

MEASURING NEED AND EFFECTIVENESS IN ADULT EDUCATION

Prepared for the California Community Colleges
Chancellor's Office

October 2015

In the following report, Hanover Research reviews the systems, procedures, and metrics used by states to gauge both the need for, and the effectiveness, of adult education services. To the extent possible, the report focuses on states where services are delivered in a regional or consortium-based model.



www.hanoverresearch.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary and Key Findings	3
INTRODUCTION	3
KEY FINDINGS.....	3
Measuring Need and Effectiveness in Adult Education.....	5
FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	5
ILLINOIS: ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY	6
MINNESOTA: ADULT BASIC EDUCATION	8
INDIANA: ADULT EDUCATION.....	10
OHIO: ADULT BASIC AND LITERACY EDUCATION.....	12
REVIEW OF STATE INDICATORS	17

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND KEY FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

Since at least the 1990s, efforts at the state and federal level have sought to develop useful accountability measures for adult education,¹ leading most prominently to the creation of the National Reporting System in 1999.² In California, the recently passed Adult Education Block Grant legislation (AB 104) establishes indicators to gauge both the need for and the effectiveness of adult education in the state’s regional consortia.³ This report reviews the measures used in other states to provide a benchmark for California’s measures and to identify any additional useful measures.

In reviewing state adult education systems, Hanover sought primarily to identify states which organize their adult education programs, at least to some extent, in regions, consortia, or some other jurisdiction encompassing multiple providers. However, despite some push towards increased regional collaboration,⁴ this type of structure remains relatively uncommon; in order to provide a comprehensive view of the adult education need and effectiveness indicators used around the country, the report also considers states that organize adult education in different ways, such as by county or by provider.

The report begins with a brief description of the federal adult education reporting requirements, for context. The report then presents a series of in-depth profiles of the need and effectiveness indicators in four states—Illinois, Minnesota, Indiana, and Ohio. Finally, a summary section provides an overview of indicators used in the eight states reviewed for this report.

KEY FINDINGS

- **To assess program effectiveness, most states use the core outcomes required by the National Reporting System.** Under federal law, all states must report results for five core indicators of adult education effectiveness, including skill level gains, educational attainment, and employment outcomes. For many states, these indicators represent the full extent of their effectiveness monitoring.
- **However, multiple states also track secondary outcome measures in addition to National Reporting System requirements.** Illinois, Minnesota, and Ohio all represent examples of states using secondary program performance measures to gauge the effectiveness of adult education. These may include indirect, process-oriented metrics, such as the use of professional development for program staff, or

¹ “Developing a National Outcome Reporting System for the Adult Education Program.” U.S. Department of Education. March 1997. pp. 4-5. http://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/DevNatOut_0.pdf

² “History of the NRS.” U.S. Department of Education. <http://www.nrsweb.org/about/history.aspx>

³ “AB-104 Education finance: education omnibus trailer bill.” California Legislature. Sec. 84911 and Sec. 84920 (b)(2)(c). http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB104

⁴ See, for instance, Ohio’s push towards a “regional services model,” discussed below.

may encompass additional student-focused measures, such as increased civic participation or involvement with their children's education.

- **Multiple states use past enrollment levels to gauge the need for adult education.** In addition to other measures, Georgia, Indiana, and Minnesota all examine prior year enrollments in adult education to allocate program funding, and sometimes uses contact hours rather than headcounts as a metric. In Minnesota, for instance, the prior year's contact hours account for 84 percent of a program's funding above its guaranteed baseline, which is based on total population.
- **To assess need, some states use more refined educational attainment segments than just possession of a high school diploma.** For instance, Illinois's index of need takes account of adults within a service area who lack a high school diploma, but gives extra weight to adults with less than even a 9th grade education. Similarly, Pennsylvania considers both the proportion of eligible adults who did not graduate from high school and the proportion of students with less than a 5th grade education.
- **In addition to employment, some states use measures of poverty to gauge need for adult education.** Both Pennsylvania and Illinois examine the population of a service area who reside in poverty to indicate need for services. Illinois allocates 25 percent of an area's adult education funding based on adults who live below the federal poverty level, compared to 5 percent allocated on the basis of unemployment.
- **Some states assess need within regional service areas as a proportion of total statewide need.** Illinois measures the "relative level of need" across its Area Planning Councils by calculating the share of the statewide target population residing within each Council. Similarly, Minnesota allocates adult education funding to its consortia as a ratio of their enrollments and populations relative to statewide totals.

MEASURING NEED AND EFFECTIVENESS IN ADULT EDUCATION

FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Under federal legislation including the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA) and the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, states must collect and report accountability data for their adult education programs, including five “core indicators” to measure program effectiveness (Figure 1).⁵

Figure 1: Adult Education Core Outcome Indicators of the Workforce Investment Act

Adult Education	Educational Attainment	Employment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated improvements in literacy skill levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receipt of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent Placement in, retention in, or completion of postsecondary education or training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Placement in unsubsidized employment Retention in unsubsidized employment or career advancement

Source: U.S. Department of Education.⁶

These five core outcome indicators are tracked through the National Reporting System, which monitors the accountability of federally funded, state-administered adult education programs.⁷ As such, the indicators often form the backbone of state-level assessment programs for adult education.

