Welcome and Introductions: Marty Kelly, State Coordinator of Adult Education, welcomed everyone to the meeting.

UTopia questions: Utopia program screen shots were shown and discussed. Information about UTopia was discussed and questions were answered.

Lunch

Program Evaluations: The Program Evaluations Instrument, used when a program is reviewed, was distributed. As required by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), programs are reviewed in some fashion every year, with a full evaluation conducted every three years. The Program Evaluation Instrument has changed because some information/records are now accessible in UTopia, for example which tests you are using. Before a site evaluation is conducted you will be informed of the visit and given the evaluation instrument, so that you can prepare information ahead of time. The evaluation is more precise than it has been in the past. The areas or categories evaluated are: administration, curriculum and instruction, data quality, student indicators, and community connections. Data quality means that the program uses the state database system (UTopia) which, you signed you would do, in signing the assurance section of the program grant. Another main area focused on, in the program review, is community connections, which means establishing collaborations with other programs and agencies including working with DWS.

Programs will be notified with the results of their review which may include the possibility of a follow-up visit (page 2). In the fiscal area, a print-out of all program revenues' and expenses is required. Grant dollars must be separated by grant category from other expenses/monies, if budgets are not presently set up this way they need to be corrected, so that your grant funding and exactly which of your expenses is being taken out of the grant is accounted for. There can be other items that need correcting, which will be re-evaluated in a follow-up visit. Content/category areas to be reviewed are on page 2-3. If as a result of the program review evidence cannot be found to support the evaluated areas then the "no" box will be checked and programs will receive written recommendations and/or notice of a corrective action.

AEFLA grants are competitive and programs are expected to follow through in the manner that is outlined in the grant application following adult education rules and policies. Corrective action may be more that just a follow-up visit. Specific program

procedures may need to be changed and may result in a program not receiving the grant the second year. If needed, programs will receive technical assistance to improve so that they will be able to continue the second year of the grant. The USOE intent is to help programs improve, but if a program does not have outcomes then OVAE does not want the USOE to continue funding a program. Adult education staff can come to programs to help correct problem areas. Going over this evaluation instrument will help programs know what is expected. When conducting a program review it is state staff prerogative to ask additional questions related to the grant; and the questions in the program evaluation instrument may not be asked in the order listed. Shauna usually does a review by asking the program administrator to take her through the process as though she were a student coming into the program. Usually by the time she have gone through this process, most of the questions, except fiscal questions, are answered.

When the program review process is completed the adult education specialist will write-up the results and Marty will review it, both of them will sign a letter with the results of the review which will be sent to the program administrator. Ultimately Marty is responsible to the OVAE for Utah's adult education programs. Programs administrators were complimented on the fine work that they and their staff do and for all that is accomplished by adult education programs.

Budgets: A sample Annual Program Report (APR), like the ones school districts use, was given to each program director. This sample budget is broken down into categories with columns for the various adult education programs (AHCS, ABE, etc.) and their code numbers (which will be checked for accuracy). Budget sheets should show the break-out expenses in each of the categories in relationship to the grant'(s) budgets. It doesn't have to be specifically like the sample APR, but this sample has a good layout for budgets and does show what the headers should look like. Make it workable for your program and our office.

Grant Targets: Each program was given their individual target sheets (intensity and duration) from their grants for the past three years. Utah's benchmark goals are the targets that Marty, as the state adult education coordinator, negotiates with OVAE every year. These targets are based upon our state's performance for the previous year. The data (URAED) is compiled and put into the NRS reports the target percentages accomplished the previous year are generated. Marty then meets with her federal specialist, Kay (who has access to five years of Utah data), and together they negotiate new state targets based upon last year's performance. For example 30% of our population will meet the criteria to have mastered literacy skill at an ABE 1 level.

A state can never negotiate down on their targets. In the upcoming target negotiation Marty hopes there is more latitude because there will be a full year of UTopia data to consider. It very importance to enter data into UTopia so that the data results are accurate, otherwise it taints what we as a state are doing. Marty has to report to OVAE the data based on students funded by all sources of money (state money, Wal-Mart or other private grants). Therefore report outcomes for all your students no matter what funding source is used to serve them.

Marty wants programs to have realistic goals and to try to project outcomes from what is going on in the community. Across the state the average cost per adult education student for a year is $365, however for CBO programs the cost is higher as they have higher manpower and overhead costs. If your cost per student is much higher then you need to look at that. Also look at program intensity, if a program is serving a student twice a week that probably will not generate the outcomes you needed to reach the program's target. In desk monitoring we will focus more on increasing outcomes. In reference to Pro Literacy Research it has been reported that nationwide goals are not being met.

