



**IOWA'S ADULT LITERACY PROGRAM**

**BENCHMARK  
PROJECTION  
REPORT**

Iowa Department  
of Education

**Program Year 2007  
July 1, 2006– June 30, 2007**

**IOWA'S**  
**ADULT LITERACY PROGRAM**

BENCHMARK  
PROJECTION  
REPORT

**Iowa Department of Education**  
**Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Preparation**

**Program Year 2007**  
**July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007**

The report was written and produced by the Iowa Department of Education. No official endorsement by any other agency or organization should be inferred. This document may be downloaded from the Iowa Literacy Resource Center's (ILRC) website located at <http://www.readiowa.org>. Proper credit for citation purposes should be given in accordance with accepted publishing standards.

**State of Iowa**  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, Iowa  
50319-0146

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

Gene E. Vincent, President, Carroll  
Sally J. Frudden, Vice President, Charles City  
Charles C. Edwards, Jr. Des Moines  
Sister Jude Fitzpatrick, Davenport  
Rosie Hussey, Mason City  
Wayne Kobberdahl, Council Bluffs  
Gregory McClain, Cedar Falls  
Mary Jean Montgomery, Spencer  
Max Phillips, Woodward  
Tara Richards (Student Member), Indianola

**ADMINISTRATION**

Judy Jeffrey, Director and Executive Officer  
of the State Board of Education  
Gail Sullivan, Chief of Staff

**DIVISION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES  
AND WORKFORCE PREPARATION**

Janice Nahra Friedel, Ph.D., Administrator

**Bureau of Community Colleges and Career & Technical Education**

Beverly Bunker, Bureau Chief  
John Hartwig, Consultant  
Helene Grossman, Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, disability, religion, creed, age or marital status in its programs or employment practices. If you have questions or grievances related to this policy, please contact Chief, Bureau of Administration and School Improvement Services, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146, (515) 281-5811.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Benchmark Levels For Program Year 2006	
<b>HISTORY AND OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL REPORTING SYSTEM.....</b>	<b>2</b>
History Of The NRS .....	2
<b>OVERVIEW OF THE NRS MEASURES AND METHODS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
NRS Measures.....	3
Core Outcome Measures.....	4
<b>BENCHMARK PROJECTION ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>OBSERVATIONS .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>APPENDIX A – ADULT LITERACY STAFF DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PROGRAM YEAR 2007 .....</b>	<b>31</b>

### LIST OF EXHIBITS AND TABLES

#### Exhibits

Exhibit 1	Goals And Core Indicators Of The Adult Education And Family Literacy Act And NRS Core Outcome Measures .....	4
Exhibit 2	Relationship Among Instructional Programs And Educational Functioning Levels.....	5

#### Tables

Table 1	Comparison Of Pre-Post Assessment Benchmark Percentage Levels For Iowa And Iowa’s Community College Adult Literacy Program By Major Instructional Program And GED Pass Rate .....	6
Table 2	Comparison Of National Reporting System Benchmark Percentage Levels For Iowa And Iowa’s Community College Adult Literacy Program For The Educational Gains Core Measures By Educational Functioning Level And The Follow-Up Core Measures .....	7
Table 3	Comparison Of Percentage Increase For Iowa’s Basic Skill Certification Program For Iowa And Iowa’s Community College Adult Literacy Program.....	8
Table 4	Analysis Of Iowa’s Community College Benchmark Projections Percentage Range For The Federal Core Performance Measures For Program Year 2007 .....	9
Table 5	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For Pre-Post Assessment – Adult Basic Education .....	10
Table 6	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For Pre-Post Assessment – English Literacy .....	11
Table 7	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For Pre-Post Assessment – Adult Secondary Education .....	12
Table 8	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks – ABE Beginning Literacy.....	13
Table 9	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks – ABE Beginning Basic.....	14

Table 10	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks – ABE Intermed. Low .....	15
Table 11	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks – ABE Intermed. High .....	16
Table 12	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks – ASE Low.....	17
Table 13	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks – EL Beg. Literacy.....	18
Table 14	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks – EL Beginning.....	19
Table 15	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks – EL Intermed. Low .....	20
Table 16	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks – EL Intermed. High .....	21
Table 17	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks – EL Low Adv. ....	22
Table 18	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For The Follow-Up Benchmarks – Entered Employment .....	23
Table 19	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For The Follow-Up Benchmarks – Retained Employment.....	24
Table 20	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For The Follow-Up Benchmarks – Obtained A GED Or Secondary School Diploma.....	25
Table 21	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For The Follow-Up Benchmarks – Entered Postsecondary Education or Training .....	26
Table 22	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For Iowa’s GED Pass Rate ....	27
Table 23	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007 For Iowa’s Basic Skills Certification Program .....	28

## INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The purpose of this publication is to present Iowa's adult literacy program approved projected benchmark percentage levels for Program Year 2006 (July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006). The passage of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998 [Public Law 105-220] by the 105<sup>th</sup> Congress has ushered in a new era of collaboration, coordination, cooperation and accountability. The overall goal of the Act is "to increase the employment, retention, and earnings of participants, and increase occupational skill attainment by participants, and, as a result improve the quality of the workforce, reduce welfare dependency, and enhance the productivity and competitiveness of the Nation." The key principles inculcated in the Act are:

- Streamlining services;
- Empowering individuals;
- Universal access;
- Increased accountability;
- New roles for local boards;
- State and local flexibility;
- Improved youth programs.

The purpose of Title II, The Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, is to create a partnership among the Federal government, states, and localities to provide, on a voluntary basis, adult basic education and literacy services in order to:

- Assist adults to become literate and obtain the knowledge and skills necessary for employment and self-sufficiency;
- Assist adults who are parents obtain the educational skills necessary to become full partners in the educational development of their children;
- Assist adults in the completion of a secondary school education.

One of the major intents of AEFLA was to establish performance measures and benchmarks to demonstrate increased accountability in line with the major goals and objectives of WIA. Section 212(2)(A) of the Act specifies that each eligible agency (i.e. The Iowa Department of Education and local grant recipients) is subject to certain core indicators of performance and has the authority to specify additional indicators. The core Federally mandated and Iowa indicators are:

- Demonstrated improvement in literacy skill levels in reading, writing, and speaking the English language, numeracy, problem solving, English language acquisition, and other literacy skills;
- Placement in, retention in, or completion of postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment or career advancement;
- Receipt of an [adult] secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent [Iowa High School Equivalency Diploma];
- Receipt of a basic literacy skills certificate in the subject areas of: (1) Reading, (2) Mathematics, and (3) Writing.

### **Benchmark Levels for Program Year 2006**

The Iowa basic skills core benchmark percentage levels for Program Year 2007 were established: (1) utilizing the Adult Education Performance Review ACT (GPRA) indicator model disseminated by the U.S. Department of Education: Division of Adult Education and Literacy (USDE:DAEL), (2) an analysis of benchmark attainment for Program Years 2001 through 2005 (July 1, 2000 – June 30, 2006 and (3) benchmark projections for Program Year 2006 (July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006).

# **HISTORY AND OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL REPORTING SYSTEM**

The National Reporting System (NRS) is a project to develop an accountability system for the Federally funded adult literacy program. This system includes a set of student measures to allow assessment of the impact of adult basic education instruction, methodologies for collecting the measures, reporting forms and procedures, and training and technical assistance activities to assist states in collecting the measures.

## **History Of The NRS**

The NRS was born in the 1990s, a decade known for its emphasis on accountability of Federal programs. During this time, all publicly funded programs and agencies faced increasing pressures to demonstrate that they have met their legislative goals and have an impact on their client populations. The requirement to demonstrate program impact was mandated in 1993 through the Government Performance and Review Act (GPRA). GPRA required all Federal agencies to develop strategic plans to ensure that services were delivered efficiently and in a manner that best suits client needs, and to develop indicators of performance to demonstrate their agency's impact.

In 1995, the U.S. Congress considered eliminating adult basic education as a separate delivery system by integrating the program into a general system of workforce development. Strong and convincing data on the impact of adult basic education at the state and federal levels were demanded to demonstrate its importance as a separate education program. Similar demands were raised at the state level. In response to these demands, the state directors of adult basic education asked the Division of Adult Education and Literacy (DAEL) to work toward developing a national system for collecting information on adult basic education student outcomes.

