### Adult Education Director's Meeting: October 7, 2008

Marty welcomed everyone and made the following introductions: Kellie Tyrell, is Jeff's and Marty's secretary. Becky Peters is Shauna's and Sandi's secretary. Brenda Jacobsen is Murray's secretary and replaces Carol Burns. Any reimbursements that you have will go to Brenda. I want to thank these three ladies in particular for the great work that they have done to keep us in order. Brenda is responsible for the reimbursements for Federal funds.

New directors and coordinators from Emery, Granite, Kane and Nebo were also introduced.

Marty: We welcome all of you. Those of you who are new, take advantage the knowledge base of people around you, because that's important.

Funding codes. Funding Codes 2367 are state-funded codes. Funding Codes 1458 are non-state-funded codes. We've eliminated code number one, which refers to students that had a high school diploma functioning higher than a 12.9 grade level. Those individuals are self-sufficient and should be in post-secondary opportunities or employment rather than adult education programs. It's been removed from UTopia. Regarding the other codes – pay attention to the codes and moving people back and forth between codes. Students can move from a state-funded code to a non-state funded code and back, but do pay attention to what the codes are and how you move students between codes to maximize one, your outcomes, and to represent the needs of your student more effectively. Questions?

If a student is a 2 or a 4 for six months, can they move some other code?

Marty: Yes. Whatever time period a student has a paid funding code you'll get credit. The verbiage has been added to the state funding codes definitions that the student must have an academic assessment with scores at or less than 12.9 grade level in at least one assessed area.

Jeff: We did a search in UTopia some time back as to where the funding codes fell. Specific to Funding Code 2, "16- to 19- out of school;" our impression was that there were far too many of them in UTopia. Some Districts were way off the charts on that code, it couldn't possibly be true. So, it is a funded code, so those Districts aren't going to be hurt, but we think that those students by and large were miscoded. So just watch that.

<?>: Why do you think that's not possible?

Jeff:

Well, we know it's possible, and we know that there are more than we've had in the past because we now take some people more readily, but in one particular district half of their students were coded as a 2. We just didn't think that the data was correct. And in going back, I think we were correct in that assumption, that they were in fact miscoded.

<?>: Are you talking about funding coding 5?

Jeff: No, I'm talking about Code 2, the "16- to 19-year olds, out of school youth." We thought that figure

was too high.

<?>: So you can change a funding code in the middle of the year?

Marty: Absolutely. You can change a funding code any time in the year based upon the circumstances of the

student. The student drives your funding code.

<?>: Is it safe to assume that that the programs that you thought were high on the use of Funding Code 2

you have talked to?

Jeff: Yes.

Marty:

The other funding code that I want you to pay attention to is Funding Code Number 9, "Out-of-State resident must pay full tuition and fees." This one has also been modified and we'll be posting the revisions to the Policy Manual as quickly as we can on the Web. But this funding code now says "out-of-state residents must pay full tuition and fees equal to the closest local public college (including UCATs) or university." Again, the same things apply: the student must be functioning at less than a 12.9 grade level in one of the assessed areas. Along the same lines, with the out-of-state people, we have a verbal agreement amongst our boundary states: Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming and Idaho that allows Utah programs to go ahead and serve out-of-state residents along the border areas at in-state adult education tuition fee rates. But any program that is not a border program, like Granite, Millard or Salt Lake, for example, must be charging out-of-state tuition comparable to the local public college, UCAT or university. Questions?

<?>: On Code 7, we're talking only literacy meaning reading, writing and math, not computer literacy?

Marty:

Exactly. Code number 7 refers to "18 years of age and over, high school graduate, academically assessed demonstrating less than 12.9 grade level in reading, writing or computation and must focus on improving basic literacy." Scrutiny should be made with persons who already have a diploma. You need to determine if the person is self-sufficient. If you have a waiting list of persons desiring

access to your program, and you're taking a person that is a high school graduate, that is at the 12.9 grade level, then I have some questions whether you should be. The program instruction must be focused on reading, writing, and computation and can only be provided in these three assessed areas as long as the area you choose reflects a score less than 12.9. It's not that you put this person in a credit recovery class again, or provides a computer literacy class. Questions regarding Code 7?

You know we've been involved in a State audit. We worked with auditors until the middle of August. They visited programs as part of the audit process. Subsequently they wrote a report summarizing their findings. The report was reviewed by Superintendant Harrington, Carol Lear, the USOE attorney, Mary Shumway, Brenda Hales, Associate Superintendent, and myself. We met with the auditor general, and the auditors themselves for an outbriefing. Subsequently Superintendent Harrington has responded to the auditors. I've given you sections of the audit. It's not available on our website, but if you go to the Legislative Auditor's page, you can find the whole report. We're going to talk about it in sections. This morning, since we have our CBOs with us, we will talk about residency, and Senate Bill 81, which is dealing with undocumented persons. You have Chapter 3 of the audit report that talks about USOE establishing qualifications for residency. You also have "Illegal Immigration SB81 Enrolled." These are your backup documents that you will be able to refer to. The auditors noted that Utah adult education programs serve everyone that inquires about services without asking them for proof of Utah residency. It has been assumed that the person is entitled to services because they live here. Well, that's not playing out well. We've had to address residency through policy and board rules. Senate Bill 81 was passed during the 2008 legislative session, and has since been enrolled as an official law that goes into effect in July 2009. This bill talks about what undocumented persons are and are not entitled to. Sections make note that undocumented persons are not entitled to benefits, public or federal. The State Office reviewed the citations in SB81 and determined that adult education is not a public or federal benefit as adult education is not postsecondary. We're not providing any college classes. We're providing high school completion, GED preparation, literacy, and English as a Second Language. What has happened subsequent to that is that our staff has been before the State Board twice now to talk about Senate Bill 81, and the ramifications associated with it. The Board has directed us to do two things: 1) to write policy defining a Utah resident, and 2) amend our policy manual. We are in the process of acting on the directives and changes to the policy. These changes will be put online for you as they are completed.

What about serving parents of K-12 students enrolled in ELL Family Literacy classes?

