

Adult Education Block Grant

Establishing Core
Definitions and
Data Systems for
Participation,
Programs, and
Post-Secondary
Transition

06.14.2017

White Paper for Data and
Accountability Committee
Meeting 2

WestEd — a nonpartisan, nonprofit research, development, and service agency — works with education and other communities throughout the United States and abroad to promote excellence, achieve equity, and improve learning for children, youth, and adults. WestEd has more than a dozen offices nationwide, from Massachusetts, Vermont and Georgia, to Illinois, Arizona and California, with headquarters in San Francisco. For more information about WestEd, visit WestEd.org; call **415.565.3000** or, toll-free, (877) 4-WestEd; or write: WestEd / 730 Harrison Street / San Francisco, CA 94107-1242.

Table of Contents

Overview	1
Tracking Participants	1
Using MIS & CCCApply for Community Colleges	1
Amending MIS	2
Amending CCCApply	3
Defining Programs	4
Excluding Credit Community College Courses	5
Defining CTE	6
Defining Basic Skills	11
Defining Other Program Areas	15
Participation Thresholds	16

Overview

This paper was prepared for the second meeting of the Adult Education Block Grant (AEBG) Data and Accountability Committee. The purpose of this paper is to summarize recommendations of the other field teams, present options for refining data collection definitions and processes, and assess the status of current data systems for meeting the goals of AEBG. This paper includes the following:

- Recommendations on data systems for tracking participants, including the use of the Chancellor's Office Management Information System (MIS) and CCCApply for data collection on community college noncredit students.
- Issues for defining the core AEBG program areas including recommendations from the assessment committees on whether to include credit programs.
- Participation thresholds for students in AEBG.
- Issues related to defining post-secondary, including transition from adult education into post-secondary and post-secondary completion.

Tracking Participants

Potential Recommendations

Based on the initial meetings of the Data and Accountability Committee, the Basic Skills Assessment Field Committee, and the Career and Technical Education (CTE) Assessment Field Committee, the following potential recommendations have emerged:

- K12 programs should be tracked in TOPSpro Enterprise (TE) and community college programs should be tracked in the MIS and CCCApply
- MIS and CCCApply should be amended to capture the data elements needed for AEBG

Using MIS and CCCApply for Community Colleges

Community college practitioners expressed concerns regarding the implementation of TE in community colleges for AEBG, and recommended that MIS be used instead. Their specific comments included:

- MIS data are more accurate, as community colleges only reported students who were funded by AEBG, per the guidance for 2016-17.
- It was difficult and time-consuming to configure CTE data to fit TE's table structure, which requires eight separate exports, even if colleges are already using TE for Title II reporting.

- Information that colleges normally collect on CTE students does not align with the participant and demographic records that are required for TE, particularly the fields on the update form.
- Colleges would prefer that barriers to employment characteristics be captured for all students, rather than have them only be available for adult education participants who are in TE.
- Given that colleges use CCCApply as their common application form, and CCCApply is aligned with MIS, CCCApply should be amended so that it captures the fields necessary for adult education.

Amending MIS

MIS has been amended over time to reflect the needs of specific funding streams and initiatives. Doing so is a three-stage process. First, data definitions are developed in concert with practitioners and the underlying infrastructure of the MIS system is modified to include the recommended changes. Second, training is conducted in the field so that practitioners understand how to track information and modify their local data systems. Finally, colleges are given a grace period where reporting is requested but not yet mandatory in order to ensure that data are being appropriately recorded. Historically, this process has taken three years to implement.

