

Building the Power

Adult Basic and Literacy Education
Conference

September 15-16, 2009

Helena, MT

The Tale of Two Processes

OR

The EPP

VS

Advancing Agriculture
Education

Standards

Questions you may be asking:

- What are the standards?
- How can the standards improve my practice?
- What can the standards do for ABLE?
- Do you really think I have time for one more thing?

“Students can do no better than the assignments they are given.” Katy Haycock, *The Education Trust*

Standards (Cont.)

- Welcome
- Introductions
- The Process

Reflection

Any

questions for

the standards team?

Unveiling the Standards

- Document Overview
- Focus on each content area

Reflection

Any

questions for the standards team?

Next Steps

- Explore
- Support Coming Your Way (September-January)
 - Copies sent to stakeholders
- Required Survey by February 1, 2010
- Technical assistance

LOGO

Accomplishments to Data

- Adopted a logo
- Developed a cadre of professional educators
- Elevated ABLE professionals
- Joined majority of states with ABLE standards
- Give educators clear direction
- Brought ESOL to life
- Created new teacher guide
- Validated what everyone has been doing
- Unified curriculum
- Generated an awareness of student needs

What's A PEP Talk?

Transitioning Adult Students in the Past

NO TIME FOR A PEP TALK

- Counsel the student (with little time, resources, or expertise)
- Submit a transition spreadsheet to OPI
- Counsel when possible
- Pray

Transitioning Adult Students in the Future

STILL NO TIME FOR A PEP TALK, BUT...

- Counsel the student with resources, expertise, and little additional time
- Students create their own transition portfolio
- Counsel according to identified needs
- Monitor the time spent in meaningful self-paced career planning
- Count your successful transitions

Transition Spreadsheet

- Look at transition spreadsheet for your program
- More students with goals
- Next step, more students with goal attainment
 - PEP talk will make a difference!

The Persistence Formula

- Go to NRS Table 4
- Find percentage of student persistence at each level
 - Column B minus Column F, then remainder divided by Column B

Day Two

- Reflection-Why are we here?
 - Where are we going?
- Moving Forward

Distance Learning Now and in the Future

- Distance Learning in 2007-2009
- Challenges
- Successes
- Future goals
- The Data
- Preparing your local

RAEC Grant

- Director Prime Directive-January 2007
- RAEC Prime Directive-Sustainability

Once the RAEC grant has ended all Montana ABLE sites will have the tools and skills to continue distance learning and maintain a protocol for partnering with community in order to most effectively maintain a healthy local economy. The protocol for working with the local employers will be flexible in order to meet local needs, and the networking model that is developed will provide the flexibility required for shifting economic needs. Sustainability will be built in from the onset of the project, as the ABLE staff will be empowered by seeing their role in a new and different ways. Empowerment leads to institutionalization, which leads to sustainability.

Winter 2008

State Perspective

- Start small and build the model and the infrastructure
- Wanted to show success, not typically successful (Project Ideal Reports)
- Bring others into the “fold”

Winter of 2009

- RAEC Grant Goes Away (Sustainability?)
 - No state staff for technical support
 - State training on the model
 - Finding time to identifying and meet with partners, make packets, schedule orientations, assign staff, monitor staff, learn how to deliver curriculum, keep them engaged, participate in conference calls, report successes, and have fun
 - Economic downturn
 - Programs worked to adhere to ideal

Challenges

- Maintaining constant, consistent contact
- Keeping students motivated/retention in spite of enthusiastic instructors' attempts to engage
- Identifying students who could/would be successful
- Initial learning and the application of GED Online and Skills Tutor
- Limited Internet access

Challenges (cont.)

- Students not completing the quizzes, so no time earned
- Time demand on staff for instruction
- Finding qualified personnel
- Students with many barriers
- Staying true to the intent of the grant

Grant Specific Challenges

- MOU constraints
- Overwhelming need for ABLE made it impossible to target any one business/agency
- Maintenance of community outreach connections
- Getting employers and partner agencies involved
- Getting agencies/businesses to complete the needs survey

Successes

- Developing a student contact list
- Expanding program opportunities and looking at students more broadly
- Involving more staff in distance learning
- Creation of posters and brochures
- Agency referrals and work with HS Counselors
- Increased community contacts and renewed relationships
- Serving a neighboring county without an ABLE program
- Reach students who cannot utilize on-site services

Success Continued

- Instructor can work from home
- It brought attention to ABLE throughout the area
- Allowed the program to look at the needs and wants of the community
- Forced the staff to make hard decisions about what the program should look like in terms of delivery and usefulness to the clientele
- Student gains
- Putting a process in place to screen, enroll, and establish DL students
- Developing a written process and procedures
- Staff committed to working collaboratively and doing DL right
- Ongoing support and dialogue
- Cost free PR for the program
- Expanded curriculum

