Numbers, geographic area to be served
- Service to least educated and special populations including homeless, incarcerated
- Activities and time schedule sufficient to accomplish program goals
- Flexible scheduling and appropriate locations for activities
- Use of assessment and diagnosis for placement
- Individualization of instruction
- Counseling, referral and placement services available
- Provision for outreach, continuous recruitment and open enrollment

Staffing (8 points)

- Qualified staff available

Evaluation (10 points)

- Process described

Facilities and Materials (4 points)

- Accessibility for handicapped

115

Budget (10 points)

- Complete submission, including local resources and requirement that 95% of grant be used for instructional purposes

133

Maryland
Funding Criteria for ABE Program Grants
For LEAs and Community Colleges

Summary of Process

Maryland requires written narratives focused on the following areas: measurable objectives based on priorities in Maryland's State Plan for Adult Education, operational plan, key personnel, with particular attention to changes in staffing and the program's response to any evaluation recommendations made by the State in the previous year. This process is utilized for programs which have approved multi-year plans. Proposals must demonstrate State's commitment to reaching adult populations most in need of, and least likely to participate, in adult education and must demonstrate coordination of resources and services.

Criteria Reviewed

Measurable Objectives (30 points)

- Numbers to be served
- Outcomes anticipated
- Specified areas of priority and recruitment

Operational Plan (30 points)

- Location and schedules of programs
- Total hours of instruction
- Instructional designs
- Recruitment plans

Personnel (10 points)

Implementation of Evaluation Recommendation (15 points)

Annual Budget and Cost Effectiveness (15 points)

Summary of Process

A formalized review form is utilized by the Montana Department of Public Instruction. Up to 100 points may be awarded to each proposal. Two individuals (one of whom may be an adult education specialist) are asked to review and rate proposals. This process is utilized for ABE program grants, teacher training projected and other special project applications. No information is provided as to a cut-off point at which a proposal is not acceptable, nor is any rationale provided for the selection of criteria.

Criteria Reviewed

Statement of Need (22 points)

- Local demographics included
- Coordination with needs of business/industry in area
- Mutual cooperation with other appropriate agencies
- Statement clear and concise

Objectives of Plan (23 points)

- Number of participants
- Descriptions of programs
- Description of program impact on participants

Activities Supporting Program Objectives (10 points)

- Description of activities
- Description of data collection process
- Evaluation relevant to objectives
- Quantifiable measures

Evaluation Plan (23 points)

- Number of participants
- Descriptions of programs
- Description of program impact on participants

Outreach Efforts (10 points)

- Advertising plan in place with formal and informal methods to reach public
- Focus on adults with lowest academic levels

Budget and Narrative Information (20 points)

- Budget supportive of objectives
- Local match identified
- Budget reflective of population density and supportive for satellite programs

Summary of Process

Oklahoma utilizes a checklist to evaluate funding proposals for general ABE/ASE programs, ABE Special Projects and Teacher Training Grants. The value assigned to each of the applicable criteria is determined by the State. No information was provided as to relative value of the following criteria nor rationale for how they were selected.

Criteria Reviewed

General Criteria for All Proposals

- Clearly stated objectives
- Sound operational plan
- Activities are relevant and necessary
- Qualified personnel
- Adequate facilities and resources to carry out plan
- Adequate evaluation provisions to determine program effectiveness

Special Projects

- Innovative methods, systems and materials
- Cooperative efforts with other Federal, State or local programs, business, industry, labor to promote coordinated activities and eliminate duplicative efforts
- Addresses critical educational needs
- Development of concepts, techniques and practices which are transferable
- Will strengthen adult education state delivery system

Teacher Training Grants

- Supports State Plan objectives for staff development activities
- Utilizes innovative methods, systems, materials or program
- Supports local needs
- Addresses critical training needs identified at national or state level
- Provides for program evaluation
- Supports other demonstration projects in geographic area
- Coordinates with other state staff development efforts
- Coordinates with other Federal assisted programs, including cooperative efforts with business and labor
- Includes eligibility criteria for participation

Wisconsin
Criteria for Review of ABE Project Applications

Summary of Process

Wisconsin utilizes a numerical rating scale for review, (maximum of 100) with ranges from 17 - 20, Excellent; 13 - 16, Very Good; 8 - 12, Good; 4 - 7, Fair; and 1 - 3, Poor. A rating of excellent implies that all requirement for the program have been exceeded; very good implies that all program requirements have been met; good indicates that most of the program goals could be accomplished; fair indicates inadequacies in several areas and a rating of poor indicates deficiencies in many program areas and a decision that the proposal is incapable of accomplishing the program objectives. No indication is given as to who does the evaluating or the rationale for the criteria selected.

Criteria Reviewed

Needs Assessment (20 points)

- Documented need
- Use of supporting data

Coordination and Multiple Funding Support (15 points)

- Identification of other sources and purposes of funding
- Evidence of collaborative planning/coordination of services
- Identification of services to minorities and handicapped students and discussion of transition services into vocational programs (Wisconsin's program is managed by the Vo-Tech Post-Secondary System)
- Measurable short and long term goals
- Plan reflects recommendations of state agency review team

Program Activities (30 points)

- Activities support needs identified
- Specified numbers of participants
- Adequate staffing
- Budget is reflective of program activities

Evaluation Activities (15 points)

- Evaluation process designed to measure impact
- Appropriate use of staff, participants, administrators and advisory committee members for evaluation
- Adequate provision for participant data collection

121

Program Scheduling (5 points)

- Adequate and logical sequence for program activities

Budget (15 points)

- Figures adequate and reasonable for program activities

Additional States

The following states indicated their criteria for funding as follows:

Alabama

- Numbers of students served
- Services to distinct populations (low-level, rural)

New Hampshire

- Program goals
- Planning and coordination
- Numbers of students served
- Instructional time frame
- Budget/Cost-effectiveness
- Staff qualifications
- Support services

Idaho

- Numbers of clients served - ABE/ASE
- Outreach efforts
- Needs assessment
- Program planning
- Measurable goals and objectives
- Staff qualifications
- Inservice training plan
- Evaluation component

Oregon

- Goals and objectives supporting state goals
- Numbers of clients served

Tennessee

- Coordination/linkages with other programs
- Past experience in delivery services
- Accountability for use of funds
- Staff Qualifications
- Commitment to state goals
- Measurable goals and objectives