Figure 2: Needs Assessment Populations for the AEFLA

- Low-income adult learners
- Individuals with disabilities
- Single parents and displaced homemakers
- Individuals with multiple barriers to educational enhancement, including individuals with limited English proficiency
- Criminal offenders in correctional institutions and other institutionalized individuals
- Other populations, such as homeless adults

Source: U.S. Department of Education.⁸

⁵ See: “Adult Education and Family Literacy Act of 1998.” U.S. Department of Education. <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/adulted/leg/legis.html>

⁶ “Core Indicators Crosswalk.” U.S. Department of Education. <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/pi/AdultEd/corecross.pdf>

⁷ “Implementation Guidelines: Measures and Methods for the National Reporting System for Adult Education.” U.S. Department of Education. February 2015. pp. 1, 8-9. http://www.nrsweb.org/docs/ImplementationGuidelines_005_updatedC25.pdf

⁸ “Guide for the Development of a State Plan Under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.” U.S. Department of Education. September 30, 2015 (expiration). pp. 7-8. <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/pi/AdultEd/state-guidance.pdf>

The same federal legislation also affects needs assessment at the state level. Under the AEFLA, programs funded with federal dollars must conduct “an objective assessment of individuals [in the service area] for adult education and literacy activities,” including a number of designated populations (Figure 2). Such information may be drawn from Census data, state or regional data sources, or data gathered by local programs themselves.⁹ As with the core outcome indicators prescribed by federal rules, these guidelines also influence the needs assessment metrics used by many states for their adult education programs.

ILLINOIS: ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY

STATE PROGRAM STRUCTURE

In Illinois, adult education is organized under Area Planning Councils (APC), which generally correspond to the boundaries of the state’s community college districts (districts may also join together to form a joint Area Planning Council across multiple districts). The APC includes representatives from all school districts and regional school superintendents principally located within the community college district, as well as from the community college district itself.¹⁰

APCs undertake an annual planning process for delivering adult education in the region, which includes “a broad-based community network” of participants including human services agencies and non-profit organizations, as well as participating educational entities. The Illinois Community College Board (ICCB), which oversees adult education in the state, requires individual providers to participate in the APC “to ensure the efficient and effective delivery of adult education and literacy services.”¹¹

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Illinois requires APCs, as part of their annual planning process, to document the need for adult education services in the region, including a description of needs within eligible populations, an explanation of any gaps in service to these populations, and a plan for delivering services to these populations.¹³ Figure 3 shows the specific types of information that APCs must include in their annual plan, at a minimum.

Figure 3: Need Indicators in Illinois

- Total area population
- Total target population
- Number of unemployed
- Number of adults on public assistance
- Number of adults needing ESL services
- Other relevant data, such as individuals with disabilities, individuals with multiple barriers, and corrections populations

Source: Illinois Community College Board.¹²

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ “Area Planning Councils.” Illinois Compiled Statutes. 105 ILCS 405 Sec. 2-4. <ftp://www.ilga.gov/JCAR/AdminCode/002/00200552sections.html>

¹¹ “Illinois State Plan – Adult Education and Family Literacy.” Illinois Community College Board. April 1, 2014. pp. 6-7. http://www.iccb.org/pdf/adulted/publications_reports/FY15_AEFL_State_Plan.pdf

¹² Ibid., pp. 10-11.

¹³ Ibid., p. 10.

In addition to annual planning by the APCs, the ICCB assesses the “relative level of need” across all APCs in the state in order to allocate funding equitably. To do so, it uses an Index of Need, which incorporates four factors and assigns them different weights (Figure 4). The greatest weight is assigned to the population of adults with less than a 9th grade education, while unemployed adults account for the smallest share of the Index of Need.

Figure 4: Illinois Index of Need for Adult Education Funding

Component	Additional Component Weighting	Overall Weighting
Number of adults 16 years and older with less than 12 grades of education	Adults below 9 grades of education weighted by 1.5	45%
Number of adults 16 to 64 years old in households below federal poverty guidelines	n/a	25%
Number of adults 16 years and older who need ESL services	Adults who do not speak English well weighted by 1.5	25%
Number of adults 16 years and older who are unemployed	n/a	5%

Source: Illinois Community College Board.¹⁴

Finally, Illinois provides for an “augmented relative assessment of need,” for use “from time to time,” which takes into account one additional factor: the number of people living in the region in households where English is not the native language. In addition to this factor, APCs may submit any “additional local information” that they believe will “more accurately reflect the needs of the local area,” and this additional information is considered in making overall funding allocations.¹⁵

EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

Illinois monitors adult education programs through on-site visits, desk reviews, and other means, such as fiscal and compliance monitoring.¹⁷ As in most states, programs’ core performance is measured through the five core National Reporting System metrics (Figure 5).

Beyond the core indicators, Illinois also uses Indicators of Program Quality, similar to Ohio.