<?>:

Marty:

The parent of a K-12 student is exempt. The student who is enrolled in K-12 is exempt because the Federal ruling that says that you cannot ask a student of K-12 age their ethnicity, where they're from, et cetera, nor can you ask the parent of a K-12 child. The persons you are serving as part of the K-12 ELL family literacy groups all have to establish proof of residency that they live in the state of Utah. The distributed Establishing Proof of Residency Policy goes into effect November 1, 2008. This is a response to the audit. We'll make sure it's on the web, please put this in your policy book. As of November 1, 2008 and after, you will be required to document proof of residency for all students. The new policy describes documents validating residency. The managing program will need to keep this documentation, and enter a notation into UTopia, as far as the date that the person entered your program and presented documentation, and the type of document. There will be a pull-down list in Utopia for you by November 1<sup>st</sup> so that you can start entering this information. You're not to go back retro, and pick up anything for anybody that you currently have in your program, as of November 1<sup>st</sup> move forward. A person cannot enroll in your program until you have this proof of residency; don't test them, don't enroll them, don't put them in a class, don't do anything – until they provide you with proof of residency. Questions?

<?>: If a person is not a Utah resident, they can enroll if they pay tuition based fees of a university?

Marty:

If they are an out-of-state person, they need to show you they're out of state and they can enroll and must pay tuition equal to the closest Utah public college (including UCAT) or university. The collected tuition/fees need to be applied to the budget that you're providing the program from.

<?>: So are we required to take a photocopy of a student's driver's license?

Marty:

Yes. The managing program. Now once that information is entered into UTopia, you are saying the person is a resident of Utah, and you will not have to ask for further proof of residency in any additional program, but it is an item that needs to be kept in perpetuity and as auditors whether it be your independent auditors, state auditors, someone from the State Office of Education, or the Federal Office of Education, we must be able to go back to the managing program to produce it.

Have you considered the condition at the Indian Reservations that straddle the state lines, treating those of other states as if they were in our state?

Marty:

These individuals are considered "border students" and are treated as residents of Utah. We've also given you the document that they will need to provide; more than likely what they'll be able to provide is their tribal correspondence. You need to see and copy the document. It's not a verbal

okay, you have to see the physical proof of it. You can't take a number and say it's on their transcript. You have to have the physical document as proof, and a copy must be maintained in the student folder of the managing program.

<?>: You have a resident in Arizona, and as long as they're a resident of that reservation, they're a Utah resident.

Marty: Right, because it's an outreach program that's agreed upon by the other state directors.

<?>: When a new year rolls around, do you need a new document?

Marty: No. Once it's been entered in UTopia, we have done due diligence. Remember you must keep the documentation in perpetuity.

<?>: What are the proof of residency requirements for those in corrections?

Marty: As long as a student is housed in a jail or a prison, you are not responsible to gather anything. But once a student paroles, and they are back in the community, those persons must provide documentation. UTopia will provide a notation. There will be something on the demographic page that tells you residency has been validated, and documentation is maintained by a specific program. For example the person goes from Alpine to Davis, you'll look on the demographics screen, Alpine will have already made a notation of that, you're not having to worry about it. But if you see that the person was in the Utah County Jail in Nebo, and they've left Nebo and they're in Ogden in the community program, Ogden's going to have to require proof of state.

<?>: As I'm scanning this, there are no time limitations for having established residency. They just have to establish residency and then they're in?

Marty: That's right. We're trying to make this simple as possible. P.O. Boxes are not acceptable proof.

Documentation must be in the person's name. If they come to you without documentation, let them know they cannot be there unless they have the documentation. I would strongly suggest that you put this on your websites and on your doors where registrations are completed.

<?> Can we use a Utah high school, college or report card?

Marty: Yes you can. If it's a transcript, you could use one that said "Valley High School," "Jordan School District" which is on the official transcripts. You should continue to ask for social security numbers. If you don't, you hurt yourself by having to do core follow-up surveys, and if your student is a GED

student, we are hindered in completing a data match and your program may not get the program outcome without a social security number.

<?>: If they come to us then with Union High School diploma, does that count then as proof of residency?

Marty: If it is not a transcript or report card that contains an address of the person it cannot be used. The unaccompanied youth who no longer is attending K-12, having given up that K-12 right, are now considered an adults. So they have to provide residency documentation. If they are currently enrolled in K-12 and adult education, you will not have to have proof of residency. If they move over to a funded funding code then you'll have provide proof of residency.

<?>: So if they're seventeen, they have to bring a parent, and is it the parent that has to declare residency? Or is it the student?

Marty: Yes. The student has given up their rights to K-12. They have to provide proof of residency. With the out-of-school youth, you still need the two letters, if they're K-12 age. The parent letter has to be there.

<?>: We've had continuous students who've been with us for a couple of years. Are they going to at some point have to provide proof of residency? Are we going to have to go back and capture every one that we've had?

Marty: I wouldn't go back, but I would, at the beginning of next year, ask that you update those records, and make them current. Or if the person leaves and come back in the middle of the year, then update those records.

<?>: We have several students that come to live in the United States with an aunt or a relative that may be seventeen or eighteen, and they have graduated, but they don't have the academic skills they need. It's difficult for them to get this documentation. Would we consider them just a Code 9 out of state clients?

Marty: Not if they're living in the state of Utah, no. They're not a Code 9. Persons that have moved here from another country who have a guardian are not considered a Code 9. They have to be a Utah resident. Until you have proof of residency within the state of Utah they cannot be served.

<?>: What about a passport that has a Utah address?

Marty: No, a passport does not have an address.

<?>: This has to do with federal funds as well state? And with residency not citizenship?

Marty: Federal as well as state funds, and residency, not citizenship. If a person can't provide you with a social security number, you still have to ask for residency documents.

If you look at the back of Chapter 3, you will see Superintendent Harrington's letter to the Auditor General, which is the very last page. You will also see, on page 23, the recommendations. We've worked hard with the auditors. We've given them documentation and verbal answers to questions that were asked. We've dialogued with them numerous times. We read the report before it became official. We've read the report since it became official. The final report goes to the Auditor General and then the report is released to the Interim Education Committee and the Budget Appropriation Committee. Other questions about SB-81 and residency?

Board Rule Update. You have the latest Board Rule updates. These become effective October 8, 2008. Rule 277-735 was clarified to mirror Rule 277-733. We clarified and defined minimum competencies for a High School Secondary Diploma being twenty-four units of credit. So, when an offender transfers from one location to another location, that he's not put into a double jeopardy where now he has to meet twenty-seven units for graduation, or twenty-eight units for graduation. Section 4 was modified by adding an entire section regarding licensure within the State of Utah, and trying to make it as generic and as easy as possible for all of you to employ competent staff.

<?>: The term describing supervision, regarding someone who's not licensed, what is supervision defined as?

Marty: "Shall instruct under supervision of a licensed program employee" means that you oversee the teacher's lesson plans and classroom instruction.