The gaps between AEBG and MIS has already been raised with the Chancellor's Office, based on attempts to build a LaunchBoard tab that captures adult education outcomes. In 2016, a preliminary list of data elements to amend was shared with the Chancellor's Office advisory committee on career and technical education data and accountability (VERATAC), which was supportive of the concept of alignment, once the metrics were finalized.¹

Based on the recommendations of the three AEBG advisory meetings held to date, the list would include the following items:

1. Reinstate the defunct ex-offenders category and add new characteristics to the special population codes (SV) including:
 - employment
 - homeless
 - seasonal farm worker
 - exhausting TANF within two years

¹ www.workforceaccountability.org/june-10-2016

2. Expand the special populations codes (SV) so that these characteristics can be applied to all students, rather than just those enrolled in CTE courses.
3. Add new options to the SSSP codes (SS) that reflect adult education goals including:
 - help a child be more successful in school
 - become a citizen
4. Allow the noncredit SSSP codes (SS) to be used for all AEBG program areas including:
 - students enrolling in courses that address child school success
 - students enrolling in citizenship courses
 - students enrolling in programs for people with disabilities
5. Amend the student matriculation goal values (SSo1) to include child school success.
6. Amend the noncredit course category (CB22) values to include attain a high school equivalency or GED.
7. Create a student assessment code (SA) that tracks gains of one or more functional levels using a federally-approved assessment instrument such as CASAS or TABE.
8. Create new completion codes (SP) for attaining a high school equivalency or GED, apprenticeship journey status, and students who completed program requirements but did not receive an award.
9. Create a new course characteristic code (CB) that would capture elements including whether a course:
 - teaches pre-apprenticeship skills
 - is part of an integrated education and training program
 - includes work-based learning
 - integrates third-party credentials

Amending CCCApply

The common application form for community colleges—CCCApply—is managed by the CCC Technology Center, which is a project of the Chancellor’s Office. A steering committee considers requests regarding changes to the form, in concert with the project sponsors.²

² <https://www.cccapplyproject.org/steering-committee/about-us>

One of the primary recommendations of the three AEBG advisory meetings held to date would be that CCCApply offer a different set of questions for adult education applicants, using a branching structure or an alternate version of the application. This would allow sensitive topics like citizenship to be avoided and for the form to be streamlined so that it only includes information that is relevant in the adult education context. CCCApply has already been working on branching solutions to address requests from other Chancellor's Office-funded projects, which could be built upon for AEBG.

However, some committee members noted that the changes outlined below may become important for Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act reporting for both noncredit and credit programs, once that funding source is reauthorized and aligned with the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). Therefore, the following additions may be needed across all versions of the form:

- 1) Amend the Personal Information section to include:
 - if participants were employed/unemployed/unemployed 27 consecutive weeks or more at time of entrance
 - ex-offender status
 - seasonal farm worker status
 - homeless status
 - exhausting TANF within two years status
- 2) Amend the Educational Goal list to include:
 - improve English language skills (ESL)
 - help a child be more successful in school
 - become a citizen
- 2) Amend the Higher Education Level question to include college certificates

Defining Programs

Potential Recommendations

Based on the three AEBG advisory meetings held to date, the following potential recommendations have emerged:

- Credit CTE and basic skills should be excluded from AEBG reporting
- Participants should only upload data on four programs (CTE, ESL, ABE, ASE), and the state should use participant goals and characteristics to infer all other program areas

Excluding Credit Community College Courses

There was considerable debate within both the Basic Skills and the CTE Assessment Field Committees about the inclusion of credit coursework, which can help inform discussion in the Data and Accountability Committee. Some of the key points included:

Basic Skills

- Because colleges were reimbursed at a lower rate for noncredit courses until recently, some created credit programs that meet the needs of the adult education population. While some programs may be converted to noncredit, other considerations may result in these courses staying on the credit side, such as local compensation agreements that pay faculty at a lower rate for noncredit courses or a philosophical belief that adult learners should begin in a credit context.
- Other committee members disagreed, and noted that AEBG objectives and target populations do not include transferable credit courses, and that K12 adult schools are not able to offer courses that provide transferrable credit.