Figure 5: Core Performance Indicators in Illinois

- Literacy skill level gains
- Entering employment
- Retaining employment
- Obtaining high school diploma
- Entering postsecondary education

Source: Illinois Community College Board.¹⁶

¹⁴ [1] “Illinois State Plan – Adult Education and Family Literacy.” Illinois Community College Board. April 1, 2014. p. 11. http://www.iccb.org/pdf/adulted/publications_reports/FY15_AEFL_State_Plan.pdf

[2] “Fiscal Year 2015 Adult Education and Family Literacy Appropriation and Supporting Technical Data.” Illinois Community College Board. p. 1. http://www.iccb.org/pdf/adulted/publications_reports/FY15_AEFL_Tech_Apdx.pdf

¹⁵ “Illinois State Plan – Adult Education and Family Literacy.” Illinois Community College Board. Op. cit., pp. 11-12.

¹⁶ See: “Adult Education and Family Literacy Provider Manual – Fiscal Year 2014.” Illinois Community College Board. p. 136. http://www.iccb.org/pdf/adulted/FY14_AEFL_Provider_Manual_v2.pdf

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 133.

These include program administration factors, such as staffing and professional development, support services, and recruitment, as well as student performance factors such as educational gains.¹⁸ To facilitate the review of programs, the ICCB maintains a “monitoring document” for program reviews, which provides a checklist of actions and characteristics programs should be exhibiting;¹⁹ Figure 6 reproduces some items from the tool.

Figure 6: Illinois Program Monitoring Checklist*

Staffing/Professional Development	Y/N	Comments/ Recommended Action
1) Program has a professional development that includes all staff.		
3) Program employs staff with appropriate qualifications/certification/credentials to deliver adult education.		
Curriculum and Instruction	Y/N	Comments/ Recommended Action
1) Curriculum guides or syllabi are available for all classes/courses.		
6) Class sizes are reasonable and physical classroom equipment is appropriate for adults.		

Source: Illinois Community College Board.²⁰

* Represents an excerpt of the original checklist.

MINNESOTA: ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

STATE PROGRAM STRUCTURE

In Minnesota, adult education services are largely organized under consortia of programs, which have been formed as “administrative units to maximize efficiency, collaborate and to share resources.”²¹ However, a “consortium” may comprise a single organization (e.g., a school district), so long as that organization has the “administrative, organizational and instructional capacity to delivery comprehensive [adult education services].”²² In fact, at least a dozen of the state’s 47 “consortia” represent no more than a single school district.²³

This consortium structure allows non-profit organizations that do not meet the full requirements – i.e., cannot provide comprehensive adult education services – to participate

¹⁸ See: “Indicators of Program Quality.” Illinois Community College Board. <https://www.iccb.org/aepl.pub.reports.html>

¹⁹ “Adult Education and Family Literacy Monitoring Document.” Illinois Community College Board.

https://www.iccb.org/pdf/adulted/publications_reports/monitoringfinal.pdf

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ “Minnesota State Plan for Adult Basic Education.” Minnesota Adult Basic Education. April 9, 1999. p. 11.

http://mnabe.org/sites/default/files/STATE_PLAN_Minn-Final_1999-04.doc

²² “Adult Basic Education Program Overview and Consortium Requirements (Fiscal Year 2016).” Minnesota Adult Basic Education. p. 7.

http://mnabe.org/sites/default/files/FY_2016_ABE_Program_Overview_and_Consortium_Requirements.docx

²³ See: “2011-2012 ABE District Alignment Directory.” Minnesota Adult Basic Education.

<http://mnabe.themlc.org/find-abe-program>

by joining an established group. In this structure, the consortium’s fiscal agent, as approved for state grant-making purposes, provides accountability for all of the organizations participating in the consortium.²⁴

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Minnesota allocates funding to adult education consortia through a formula that incorporates total population, adult learner population, and prior year enrollments in adult and English-learner education programs.²⁵ Figure 7 shows the ratios and weightings used to calculate allocations for individual consortia.

Figure 7: Need Assessment Ratios for Minnesota Adult Education

Component	Weighting*	Description
Total population	Baseline	As baseline funding, consortia receive the greater of ~\$4,000 or ~\$2 per resident of the service area.
Enrollment, total	84%	Calculated by the program’s prior year total contact hours, as a ratio of statewide total contact hours.
Enrollment, English learners	8%	Calculated by the program’s prior year English learner enrollment, as a ratio of statewide English learner enrollments.
Population, adult learners	8%	Calculated by the consortium’s Census population of adults 25 years and older with no high school diploma, as a ratio of the statewide population of such adults.

Source: Minnesota Statutes.²⁶

* Minnesota provides “basic population aid” as a baseline of funding for adult education consortia. Additional “program revenue” is allocated according to the weights shown here.

EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

Similar to other states, Minnesota monitors adult education program effectiveness through multiple procedures, including desk review and on-site visits. The core benchmarks for program performance are seven “student-centered outcomes,” analyzed on a “cohort basis,” which reflect the core indicators required by the National Reporting System (Figure 8).²⁸

Beyond these core indicators, Minnesota also asks programs to report on a series of secondary outcome measures related to employment or

Figure 8: Core Performance Indicators in Minnesota

- Educational Function Level completion
- Obtaining a job
- Retaining a job
- Entering a postsecondary institution
- Entering postsecondary training
- Obtaining a GED
- Receiving a high school diploma

Source: Minnesota Adult Basic Education.²⁷

²⁴ “Adult Basic Education Program Overview and Consortium Requirements (Fiscal Year 2016).” Minnesota Adult Basic Education. Op. cit., p. 7.

²⁵ “Adult Basic Education Aid.” Minnesota Statutes. 124D.531 Subd. 3. <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/?id=124D.531>

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ “Adult Basic Education Program Overview and Consortium Requirements (Fiscal Year 2016).” Minnesota Adult Basic Education. Op. cit., pp. 11-12.

²⁸ Ibid.

economic well-being, community participation, and family strength.²⁹ Some of these outcomes, such as involvement in children’s education, can be found in use as secondary outcomes in other states, such as Ohio.

Figure 9: Secondary Outcome Measures for Minnesota Adult Basic Education

Category	Outcome	Description
Employment	Reduction in Receipt of Public Assistance	Programs track number of students who enter the program receiving public assistance and number who meet goal of giving up assistance due to employment or increased income.
Community	Achieved Citizenship Skills	Programs track number of students who have a goal of obtaining citizenship and number who obtain skills to pass the citizenship exam.
Community	Voting Behavior	Programs track number of students who have never voted and follow-up to see if students meet their goal of voting or registering to vote.
Community	General Involvement in Community Activities	Programs track number of students who have as a goal (and who achieve the goal) participating in community activities such as volunteering for a neighborhood or community organization.
Family	Involvement in Children’s Education	Programs track number of students who have as a goal (and who achieve the goal) helping children with homework, interacting with children’s teachers, or similar activities.
Family	Involvement in Children’s Literacy-Related Activities	Programs track number of students who have as a goal (and who achieve the goal) reading to children, visiting the library, or similar activities.

Source: Minnesota Adult Basic Education.³⁰

INDIANA: ADULT EDUCATION

STATE PROGRAM STRUCTURE

Indiana organizes adult education services into 11 multi-county regions,³¹ each served by a consortium of educational providers, workforce development agencies, and other partners. The state implemented the regional system in 2010 to “provide the most effective platform to provide adult education services and complement other statewide initiatives.” Specifically, the regional consortia “mirror the design of the Indiana workforce investment system and its workforce service areas,” which have been defined based on “quantitative analysis and qualitative evaluation.”³²

²⁹ “Minnesota ABE FY 2014-2015 Reporting Requirements.” Minnesota Adult Basic Education. pp. 11-12. www.mnabe.org/sites/default/files/SFY_2015_Reporting_Requirements_1.doc

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ “Adult Education: Locations.” Indiana Department of Workforce Development. http://www.in.gov/dwd/adulted_locations.htm

³² “Indiana State Plan – Adult Education and Family Literacy.” Indiana Department of Workforce Development. July 1, 2015. p. 11. http://www.in.gov/dwd/abe/files/2015_Indiana_State_Plan_Draft.pdf

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Indiana assesses need within each region based on prior adult education enrollments and the number of unemployment insurance claimants who do not have a high school diploma. The state also allocates a substantial portion of adult education funding based on performance incentives. All allocation metrics are assessed relative to statewide totals.³³

Figure 10: Allocation Components for Indiana Adult Education

Component	Weight	Description
Enrollment	40%	Program enrollments from prior two years, as a share of statewide program enrollments.
UI Claimants	10%	Unemployment insurance claimants without a high school diploma, as a share of statewide total.
Performance	50%	Dollars earned in performance incentives for prior two years, as a share of dollars earned by all programs statewide.

Source: Indiana Department of Workforce Development.³⁴

The performance incentive component of Indiana’s allocation model relies upon a schedule of reimbursements that program can receive for achieving certain goals. These tend to reflect the core performance indicators required by the National Reporting System, such as level gains, employment, or educational attainment. Thus, for instance, under the current performance incentive schedule a program can earn \$600 for every student who enrolls in college-level coursework at a two- or four-year institution or enrolls in an apprenticeship program. Similar incentives apply for students who pass a literacy skill level, complete a high school diploma, or gain employment. For some indicators, the incentive increases for completion within a certain time period (e.g., attainment of a high school diploma within six weeks of beginning the program).³⁵

EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

To track effectiveness, Indiana requires each of its 11 adult education regions to set annual performance targets for eight outcome measures. As the state notes, a number of these metrics “coincide with [National Reporting System] measurements” or other federally required indicators. The measures also examine overall program enrollments (Figure 11).