Are Programs Eager to Continue

What Do You Want to Accomplish

- Targeting younger learners toward their GED
- Effectively get the word out that this is available
- Strengthen partnerships, especially Job Service
- Involve outlying communities
- Involve more staff in DL instruction
- Do a better job of assessing the probability of a student being a DL candidate
- Collaborate with other DL providers
- Continue work with high school drop outs
- Improve student motivation
- Regular distance education orientations/enrollment
- Require 2-3 weeks in classroom before allowing students to become a DL student
- Work more efficiently as a group
- Develop a smooth transition from intake forward
- Manage an expanded program without pulling resources from other program needs
- Putting in place a process and protocol coordinated by a distance learning coordinator

State Wide Data

- **50** DL students for 08-09
 - **46** students with 12 or more hours
 - **3** beginning basic (41 hours) 33% completion
 - **10** intermediate low (326 hours) 50 % completion rate
 - **18** ABE intermediate high (hours) 28% completion rate
 - **11** ASE low (559 hours) 36% completion rate
 - **4** ASE high (80 hours) 25% completion rate

State Adherence to the Model

Nine Reasons

Local Program Data

- Billings
- Missoula

- Goal to have state spreadsheet!

State Initiative for 2009-2010

- Include distance learning hours for all students
 - Curriculum must be delivered to students separated by geography, time or both
 - Teachers receive ongoing DL support
- Maintain GED Online Mission
 - Increase number of GED Online seats
 - Creatively engage students in online learning

State initiative for 2009-2010

Focus Professional Development for Year

- LINCS
- Best Practice Demo
 - Teacher Tube
 - Face Book
 - Using the flip

2009-2010 Distance Delivery-Policy

- Blended model includes on-site intake, goal setting, pre/post tests
 - Create a blended model that will work for you
- Program director and involved staff must attend DL professional development
- Select a lead DL instructor (when applicable)
 - Maintain communication with state staff on student enrollment
 - Coordinate efforts to recruit and identify students
- Complete state distance learning activities as a team (application)
 - Participate in monthly conference calls
- Submit an application
 - Describe program implementation (teachers, hours, student screening, etc.)
 - An assessment of student successes (ages, ed gains, core goals, etc.)
 - A goal to increase number of distance learners

Application

- Programs not involved last year must have GED Online training (3-4 hours on the system)
 - October 16, 2009
 - Lincoln Center (Billings, MT)
- Submit a letter to the state validates you access do not have access Skills Tutor, PLATO, or Nova Net to qualify for state Skills Tutor seats

Burning Questions

Table Talk

Five minutes to begin sharing on plan for next year.

The MABLE Story

- 2006-07 Transition from SIMS to Web-based
 - Task force describing what programs needed in MABLE
 - Designed by programmer with support from state team and input from the field while being built
 - Approved by the feds and call exemplary
 - February teleconference
 - Regional training June 2007 and October 2007
 - Asked for your input
 - » Task List/Enhancement List was developed based on feedback
 - » Stayed on the task list

MABLE Reborn

- What drove the rebirth?
 - Fixes , fixes, fixes
 - No time for enhancements
 - Assessment policy required changes
 - PAI-student can choose
 - Increased instructional intensity
 - Post test validations
 - Continuous term of instruction

How Does OPI Process Work?

- OPI/ABLE team reviews Assessment Policy and NRS Policy, and field input
- Discuss with programmer-redesign sections that didn't work and aligned sections with policy
- Program is put into test
- Testing by IT staff/OPI administrative assistance
- Moved into production
- Provide ongoing technical assistance and meet when modifications are needed

How Is Assessment Policy Developed?

- Finding in 2007 audit
 - MT has an outmoded assessment policy to guide appropriate administration under the NRS.
 - Given sections that required changes
 - Submitted in December 2008
 - Required changes in February, 2009
 - More changes in June, 2009
 - Policy approved June 29, 2009

Post Test Policy

- January 2009-informed directors of 60 requirement in other states
- Formed a subcommittee to address issue
- February 2009-e-mailed MT exceptions to D.C
- Built “exception drop down” in MABLE
- June 2009-Exceptions language eliminated at request of OVAE
- August 2009-Academic exception at 50 hours provided

MABLE Handbook

Questions?

Use Technical Assistance Form for all questions.

Attach to e-mail sent to:

cflynn@mt.gov

ligardner@mt.gov

CAELA Update

BEST

Practice

Model

LINCS

- What else is there?
- Moving from building the foundation to focused instruction
- ASRP
 - How to use this resource

Making the Community Work for You

- Resources are shrinking
- Demands are increasing
- Find help!