CTE

- People served by adult education don't think of themselves as college students, so they are much less likely to enroll in credit programs.
- Now that colleges are reimbursed for enhanced noncredit programs at the same rate as credit programs, many colleges are moving offerings that target adult learners to noncredit, or are developing new programs that are focused on this population. This shift should be supported, as free classes, open-entry-open-exit structures, opportunities to repeat courses and to not have grades count toward future GPAs, and enhanced support services are all beneficial for the target participants.
- Including credit programs in reporting may lead some colleges to argue that funding credit programs should be allowable, and as a result, AEBG may not address its goals of ensuring that colleges are serving adult learners with educational deficits.

Defining CTE

The CTE Assessment Committee recommended that the three CTE program areas in AEBG be reported as part of a broader CTE category with the following caveats:

- AEBG establishes criteria for defining a short-term CTE programs and eligible completions
- AEBG should establish means to track participation in pre-apprenticeship programs or pre-apprenticeship related courses
- Adult schools should not report on adults “entering or re-entering the workforce” as a program, but rather the state should run analyses using participant characteristics to identify individuals who are connecting or re-connecting to the labor force after an absence

The CTE Assessment Field Committee recommended that CTE programs be defined as those that are:

- connected to a career pathway
- teach skills that lead to stable employment
- enable students to earn a credential that is recognized by employers
- support participants in preparing for college credit or noncredit programs

They noted that there are sufficiently rigorous program approval processes in both K12 and community colleges ensure that any adult education CTE program should considered to be industry-recognized.

Federal and State Definitions for Short-term CTE

WIOA does not specify a timeframe for short-term CTE programs leading to employment. Federal guidance, such as TEGL 15-10, identifies the value of post-secondary industry-recognized credentials that take less than two years to complete, but it makes no specific recommendations as to the number of units. In practice, training programs eligible for WIOA funding on the Eligible Training Provider Lists (ETPL) administered by local workforce boards are less than twelve months in length and must meet specific goals for placement into the workforce after completion.

Federal guidance implies that a credential is more than a single course and that credentials are often broken into smaller chunks that students may complete over time. This definition indicates that, in order to progress in an occupation, participants may need to build a broader set of competencies and skills that those included in a

single course or small certificate. The federal guidelines also set some minimum thresholds. For example, work readiness certifications, certificates offered by local workforce boards, and occupational safety certifications like OSHA 10 or Safeserve do not count in credential completion metrics under WIOA.

In order to be eligible for Title IV funding, Federal Student Aid (FSA) guidelines require vocational post-secondary programs to be at least 15 weeks in length, include 600 clock hours or 16 credit hours of instruction, and lead to gainful employment. Many K12 adult schools are accredited by the Council of Occupational Education (COE) or the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), which allows them to access federal financial aid for their CTE programs. This means that they are subject to the FSA guidelines, in addition to program-specific guidelines required by their accrediting agencies. For COE, programs must be approved by an industry advisory committee and have a combined completion and placement rate of 70%.

Short-term certificates in community colleges are defined as 30 credit hours or less, although the Chancellor's Office requires approval for certificates as low as 18 credits. Colleges can also petition to have lower-unit awards, such as nine-unit emergency medical technician programs, be approved by the Chancellor's Office. Many colleges offer locally-approved certificates of under 18 units. While these can be reported to the Chancellor's Office MIS, many colleges do not, which means they might be missing from AEBG reporting. The Chancellor's Office has determined that it will exclude very low-unit certificates (credit certificates below 6 units or noncredit certificates below 48 contact hours) from accountability reporting and the incentive funding for the Strong Workforce Program.