³³ [1] “Adult Education Program Grant Continuation Guidance.” Indiana Department of Workforce Development. July 1, 2015. p. 3. <http://www.in.gov/dwd/files/2015AdultEducationContinuationGuidance.pdf>
 [2] See: “Appendix A: Adult Education Formula and Allocation.” Indiana Department of Workforce Development. <http://www.in.gov/dwd/adultedadmin/grants.htm>
³⁴ “Adult Education Program Grant Continuation Guidance.” Indiana Department of Workforce Development. Op. cit., p. 3.
³⁵ See: “Appendix C: Performance Incentive Schedule.” Indiana Department of Workforce Development. <http://www.in.gov/dwd/adultedadmin/grants.htm>

Figure 11: Performance Outcome Measures for Indiana Adult Education

Category	Measure	Description
Educational Attainment	Completing a Level	Percentage of students who complete a level.
	Pre- and Post-Tested Completing a Level	Percentage of students who are pre- and post-tested and complete a level.
	Obtained a High School Diploma	Percentage of students who obtain a diploma or equivalent.
	Entered Postsecondary Education/Training	Percentage of students who enter postsecondary education/training.
Employment	Entered Employment	Percentage of students who gain employment after exiting adult education.
	Retained Employment	Percentage of students who had employment and retain it.
Program Enrollments	Adult Education Enrollment	Number of students enrolled in adult education.
	WorkINdiana Enrollment	Number of students enrolled in WorkINdiana, the state’s workforce training program.

Source: Indiana Department of Workforce Development.³⁶

OHIO: ADULT BASIC AND LITERACY EDUCATION

STATE PROGRAM STRUCTURE

In Ohio as in other states, providers eligible for adult education grant funding may include local educational agencies (e.g., school district), higher education institutions, other public or private organizations, or a consortium of any of these organizations.³⁷ In practice, most adult education providers in Ohio, including colleges, school districts, and career centers, operate independently. Most providers serve a specific county, though some counties may have more than one provider and some providers may serve more than one county.³⁸

However, since at least 2012,³⁹ Ohio has been encouraging providers to “conceptualize within a regional services model” in order to “increase efficiency and to avoid duplication of [adult education] services in Ohio.” In this model, a single fiscal agent (i.e., a provider) may provide “comprehensive [adult education] services . . . to a designated area (county, city or region),” either “through its own resources” or in partnership with other agencies.⁴⁰ As part of this shift, Ohio now asks providers applying for an adult education grant to “describe how

³⁶ “Adult Education Program Grant Continuation Guidance.” Indiana Department of Workforce Development. Op. cit., p. 8.

³⁷ “Adult Basic and Literacy Education Request for Proposal.” Ohio Department of Higher Education. March 21, 2014. p. 3. <https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/able/Grants/FY%202015%20ABLE%20Program%20Grant%20RFP%203-21-2014.docx>

³⁸ See: “ABLE Locations by County.” Ohio Department of Higher Education. <https://www.ohiohighered.org/able/locations>

³⁹ Gove, J. “Fall Administrators’ Meeting.” Ohio Department of Higher Education. Fall 2012. Slide 9. <https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/able/Meetings/Fall%202012%20presentation%20Final.ppt>

⁴⁰ “Adult Basic and Literacy Education Request for Proposal.” Ohio Department of Higher Education. Op. cit., p. 3.

[they] will collaborate with other [adult education] programs in the regional service area . . . [and how they] will collaborate with other University System of Ohio partners.”⁴¹

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

To demonstrate need, Ohio asks providers applying for adult education grants to indicate the area to be served, the “eligible population” in the region, and the projected enrollment in the provider’s programs.⁴² The state understands “eligible population” to include adults 18 years or older without a high school diploma.⁴³

Figure 12: Need Indicators in Ohio

- Number of years of schooling
- Educational needs (e.g., ESOL, ABE)
- Employment status
- Social economic status
- Immigration status
- Demographics (e.g., ethnicity, age)
- Family characteristics (e.g., marital status, children)
- Availability for instruction (days, times, etc.)

Source: Ohio Department of Higher Education.⁴⁴

Ohio provides more detailed guidelines for programs to assess local need after receipt of a grant but before commencement of a program. The state encourages providers to conduct a needs assessment to “determine the scope of the program, including the number and type of services and classes to offer, class locations, schedules, staffing, instructional materials and training needs.” Ohio’s guidelines envision a highly localized process, in which

providers gather certain information about the “target population” in the region (Figure 12).⁴⁵

EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

Ohio uses multiple types of measures to assess the performance of adult education programs (Figure 13). The Core Indicators of Performance reflect those required by federal law the National Reporting System, including improvements in literacy skill levels, attainment of a high school diploma, and placement in postsecondary education or employment.⁴⁶

⁴¹ “Adult Basic and Literacy Education – Application – Fiscal Year 2015.” Ohio Department of Higher Education. Part B. <https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/able/Grants/FY%202015%20Grant%20application%203-21-2014.xlsx>

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ See: [1] “Adult Basic and Literacy Education Request for Proposal.” Ohio Department of Higher Education. Op. cit., p. 6. [2] “Census Information.” Ohio Department of Higher Education. <https://www.ohiohighered.org/ABLE/grants>