To meet this request, DAEL devoted its March 1996 national meeting of state directors of adult education to developing a framework for program accountability. This framework specified the purposes of the adult literacy program, the essential characteristics of an accountability system and identified seven categories of outcome measures. At the March 1997 DAEL national meeting, a broad group of adult basic education stakeholders validated the framework, identified outcome measures for a new national reporting system, and discussed possible methodologies for the system. Based on these decisions, the NRS was designed and formally began in October 1997.

The proposed voluntary nature of the NRS changed in August 1998, when the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act within the Workforce Investment Act became law. This Act established accountability requirements, including that states develop outcome-based performance standards for adult literacy programs, as one means of determining program effectiveness. The NRS mandate was then expanded to establish the measures and methods to conform to the Workforce Investment Act requirements.

## **OVERVIEW OF THE NRS MEASURES AND METHODS**

The outcome from the first two phases of the NRS project was the development of measurement definitions, methodologies and reporting formats for the NRS, which become effective beginning with Program Year 2001. The pilot phase also produced an overall framework of NRS operation at the local, state and Federal levels.



## NRS Measures

The *requirements of WIA, consensus* among the stakeholders and advisory board members, and the *need for uniform valid and reliable data* were major factors guiding development of NRS measures. Other factors affecting development of the measures included the need to *accommodate the diversity* of the adult basic education delivery system and the need for *compatibility of the definitions* with related adult literacy and training programs.

As a state-administered program, the nature of adult literacy service delivery varies widely across states in its goals, objectives and the resources available to states to collect and report data. It is especially important that the definitions for outcome measures be broad enough to accommodate these differences, yet concrete and standardized sufficiently to allow the NRS to establish a uniform, national database. Similarly, other adult education, employment and training programs with which adult literacy programs cooperate and coordinate have systems of accountability and outcome measures.

To ensure this accommodation to the diverse delivery system and compatibility with related systems, NRS staff conducted a thorough review of measure definitions planned or in use currently by all states and all Federal employment and training programs. To identify state measures used, for example, NRS staff conducted an evaluability assessment of all states in early 1998 and obtained copies of measure definitions from states that had their own measures. In addition, NRS staff reviewed the existing measure definitions used for DAEL's Annual Statistical Performance Report and measures and definitions utilized by the U. S. Department of Education for Title I of WIA.

The NRS includes two types of measures: (1) core, and (2) secondary. The core measures apply to all adult literacy students receiving 12 or more hours of service. There are three types of core measures:

- **Outcome measures**, which include educational gain, entered employment, retained employment, receipt of secondary school diploma or GED and placement in postsecondary education or training;
- **Descriptive measures**, which include student demographics, reasons for attending and student status; and
- **Participation measures**, which include instructional contact hours and enrollment in instructional programs for special populations or topics (such as family literacy or workplace literacy).

Performance standards required by WIA were then established for the core outcome measures and awarding of Federal incentive grants were tied to these performance standards.

The NRS secondary measures include additional outcome measures related to employment, family and community that adult literacy education stakeholders believe are important to understanding and evaluating adult literacy programs. States are not required to report on the secondary measures and there are no performance standards tied to them. The optional secondary measures will not be used as a basis for incentive grant awards. There are also secondary student status measures that define target populations identified in WIA. These measures are provided for states that want to report on the services provided to these populations.

## Core Outcome Measures

The central measures of the NRS are the student *outcome* measures. While by no means the only measures that could be used to evaluate adult literacy programs, the outcome measures selected represent what a broad consensus of adult literacy educators believe are appropriate for providing a national picture of the performance of the program. The multi-year process employed by the NRS to identify and define the measures included input from state directors of adult education, Federal education officials, local education providers, representatives of volunteer literacy organizations and experts in performance accountability systems.

The five NRS core outcome measures were selected to address the requirements for core indicators of performance delineated in the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act. **Exhibit 1** shows how the measures relate to these requirements and goals for adult literacy programs stated in the legislation.

### Exhibit 1

#### Goals And Core Indicators Of The Adult Education And Family Literacy Act And NRS Core Outcome Measures

Goals of Adult Basic Education Described in the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act of WIA	<i>Core Indicators</i> Required by the Adult Education and Family	Literacy Act of WIA National Reporting System <i>Core Outcome Measures</i>
Assist adults to become literate and obtain the knowledge and skills necessary for employment and self-sufficiency.	Improvements in literacy skill levels in reading, writing and speaking the English language, numeracy, problem-solving, English language acquisition, other literacy skills.	❖ Educational gains (achieve skills to advance educational functioning level)
Assist parents to obtain the skills necessary to be full partners in their children's educational development. Placement in, retention in, or completion of, postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment or career advancement.	Placement in, retention in, or completion of, postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment or career advancement.	❖ Entered employment ❖ Retained employment ❖ Placement in postsecondary education or training
Assist adults in the completion of secondary school education.	Receipt of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent.	❖ Receipt of a secondary school diploma or pass GED tests.

Educational gain, a key outcome in the NRS, provides a measure of adult literacy gains resulting from instruction. This measure applies to all students in the program (except pre-designated "work-based project learners"). To determine this measure, local programs assess students on intake to determine their *educational functioning level*. There are four levels for adult basic education (ABE), one for adult secondary education (ASE) and six levels of English Literacy students (EL). Each level describes a set of skills and competencies that students entering at any given level can perform in the areas of reading, writing, numeracy, speaking, listening, functional and workplace areas. Using these descriptors as guidelines, programs determine the appropriate initial level in

which to place students using a standardized assessment procedure (a test or performance-based assessment). The program decides the skill areas in which to assess the student, based on the student's instructional needs and goals.

**Exhibit 2** depicts the relationship among the three major instructional programs and the educational functioning levels within each major program. The educational functioning levels describe the learner's entry level ability in the areas of reading, writing, numeracy and functional workplace skills. The exhibit reflects the revised NRS Educational Functioning Levels for the English Literacy instructional program.

## Exhibit 2

### Relationship Among Instructional Programs And Educational Functional Levels

Instructional Program	Educational Functioning Level	CASAS Level	CASAS Standard Score Range
<b>Adult Basic Education (ABE)</b>	ABE Beginning Literacy	Level A	Under 200
	ABE Beginning Basic Education	Level B	201 to 210
	ABE Intermediate Low	Level B	211 to 220
	ABE Intermediate High	Level C	221 to 235
<b>Adult Secondary Education (ASE)</b>	ASE Low	Level D	236 to 245
	ASE High	Level E	246 and Above
<b>English Literacy:</b>	Beginning ESL Literacy	Level A	165 to 180
	Low Beginning ESL	Level A	181 to 190
	High Beginning ESL	Level A	191 to 200
	Low Intermediate ESL	Level B	201 to 210
	High Intermediate ESL	Level B	211 to 220
	Advanced ESL	Level C	221 to 235

After a pre-determined amount of instruction or time period determined by each state, the program conducts follow-up assessments of students in the same skill areas and uses the functioning level descriptors to determine whether the student has advanced one or more levels or is progressing within the same level. The state has discretion to establish the student assessment method used within the state, as well as procedures for progress assessment. Iowa utilizes the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment (CASAS) as the statewide standardized assessment system. States may also use additional educational levels and skill area descriptors, as long as they are compatible with NRS levels and skills. **Tables 5-7** display the pre-post assessment approved benchmark levels for the three adult literacy instructional programs. **Tables 8-17** display the approved benchmark levels for the educational instructional gain categories. The tables reflect both the community college and state approved benchmark percentage levels.

The remaining core outcome measures are *follow-up* measures, reported some time after the student leaves the program. However, the follow-up measures apply only to students who enter the program with goals related to the measures. For unemployed students who enter the program with a goal of obtaining employment, there are two measures: (1) entered employment—whether the

student obtained a job by the end of the first quarter after leaving; and (2) retained employment—whether the student still has the job in the third quarter after exit. This measure also applies to employed students who have a goal of improved or retained employment. For students whose goal is to advance to further education or training, there is a measure of entry into another such program. For students who entered with a goal of obtaining a secondary school diploma or passing the GED tests, there is a measure of whether the student obtained the credential. **Tables 18-21** display the approved benchmark percentage levels for the program follow-up categories. The tables reflect both the community college and state approved benchmark percentage levels. **Table 22** displays the projected increase in the state GED percentage pass rate.