Hot Topics

- Funding Formula
- Compulsory Education
 - Evaluate the impact on ABLE and GED testing
- Monitoring serving high school students
 - Facts
 - FY2009 school year was \$6,037 per high school ANB
 - If students turn 19 before September 10th, they do not get ANB.
 - Count days 2008-09: October 6th and February 2nd
 - First Monday in October and February

Protocol: Statewide Best Practice

Funding Formula Task Force 2007

- Increase in state funding-had to have plan for distributing increased funds (addendum to Five-Year Plan)
- Task Force-August 2007
 - Set Priorities
 - Built the formula with weights
 - Addendum to Five-Year Plan submitted to Governor and OVAE

Funding Formula Task Force 2008

- Preparation for American Community Survey
- Possible cut in allocation
- Meet November and December
 - Maintained original formula
 - 10% Hold Harmless, 17% Cap
 - Shared formula and distribution example in January

Applying the Formula in 2009

- Send the allocation to IT staff
- Numbers are plugged into the spreadsheet
- Spreadsheet is sent to division administrator and program director with clarifying information
 - i.e. 10% hold harmless and 17% cap would not work
 - Allocation numbers in the spreadsheet are checked to meet total award
 - State ABLE director does not make allocation decisions

Spreadsheet Release

- Dissemination to the field request
 - Meeting with OPI fiscal for approval,
 - Advised a written request was needed,
 - Once received questions regarding the spreadsheets, should be sent to Linda Gardner

Funding Formula-Next Steps

- National Training on Performance-Based Funding in Adult Education
 - Review of formula components
 - Tools for modeling alternative formulas
 - Selection of formula components
 - Strategies for roll out

Serving 16 Year Olds

Report: NRS Table 3

Program Year: 2009

Site Name: All Sites - No Satellite Sites (Only Reportable Students)

ProgramType	Age16to18	Age19to24	Age25to44	Age45to59	Age60Up	Total
ABE	653	570	779	274	36	2312
ASE	223	148	167	90	11	639
ESL	1	36	118	54	20	229
Total	877	754	1064	418	67	3180

All Students

Report: NRS Table 3

Program Year: 2009

Site Name: All Sites - No Satellite Sites (All Students)

ProgramType	Age16to18	Age19to24	Age25to44	Age45to59	Age60Up	Total
ABE	1018	991	1201	358	40	3608
ASE	338	249	260	113	11	971
ESL	2	41	144	56	23	266
Total	1358	1281	1605	527	74	4845

Formalized Process for Serving 16-19 Year Olds

- Protocol for Serving High School Age Students
- Notify appropriate staff in school districts served by their program of the need for a documented procedure for ABLÉ programs serving high school age students. Document the manner in which you contact your local schools. If the authorized representative of your ABLÉ grant is a school district, you should request access to the school's student accountability program (i.e. School Master, Power School (not sure that is the name, I can't read my writing). This would provide instant access to the enrollment status of the student.
- Providing services:
 - Obtain telephone verification of student withdrawal from school before providing service. Document telephone contact in the student's personal folder.
 - Request written verification of the student's withdrawal. The manner in which the letter is received should suit the needs of the school district and the local ABLÉ program. (Student delivered, e-mail requests, faxes)
 - Within five business days, obtain written documentation on school letterhead verifying the date of the student's withdrawal. If documentation is not received within five business day, discontinue instructional services until the letter is received.
 - File withdrawal letter in student's personal folder.
- The above steps are the minimal requirement. Individual programs may determine that written documentation is necessary before providing any instructional service.

Remedies for Non-Compliance

- **§ 80.43 Enforcement.**
- (a) *Remedies for noncompliance.* If a grantee or subgrantee materially fails to comply with any term of an award, whether stated in a Federal statute or regulation, an assurance, in a State plan or application, a notice of award, or elsewhere, the awarding agency may take one or more of the following actions, as appropriate in the circumstances:
 - (1) Temporarily withhold cash payments pending correction of the deficiency by the grantee or subgrantee or more severe enforcement action by the awarding agency,
 - (2) Disallow (that is, deny both use of funds and matching credit for) all or part of the cost of the activity or action not in compliance,
 - (3) Wholly or partly suspend or terminate the current award for the grantee's or subgrantee's program,
 - (4) Withhold further awards for the program, or
 - (5) Take other remedies that may be legally available.
- (b) *Hearings, appeals.* In taking an enforcement action, the awarding agency will provide the grantee or subgrantee an opportunity for such hearing, appeal, or other administrative proceeding to which the grantee or subgrantee is entitled under any statute or regulation applicable to the action involved.
- (c) *Effects of suspension and termination.* Costs of grantee or subgrantee resulting from obligations incurred by the grantee or subgrantee during a suspension or after termination of an award are not allowable unless the awarding agency expressly authorizes them in the notice of suspension or termination or subsequently. Other grantee or subgrantee costs during suspension or after termination which are necessary and not reasonably avoidable are allowable if:

MUSWA

- 2010 Testing
- Window and
- Writing Workshop Dates Set
-
- Schools may plan ahead to a **testing window of February 1-26 for the 2010 MUSWA**. Schools should schedule a regular testing date, as well as one day for make-up tests within this window
-
- Scoring workshops will follow this schedule:
-
- · March 8-9 Kalispell
- · March 10-11 Missoula
- · March 15-16 Billings
- · March 16-17 Miles City
- · March 18-19 Glasgow
- · March 22-23 Great Falls
- · March 24-25 Helena
- · March 29-30 Bozeman
-
- Please mark your calendars with these dates. You are not obligated to attend the training nearest you, nor must all personnel from a single school district attend the same workshop. Teachers from all grade levels and subject areas are encouraged to attend.