⁴⁴ “Ohio Adult Basic and Literacy Education – Administrators’ Manual.” Ohio Department of Higher Education. June 2012. p. 4-6. <https://www.ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/able/reference/policies/Administrators%20Manual%20August%2013%20final.pdf>

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ “Revised Program Plan for Adult Basic and Literacy Education.” Ohio Department of Higher Education. April 1, 2014. p. 5. <https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/able/reference/policies/state%20plan%20FY%202015%2006-20-2014%20%28with%20OCTAE%20Approved%20Targets%29.pdf>

Figure 13: Effectiveness Indicators in Ohio

Core Indicators of Performance
Secondary Performance Measures (Optional)
Indicators of Program Quality (Optional)

Source: Ohio Department of Higher Education.⁴⁷

primary care givers” in their children’s education or in literacy-related activities with their children. This set also includes the number of participants obtaining a high school diploma *and* continuing to postsecondary education.⁴⁸

Beyond these, Ohio has established two sets of additional, optional measures of program performance. One set, called Secondary Performance Measures, focuses in particular on family literacy. These measures look at the “increased involvement of parents, custodians and

Ohio uses the second set of optional measures, the Indicators of Program Quality, to “guide the local grant application and program review processes.”⁴⁹ These indicators cover eight areas of program operation (Figure 14), and extend beyond the basic performance outcomes measured by the core indicators. In particular, the Indicators of Program Quality reflect the underlying processes and structures of adult education programs, such as facilities, program administration, or professional development for instructors.

Figure 14: Ohio Indicators of Program Quality

Indicator	Description
1.0 Student Achievement	Students demonstrate progress towards goals.
2.0 Physical Environment	Program provides a safe physical environment with adequate space, equipment, and other facilities.
3.0 Program Planning & Administration	Program planning and administration is based on a written plan and is informed by evaluation.
4.0 Curriculum & Instruction	Program has a written curriculum and matches instruction to student needs and learning styles.
5.0 Professional Development	Program has an ongoing professional development process for instructors.
6.0 Support Services	Program provides a system for support services that promotes student achievement of goals.
7.0 Student Recruitment & Promotion	Program successfully recruits from target populations for literacy services.
8.0 Transitions	Program provides services facilitating transitions to further training, education, or employment.

Source: Ohio Department of Higher Education.⁵⁰

Ohio segments the Indicators of Program Quality into a detailed rubric of indicators, measures, and standards. In this hierarchical structure, the indicator defines the program characteristic under consideration. The measures then establish how a program can demonstrate compliance with the indicator, and the standards set a minimum level of performance on the measure. Standards may be quantitative (e.g., a certain percentage of

⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 5-6.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 6.

⁵⁰ Table contents adapted from: Ibid.

students passing a standardized test) or qualitative, depending on the nature of the measure. As an example, Figure 15 provides the measures and standards for one Indicator of Program Quality, that which relates to student support services.

Figure 15: Example of Ohio Indicators of Program Quality

6.0 Support Services		
Indicator	Measures	Standards
Program provides a system for support services that promotes student achievement of goals.	A. Program has a written plan describing student support services, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Child care services 2. Transportation services 3. Flexible schedules 4. Special accommodations 	A.1 Program identifies support services needs by formal or informal assessment, documented on file.
		A.2 Program uses assessment information to provide support services directly or through referrals.
		A.3 Program follows up on support services referrals.
		A.4 Program follows up with students missing class for a month or more to identify possible support services needs.
	B. Program staff possess knowledge and skills to make appropriate support services referrals within the program and within the community.	B.1 All sites maintain a current listing of available community support services, reviewed annually.
		B.2 All program staff have a copy of the program’s written plan for support services.
	C. Program establishes linkages with other adult education programs and other community providers or systems.	C.1 Program coordinates with other community resources, as evidenced by MOUs with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. University System of Ohio providers (e.g., community colleges) 2. Other postsecondary educational institutions 3. Ohio Means Jobs centers 4. Social services agencies 5. Employers 6. K-12 schools

Source: Ohio Department of Higher Education.⁵¹

As noted, the Indicators of Program Quality inform the program review process in Ohio, along with the core and secondary performance indicators. The latter tend to be covered during an annual desk review process, in which state officials examine local program data on student achievement and administrative requirements such as timely data submission.⁵² A more in-depth, on-site program review may be executed for certain programs, based on

⁵¹ Table contents adapted from: “Adult Basic and Literacy Education – Indicators of Program Quality.” Ohio Department of Higher Education. July 2015. pp. 12-13. https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/able/reference/accountability/Indicators%20of%20Program%20Quality_1.pdf

⁵² “Ohio Adult Basic and Literacy Education – Administrators’ Manual.” Ohio Department of Higher Education. Op. cit., pp. 7-1, 7-2.

factors such as consecutive years of unacceptable desk review results, major changes in personnel or program structure, or simply a long period since the last on-site review.⁵³

For on-site program reviews, Ohio has developed a review instrument, which provides a series of checklists and questions detailing the documents and other information items a program should provide. Figure 16 shows an excerpt from the checklist of documents programs must produce, specifically those related to program information. Other checklists ask for documents related to fiscal or student information.⁵⁵

Figure 16: Checklist for On-Site Program Review: Program Information*

- ✓ Last two years' Annual Performance Report
- ✓ Copy of Learning Disability Plan
- ✓ Written program curriculum and sample lesson plans
- ✓ Copy of all staff certifications
- ✓ Employee policy handbook
- ✓ Job descriptions for all staff positions
- ✓ Employee evaluation instruments
- ✓ Copies of advisory committee agendas and minutes
- ✓ Community support services materials for students
- ✓ Sample recruitment materials (e.g., pamphlets)

Source: Ohio Department of Higher Education.⁵⁴

* Represents an excerpt of the original checklist.