Federal and State Definitions for Pre-Apprenticeship

There is clear federal guidance on quality indicators for pre-apprenticeship programs, which include:

- Approved training and curriculum based on industry standards, and approved by a documented registered apprenticeship partner.
- Recruitment, educational, and pre-vocational strategies that prepare under-represented, disadvantaged, or low-income individuals to meet the entry requisits of one or more registered apprenticeship programs.
- Access to appropriate support services.
- Meaningful hands-on training that does not displace existing paid employees.
- Formal direct entry or articulation agreements with its registered apprenticeship partners.³

³ Department of Labor Training and Employment Notice 13-12 (2012). *Defining a Quality Pre-Apprenticeship Program and Related Tools and Resources*. https://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/attach/TEN/TEN_13-12.pdf

This definition was adopted under the California Apprenticeship Initiative administered by the CCCCCO, which has funded new pre-apprenticeship programs led by K12 systems and community colleges in California. The CTE Assessment Field Committee noted that this definition was not well known or understood by the field and that a clearer definition of pre-apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship related courses needed to be developed and disseminated.

Potential CTE Definitions

The Data and Accountability Committee and the CTE Assessment Field Committee urged that student goals, assigned program, and course-taking patterns be taken into account when tracking CTE participants. Therefore, participants could be identified using the data definitions in Figure One. However, it should be noted that the Chancellor’s Office has not elected to use student goals in other accountability frameworks because the information has proven to be unreliable, compared to student course-taking patterns.

FIGURE ONE: Data Elements for CTE Programs

TOPSpro Enterprise	Chancellor’s Office MIS
Students would be flagged as belonging to CTE programs if <u>any</u> of the following were recorded:	Students would be flagged as belonging to CTE programs if <u>any</u> of the following were recorded:
Goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get a job • Retain job • Get a better job • Work-based project 	Goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earn a career technical certificate without transfer (SS=E) • Discover/formulate career interests, plans, goals (SS=F) • Prepare for a new career (acquire job skills) (SS=G) • Advance in current job/career (update job skills) (SS=H) • Maintain certificate or license (SS=I)
Instructional program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career and technical education (CTE) • Workforce readiness 	Course-taking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Took one or more noncredit CTE courses, based on a vocational TOP code (CB03) and noncredit status (CB04=N)
Special program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workplace ed. 	Noncredit course code: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Took one or more noncredit courses flagged as Short-term CTE (CB22=I) or Workforce preparation (CB22=J)

The Data and Accountability Committee and the CTE Assessment Field Committee both agreed that pre-apprenticeship participants should be flagged as a subset within CTE programs. This will require that the definitions for pre-apprenticeship be much more clearly defined, so that data collection is more accurate, given widespread confusion about state and federal requirements. It will also require a new field in the MIS system, given that a review of pre-apprenticeship programs associated with the California Apprenticeship Initiative by the RP Group has shown that there are no MIS data elements that currently track this course characteristic (although a list of programs could be identified manually from the applications for CAI funding).

FIGURE TWO: Data Elements for Pre-Apprenticeship Programs

TOPSpro Enterprise	Chancellor’s Office MIS
Students would be flagged as belonging to Pre-apprenticeship programs if the following was recorded:	Students would be flagged as belonging to Pre-apprenticeship programs if the following was recorded:
Instructional program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-apprenticeship 	Course-taking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Took one or more courses with a pre-apprenticeship flag (no code currently exists)

The Data and Accountability Committee and the CTE Assessment Field Committee also concurred that Workforce Entry/Reentry programs should reflect outcomes of student populations with CTE programs. The figure below demonstrates how this could be accomplished, provided that the MIS system be expanded to track outcomes for additional WIOA categories for barriers to participation.