## BENCHMARK PROJECTION ANALYSIS

The purpose of this section of the report is to present an analysis of the projected benchmark trends. Given that Program Year 2007 marks the fourth year that Iowa's adult basic education local programs projected benchmark percentage completion levels for the state and Federally mandated benchmarks, the analysis is designed to identify statistical trends that can be utilized to refine benchmark projections in succeeding years. The following factors were utilized in establishing Program Year 2007 benchmark projections: (1) benchmark attainment percentage levels for Program Years 2001-2005, (2) benchmark projection percentage levels for Program Year 2006 and (3) local adult literacy program goals and instructional strategies. Given the continuous improvement language contained in AEFLA, a general goal is to establish benchmark percentages at a higher level year each year. Therefore, **Tables 1 through 4** provide an overall analysis of the national, state and local ABE program benchmark projections for Program Year 2007.

**Table 1** depicts a comparison of pre-post assessment percentage levels for the three major adult literacy instructional programs: (1) Adult Basic Education, (2) English Literacy, and (3) Adult Secondary Education. The benchmark percentages compare the relationship between the state projections vis-à-vis the mean community college projections. Table 1 also provides a comparison of Iowa's GED pass rate.

**Table 1**

**Comparison Of Pre-Post Assessment Benchmark Percentage Levels  
For Iowa And Iowa's Community College Adult Literacy Program  
By Major Instructional Program And GED Pass Rate**

Instructional Program	State Projection	Community College Mean Projection	Percent Difference From State Projection
Adult Basic Education (ABE)	86%	84%	-2%
English Literacy (EL)	53%	52%	-1%
Adult Secondary Education (ASE)	88%	87%	-1%
GED Pass Rate	96%	95%	-1%

**Table 2** displays a comparison of benchmark percentage levels for each one of the Federally mandated core measures. The benchmark percentage comparisons show the relationship between the state and local program projections. The Program Year 2007 projections for the community college based local programs represent a 3% plus or minus deviation range from the state projection. This range was successfully achieved for all federal benchmarks as reported in Column C.

**Table 2**

**Comparison Of National Reporting System Benchmark Percentage Levels For Iowa And Iowa’s Community College Adult Literacy Program For The Educational Gains Core Measures By Educational Functioning Level And The Follow-Up Core Measures**

<b>Educational Gains Core Measures (Educational Functioning Level)</b>	<b>(A) * State Projection</b>	<b>(B) Community College Mean Projection</b>	<b>(C) Percent Difference from State Projection</b>
Beg. Lit ABE	45%	44%	-1%
Beg ABE	50%	48%	-2%
Low Int. ABE	52%	51%	-1%
High Int ABE	62%	61%	-1%
Low ASE	78%	76%	-2%
Beg Lit EL	48%	48%	0%
Beg EL	43%	41%	-2%
Low Int. EL	48%	47%	-1%
High Int EL	44%	42%	-2%
Low Ad EL	40%	38%	-2%
<b>Follow-Up Core Measures</b>			
Entered Empl.	78%	76%	-2%
Job Retention	90%	89%	-1%
Earned GED or HS Comp.	80%	78%	-2%
Entered Post-Secondary Education or Training	56%	55%	-1%

\* **Source:** State Projections are based on negotiated benchmark levels with United States Department of Education: Division of Adult Education and Literacy (USDE:DAEL).

The following observation was extrapolated from the data presented in **Tables 1 and 2**:

- The community college mean projections are realistically aligned with the state projections for all benchmark categories.

**Table 3** is designed to depict a projected state to local program level comparison of the percentage increase in the number of basic skill certificates issued from one program year to the succeeding program year.<sup>1</sup> The projection is based on a 2% increase from Program Year 2005 to Program Year 2007.

**Table 3**

**Comparison Of Percentage Increase For Iowa’s Basic Skill Certification Program For Iowa And Iowa’s Community College Adult Literacy Program**

State Projection	Total Community College Percentage Projection	Percent Difference From State Projection
2%	2%	0%

**Table 4** presents an analysis of the range of benchmark percentage levels for each one of the State/Federally mandated core measures. The Table displays the lowest and highest percentage level and the percentage difference for each benchmark for the community college based benchmark projections for the following categories: (1) Pre-Post Assessment, (2) Educational Gains by Educational Functioning Level (EFL), (3) Follow-up Core Measures and (4) Other State Measures.

<sup>1</sup> The reader is referred to the publication titled *Iowa’s Community College Basic Literacy Skills Credential Program Annual Report Program Year 2005* for a description of Iowa’s Basic Literacy Skills Certification Program.

**Table 4**

**Analysis Of Iowa's Community College Benchmark Projections Percentage Range  
For The Federal Core Performance Measures For Program Year 2007  
(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)**

<b>Pre-Post Assessment</b>	<b>Lowest Percentage Level</b>	<b>Highest Percentage Level</b>	<b>Percent Difference</b>
Adult Basic Education	83%	86%	3%
English Literacy	50%	56%	6%
Adult Secondary Education	85%	91%	6%
<b>Educational Gains Core Measures By Educational Functioning Level</b>			
Beginning Literacy ABE	42%	48%	6%
Beginning ABE	47%	50%	3%
Low Intermediate ABE	49%	54%	5%
High Intermediate ABE	59%	64%	5%
Low ASE	75%	80%	5%
Beginning Literacy EL	45%	51%	6%
Beginning EL	40%	46%	6%
Low Intermediate. EL	45%	51%	6%
High Intermediate EL	41%	47%	6%
Low Advanced EL	37%	43%	6%
<b>Follow-Up Core Measures</b>			
Entered Employment	75%	78%	3%
Job Retention	87%	90%	3%
GED or High School Completion	77%	91%	14%
Entered Post-Secondary Education or Training	53%	56%	3%
<b>Other State Measures</b>			
GED Pass Rate	93%	96%	3%
Basic Skills Certificate Percentage Increase Over PY 05	2%	3%	1%

The following observations were noted from the data presented in **Table 4**:

- There is little variance among the lowest and highest projected benchmark percentage levels for a majority of the benchmark categories as noted in the 'Percent Difference' category. The variance ranges from 3% - 7% with the exception of the "GED or High School Completion" follow-up core measure. The variance range was 14%.

**Table 5**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For Pre-Post Assessment  
(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)**

**Program Type:** Adult Basic Education (ABE)

<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME</b>	<b>APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL</b>
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	83%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	83%
Iowa Lakes Community College	86%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	83%
Iowa Central Comm. College	83%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	86%
Hawkeye Comm. College	83%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	86%
Kirkwood Community College	86%
Des Moines Area Community College	86%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	86%
Iowa Western Comm. College	86%
Southwestern Comm. College	83%
Indian Hills Comm. College	86%
Southeastern Comm. College	86%
Iowa Department of Education	86%

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.