<?>: Would they be paid a different rate?

Marty: That's a local program decision. That's not our decision.

<?>: In 2012, how many districts will have or are expected to go higher than twenty-four?

Marty: The question was, how many districts in 2012 will be changing their graduation rates. I don't have a direct answer for that question.

<?>: The reason we're requiring additional credits now is because we feel like in 2012 we'll have to raise the units of credit anyway.

Marty:

2012 is four years away. So, right now we need to stay at twenty four. I'll have more direction and when we come back together in our next meeting.

<;>:

Regarding teacher certification, the rule says that if a person has a post-secondary degree but are not licensed in elementary or secondary education, they may be considered for employment solely in the adult education program teaching adult students following the completion of a student field teaching experience in an accredited education program.

Marty:

Yes, this means that if you are using someone who has a degree in economics, for instance, if the person completed a student teaching experience in an adult education program that is overseen by the principal of the school, at that point you could issue a letter of authorization and a license to teach only in an adult education program through the alternative license route.

State budget cuts. We at the State Office of Adult Education have prepared a plan to cut 5-percent of our state funds from our Uniform School Funds, if directed. Presently, this impacts the two prisons. However, we are anticipating that this next legislative session we again may be asked before the end of the fiscal year to make either a 3-percent cut or a 5-percent cut. We are also anticipating in this next Legislative session that our minimum school program funding may be cut. It is suggested that programs hold tight with expenditures this year given the state of the economy. The March St. George meeting will be replaced with a one-day meeting at a location yet to be determined. Our next director's meeting will be December 18<sup>th</sup> at the Jones Center.

Jeff:

Let me echo that if I can. We'll do our part as well. I've told some of you, especially the prison sites, who already had some idea of what their cut was going to be, and neither one of them liked it. What Marty is saying is true. Across the board, if there are certain practices that you can implement to save money and in fact carry over some funds into the next year, do so. I've talked to Marty about this, we would look at relaxing our carryover policy so if it was more than 10-percent, you wouldn't be penalized. Anything that you can do to help minimize the effect of less adult education money next year would be prudent on your part. The other thing is, after January, say there is another 5-percent cut, or the first 5-percent, or whatever figure the legislature comes up with, the further you get into the school year, the tougher it is to come up with this money. Corrections, for example, could have come up with what their fair share was last week, but if it's May that they have to come up with it, that's a real problem — if they haven't squirreled that money away in anticipation of having to come up with it. So, you've got a head's up that something is going to happen here. We

don't know what the effect will be. But it's up to you to look at your budgets and try not to spend it all down like we normally want you to. Remember though federal funds cannot be carried over.

<?>: This morning in the Tribune, they talk about 8-percent increase in number of post-secondary education students. In Salt Lake, we're experiencing unbelievable increase in the number of Adult ESL students because of the economy. It would seem to me that it could be to our benefit to let the Legislature know the difference in numbers of UTopia last year versus the current status of UTopia right now.

Jeff: I have also heard this from higher education, and what you say is right. It was an 8-percent increase, but their budgets are slated to be cut 4-percent. So I don't know how they're going to reconcile that, but we're going to possibly be in the same situation.

<?>: I'm just saying you have the capability now with UTopia to accurately say how many students are enrolled in adult education programs today. You never had that before.

Marty: It's funny you should bring that up, because one of the things during our outbriefing with the auditors was our track records for outcomes was not real productive. When the economy's good, higher education's numbers go down, Department of Workforce numbers go down, our numbers go down. We will make efforts to make sure that the fiscal analysts understand the status of adult education data.

<u>Summer Institute</u>: Summer Institute will be held August 3-4, 2009.

<u>New Federal Competition</u>: we will host a new federal competition sometime in March for our AEFLA funds. We'll let you know more about that in our December meeting as to the specifics.

<u>Program Monitoring Schedule</u>: You should have in your packet a copy of the Program Monitoring Schedule for this year. In addition you see the list of staff overseeing the desk monitoring – who's responsible to work with you on a monthly basis to review UTopia data as provided. Questions?

Wimba Information: you also have a hand out describing Wimba information.

<u>Independent Auditor Outcomes</u>: after thorough review of the audits submitted by the auditors, several things have been noted. Errors in your audit outcomes were partly our fault, partly UTopia's fault, and partly your fault. Programs didn't have in student files the official copy of the GED Test Score Report, documents, attendance records and credit records had been shredded that were needed for the audit. In several audits there were no records for non-instructional contact hours.

Remember, we said you could keep them on a spreadsheet, you could keep them in a clip board. A couple of the auditors said to keep contact hours by class or by student. It is suggested that you work with the auditors to make it as painless as you can. In some programs, the auditors completed their audit without you. I'm a little concerned about that because you as a program director are responsible and should have a chance to dialogue with your auditor before the submission of their report to us. Section M of your policy manual is the auditor guidelines. It's the same document that the auditors have. It tells you exactly what you have to have in order to meet with success with the auditor. Presently you are held harmless for your audit report. Next year, you will not be held harmless. For auditor findings submitted, you will be expected to take corrective action. The specialists will assist you in addressing and monitoring resolution of the auditor's findings. Failure to resolve the findings could result in rescinding of funds.

<?>: Question, Marty, about holding harmless? What does that entail? Our numbers versus what UTopia has?

Marty: This year you are being held harmless for your audit due to the newness of UTopia and the expected program documentation requested. For example, programs didn't have the documentation for the contact hours, credits, test data, et cetera. Again, a reminder: you will be held in control of your independent audits this coming year, so pay attention to that, pay attention to what you have to have.

You need to see your program audits before we see them because you can reconcile some data right there and respond in most cases. We'll make that plain in our policy and to the auditors as to what's expected on their part.

Marty: I recently met with the Department of Workforce Services regarding an assessment pathway. The development of an assessment pathway comes about because of DWS's need to service out-of-school youth when some programs are closed. DWS will start, especially in the rural areas, completing assessments of their own clients, and they will be sharing with you electronically the TABE test results. You may accept those assessment results as long all information is there and the client comes to you within twenty-five days of the date of the test that DWS administered. Put the received documentation in the student's file so you have your audit documentation, enter the scores into UTopia. It'll have the DWS examiner's name on it. For data entry purposes use your name as program director, as assessor as you will not have the DWS staff member in your database.

Jeff:

If the test is older than thirty-five days, call the DWS caseworker and let them know you cannot accept the test and you're retesting them.