FIGURE THREE: Data Elements for Workforce Entry/Reentry Programs

TOPSpro Enterprise	Chancellor's Office MIS
<p>Students would be flagged as belonging to Workforce Entry/Reentry programs if a barrier/characteristic <u>and</u> any of other elements were recorded:</p>	<p>Students would be flagged as belonging to Workforce Entry/Reentry programs if a student characteristic <u>and</u> course-taking thresholds were met:</p>
<p>Barrier/Characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 55 or older • Displaced homemaker • Ex-offender • Foster care youth • Homeless • Longterm unemployed • No TANF within 2 years 	<p>Characteristic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 55 or older (STD1) • Displaced homemaker (SV05) • Foster youth (SG03) • Homeless (no code currently exists) • Long-term unemployed (no code currently exists) • No TANF within 2 years (no code currently exists)
<p>Goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get a job • Get a better job 	<p>Goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earn a career technical certificate without transfer (SS=E) • Discover/formulate career interests, plans, goals (SS=F) • Prepare for a new career (acquire job skills) (SS=G)
<p>Instructional program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career and technical education (CTE) • Workforce readiness 	<p>Course-taking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Took one or more noncredit CTE or general studies courses associated with career or interpersonal skills, based on course codes (CB03) and noncredit status (CB04=N)
<p>Special program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jail • Community corrections • State corrections • Homeless program 	<p>Noncredit course code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Took one or more noncredit courses flagged as Short-term CTE (CB22=I) or Workforce preparation (CB22=J)

Defining Basic Skills

The Federal Department of Education (DOE) defines adult basic education (ABE), adult secondary education (ASE), and English as a second language (ESL) in terms of educational functioning levels (EFLs). ABE focuses on basic educational skills below the 9th grade level, ASE on educational skills leading to a state-recognized high school diploma or its equivalent, and ESL on English language acquisition for non-native speakers. For K12 adult schools, in particular WIOA Title II funded agencies, DOE established the National Reporting Service (NRS) as the national reporting system for federally-funded adult education programs. NRS defines EFLs for ABE, ASE, and ESL programs as well as approved testing instruments for assessing measurable skills gains. The California Department of Education relies on the NRS system and the CASAS assessment as the NRS-approved testing instrument for measuring student skills gains and for a statewide pay-point system for disbursing WIOA Title II funds to K12 adult schools and WIOA-funded community college noncredit programs.

FIGURE FOUR: National Reporting System: Educational Functioning Levels

Adult Basic Education	Adult Secondary Education	ESL
Beginning ABE Literacy	Low Adult Secondary Educ.	Beginning ESL Literacy
Beginning Basic Education	High Adult Secondary Educ.	Low Beginning ESL
Low Intermediate Basic Educ.		High Beginning ESL
High Intermediate Basic Educ.		Low Intermediate ESL
		High Intermediate ESL
		Advanced ESL

Each EFL in ABE, ASE, and ESL includes three distinct competency areas that must be incorporated in assessments for advancement to the next level, including:

- ABE and ASE: basic reading and writing, numeracy skills, and functional and workplace skills
- ESL: listening and speaking, basic reading and writing, and functional and workplace skills

In the discussions about basic skills and ESL in the Basic Skills Assessment Committee, the incorporation of functional and workplace skills was a basic differentiator between WIOA funded and non-WIOA funded programs. Issues regarding the assessment of

those areas will be explored in detail at the next Data and Accountability Committee meeting.

ESL

Within the AEBG committees, there was little controversy over how ESL programs should be defined, with student goals, assigned programs, and course-taking patterns emerging as effective predictors.

FIGURE FIVE: Data Elements for ESL Programs

TOPSpro Enterprise	Chancellor’s Office MIS
Students would be flagged as belonging to ESL programs if <u>any</u> of the following were recorded:	Students would be flagged as belonging to ESL programs if <u>any</u> of the following were recorded:
Goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve English skills • US citizenship 	Goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve English language skills (no code currently exists) • Become a citizen (no code currently exists)
Instructional program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESL/ELL • Citizenship 	Course-taking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who took one or more noncredit ESL or citizenship/ESL civics courses, based on TOP code (CB03) and noncredit status (CB04=N)
Special program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EI civics (IELCE) 	Noncredit course code: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who took one or more noncredit courses flagged as English as a second language (CB22=A) or Citizenship for immigrants (CB22=B)

ABE and ASE

The question of when a course is ABE and when it is ASE proved to be complex. While there are clear definitions in the K12 adult education environment based on standards associated with 9th grade English and math and associated CASAS scores, the end goal for participants may vary. For example, some students who assess into ASE are not seeking a high school diploma, high school equivalency, or GED. The issue becomes even blurrier in the context of community colleges, where ABE and ASE are grouped together, and most programs are leveled relative to skills required for transfer-level coursework (known as CB21 levels), rather than K12 or adult education standards.