**Table 6**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For Pre-Post Assessment  
(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)**

**Program Type:** English Literacy

<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME</b>	<b>APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL</b>
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	50%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	51%
Iowa Lakes Community College	53%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	50%
Iowa Central Comm. College	50%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	53%
Hawkeye Comm. College	53%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	53%
Kirkwood Community College	53%
Des Moines Area Community College	56%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	53%
Iowa Western Comm. College	53%
Southwestern Comm. College	50%
Indian Hills Comm. College	53%
Southeastern Comm. College	56%
Iowa Department of Education	53%

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 7**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For Pre-Post Assessment  
(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)**

**Program Type:** Adult Secondary Education (ASE)

<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME</b>	<b>APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL</b>
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	85%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	85%
Iowa Lakes Community College	88%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	86%
Iowa Central Comm. College	85%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	88%
Hawkeye Comm. College	85%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	88%
Kirkwood Community College	88%
Des Moines Area Community College	91%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	88%
Iowa Western Comm. College	88%
Southwestern Comm. College	85%
Indian Hills Comm. College	88%
Southeastern Comm. College	89%
Iowa Department of Education	88%

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 8**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks  
(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)**

**Program Type:** Adult Basic Education

**Educational Functioning Level Category:** ABE Beg. Literacy

<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME</b>	<b>APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL</b>
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	43%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	44%
Iowa Lakes Community College	45%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	42%
Iowa Central Comm. College	42%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	45%
Hawkeye Comm. College	42%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	45%
Kirkwood Community College	45%
Des Moines Area Community College	42%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	45%
Iowa Western Comm. College	45%
Southwestern Comm. College	42%
Indian Hills Comm. College	45%
Southeastern Comm. College	48%
Iowa Department of Education	45%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 9**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks**

(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)

**Program Type:** Adult Basic Education

**Educational Functioning Level Category:** ABE Beg. Basic

<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME</b>	<b>APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL</b>
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	47%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	49%
Iowa Lakes Community College	50%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	47%
Iowa Central Comm. College	47%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	50%
Hawkeye Comm. College	47%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	50%
Kirkwood Community College	50%
Des Moines Area Community College	47%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	50%
Iowa Western Comm. College	50%
Southwestern Comm. College	47%
Indian Hills Comm. College	50%
Southeastern Comm. College	52%
Iowa Department of Education	50%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 10**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks**

(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)

**Program Type:** Adult Basic Education

**Educational Functioning Level Category:** ABE Int. Low

<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME</b>	<b>APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL</b>
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	49%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	51%
Iowa Lakes Community College	52%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	49%
Iowa Central Comm. College	49%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	52%
Hawkeye Comm. College	49%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	52%
Kirkwood Community College	52%
Des Moines Area Community College	49%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	52%
Iowa Western Comm. College	52%
Southwestern Comm. College	49%
Indian Hills Comm. College	52%
Southeastern Comm. College	54%
Iowa Department of Education	52%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 11**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks**

(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)

**Program Type:** Adult Basic Education

**Educational Functioning Level Category:** ABE Int. Hi.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	59%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	61%
Iowa Lakes Community College	62%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	59%
Iowa Central Comm. College	59%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	62%
Hawkeye Comm. College	59%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	62%
Kirkwood Community College	62%
Des Moines Area Community College	59%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	62%
Iowa Western Comm. College	62%
Southwestern Comm. College	59%
Indian Hills Comm. College	62%
Southeastern Comm. College	64%
Iowa Department of Education	62%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 12**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks**

(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)

**Program Type:** Adult Secondary Education

**Educational Functioning Level Category:** ASE Low

<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME</b>	<b>APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL</b>
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	75%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	76%
Iowa Lakes Community College	78%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	75%
Iowa Central Comm. College	75%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	78%
Hawkeye Comm. College	75%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	78%
Kirkwood Community College	78%
Des Moines Area Community College	78%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	78%
Iowa Western Comm. College	78%
Southwestern Comm. College	75%
Indian Hills Comm. College	78%
Southeastern Comm. College	80%
Iowa Department of Education	78%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 13**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks**

(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)

**Program Type:** English Literacy

**Educational Functioning Level Category:** EL Beg. Lit.

<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME</b>	<b>APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL</b>
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	45%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	47%
Iowa Lakes Community College	48%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	45%
Iowa Central Comm. College	45%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	48%
Hawkeye Comm. College	45%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	48%
Kirkwood Community College	48%
Des Moines Area Community College	51%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	50%
Iowa Western Comm. College	48%
Southwestern Comm. College	45%
Indian Hills Comm. College	48%
Southeastern Comm. College	49%
Iowa Department of Education	48%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.



**Table 14**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks**

(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)

**Program Type:** English Literacy

**Educational Functioning Level Category:** EL Beg.

<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME</b>	<b>APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL</b>
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	40%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	42%
Iowa Lakes Community College	43%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	40%
Iowa Central Comm. College	40%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	43%
Hawkeye Comm. College	39%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	43%
Kirkwood Community College	43%
Des Moines Area Community College	46%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	45%
Iowa Western Comm. College	43%
Southwestern Comm. College	40%
Indian Hills Comm. College	43%
Southeastern Comm. College	44%
Iowa Department of Education	43%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 15**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks**

(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)

**Program Type:** English Literacy

**Educational Functioning Level Category:** EL Int. Low

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	45%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	47%
Iowa Lakes Community College	48%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	45%
Iowa Central Comm. College	45%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	48%
Hawkeye Comm. College	45%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	48%
Kirkwood Community College	48%
Des Moines Area Community College	51%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	50%
Iowa Western Comm. College	48%
Southwestern Comm. College	45%
Indian Hills Comm. College	48%
Southeastern Comm. College	48%
Iowa Department of Education	48%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 16**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks**

(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)

**Program Type:** English Literacy

**Educational Functioning Level Category:** EL Int. High

<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME</b>	<b>APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL</b>
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	41%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	43%
Iowa Lakes Community College	44%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	41%
Iowa Central Comm. College	41%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	44%
Hawkeye Comm. College	41%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	44%
Kirkwood Community College	44%
Des Moines Area Community College	47%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	45%
Iowa Western Comm. College	44%
Southwestern Comm. College	41%
Indian Hills Comm. College	44%
Southeastern Comm. College	45%
Iowa Department of Education	44%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 17**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For The Education Gain Core Benchmarks**

(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)

**Program Type:** English Literacy

**Educational Functioning Level Category:** EL Low Adv.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	37%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	39%
Iowa Lakes Community College	40%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	37%
Iowa Central Comm. College	37%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	40%
Hawkeye Comm. College	37%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	40%
Kirkwood Community College	40%
Des Moines Area Community College	37%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	40%
Iowa Western Comm. College	40%
Southwestern Comm. College	37%
Indian Hills Comm. College	40%
Southeastern Comm. College	43%
Iowa Department of Education	40%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 18**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For The Follow-Up Benchmarks**

(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)

**Follow-Up Measure Category:** Entered Employment

<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME</b>	<b>APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL</b>
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	78%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	76%
Iowa Lakes Community College	78%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	75%
Iowa Central Comm. College	75%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	78%
Hawkeye Comm. College	75%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	78%
Kirkwood Community College	78%
Des Moines Area Community College	75%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	78%
Iowa Western Comm. College	78%
Southwestern Comm. College	75%
Indian Hills Comm. College	78%
Southeastern Comm. College	78%
Iowa Department of Education	78%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Entered Employment".

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 19**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For The Follow-Up Benchmarks  
(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)**

**Follow-Up Measure Category: Retained Employment**

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	87%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	88%
Iowa Lakes Community College	90%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	87%
Iowa Central Comm. College	87%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	90%
Hawkeye Comm. College	87%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	90%
Kirkwood Community College	90%
Des Moines Area Community College	87%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	90%
Iowa Western Comm. College	90%
Southwestern Comm. College	87%
Indian Hills Comm. College	90%
Southeastern Comm. College	88%
Iowa Department of Education	90%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Retained Employment".

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 20**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For The Follow-Up Benchmarks**

(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)

**Follow-Up Measure Category:** Obtained a GED or Secondary School Diploma

<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME</b>	<b>APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL</b>
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	77%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	91%
Iowa Lakes Community College	80%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	77%
Iowa Central Comm. College	77%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	80%
Hawkeye Comm. College	77%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	80%
Kirkwood Community College	80%
Des Moines Area Community College	77%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	80%
Iowa Western Comm. College	80%
Southwestern Comm. College	77%
Indian Hills Comm. College	80%
Southeastern Comm. College	80%
Iowa Department of Education	80%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Obtained a GED or Secondary School Diploma".

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 21**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For The Follow-Up Benchmarks  
(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)**

**Follow-Up Measure Category:** Entered Postsecondary Education or Training

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	53%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	54%
Iowa Lakes Community College	56%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	53%
Iowa Central Comm. College	53%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	56%
Hawkeye Comm. College	53%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	56%
Kirkwood Community College	56%
Des Moines Area Community College	53%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	56%
Iowa Western Comm. College	56%
Southwestern Comm. College	53%
Indian Hills Comm. College	56%
Southeastern Comm. College	56%
Iowa Department of Education	56%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Entered Postsecondary Education or Training".