Sandi:

CAELA training for teachers. We are continuing CAELA training this year. We have already had two trainings. Both were in September. Another training will be November on the 8<sup>th</sup> in Springville. This one will deal with using the ESOL standards. Those of you who have teachers using the ESOL standards, you need to have them at this training. Another training will focus on ESOL Internet sites and the best way to use them with your students, both interactive sites and informational sites for teachers will be shared. At the last CAELA training, Oxford University Press presented free dictionaries and other curricula materials to ESOL programs. A 20% discount will be given to programs placing an order with him. Sandi will collect them and send them all in at one time. Please send your P.O.s with your addresses to her immediately. The materials will be sent directly to programs. This offer applies to any Oxford materials. It was recommended at the training that programs purchase the materials and pilot the entire product rather than one section. But that's totally a program decision. All of you should have a copy of the ESOL standards. The standards are downloadable from the adult education website.

Shauna:

You're well aware that we have implemented the ESOL standards, and we're moving forward and implementing standards for ABE. Our committee has started developing ABE standards for reading. It is important from a State level, and should be important from a program level that all programs be effective. If a program is to carry out quality instruction, then as a state we have to have indicators of quality instruction.

ABE committee (Anita Leimbach, Debra Young, Donica Bigelow and Lynne McKenna) presented the ABE reading standards.

Sandi:

Summer Institute will be held August 3-5, 2009 at Murray High School. The format has changed. Sessions will be three-hour workshops rather than one hour. We need topic suggestions geared for your teachers. Your suggestions would help us in planning the institute. Please submit topics for consideration by December 1<sup>st</sup>. We will be rolling out ABE standards at Summer Institute. The UAACE Fall Conference is coming up. Those of your teachers who attended the Spring Mountain Plains Conference now members of UAACE. All conference information can be found on the UAACE website.

Marty:

We are updating the adult education state website. There will be sections specifically for ESOL that will provide resources for speaking, listening, writing, and reading. The same for ABE and adult high

school completion. Strategies, resources, curriculum, et cetera, will be accessible. We've asked Kathy Webb, who is the State Director of the Electronic High School, and her associate Kim Deamer to present information to us about Electronic High School as an option for adult education.

### Kathy Webb and Kim Deamer gave a presentation on the Electronic High School program.

Marty: Earlier this spring, I met with Pam Denicke from the Single Moms Foundation, and had an opportunity to talk to her about resources for women. Often, we ignore our women population in looking for resources to meet their needs.

## Pam Denicke from the Single Mom Foundation gave a presentation on the community links found on the Single Mom Foundation.

Marty: This is a great resource because it reaches state-wide. It doesn't matter if you're down in Kane County or if you're up in Logan, these are still resources that you can access to meet the needs of your clients.

The refugee population is increasing significantly in Utah. They will become the next generation of workers. We as providers of adult education need to pay direct attention to this population. I've asked Gerald Brown, who's the Executive Director of Refugee Programming for the Department of Workforce Services and Patrick Poulin, Executive Director of the International Rescue Committee and one of our own colleagues to speak regarding refugees in Utah.

# Gerald Brown of the Department of Workforce Services Refugee Resettlement Office and Patrick Poulin of the International Rescue Center gave a presentation on what services their programs provide for refugees.

Marty: Education is becoming a real issue within the refugee community. Refugee families are very concerned about their children dropping out of school, getting into trouble because of behavioral issues, or being perceived as neglected. The following programs: the English Skills Center, Granite, Jordan, Horizonte, English Language Center, Asian Association, Salt Lake Aging Services and Guadalupe all serve refugees. Refugees are a population that we do really need to reach out-of-the-box and involve ourselves within their community of in providing adult education services as well as reaching out to K-12 and work with refugees within their community. You also have in your packet a refugee conference flyer that describes the Utah Refugee Conference that's coming up on November 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>. Those of you that receive a refugee grant are expected to register, using some of your refugee grant money to attend this conference. All of you should consider attending, giving you a greater understanding of the refugee community, and what you can do as service providers.

### [LUNCH BREAK]

#### Nate Southerland from UEN gave a presentation on how to Wimba.

Toni:

UTopia update: I'd like to introduce Al Newton, the other developer. This past month, we've concentrated on data matching. We did our first data match with GED the first part of September, and the results were not as satisfactory as we would like them to be, so we're improving that process. The first DWS and USHE data matches are scheduled in the near future. What we found with the GED data match was – that, due to typographical errors including social security numbers we could not generate a match. We also found that there were social security numbers sitting on NRSPro that we didn't have record of in UTopia. We also found that access codes (cryptic codes that are alpha-numeric) contained numerous typographical errors, so they didn't match. We found that 59% of the records that we weren't able to verify could have been verified if we had set up date of birth, first name and last name along with the social security numbers and access codes, which were the only two fields we sent up. We are reworking how we do the data match procedure. A new field has been added to the SEOP screen in the goal history section. If the GED has been verified by NRSPro, we have a "yes" by the achieved box, and we have a "no" if it's not. The POM report: there's now one POM report out on the website broken into reports: 1) a 2008 Beta report that has very lax rules. And 2) another report called the POM 2009, which has the standard rules. After this meeting today, you will have a POM 2008 and the POM 2009 report. The specs for these reports are in last night's copy of the user guide, which I pushed out to the website last night. A Youth-in-Custody module was added to UTopia to track younger students. This component is about to go on line. If you ever see any non adult education data on your screen, it's probably Youth-in-Custody. Please call us up and let us know. Reports. We've been concentrating on POM and NRS reports. Unfortunately, this has resulted in putting all other reports on the back burner. During programs audits a new report was developed called "Detailed Contact Hours Report" that lists the student and all contact hours for every class within a date range. It is available all programs. Pending features. Al is devising a new screen that's going to be like the SEOP screen called the "Student Outcomes Screen." It will detail everything you wondered about on the POM. Lots of times we get emails saying, "John Doe should have gotten his GED, it's not showing up on the POM. What happened?" With this report you will be able to log into UTopia, pull up John Doe's record, go to his outcomes data screen and find out why. For instance, he didn't have a goal, or have a test, it's all spelled out. This report will be released shortly. Distance Learning will be addressed shortly. I wanted to thank everyone for helping us with finding bugs and being patient with Webmaster email. My goal is to have Webmaster email turned around within 24 hours.

Marty:

Toni and Al have "saved our bacon." Closing our federal audit corrective action is closer to reality. Notices of UTopia updates, have been going directly to the UTopia administrators. Are you as program directors getting that information? If not, please let us know and we will make sure you are included in our email updates.