The Data and Advisory Committee will need to determine whether a participant’s goal of attaining a secondary credential should become the defining characteristic of ASE as opposed to ABE, or if ABE and ASE participants should be grouped together and those seeking a secondary credential should be considered a sub-group of ASE.

If ASE is defined more broadly, where participants are building skills for jobs or post-secondary success that associated with 9th grade standards and above, then crosswalks will need to be developed that determine how community college CB21 levels relate to the Common Core standards, the Department of Education’s Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE) college and career standards, the National Reporting System (NRS) levels, and CASAS scores. The competency maps for ESL, English, and math developed for the community college Common Assessment Initiative, which provide a more granular set of standards associated with the CB21 levels, could be a helpful resource in accomplishing this task, as they were constructed using the K12 and adult education standards as reference points. See Figure Six for an example of how the standards could be crosswalked, Figure Seven for potential ABE program data elements, and Figure Eight for ASE program data elements.

FIGURE SIX: Example of How CB21 Rubrics Relate to Common Core, OCTAE & NRS Standards

CB21 Competency	Common Core & OCTAE Standards	NRS Level
Four-levels below transfer	Third grade standard	Low intermediate basic education
Read, identify, summarize & restate the main idea of the text in writing.	Determine the main idea of a text; recount the key details and explain how they support the main idea.	Summarize a text.
		Beginning basic education
		Identify the main idea of a multi-paragraph text.

FIGURE SEVEN: Data Elements for ABE Programs

TOPSpro Enterprise	Chancellor's Office MIS
Students would be flagged as belonging to ABE programs if <u>any</u> of the following were recorded:	Students would be flagged as belonging to ABE programs if the student goal <u>and</u> course-taking thresholds were met:
Goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve basic skills 	Goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve basic skills (SS=K)
Instructional program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic skills (ABE) 	Course-taking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Took one or more noncredit English or math courses, based on TOP code (CB03) and noncredit status (CB04=N) that were below 9th grade standards, based on a crosswalk between CB21 and adult education educational functioning levels (no crosswalk currently exists)
CASAS assessment score: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 236 	

FIGURE EIGHT: Data Elements for ASE Programs

TOPSpro Enterprise	Chancellor's Office MIS
Students would be flagged as belonging to ASE programs if <u>any</u> of the following were recorded:	Students would be flagged as belonging to ASE programs if the student goal <u>and</u> course-taking thresholds were met:
Goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H.S. diploma/HSE 	Goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete credits for high school diploma or GED (SS=L)
Instructional program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High school diploma • High school equivalency (HSE) 	Course-taking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Took one or more noncredit English or math courses, based on TOP code (CB03) and noncredit status (CB04=N), and based on a crosswalk between CB21 and adult education educational functioning levels, was 9th-12th grade standards
CASAS assessment score: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 236 or higher 	Noncredit course code: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who took one or more noncredit courses for Elementary and secondary basic skills (CB22=C)

Defining Other Program Areas

One of the major recommendations of the CLASP report on AEBG was the importance of distinguishing “populations” from “services” in fund reporting for AEBG, but the distinction applies equally to data and measuring outcomes. While participation and outcomes in programs is important to the recommendations for the Data and Accountability Committee, many of the program areas require the careful flagging of specific populations to capture categories such as adults entering or re-entering the workforce. This bleeds into another one of the CLASP report recommendations, which is to connect the impacts of AEBG to the identified communities of need targeted by the initiative and how these efforts blend into regional workforce, human services, corrections, school, and college infrastructures.