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.



**Table 22**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level For Program Year 2007  
For Iowa's GED Pass Rate  
(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)**

**Follow-Up Measure Category: GED Pass Rate**

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK NUMBER LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	93%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	93%
Iowa Lakes Community College	96%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	96%
Iowa Central Comm. College	93%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	96%
Hawkeye Comm. College	96%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	96%
Kirkwood Community College	96%
Des Moines Area Community College	96%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	96%
Iowa Western Comm. College	96%
Southwestern Comm. College	94%
Indian Hills Comm. College	96%
Southeastern Comm. College	96%
Iowa Department of Education	96%

**Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

**Table 23**

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level Increase For Program Year 2007  
For Iowa's Basic Skills Certification Program  
(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)**

**Follow-Up Measure Category: Iowa Basic Skills Certification Program**

<b>COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME</b>	<b>*PROGRAM YEAR 2005 BENCHMARK ATTAINMENT LEVEL</b>	<b>**PROGRAM YEAR 2007 PROJECTED LEVEL</b>	<b>PROJECTED PERCENT INCREASE FROM PY 05 TO PY 07</b>
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	234	239	2%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	192	196	2%
Iowa Lakes Community College	45	48	2%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	69	71	2%
Iowa Central Comm. College	317	323	2%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	537	547	2%
Hawkeye Comm. College	214	218	2%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	624	637	2%
Kirkwood Community College	622	634	2%
Des Moines Area Community College	721	735	2%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	446	456	2%
Iowa Western Comm. College	534	544	2%
Southwestern Comm. College	120	122	2%
Indian Hills Comm. College	713	727	2%
Southeastern Comm. College	290	299	3%
Iowa Department of Education	5,678	5,796	2.1%

\* **Source:** Iowa's Community College Basic Literacy Skills Credential Program Annual Report: Program Year 2005; Table 2, p. 7.

\*\* **Source:** Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2007 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2007.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

The following observations for the establishment of benchmark projections for Program Year 2006 are:

- Program Year 2007 is the fourth year that Iowa's community colleges have established benchmark projections. The projections will assist the local programs to establish program priorities and strategies for benchmark attainment.
- The benchmark attainment for Program Years 2001-2005 and benchmark projections for Program Year 2006 will provide a database for Program Year 2007 benchmark projections.
- A series of special demonstration projects and research projects have been initiated in order to assist local program successfully achieve benchmark projections.
- The successful benchmark completion rate is viewed as the key indicator for measuring program accountability and continuous program improvement at the state and local level.
- The Program Year 2007 benchmark projections indicate that Iowa's community college based adult literacy programs are in close proximity to the state level negotiated benchmarks. This observation indicates that Iowa's adult basic education community college based delivery system is seamless, comprehensive, pro-active and united.

# **APPENDIX A**

## **ADULT LITERACY STAFF DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PROGRAM YEAR 2006**



# STATE OF IOWA

THOMAS J. VILSACK, GOVERNOR  
SALLY J. PEDERSON, LT. GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
JUDY A. JEFFREY, DIRECTOR

**DATE:** December 1, 2005  
**TO:** ABE Coordinators  
**FROM:** Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Preparation  
**SUBJECT:** Iowa's Adult Literacy Local Program Plan Extension for PY 2007

Attached is a copy of the guidelines for: 1) amending the FY 2000-2004 local ABE Program Plan, 2) submission of the staff development plan for PY 2007 (July 1, 2006-June 30, 2007), 3) Benchmark Projections, 4) EL Civics Program, 5) Content Standards Implementation Plan, and 6) CASAS Test Security Agreement. The local program plan amendment is optional but the submission of the PY 2006 staff development plan and benchmark projections are required. **Please submit three (3) copies of the amended plan and/or staff development plan to me by March 15, 2006.** An electronic draft copy may be submitted to me for proofing by **March 1, 2006.**

The following sections are included in the guidelines:

- Section I: Local Plan Narrative Guidelines;
- Section II: Compliances;
- Section III: Assurance Procedures;
- Section IV: Staff Development Guidelines;
- Section V: English Literacy and Civics Education Guidelines;
- Section VI: Benchmark Guidelines;
- Section VII: Incentive Grant Application;
- Section VIII: Content Standards Implementation Plan Guidelines;
- Section IX: CASAS Test Security Agreement;
- Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion—Lower Tier Covered Transactions. (This page must be dated and signed);
- Adult Literacy Program Plan Checklist.

If there are questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

John Hartwig  
Iowa Adult Education State Director

State of Iowa  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Bureau of Community Colleges  
Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146

Proposal No. \_\_\_\_\_  
(DE Use Only)

## Guidelines for Grant-for Services

### FIVE-YEAR ADULT EDUCATION GRANT-FOR-SERVICES

The Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (Title II) of Workforce Investment Act of 1998.

### COVER SHEET

- Amended Grant-for-Services for Adult Basic Education  
 Staff Development Plan for PY 2007

Submitted by \_\_\_\_\_ in accordance with Iowa's Adult Literacy Program  
for the period of **July 1, 2006** through **June 30, 2007**.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of ABE Coordinator Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Business Manager Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Administrative Officer Date

.....

### To be completed by the Iowa Department of Education

Date which plan or amendment is effective: July 1, 2006

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Consultant Date  
Bureau of Community Colleges  
and Workforce Preparation

**GRANT FOR SERVICES VENDOR FACT SHEET**

All blanks must be filled in. Put "N/A" if not applicable. Please type or print in black ink.  
Submit three copies of grant-for-services.

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
Legal Name of Sponsor

\_\_\_\_\_ Phone (area code)

\_\_\_\_\_

Parent Organization (if applicable)

\_\_\_\_\_ Phone (area code)

2. Check the Organization:
- a. Community College
  - b. Public School District
  - c. 4-Year College University
  - d. Other \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of organization)

3. Person responsible for directing the program:

\_\_\_\_\_ Title

\_\_\_\_\_ Phone (area code)

4. Legal Fiscal Agent:

\_\_\_\_\_ Title

\_\_\_\_\_ Phone (area code)

# SECTION I: LOCAL PLAN NARRATIVE GUIDELINES

(If you are not amending your Local Plan, skip Section I)

Section 231(a) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (The Adult Education and Family Literacy Act) indicates “from grant funds made available under Section 211(b), each eligible agency shall award multiyear grants or contracts, on a competitive basis, to eligible providers within the State or outlying area to enable eligible providers to develop, implement, and improve adult education and literacy activities within the state.” Section 231(e) provides that the below listed twelve (12) criteria shall be utilized in the screening and selection of local provider proposals.

The listed (12) criteria provide the request for proposal (RFP) guidelines for grant consideration under the auspices of the title II of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998.

## A. Integrated Programs

The following twelve (12) selection criteria will constitute the major portion of the RFP guidelines. The RFP guidelines will contain the following sections relative to the twelve selection criteria. The numbers in parentheses following each criteria statement reflects the number of possible points awarded for that section of the local proposal. Selection criteria numbers 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 11 are weighted due their increase priority to meet the mandates of the Act. The highest number of points an application could receive would be 100.

1. *The degree to which the eligible provider will establish measurable goals for participant outcomes. (14)*

This section should describe: 1) the process of establishing core performance indicators, 2) strategies for data collection on the core performance indicators, 3) process (es) for reporting progress on the achievement of core performance indicators.

The measurable goals center around three (3) different levels of core performance indicators.

- a. demonstrated improvements in literacy level skill levels in reading, writing, and speaking the English language, numeracy, problem-solving, English language acquisition, and other literacy skills;
- b. placement in, retention in, or completion of postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment or career advancement;
- c. receipt of a secondary school diploma [includes adult high school diploma] or its recognized equivalent [GED].