In addition to document review, the on-site program review process includes a series of questions, which incorporate the Indicators of Program Quality and other performance benchmarks. Figure 17 presents an excerpted selection of questions, along with the corresponding Indicator of Program Quality (IPQ).

Figure 17: On-Site Program Review Items for Ohio Adult Education*

The local program:	Y/N	Corroborating Documentation	State Adult Education Program Manager Comments	Relevant IPQ
1) Conducts a minimum of one staff meeting per quarter.				3.B.5
4) Has a process in place for standard fiscal accounting, budgeting, documenting, and reporting fiscal practices				3.C
9) Has a process in place for determining why absent students are not attending classes and strategies to re-engage students in the program.				6.A.4
11) Has recruiting materials, including a website, that are current, student-friendly, and contain [state] branding.				7.A.2

Source: Ohio Department of Higher Education.⁵⁶

* Represents an excerpt of the original checklist.

⁵³ "Revised Program Plan for Adult Basic and Literacy Education." Ohio Department of Higher Education. Op. cit., p. 8.

⁵⁴ "Review Instrument for Local Program." Ohio Department of Higher Education. February 2014. pp. 5-6. https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/able/reference/accountability/Review%20Instrument%20FINAL%205-8-2014_0.doc

⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 5-13.

⁵⁶ [1] Ibid., p. 8.

[2] "Adult Basic and Literacy Education – Indicators of Program Quality." Ohio Department of Higher Education. Op. cit.

REVIEW OF STATE INDICATORS

The two tables in this section show the need and effectiveness indicators used in a selection of states reviewed for this report. Figure 18 outlines the geographic organization of adult education in the states reviewed.

Most of the states reviewed use a combination of similar indicators, although definitions may vary slightly from state to state. For instance, most states include the adult learner population within a service area as an indicator of regional need, but some may examine this population from multiple angles. Thus, Florida accounts for not only the total adult population who lack a high school diploma, but also young adults (ages 16 to 24 years old) who have dropped out of the state’s K-12 education system within the previous six years.

Figure 18: Geographic Organization of Adult Education

State	Principal Area/Entity of Organization	Definition/Explanation
Florida ⁵⁷	Provider	Providers organized roughly by county, but service areas may overlap.
Georgia ⁵⁸	Service Delivery Area	31 regions of one or more counties, with a lead agency responsible for each region.
Illinois ⁵⁹	Area Planning Council	Consortia of providers operating within each community college district.
Indiana ⁶⁰	Consortium	11 regions organized to mirror the state’s workforce development system.
Kentucky ⁶¹	County	Adult education funds allocated by county.
Minnesota ⁶²	Consortium	47 consortia of providers, typically based around school district boundaries.
Ohio ⁶³	Provider	Providers are distributed roughly by county, but service areas may overlap.
Pennsylvania ⁶⁴	Provider	Depending on location, providers may serve multiple counties.

⁵⁷ “Adult Ed Map.” ACE of Florida Foundation. <http://www.aceoffloridafoundation.org/adult-ed-map/>

⁵⁸ [1] See: “FY 2016 Estimated Allocations.” Georgia Office of Adult Education. <http://literacy.coe.uga.edu/rfa/rfa16/rfa-fy16-budgets.html>

[2] “Adult Education Service Delivery Areas for FY2010.” Georgia Office of Adult Education. http://literacy.coe.uga.edu/rfa/rfa11/rfa_map.pdf

⁵⁹ See Illinois section, above.

⁶⁰ See Indiana section, above.

⁶¹ See: “KYAE County Funding Allocations.” Kentucky Adult Education. <http://kyae.ky.gov/NR/rdonlyres/8ECF5017-1A0A-4B0E-B986-E42DAE308D1B/0/FundingAllocations201213.pdf>

⁶² See Minnesota section, above.

⁶³ See Ohio section, above.