Outcomes of the state audit continued related to the funding of the funding formula by State Funding, Chapter Four. Senator Stevenson and Senator Dayton requested a state audit three years ago to determine if there was a duplication of services between higher education, the Department of Workforce Services, and adult education. The audit found no duplication of services. Through the audit process the following were cited as findings: 1) residency, 2) serving persons who may be undocumented, and 3) paying for both GED and high school diploma outcomes. The auditors also reported that the amount of time a person spends in an adult education program from the time they receive their GED to the completion of the high school diploma was minimal – less than thirty days. In discussion with the auditors, we discussed the lack of their history regarding understanding how long students had been working on their outcomes before they were achieved. The auditors also discussed the industry standard. The industry standard is that a GED is a high school equivalency across the states. There are only four states in the union that give an adult high school diploma in addition to a GED, and we're one of them. Thus as a result of the audit programs double dip on graduation outcomes. Murray Meszaros has put together a summary of the findings across the nation regarding GED outcomes versus adult high school diploma outcomes. The auditors recognize that Utah has always valued adult high school diplomas but also recognized the GED as an equal industry standard. Program staff must work with each student to decide what is best for the client, and move the client forward to access the economy, access employment, access postsecondary opportunities, and training – rather than looking at what is best for the program. As state staff we presented the audit findings to the Board of Education Curriculum Committee seeking direction. All of the findings were discussed. They questioned the double funding of secondary completion outcomes, as well as the issues surrounding the issuing of diplomas and GEDs and their equivalency. Discussion surrounded the idea of calling the GED an equivalency diploma. As a result of their discussion, other questions were raised:

• Since adult education provides services to individuals who are sixteen and seventeen years of age, out-of-school youth, should the GED be an offering for those individuals?

- Should there be a GED preparation track within the high schools that could assist at-risk individuals in preparing for the GED?
- Should the practice of allowing adult education programs to have both outcomes a GED and a diploma be continued?

Outcomes of the first Board meeting was a motion was made within the Curriculum Committee to accept the title of "Utah Equivalency Diploma" for the GED and for us to form a study committee to take a look at the options surrounding the GED, conduct a survey regarding the other issues: youth, the preparation program, and lowering the GED testing age to sixteen. A survey was sent to 242 constituents across the state ranging from district superintendents, high school principals, counselors, special education teachers, and adult education directors representing urban, rural and incarcerated programs. It was also sent to PTA, higher education, the Governor's Office, Department of Workforce Services, and Vocational Rehabilitation. We prepared a summary sheet for the Board. The results show that high school principals were opposed to having a GED preparation program, high school counselors and special education personnel favored a preparation track. Adult Education directors were mixed. The other constituents - the Governor's Office, the Department of Workforce Services, and the other entities - were mixed. The results were presented to the Board Curriculum Committee. We thought we had an approval on the motion for the GED to become a Utah Education Equivalency Diploma, but it was not. The lowering of the age of administration of a GED to a person who's sixteen was not popular. We were given the charge to go back and look at our adult education rule, to bring it to the Board Curriculum Committee in November to readdress and talk about changes to the adult education rule.

The auditors indicated there was a double dip between the GED and the diploma that has to cease. Our corrective action is to put that into place. Whether it's a GED or Adult Education Diploma – the first outcome will be paid. The majority of clients in the state of Utah are not high school completion people when they enter an adult education program. The majority of our clients are ABE and ESL clients. It is very important that programs work with clients to address their educational needs, not only in the present, but also in the future – and what their employment goals are in relationship to their educational outcome. It is very important that what you look at is the student's needs, not the program's needs. Programs must evaluate the students' academic needs. If clients are accessing your program because they want their GED versus an adult secondary high school diploma, programs may need to restructure staff teaching assignments. If our statistics with the URAED and the POM hold true, then the majority of your clients should not be in a GED or adult high school

secondary diploma completion program. The majority of your clients should be working on improving their literacy, working on intensity and duration to advance their academic level gains. When you have that in place, then you can move forward to look at whether a GED or a adult education seconary diploma is the most appropriate area of focus. We have also been in violation of our state agreement with GEDTS by the issuing of credits for passing the GED. The agreement says that Carnegie Units of credit are not to be issued for passing of the GED towards any kind of high school diploma.

We have had two meetings with the Consortium since the audit. The first was immediately after the audit results were announced, and the second was after the September Board meeting seeking their input representing you as constituents. This was the first opportunity we had for everybody to come together. What we did hand out today was the draft of the board rule that has not been submitted to the board until you have had a chance to provide input.

<?>: We have just let counselors make their plan for the year, now we're changing the ball game mid-year. Is there any consideration for us to fulfill the promises made to these students for the rest of this year?

Marty: Yes.

Murray: The GED Testing Services doesn't just haphazardly choose questions to be on the test. They go through a rigorous norming process that most of your high schools have been involved with in one form or another. The NCTM, other organizations like the Math Association, the Language-Arts Writing Association, many organizations and many states are involved in the norming of the GED test. The norming of the 2002 test that we're in right now, ten state specialists from Texas, Florida, Colorado, California, and others were involved with the decision as to what guestions and how these questions were to be posed, and so forth. So it went through a vigorous process and they came up with the test that is presently used. Just so you know, the average pass rate for the 2002 test is roughly five percent rate lower than the national pass rate of the 1998 series. So, whatever typical high schools offer for their graduation curriculum - those same standards were applied to the development of the GED tests themselves. If high school seniors were to take the a GED, 40% would fail. As we're comparing high school graduates to GED graduates, typically the conversation goes something like this: I know that my GED graduates cannot get a high school diploma. We must remember not to compare the best of the high school graduates against the worst of the GED graduates. If I were to do the flip-flop, and I took the best of the GED graduates and compared them

to your high school graduates, they would knock their socks off. There are students right now at the University of Utah on academic scholarships who went the GED route. Yes, there are lots of issues with the GED candidates. If you had a family that had years and years of severe poverty, which is a big issue that impacts whether students are successful in school or not; if you had generations of drug abuse; et cetera, you might not do so well in high school, either. Typically, what we find based on research, I.Q. is equal to I.Q., E.Q. is not equal to E.Q. The intellectual quotient of an individual who takes the GED and passes it, is equal to a high school graduate in the same sort of setting. In other words, if you took a person who is a GED graduate, he or she would probably do as well in all academic areas, including financial literacy, as your high school graduate would. Where the challenge is, is that those individuals often times have issues in their lives that you are all aware of that preclude them from being successful by staying in the system. Now am I and advocate for the GED? I wish we could put it out of business. I wish that you were all out of business. I want every kid to stay in high school and graduate from high school in a regular K-12 program. The GED was designed as a second opportunity tool. The military in 1942 asked for this to be developed so their returning army men and women could have something to move forward, to quantify their skills. The GED is still in that major category - to "quantify skills."