2. *The past effectiveness of an eligible provider in improving literacy skills of adult and families, and, after the one-year period beginning with the adoption of an eligible agency’s performance measures, the success of an eligible provider receiving funds in meeting or exceeding such performance measures, especially with respect to those adults with the lowest levels of literacy. (10)*

The following areas should be addressed: 1) number of persons (16+) functioning at the National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS) Levels 1 and 2 by city, county, Congressional district, or community college district, 2) the strategies that will be utilized to meet or exceed the core performance indicator standards within one year after adoption commencing on July 1, 1999, especially with respect to those adults with the lowest levels of literacy (i.e. NALS Levels 1 and 2), 3) the past effectiveness of the provider in meeting the literacy needs of the adult population including the number of years the provider has rendered basic skills education and services.

3. *The commitment of the eligible provider to serve individuals in the community who are most in need of literacy services, including individuals who are low income or have minimal literacy skills. (5)*



This section should include: 1) a description of a profile of adults functioning at NALS Levels 1 and 2, 2) a strategy for serving the state's priority target populations, 3) the number of low income adults residing in the geographical area served by the local provider and specific strategies for meeting their literacy needs.

The priority target populations are as follows:

- **able-bodied** welfare recipients (AWR). Persons who received AFDC or food stamps and who did not have disabilities that prevented them from working. Able-bodied welfare recipients, including women caring for young children, represent about 7.4 percent of the Iowa adult population and about three-quarters of the Iowa adult population receiving welfare;
  - **low-wage** earners who were not recipients of public assistance (LWW). Adults who did not receive AFDC or food stamps and were employed full-time at, or below, the minimum wage. This population constitutes about 8.4 percent of the Iowa adult population;
  - **at-risk** youth (ARY). Persons age 16 to 21 who had not completed high school and were not currently enrolled in school. At-risk youth comprises approximately .6 percent of the Iowa population age 16 and over;
  - **persons** for whom English was their second language (ESL). Persons who indicated on the IASALS that they would not speak or write in English. The ESL population constitutes about 1.4 percent of the Iowa adult population;
  - **dropouts** with relatively high educational attainment (HiDrp). Persons who dropped out of high school during eleventh grade. This population makes up about 3.1 percent of the Iowa adult population;
  - **least** educated school dropouts (LoDrp). Persons whose educational attainment was grade ten or less. LoDrp comprises about 1.7 percent of the Iowa adult population;
  - **other** eligible populations (i.e. minorities, corrections, institutionalized, etc.)
4. *Whether or not the program: (a) is of sufficient intensity and duration for participants to achieve substantial learning gains, (b) uses instructional practices such as phonemic awareness, systematic phonics, fluency, and reading comprehension that research has proven to be effective in teaching individuals to read. (10)*

The criteria “of sufficient intensity and duration” can be quantified and reported by: 1) the Iowa Basic Skills Certification Program, or 2) the attainment of individual student goals in relation to specific competencies and clusters of competencies in which the adult learner has demonstrated mastery.

This section should describe the strategies the eligible provider will adopt to demonstrate the criteria “of sufficient and duration” in relation to the implementation of the Iowa Basic Skills Certification Program and/or student goal attainment accomplishments in relation to specific competencies achieved or student goal attainment.

This section should also describe current and future instructional strategies, practices and methodologies that have proven effective in teaching individuals to read.

5. *Whether the activities effectively employ advances in technology is appropriate, including the use of computers. (5)*

The section should include a description of the current and future strategies the eligible provider will utilize with the use of instructional technology. This description should detail: 1) the type of instructional software utilized, 2) the number of computers available, 3) the different types (i.e. brands) of computers utilized, 4) the number of instructional sites utilizing instructional technology strategies, 5) the number of projected sites to utilize instructional technology in the next five (5) years.

6. *Whether the activities are built on a strong foundation of research and effective educational practice. (12)*

This section should describe the specific Iowa research studies including practitioner studies, conducted during the last 5-8 years, which have led to improvement in current or projected instructional activities or led to innovative new approaches in curriculum development, competency based education, accountability, identification of target populations, etc. Describe other studies which have assisted in program improvement and accountability.

This section should include a description of how the Iowa Basic Skills Certification Program will be integrated into the basic skills programs over the next 3 years beginning July 1, 1999. This description should include: 1) the number and types of instructional sites (i.e. workforce development centers, corrections, community action centers, institutions, libraries, etc.), 2) the number of potential students who will be served by the basic skills certification program, 3) the projected number of certificates to be issued over the next 3 years beginning July 1, 1999.

7. *Whether the activities provide learning in real life contexts to ensure that an individual has the skills needed to compete in the workplace and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. (10)*

Describe the strategies utilized to incorporate the priority competency areas, delineated in the Iowa Adult Basic Skills Survey (IABSS) study, into student, instructional and program outcomes. Include a description of how priority competencies are taught in a real life context to assist the learner in meeting employability and/or life skills goals.

8. *Whether the activities are staffed by well-trained instructors, counselors and administrators. (5)*

Describe the qualifications which the instructional staff, counselors and administrators possess. This section should include the annual staff development plan for state fiscal year 2000 (July 1, 1999-June 30, 2000). The staff development plan should include goals, objectives and specific activities along with an estimate of the amount of dollars needed to fund staff development activities.

9. *Whether the activities coordinate with other available resources in the community, such as by establishing strong links with elementary schools and secondary schools, postsecondary educational institutions, one-stop centers, job training centers, and social service agencies. (5)*

This section should include: 1) the number and types of agencies, organizations, institutions, etc. with whom the eligible provider currently collaborates, coordinates and cooperates, 2) the number and types of entities represented on the participatory planning committee, 3) the role, scope and function of the participatory planning committee in formulating policy, establishing strategic planning activities, and providing over all guidance and direction for the basic skills program.

This section should also describe the process the local provider has initiated to implement the memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the local Workforce Development Center. The most common literacy services provided are: 1) initial assessment utilizing the CASAS ECS 130 appraisal, 2) referral to literacy classes, 3) providing adult learner progress reports utilizing the TOPSpro software. This section should also describe any negotiated financial arrangements to provide basic literacy services.

10. *Whether the activities offer flexible schedules and support service (such as child care and transportation) that are necessary to enable individuals, including individuals with disabilities or special needs, to attend and complete programs. (5)*

This section should describe: 1) support services (i.e. child care, transportation, etc.) currently available, 2) cooperative agreements with other agencies (i.e. vocational rehabilitation, Department of Human Services, etc.) designed to assist in providing ancillary services, 3) types of class scheduling strategies to assist individuals with disabilities or special needs.

11. *Whether the activities maintain a high-quality information management system that has the capacity to report participant outcomes and to monitor program performance against the eligible agency performance measures. (14)*

This section should include: 1) a description of how the statewide basic skills information system (i.e. TOPSpro) will be integrated and utilized for reporting student outcomes, program outcomes, and core performance indicators, 2) future plans for expansion of the TOPSpro system and for reporting and accountability purposes during the next three years beginning July 1, 1999.

12. *Whether the local communities have demonstrated a need for additional English literacy [ESL] programs. (5)*

This section should describe: 1) the current and projected number of students enrolled in English literacy (ESL) programs, 2) a description of English literacy target population(s) located within the geographical area served by the eligible provider, 3) projected number of adults in need of English literacy services.

## **SECTION II: COMPLIANCES**

1. The grantee will submit annually the prorate sheet containing statistics on number of classes and enrollment, contact hours, and reimbursable hours, and ABE-9 financial form outlining federal and local expenditures.
2. The ATT-1/ATT-2 forms must be submitted to request approval and reimbursement for teacher training activities and to following progress in the completion of the indicated activities.

## **SECTION III: ASSURANCE PROCEDURES**

The following criteria for assurance procedures must be included in all local program plans.