The Data and Accountability Committee recommended that two other program areas, Adults with Disabilities and Child School Success, should be broken out from other populations in analyses conducted at the state level. The figures below show how this could be accomplished using student characteristics, course-taking, and goal data. For example, these data elements could be combined to distinguish disabled students participating in other program areas (ABE, ASE, ESL, CTE) versus those who are in programs for the profoundly disabled. In the case of child school success, additional data elements may be needed in the MIS system to track this population more reliably.

FIGURE NINE: Data Elements for Adults with Disabilities

TOPSpro Enterprise	Chancellor's Office MIS
Adults with Disabilities would be flagged based on the following characteristics:	Adults with Disabilities would be flagged based on the following characteristics:
Barrier: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled 	Characteristic: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flagged as participating in Disabled Student Services (SD01)
Instructional program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adults with disabilities 	Course-taking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Took one or more noncredit course (CB04=N)
	Noncredit course code: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Took one or more noncredit courses for Persons with substantial disabilities (CB22=E)

FIGURE TEN: Data Elements for Child School Success

TOPSpro Enterprise	Chancellor’s Office MIS
Child School Success would be flagged based on the following characteristics:	Child School Success would be flagged based on the following characteristics:
Goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family goal 	Goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child school success (no code currently exists)
Instructional program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adults supporting K12 student success 	
Special program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family literacy Tutoring 	Noncredit course code: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who took one or more noncredit Parenting courses (CB22=F)

Participation Thresholds

Potential Recommendations

Based on the three AEBG advisory meetings held to date, the following potential recommendation emerged:

- Amend MIS so that student services can be tracked for all AEBG populations, using the noncredit SS codes (SS12-20).

Reportable Individuals and Participants

The WIOA guidelines set clear thresholds for reporting. Reportable individuals are those who have “taken action that demonstrates an intent to use program services and who meets specific reporting criteria of the program, including: 1) Individuals who provide identifying information; 2) Individuals who only use the self-service system; 3) Individuals who only receive information-only services or activities.”⁴ In contrast, participants are those with 12 or more contact hours.

Currently in AEBG, agencies have been instructed to count supportive services, including services related to advising and enrollment assistance, as part of the contact hours for designating someone as a participant. This is defined differently in K12 adult education and community colleges. TE is already set up to capture thresholds for reportable individuals and participants, so this information will be available for all K12 adult schools.

⁴ https://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/attach/TEGL/TEGL_10-16_Attachment_1.pdf

If MIS is used, information would come from several different types of codes. For example, colleges track activities related to matriculation as part of their compliance with the Student Success Act, with a focus on orientation, educational planning, and assessment (activities that typically occur after enrollment through CCCApply). The following flags could be used to identify reportable individuals for supportive services:

- Participation in noncredit orientation (SS16)
- Participation in noncredit assessment for placement (SS17)
- Participation in noncredit counseling/advisement (SS18)
- Participation in noncredit education plan development (SS19)
- Participation in other services (SS20)

However, the Chancellor's Office would need to expand the students who can be tracked using these flags to include the three excluded AEBG areas (adults with disabilities, child school success, and EL/Civics).

Additionally, colleges operate specialized student assistance programs for low income students (EOPS), CalWORKs participants, disabled students (DSPS), and foster youth. Participation in these programs is tracked in MIS using a variety of codes (SE, CW, SD, SG). However, students who are eligible for these services may not declare or participate in these programs, and reporting on some of these elements is inconsistent among colleges, and thus could not be included in AEBG reporting.

For instruction, attainment of the 12 or more instructional contact hours threshold can be tracked in MIS using positive attendance codes (SX05). However, some additional guidance may be needed to ensure that colleges are tracking contact hours correctly.



730 Harrison Street
San Francisco, California 94107-1242