<?>: Murray, I agree with everything you're saying, and you're absolutely right. For years here the state of Utah, we have been using that same rational to justify the issuance of those five credits toward a adult education secondary diploma. Now, the military issue, and one of the reasons they take such a dim view of the GED is because they have, according to their own research, such a high wash-out rate compared to those who finish a high school diploma. And if you talk to the military researchers, they will tell you that we think the reason for that is, the GED kids may be doing well in those areas that are tested on the GED, those who pass, but without having the commitment.

Murray: I.Q. is not equal to E.Q. Again, these tests are not measuring emotional quotient. They're measuring intellectual quotient.

<?>: I think the state of Utah has taken the right approach over the years. It's not something that happened on a spur of the moment. It's not something that happened as a result of a legislative audit that was probably designed for other purposes, other than just finding out these facts. It's something that has resulted over a long period of time, as long as you've been in the business, for some very good reasons along the way, and to simply just cut it off because some legislative auditors didn't like what they were looking at may not be the right decision. It may be the decision we end up with, and it sounds like it probably is, but it may not be in the best interest of students.

Murray:

Thank you. Let me just share with you research regarding GED graduates. This is not self reported data, this is social security number against social security number data. Students who have passed the GED Tests with a 550 or more enroll in post-high school education at the rate of eighty-five percent.

<?>:

What's the percentage of GED completers that score that high, though?

Murray:

I don't have the answer for that one.

<?>:

It's probably less than twenty percent.

<?>:

If it's nothing about money, if somebody has the GED or gets a GED and they still want a diploma, and we don't count it for anything with money, do we still serve them?

Marty:

No.

<;>:

That goes to my question. What happens to the guy that is counseled, gets the GED, but then comes back and says: having the GED has not opened the door into a career field that I wanted; I really need the high school diploma. That person is then prevented from earning a high school diploma. The only choice they have is to go onto a community college where it costs more money and more tuition to try to gain any kind of lower education.

Murray:

All the more reason why you've got to do some good counseling in the first place. That's what happens in the high schools. Students enter on a career path, career fields, counseled, and they are "buyer beware."

<;>:

Can they come back and just not use these five credits from passing the GED?

Marty:

I'm going to go back to where we originally were. So the question asked was: could you go ahead with a student in your program and finish a high school diploma; could we allow this to happen until the end of the year? If the person is currently enrolled in your program, and they have a GED, they have until June 30<sup>th</sup> to complete an adult education secondary diploma..

<?>:

And count the GED?

Marty:

The GED will be the first outcome and the only outcome you'll be paid on, you will not be paid on a diploma because they are an equivalency as far as payment.

<?>: Okay, so just so I understand this: the student I have right now that completed the GED on July 2 and completes the adult education secondary diploma on December 31<sup>st</sup>, my program receives funding for the GED because that is worth more money or do I get paid for the high school diploma? Which one do I get paid for?

Shauna: For the first outcome.

Marty: Jeff corrected me. The outcomes between now and December 31<sup>st</sup>, you get both outcomes, a GED and a diploma. If the person is in your program now, receives the GED and he wants a diploma, you may go ahead and complete it by June 30<sup>th</sup>.

<?>: I'm curious about people that took a GED. Do we have multiple year plans? We have a number of people that were already given five credits for that GED, it's already been awarded, it's already in UTopia. Do we now have to rescind those five credits?

Marty: No, they have until the end of the program year to finish up.

<?>: So we can use past GEDs. What about a person who comes to us with a GED, wants a diploma, we did not get paid for the GED, they walked in and said, here is my GED. Can I now say, well, I cannot give you five credits for that any more, but since what you want is a diploma, you can still have one.

Marty: We're not going back and rescinding GEDs and turning them into diplomas, because if we do that for adult education students we would have to do it for individuals who have not accessed adult education.

<?>: What about the five credits? So students only have until June to use those credits?

Marty: If they are currently enrolled in your program.

You have the Board rule. "Draft" is written across the top of it. It says "draft" because it has not gone to the Board for action. Let's walk through it, and let me tell you what we had to change in it. We were asked to address residency, and then the equivalency of the diploma. We added words that stated that our programs were below a collegiate post-secondary level, and that programs were provided by school districts and CBOs. On Line 39 on Page 1, spelling errors were corrected for eligible adult education students who are seeking an adult education secondary diploma. Since the language talks about adult high school completion, we took out the GED verbiage. Page 2, Line 43 through 47, certificate of GED has been removed, and if you go to Line 67, where the rule talks

about an eligible adult student the definition of who is eligible has been expanded to include documentation of residency.

<?>: Question back on 43. It says traditional four-year high school. So we are agreeing that a GED is the same as a traditional four year traditional high school diploma, and we're all agreeing to that concept. Is that what that means?

Marty: We're saying the GED is the standard, and there is no longer a GED certificate available.

<?>: So we have to say that then, because the Board voted on it, or can we disagree with that?

Marty: It is open for discussion.

<?>: Do we need to clarify Line 41, because now there are two different things. There's a GED equivalency high school diploma and then an adult education secondary diploma.

Marty: We're talking about lines 35 through 41, adult high school completion. This means a program of academic instruction at a 9.0 grade level or above on Board-approved subjects. We are talking about core curriculum for the adult high school completion.

Page 3 lines 93 through 97, we've talked about GED. General education development, preparation means a program intended to provide instruction in five specific subject areas, for eligible adult education students who seek a Utah high school equivalency diploma for successfully passing the GED tests.

Lines 108 through 110, measurable outcomes means indicators of student achievement in adult education programs in used or state funding purposes. If you look at line 106, the language has been clarified – individuals 16 years of age or older without a high school diploma or equivalency.

Line 121 refers to a participant. Participant means an adult education student not meeting the qualifications of an enrollee the language has been modified.

Page 4, lines 131 through 137, Utah High School Equivalency Diploma means an equivalency diploma issued by the GED testing centers as agents of the USOE to individuals who have successfully passed all five subject areas of the GED Test based on Utah passing standards measuring the major and lasting outcomes and concepts associated with traditional four-year high school education. Please cross out "For an Adult Education Program" on line 133.

Page 5, line 169, talks about the federal adult education. We have inserted the acronym AEFLA for clarification purposes.