1. Procedure for determining that no more than 10% of federal funds are expended for corrections or institutionalized programs.
2. Procedure of policy for serving adult populations in NALS Levels 1 and 2.
3. Federal funds used for local ABE programs are on a 75% basis, providing adequate funds are available, with remaining 25% or more provided by grantee.
4. Certification that the governing board of grantee has approved participation in the Adult Basic Education Program of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.
5. Certification that the Adult Basic Education Program will be conducted in compliance with regulations as stated in the Iowa State Plan for Adult Basic Education, Department of Education; fiscal, program and class enrollment reports will be submitted as requested by the State Department of Education.
6. Certification that Adult Basic Education Program will comply with all relevant provisions of the Iowa Civil Rights Act of 1965 as amended, Iowa Executive Order #15 of 1973, Federal Executive Order 11246 of 1965 as amended by Federal Executive Order 11275 of 1967, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, and all provisions relevant to fair employment.
7. Certification that no more than 5% of the federal allocation will be expended on administrative salaries and benefits.
8. Certification that all students, faculty and other program beneficiaries will have equal access to program services regardless of gender, race, color, national origin, disability, or age.
9. Certification that the special needs of student, faculty and other program beneficiaries will be addressed.

## SECTION IV: STAFF DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

Describe the methods by which the staff development plan will provide professional growth for program personnel (supervisory, teachers, aides, counseling and clerical). Discussion should include, but not be limited to, areas of orientation, pre-service and in-service at local, quadrant and state levels. Consider how technology will affect the local plan. Is the state plan reflected in the local plan? Are the state initiatives such as GED 2002, family literacy, content standards and ESL addressed? List the priority areas in Program Year 2007.

This section should contain goal statements, objectives, and activities for the goals and objectives established in Part II.2. Project same level funding as Program Year 2006 in your budget. Include a proposed one-year itemized budget following the guidelines listed below:

### A. Non-Allowable Costs

- 1) Stipends will not be paid to workshop participants out of state teacher training monies.
- 2) Lodging will not be paid out of state teacher training monies without prior approval from the Adult Education Section.
- 3) Expenses for out-of-state travel (e.g. CASAS Summer Institute, ABE Commission, AAACE) will not be paid out of teacher training monies without prior approval from the Adult Education Section.

### B. Allowable Costs

- 1) In-state travel will be reimbursed at the institutional rate, not to exceed 29 cents per mile.
- 2) Meals will be reimbursed in accordance with the state guidelines, not to exceed:
  - a) breakfast \$5.00
  - b) lunch \$6.00
  - c) dinner \$12.00
- 3) Statewide conferences may be included in this plan.
- 4) State adult education teacher training monies may be used to send additional participants to a state leadership teacher-training workshop. The project director must approve the additional participants. Only expenses for mileage and meals may be provided.
- 5) ABE teacher training funds may be used for fees, honorariums, and materials necessary for teacher training activities.

### C. Sample Outline for Adult Education Program/Teacher Training Plan

#### Adult Education Program Plan

##### Priority Area I

##### Goal I

##### Objective 1.

Activity 1.

Activity 2.

##### Objective 2.

Activity 1.

Activity 2.

##### Goal II

##### Priority Area II

ADULT EDUCATION TEACHER TRAINING						
				Projected	Total	Costs
Dates	Activity Title and Objectives	Number of Participants	Projected Breakdown of Costs	State	Local	Combined
			(As applicable to each activity)			
			Travel			
			Meals			
			Fees			
			Honorariums			
			Materials			
			Other			

Total State Reimbursement Requested \_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION V: ENGLISH LITERACY AND CIVICS EDUCATION GUIDELINES

**A one-year special allocation will be available for the purpose of expanding and enhancing English Literacy and Civics Education programs. To qualify for the allocations, the following must be submitted:**

**A. Define the EL population**

- Specify ethnic groups
- Approximate number served
- Number of current EL classes/location

**B. Describe the services provided**

- Include potential for expanded services
- Instructional method description

**C. Plan**

- Include goals/objectives for the project
- Time lines
- Outcomes

## SECTION VI: BENCHMARKS GUIDELINES

The purpose of the Benchmark section is to make reasonable benchmark projections for local program attainment for PY 2006. List specific steps to achieve projected benchmarks. Strategies may include orientation, staff development, coding, etc. Refer to the following four reports: 1) *Iowa's Adult Basic Education Program Benchmark Projections for PY 2006*, 2) *Iowa's Community College Basic Literacy Skills Credentials Program Year 2005*, 3) *Iowa's Adult Basic Education Program Annual Benchmark Report: Program Year 2005* and 4) *Iowa's NRS Benchmark CQI Model*.

**1. Basic Skills Certification**

- Program Year 2005 will be the base year for Program Year 2007 Basic Skills Certification benchmark projections.

- Refer to Table 1, Column K to obtain baseline data for the 2% benchmark projection for each community college (i.e. Northeast Iowa Community College issued 234 basic skill certificates during Program Year 2005. Therefore, a projected number of basic skill certificates to be issued for Program Year 2007 would reflect a minimum of 2% increase or a numeric increase from 234 to a projected 239-240.) The projection figure to be entered into Table 2 is a numeric figure and not a percentage figure.

## 2. Pre/Post Assessment

- Include a narrative for benchmark attainment.
- Benchmark projections should be 3% points + or – the state negotiated benchmark. If there is a reason a projection is not in the 3% range + or -, please state the reason.

## 3. Educational Gains/Follow-up Measures

- Insert Projections for Program Year 2007 into Table 2.
- Include a narrative for benchmark attainment.
- Benchmark projections should be 3% points + or – the state negotiated benchmark. If there is a reason a projection is not in the 3% range + or -, please state the reason.

**TABLE 1**

**Number of Basic Literacy Skills Certificates Issued by Iowa's Community Colleges  
by Subject Area and CASAS Certification Level for Program Enrollees During Program Year 2005  
(July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005)**

A Community College	B Reading CASAS LEVEL				C Sub total	D Mathematics CASAS LEVEL				E Sub total	F *Writing CASAS LEVEL				G Sub total	H **Listening CASAS LEVEL			I Sub total	K Total (Col C + Col E + Col G + Col I)
	A	B	C	D		A	B	C	D		A	B	C	D		A	B	C		
Northeast IA Comm. College	23	26	25	49	123	0	23	35	29	87	0	3	3	2	8	1	3	12	16	234
North IA Area Comm. College	50	17	12	11	90	4	18	30	39	91	4	4	2	1	11	0	0	0	0	192
IA Lakes Comm. College	3	3	6	16	28	2	6	5	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Northwest IA Comm. College	20	21	16	6	63	0	1	2	1	4	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	69
IA Central Comm. College	72	53	46	44	215	1	7	45	24	77	0	0	0	0	0	16	8	1	25	317
IA Valley Comm. College Dist.	58	81	76	74	289	3	22	54	64	143	1	6	6	0	13	45	36	11	92	537
Hawkeye Comm. College	1	10	25	18	54	5	45	30	19	99	0	0	0	0	0	25	18	18	61	214
Eastern IA Comm. Coll. Dist	62	77	134	137	410	6	49	69	35	159	0	0	0	0	0	19	34	2	55	624
Kirkwood Comm. College	17	43	36	169	265	5	30	29	227	291	2	1	7	3	13	17	17	19	53	622
Des Moines Area Comm. Coll.	91	160	151	47	449	5	18	17	5	45	4	14	24	6	48	37	101	41	179	721
Western IA Tech Comm. Coll.	37	53	38	100	228	0	19	15	92	126	12	23	6	0	41	28	19	4	51	446
Iowa Western Comm. College	9	18	30	102	159	2	24	56	252	334	0	2	6	8	16	16	9	0	25	534
Southwestern Comm. College	18	12	19	29	78	0	1	27	14	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Indian Hills Comm. College	51	46	64	139	300	29	41	98	118	286	6	10	16	13	45	26	31	25	82	713
Southeastern Comm. College	17	18	34	56	125	8	35	64	49	156	0	0	0	1	1	6	1	1	8	290
<b>TOTAL</b>	529	638	712	997	2,876	70	339	576	972	1,957	29	63	72	34	198	236	277	134	647	5,678

**Source:** Program Year 2005 Basic Literacy Skills Certification and High School Diploma Report for Program Year 2005: Iowa Department of Education

\* The Writing Skills component of Iowa's Basic Skills Certification program was implemented during Program Year 2002. The Reading and Mathematics components were implemented during Program Year 1998.

\*\* The Listening Skills component of Iowa's Basic Skills Certification program was implemented during Program Year 2004.