⁶⁴ “Find an Adult Education Program.” Pennsylvania Department of Education. <http://www.paadultedresources.org/find-an-adult-ed-program.html>

Figure 19: Need Indicators for Adult Education

State	Population			Enrollments		Employment & Economy		Other
	Total Pop.	Adult Learner Pop.	English Learner Pop.	Adult Education Enrollments	English Learner Enrollments	Unemployment	Poverty	
Florida ⁶⁵		●	●					
Georgia ⁶⁶		●		●				●
Illinois ⁶⁷	●	●	●			●	●	
Indiana ⁶⁸		●		●		●		●
Kentucky ⁶⁹		●						
Minnesota ⁷⁰	●	●		●	●			
Ohio ⁷¹								
Pennsylvania ⁷²		●				●	●	●
<p>“Other” Indicators: Georgia: Program performance, based on students completing an educational functional level. Indiana: Program performance, based on various incentives. Pennsylvania: Percentage of eligible adults who belong to minority groups.</p>								

⁶⁵ “2000-2015 Florida’s State Plan – Adult Education and Family Literacy Act of 1998.” Florida Department of Education. pp. 44-45.
<http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7522/urlt/ConsolidatedStatePlan.pdf>

⁶⁶ [1] “2.1 The Georgia Adult Education Funding Program.” Georgia Office of Adult Education. pp. 6-7. <http://literacy.coe.uga.edu/manual/p2.1/2-1.pdf>
 [2] “Adult Education Census of Need.” Georgia Office of Adult Education. <http://literacy.coe.uga.edu/rfa/rfa15/GA-AdultEducCensus-of-Need.pdf>

⁶⁷ See Illinois section, above.

⁶⁸ See Indiana section, above.

⁶⁹ “Kentucky Adult Education Policy and Procedure Manual.” Kentucky Adult Education. July 1, 2013. p. 51. <http://kyae.ky.gov/NR/rdonlyres/EB8FB452-6546-4A59-A7FC-FF4E33FD74CF/0/201314PolicyManual.pdf>

⁷⁰ See Minnesota section, above.

⁷¹ See Ohio section, above.

⁷² “Adult Education and Family Literacy Guidelines for Program Year 2015-16.” Pennsylvania Department of Education. July 2015. p. 2.
<http://www.education.pa.gov/Documents/Postsecondary-Adult/Adult%20Basic%20and%20Family%20Literacy%20Education/ABLE%20Administrative%20Documents%20Library/Adult%20Education%20and%20Family%20Literacy%20Guidelines%202015-16.pdf>

Figure 20: Effectiveness Indicators for Adult Education

State	Adult Education		Educational Attainment		Employment		Other
	Enrollments	Level Completion	High School Diploma	Entered Postsecondary	Entered Employment	Retained Employment	
Florida ⁷³		●	●	●	●	●	
Georgia ⁷⁴		●	●	●	●	●	
Illinois ⁷⁵		●	●	●	●	●	●
Indiana ⁷⁶	●	●	●	●	●	●	
Kentucky ⁷⁷		●	●	●			
Minnesota ⁷⁸		●	●	●	●	●	●
Ohio ⁷⁹		●	●	●	●	●	●
Pennsylvania ⁸⁰		●	●	●	●	●	
<p>“Other” Indicators: Illinois: Secondary performance indicators examine program administration factors such as staffing and professional development. Minnesota: Secondary indicators examine student outcomes such as civic participation or involvement in child’s education. Ohio: Indicators of program quality examine secondary factors such as program facilities and staffing.</p>							

⁷³ See: “2015-2016 Performance Measures.” Florida Department of Education. <http://www.fldoe.org/academics/career-adult-edu/adult-edu/resources.stml>

⁷⁴ “5.3 Proposed Performance Measures.” Georgia Office of Adult Education. May 28, 2013. <http://literacy.coe.uga.edu/rfa/rfa15/goals.pdf>

⁷⁵ See Illinois section, above.

⁷⁶ See Indiana section, above.

⁷⁷ “Kentucky Adult Education Policy and Procedure Manual.” Kentucky Adult Education. Op. cit., pp. 32-33.

⁷⁸ See Minnesota section, above.

⁷⁹ See Ohio section, above.

⁸⁰ “Adult Education and Family Literacy Performance Standards.” Pennsylvania Department of Education. p. 2. <http://www.education.pa.gov/Documents/Postsecondary-Adult/Adult%20Basic%20and%20Family%20Literacy%20Education/ABLE%20Administrative%20Documents%20Library/Adult%20Education%20Policy%20-%20Performance%20Standards.pdf>

PROJECT EVALUATION FORM

Hanover Research is committed to providing a work product that meets or exceeds partner expectations. In keeping with that goal, we would like to hear your opinions regarding our reports. Feedback is critically important and serves as the strongest mechanism by which we tailor our research to your organization. When you have had a chance to evaluate this report, please take a moment to fill out the following questionnaire.

<http://www.hanoverresearch.com/evaluation/index.php>

CAVEAT

The publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this brief. The publisher and authors make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this brief and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of fitness for a particular purpose. There are no warranties that extend beyond the descriptions contained in this paragraph. No warranty may be created or extended by representatives of Hanover Research or its marketing materials. The accuracy and completeness of the information provided herein and the opinions stated herein are not guaranteed or warranted to produce any particular results, and the advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for every partner. Neither the publisher nor the authors shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages. Moreover, Hanover Research is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. Partners requiring such services are advised to consult an appropriate professional.



4401 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 400

Arlington, VA 22203

P 202.559.0500 F 866.808.6585

www.hanoverresearch.com