Line 173 refers to the statute as the standards and procedures governing both federal and state funding of adult education programs administered by the USOE adult education services.

Section 189 under program standards, the following section has been added to address border state students: Utah adult education services may be offered to qualified persons whose primary residence is located in a bordering community not conducive to their commuting to the neighboring state's closest adult education program. These persons are not subject to paying out-of-state tuition.

Page 6 line 221 charges: education staff including program administrators assigned to provide educational services to be qualified as appropriate for their assignments.

Page 7, the words relating to our policy manuals "July 2006" have been eliminated and the reference to updating annually, or as needed, have been added.

Section 6-A has been modified: a student who's at least sixteen years of age but less than nineteen years of age who has not graduated from high school who is a resident of the Utah School District and who is enrolled in a K-12 program may with parental and guardian consultation and written approval, if applicable, under the state administered adult education programs be enrolled in the adult education program.

Section B line 292, a student seventeen years of age and older without a high school diploma but whose high school class has graduated who is a Utah resident and intends to graduate with a K-12 high school may with parent or guardian consultation and written approval enroll in a state adult education program and upon proof of state residency. This has not been through the attorneys, this may change to say that if the person is enrolled in K-12 and adult education, but under the age of eighteen proof of residency may not have to be presented.

Page 8, Section 314, a student may receive an adult education secondary diploma upon completion of the minimum required units of Carnegie credits as defined by the local adult education program for the Utah High School Equivalency diploma upon successful completion of the GED Test. This student may return to his regular high school prior to the time that his class graduates to complete all necessary requirements for the traditional K-12 diploma, provided: a) he has not completed the requirements necessary for an adult education secondary diploma, or b) he has not successfully

passed the GED Test and received a Utah High School Equivalency Diploma, and Statement 5, an out-of-school youth who has received either an adult education diploma is not eligible to return to a K-12 high school. Written course descriptions for GED Test preparation, ESL, ABE courses shall be developed cooperatively by school districts.

<?>: A student that comes in with twenty-three-and-a-half credits and earned a half a credit with us, if they test on an ABE level, we would not be able to get them a diploma? Is that how I'm reading this?

Marty: Credit issued for ABE classes is a local Board decision. Typically, ABE curriculum would not be designed for an adult high school completion student simply because of of ABE levels.

<?>: Let's say it is a computer technology credit, am I reading this that if they test on ABE 3 that they would not be eligible for a diploma?

Marty: It is your local Board decision as to whether ABE course curriculum is approved for high school credit.

<?>: If they test in ABE, can we give them a diploma, if they do approved high school work?

Marty: It is hoped that as you counsel and evaluate your students that they are academically capable of completeing high school 1 and 2 curriculum. If you are issuing credit for curriculum that is less than a high school 1 or a High School 2 level, then that is your local Board decision.

Line 406 through 413: Adult Education students receiving education services in a state prison or jail education program may graduate with an adult education secondary diploma.

Line 411: demonstrated course competency or a Utah equivalency diploma for successful completion of the GED Test. Language has been added that applies for jails and prisons.

Line 414: Adult Education Secondary Diploma graduation requirements may be modified for adult students with documented disabilities through documented IEP plans, etcetera.

Page 11, Section 431 through 466: an adult education student seeking a Utah High School Equivalency Diploma shall be offered a course of academic instruction designed to prepare the student to take the GED Test. A Utah High School Equivalency Diploma will be awarded by a Utah GED testing center. Upon the completion of an Adult Secondary Diploma or a Utah High School Equivalency diploma, adult education students may continue in an adult education program to improve their basic literacy skills only if their academic skills are less than a 12.9 grade level in an

academic area of reading, math, or English and they lack sufficient mastery of basic educational skills to enable them to function effectively in society. The focus of instruction must solely be literacy oriented, and is limited specifically to English, math and reading.

Page 14, Section 10, refers to the audits and what records are kept in perpetuity, and what is to be kept on an annual basis. So "A" refers to official records kept in perpetuity, the first one is documentation on Utah residency on Line 576 and 577, and the second part of "A" is the student's initial managing program shall maintain documentation of Utah residency, in the student's file in perpetuity. Documentation of such proof shall be entered in the student's UTopia data record.

Line 589 describes other items that are kept for perpetuity: completed core follow-up surveys have been added, releases of information requesting student record information, annual releases of student information to other requesting agencies, special education IEPs for students under the age of twenty-two, outside psychological, psychiatric or medical documentation used in determining education programming accommodations and record of accommodations, et cetera.

Line 596: validating student outcomes on an annual basis – the student's managing program shall maintain records for each program site which clearly and accurately show for each student a signed or refusal to sign waiver of release form, all assessment protocol sheets, pre- and post-tests used to determine the student's EFL and level gains, contact hours – both non-instructional and instructional documentation. These items are only kept for an annual basis. When your program audit is complete, you're done with the information that is not needed in perpetuity and may shred them.

Line 616 through 623: discusses the local programs preparing and submitting to the USOE written corrective action found for each audit finding by October 15<sup>th</sup>, and that the USOE adult education staff are responsible to monitor and assist programs in the resolution and corrective action plans as well as a program's failure to resolve audit findings may result in termination of state and/or federal funding.

<?>: Are you talking just about independent audits completed by independent auditors or the USOE program monitoring?

Marty: Both. This section will be clarified.

For further clarification, when we met with the Board Curriculum Committee last week, their direction was for us to prepare the rule with terminology using Utah Equivalency High School

Diploma. This period of time is to gather public input so they can move forward. The Board actually will take action on this rule at this coming meeting.

The GED verification issues on the POM is the accuracy of entering the access code, which is case sensitive. We are finding that there are programs that enter GED outcomes based upon what a client says without any verification from NRSPro. Credits have been awarded towards an Adult High School Secondary Diploma without proof of a successful GED outcome. In some cases the GED Tests in fact have not been passed.