**Interpretation:** The data indicates 2,876 (51%) reading certificates, 1,957 (34%) mathematics certificates, 198 (4%) writing certificates and 647 (11%) listening certificates for a total of 5,678 certificates, which were issued during Program Year 2005. The greatest percentage (59%) of reading certificates was issued at CASAS C and D levels. The greatest percentage (79%) of mathematics certificates was issued at CASAS C and D levels. The greatest percentage (68%) of writing certificates was issued at CASAS B and C levels. The greatest percentage of listening certificates (79%) was issued at CASAS levels A and B.

**Table 2**

**Local Benchmark Projections for Program Year 2007**

(July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007)

<b>STATE BENCHMARKS</b> <b>Pre/Post Assessment Instructional Program</b>	<b>PY 07</b> <b>STATE Percent</b> <b>Projection</b>	<b>PY 07</b> <b>Local Percent</b> <b>Projection</b>
ADULT BASIC EDUCATION (ABE)	86%	%
ENGLISH LITERACY (EL)	53%	%
ADULT SECONDARY EDUCATION (ASE)	88%	%
<b>Other State Benchmarks</b>		
GED PASS RATE	96%	%
BASIC SKILL CREDENTIAL ISSUANCE INCREASE FROM PY 05 to PY 07	* 2%	
<b>FEDERAL BENCHMARKS</b> <b>EDUCATIONAL GAINS CORE MEASURES – NRS (EDUCATIONAL FUNCTIONING LEVEL)</b>		
BEGINNING LITERACY ABE	45%	%
BEGINNING ABE	50%	%
LOW INTERMEDIATE ABE	52%	%
HIGH INTERMEDIATE ABE	62%	%
LOW ASE	78%	%
BEGINNING LITERACY EL	48%	%
BEGINNING EL	43%	%
LOW INTERMEDIATE EL	48%	%
HIGH INTERMEDIATE EL	44%	%
LOW ADVANCED EL	40%	%
<b>Follow-Up Core Measures – NRS</b>		
ENTERED EMPLOYMENT	78%	%
JOB RETENTION	90%	%
EARNED GED OR HS COMPLETION	80%	%
ENTERED POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION OR TRAINING	56%	%

\* See Table 1, Column K to project the number of issued Basic Skill Credentials.

**SECTION VII: INCENTIVE GRANT APPLICATION** - (This section should only be completed by a local provider who met the eligibility criteria for an incentive grant).

- A. Describe the planned activities. This information should include a description of how the activities are innovative, comprehensive and coordinated, and targeted to improve program performance. Include information on how services build on, rather than duplicate, existing literacy program services mandated by the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA).
- B. Describe ways in which the activities are related to improving local program benchmark performance levels on the state and federal mandated benchmarks for each different activity planned. For example, describe how the activities will strengthen the local program's ability to improve literacy levels, increase employment, increase transitions to further education and training, and/or improve technical and employability skills.



- C. Describe collaborative efforts with stakeholder groups, participating literacy partners and the general public on the use of incentive award funds. Local programs are encouraged to seek public input on the use of state incentive funding, including representatives of vocational education programs, other workforce partners and cooperating literacy partners.

## **SECTION VIII: CONTENT STANDARDS IMPLEMENTATION PLAN GUIDELINES**

The purpose of this section is to outline the community college district's Content Standards Implementation Plan. The narrative must include the following:

- Indicate the projected number of years for full district implementation of content standards (i.e. 3-4 years);
- Provide the number and type of classes in which content standards will be implemented (e.g. ABE, ESL, ASE or any combination of classes);
- Provide the number of participating instructors and instructional area(s) (e.g. ABE, ESL, ASE);
- Enumerate the content standards categories which will be implemented during Program Year 2007 using the CASAS Content Standards Coding System (e.g. R1 Beginning Literacy/Phonics, R2 Vocabulary, R3 General reading comprehension, R4 Text in format, etc.);
- List the number and type of staff development activities for implementation of content standards (i.e. local workshops, regional workshops, etc.).
- Discuss how the implementation of content standards will assist in program improvement and improving benchmark performance.

## **SECTION IX: CASAS TEST SECURITY AGREEMENT**

The Iowa Department of Education requires that all funded adult literacy programs sign an annual CASAS test security agreement. This agreement includes the following stipulations:

- The local adult education program director assumes responsibility for safeguarding all CASAS-developed assessment materials, including Test Administration Manuals, and answer sheets (which contain certain marks or responses);
- All CASAS materials should be stored in a locked (preferably fireproof) file cabinet accessible to the program director or his/her designee(s);
- Staff administering assessments should return all materials immediately after use to the program director or his/her designees;
- All answer sheets and writing samples are treated as confidential until destroyed;
- No duplication of any test form or any portion of any test form is permitted for any reason;
- Inventory information concerning CASAS materials will be supplied to the Iowa Department of Education when requested;
- Defaced materials may not be destroyed unless authorized by Iowa Department of Education;
- Programs may not use displays, questions, or answers that appear on any CASAS test to create materials designed to teach or prepare learners to answer CASAS test items. Instead, programs should use instructional resources provided by CASAS (e.g. Quick Search and other support materials) to link curriculum, assessment instruction.

**Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and  
Voluntary Exclusion -- Lower Tier Covered Transactions**

This certification is required by the Department of Education regulations implementing Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, 34 CFR Part 85, for all lower tier transactions meeting the threshold and tier requirements stated at Section 85.110.

**Instructions for Certification**

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective lower tier participant is providing the certification set out below.
2. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was entered into. If it is later determined that the prospective lower tier participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.
3. The prospective lower tier participant shall provide immediate written notice to the person to whom this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective lower tier participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.
4. The terms "covered transaction," "debarred," "suspended," "ineligible," "lower tier covered transaction," "participant," "person," "primary covered transaction," "principal," "proposal," and "voluntarily excluded," as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definitions and Coverage sections of rules implementing Executive Order 12549. You may contact the person to which this proposal is submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.
5. The prospective lower tier participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency with which this transaction originated.
6. The prospective lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion-Lower Tier Covered Transactions," without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.
7. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may but is not required to, check the Nonprocurement List.
8. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.
9. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 5 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

**Certification**

- (1) The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.
- (2) Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

NAME OF APPLICANT	PR/AWARD NUMBER AND/OR PROJECT NAME
<b>Adult Literacy Program</b>	
PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE	
SIGNATURE	DATE

ED 80-0014, 9/90 (Replaces GCS-009 (REV.12/88), which is obsolete)

## Adult Literacy Program Plan Checklist

- Cover sheet signatures (Required);
- Certification signature (Required);
- Section I – Local Plan (Optional);
  - Skip if not amending
- Section II – Compliances (Required);
  - ATTs
  - ABE-9s
- Section III – Assurances (Required);
- Section IV – Staff Development (Required);
  - Budget
  - Plan
- Section V – EL/Civics (Required);
  - Population
  - Services Provided
  - Plan
- Section VI – Benchmarks (Required);
  - Basic Skills Certification
  - Pre/Post
  - Educational Gains
  - Follow-up Measures
- Section VII – Incentive Grant Application (for qualified programs) (Required);
  - Planned Activity
  - Description
  - Collaboration
- Section VIII – Content Standards Implementation Plan (Required);
- Section IX – CASAS Test Security Agreement (Required);
- Signed Lower Tier Certification (Required).

## Adult Literacy Program Plan Checklist

**Community College Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact Person:** \_\_\_\_\_

<input type="checkbox"/>	Cover sheet signatures (Required);
<input type="checkbox"/>	Certification signature (Required);
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section I – Local Plan (Optional); • <i>Skip if not amending</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section II – Compliances (Required); • ATTs • ABE-9s
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section III – Assurances (Required);
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section IV – Staff Development (Required); • Budget • Plan
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section V – EL/Civics (Required); • Population • Services Provided • Plan
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section VI – Benchmarks (Required); • Basic Skills Certification • Pre/Post • Educational Gains • Follow-up Measures
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section VII – Incentive Grant Application (for qualified programs) (Required); • Planned Activity • Description • Collaboration
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section VIII – Content Standards Implementation Plan (Required);
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section IX – CASAS Test Security Agreement (Required);
<input type="checkbox"/>	Signed Lower Tier Certification (Required).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date