Jeff:

You have two POM reports: draft 1 and draft 2. One says "Without GED verification" and the other says "With GED verification." Look at the "Without." We know from all UTopia trainings that not every program is up-to-date in entering UTopia data. There's no doubt that UTopia is a work in progress. As such, we did not want those changes to count against you. Since this was the Beta year, we want to analyze the data in the most liberal way possible. The outcomes reported in Draft 1 "without GED verification" gave you credit for all of the official enrollees that you had. We gave you credit for all the enrollee and participant hours. Remember that in the hard and fast rules for the Program Outcome Measure, a participant only receives 11.99 hours. We found out as we looked at programs outcomes, that you had participants that might have had a thousand hours, and even though they have a thousand hours because you had not completed some of the other requirements that would have turned that person into an enrollee you were penalized. We did not want to hold it at 11.99, so if you generated a thousand hours, then they are on here. Diplomas and GEDs are separate here and you would be paid accordingly since that is what our funding formula is. Now, this was also difficult to come up with and reconcile. And so our best effort is, these are the numbers. Both figures are down from last year. Since UTopia is a work in progress, we are doing everything we can to give programs as much as possible as we want to be able to report the best outcomes possible to both OVAE and the Legislature. The difference between these two reports is GED verification. The next page is where we verified those GEDs. This is funding for 2009-2010. Now for our next package of materials. Scenario 3, third page. Because we know we have to change the funding formula because programs will only be paid on one outcome - either the GED or the diploma, what Scenario 3 does, is simply take our current funding formula, combine the amounts of money and percentages for the GED and high school diploma, puts them together and computes what we think will be generated.

Jeff:

At the last consortium meeting, we talked that as long as we have to go in and change the funding formula, is there a better way to distribute these funds? Are there better percentages than what we

currently have? And so we looked at two additional ones. Look at Scenario 1. Scenario 1 gives a greater percentage for enrollees, going from 25 to 27 percent. Contact hours remain the same. Base remains the same. GED and diploma were reduced to 20 percent, down from 27-1/2 percent, level gains were increased to 20 percent, credits modestly from 7.5 to 8 percent. No decision has been made to accept any of these possibilities. We also will not be changing the formula this year. It actually goes into effect next year, so we have plenty of time. Scenario 2, we have given enrollees 30 percent of the money. Contact hours remain the same. Supplemental the same, basis the same. GEDs and diploma outcomes are at 25 percent. Level gains were reduced by half from the previous one you looked at. Credits went up yet again to 10 percent.

### Jeff answered questions regarding the formula variations.

Jeff: We really need to solidify the expectations between now and June 30, 2009, for GEDs and diplomas, so programs can plan. The other thing that will change the funding spreadsheet and your budgets, is that another school district will be a reality as of July 1, 2009. Jordan District is splitting. We do not know how the funding for those two districts will look.

Marty: There are five additional items. 1) To the ABE committee that helped Shauna, working on the ABE standards – thank you very much; your time is greatly appreciated. 2) If you have students who have taken a GED in another state, and you are entering the GED outcome into the database, whether he is working on a diploma or not, please e-mail the Webmaster or have your UTopia Administrator email the Webmaster, and let us know what state the GED was received in, so that the GED can be validated. Up until now, when you submitted URAED reports and our NRS reports, we have never validated any GEDs. Practice would suggest that the numbers of GED outcomes may go down. It is very important to make sure that you have valid information. Do not enter a GED achievement until you know and you can validate the outcome. 3) I want to thank you for this lively discussion today, and I really do appreciate your feedback and your input. Know that we will continue working on the Board rule. The Adult Education Consortium meets tomorrow. We will take your input and work together further to represent your voice. Your Consortium representatives should be working with you regarding input. I would hope that as a group of adult educators that you would look to what is right for your students. An adult education diploma may not always be the right option. In this day and age people need to be able to move forward into employment and into post-secondary opportunities. I do know we have to stop double dipping. I do not know if it is in our or the student's best interest to only offer diplomas and tell people who want a GED to go someplace else. Do we do our clients a disservice? We do. You have a chance to impact a person's life, and whatever impact

that is, whether it's a GED or an adult education secondary diploma, it's your responsibility, whatever that is within the community. We do take your input seriously. Do know that what we're doing is gathering input for the November Board meeting. We have taken to heart your input. As I said earlier, we are meeting with the Consortium tomorrow and will move forward and continue to put items out on the web so you have a chance for input. 4) When we meet again in December, we will have the new POM that will be updated. The December POM will be the official outcomes for 2007-2008. I do anticipate some action at the Legislature given the economy. 5) We have to provide the state auditors with proof of action on our corrective action as they call for it. We do want to have this resolved and behind us, but we need your support to be able to do that and to move the adult education agenda — not for us as programs, but for us as citizens within the state and making the best impact for our citizens. I hope that you will think about what is best for your community and how you can utilize the people you have on staff. Look at the curriculum and at the focus you really want for your clients, and have your clients help you drive what your program is doing. You can refocus and utilize your staff to define what you really want your program to do for the people of Utah.

<?>: My comment was, if the legislature does cut funding for adult education, we will have to cut services. It's as simple as that. I think an important consideration for us is that, after the Board takes action on November 7<sup>th</sup>, whatever that action is, when you factor out the holiday, we'll only have about a month to get word out to everybody that there have been these changes. One of the things that concerns me is that probably over fifty percent of all the students who get a GED in the state of Utah do not come through adult education. We have got to make sure that we educate the community. We have got to make sure that the testing center people know that the change has been made. Murray made the comment that we have to provide good counseling up front. Well, we do. The problem is, is that not everybody listens to it, and that is why we have a lot of the students we have. We're going to have to do an especially good job of getting word out about these changes so that we don't have somebody coming off the street into a testing center, getting a GED and then six months later deciding they want to go into the Marines and cannot get in because they do not have a high school diploma. We have got to make sure that we do as much as we can to prevent misunderstandings down the road.

Marty: That's good feedback. It does take all of us to support one another, to make sure we are all on the same page. You made a comment that this is the final. The Board has given us direction, but remember this is a time for public input. Board meetings are open meetings, and you are more than

welcome to attend the Curriculum Committee as well as the general session in the afternoon. Public comment is heard in the mornings at 11:45 a.m. I would hope that we as State staff can work to support you as programs, but also work to support the clients within the state in advocating on the best behalf of everybody.

<?>: I was just wondering when this has not been before the Board, is this basically cut and dried?

Marti:

What they said to us, was they approved in the Curriculum Committee the name of the GED to become a Utah High School Equivalency Diploma and asked us to draft rule that would support this notion and to put the timelines in place as to when this would go into effect. I heard you very clearly say: give us some time, let us transition, let us look at that. The January 1<sup>st</sup> date is something that we had put in place thinking that we are to move the agenda forward with the Board. We will have more for you after the November Board meeting, and then we'll have another meeting in December with all of you, where we can talk further. I would move forth with your current students to complete their diploma before the end of the year for two reasons: 1) because of the possible changes in the Board, and 2) because of the economy. Thanks everybody for staying and being here today.