Please note that when you are completing the top portion of the target page of the Measurable Goals (grant app.) the count can't be duplicated. Since students can have more than one goal the bottom section of the measurable goals page can be a duplicated count.

When programs do not receive the full amount of funding applied for the question then becomes can a program still serve the same number of students? Often the budget page is adjusted but not the student target numbers. The top part of the grant target page refers to increasing students' educational functioning levels. The four core goals (students have to choose at least one) are at the bottom of that page.

Marty said she was concerned when a program states that 60 -70% of students will meet level gain goals as the programs targets (this is really a lofty goal). When setting targets programs should go back to URAED reports and look at what the program accomplished for that year and then set targets.

If a program is having greater success in certain areas consider the reasons. Could it be your teacher is successful, if so maybe that teacher could help other teachers? Look at where your program is having success and consider how your program can be improved in the other target areas. In the March meeting we will be looking more at data and comparing your data with other's (blind) data.

Federal requests for reimbursements should be made once a month. The specialist will check the program's budget with the request of the reimbursement to make sure that they match. Some budget categories can be changed if you notify Marty ahead of time with an explanation of why. Any change can't be more than 10% from one category to another.

Assessment Policy: The assessment policy was distributed; it has been updated to assure that all UTopia rules are address in the policy (updated version is not on the web). OVAE has looked over the preliminary version and has approved the policy.

Specific information regarding BEST and CASAS testing is on pages 5-6. The first bulleted information, on page 6, regarding testing after 60 hour of instruction was read.

Programs don't have to assess every 60 hours but they are wise to do so, because if the student leaves at least the program will have generated a level gain. Assessments need only be made in the area the student is focusing on. If you know a student is leaving you can test after 40 hours. The reason for this rule is testing more often than that reduces the credibility of the test (second bullet). The end of the year (May or June) test can also serve as the pre-test and establishes the Entering Functioning Level for the new program year. If your program has students that you are not sure if they will be coming back you may want to error on the side of them coming back and post-test them (if they have enough hours) in May or June using the full BEST, CASAS, or TABE. Testing on instructional hours can cross over the July 1 boundary, meaning instructional contact hours between tests from the previous fiscal year, behind the scenes continues to accumulate determining when the next post-test should be given. However, instructional contact hours for the program's "outcomes" start at zero at the beginning of the new fiscal/program year (July 1). Best practice is to have at least 60 hours of instructions before testing. Testing rules are explained in detail in the UTopia manual (section 10.1.1.1) and it would be in your program's best interest to carefully read them.

Distance learning: Distance learning is for programs where 85 % of the student's instruction is not in front of a teacher, but information is in packets or is computer based from home. Most community-based programs are teaching students in the classroom, but some may use distance learning, if or where there are long distances to travel to sites. There is a policy (recently changed/updated) that describes distance learning.

Desk Monitoring: A handout regarding desk monitoring specific to community-based organization was distributed. Each community-based organization is assigned to one of the specialists for desk monitoring and program assistance.

Desk Auditing Assignments – 2007-2008

Sandi	Shauna	Jeff
Asian Association	English Language Center	Price City Library
English Skills Center	International Rescue Center	San Juan Foundation
Guadalupe	Literacy Action Center	Snow College
Salt lake County Aging	Project Read	

Site visits to each program are completed every three years. Through UTopia (desk monitoring), information is available from a distance (our office). USOE staff with UTopia, now assists programs in reaching target outcomes by receiving and discussing UTopia data with program staff. It is essential that all student data is entered into UTopia as the data entered will determine your programs future level of funding. Some states hold money back to be used as reward money for programs that exceed their stated outcomes. Our office distributes all of Utah's money. If through desk monitoring, programs are found to be very low in their performance, then we may consider reducing funds.

The following items are addressed through desk monitoring: educational level completion, receipt of secondary credential, entered post secondary education, entered employment, retained employment, number and percentage of students pre-tested by set time, number and percentage of students pre and post-tested. Some programs never post-test because students are unable to complete enough instructional hours. Other items that may be evaluated during desk monitoring are average contact hours between pre and post testing, number of students who completed goal setting process, time the goal setting was completed, number of students with goals, number of students with social security numbers, total enrollment, enrollment by sub groups (demographic variable, educational levels), average attendance hours, number of credential teachers, average hours of professional development, expenditure per student, expenditure per outcome, expenditure per instructional hour.

UTopia could potentially look at all of these items. UTopia will provide programs with the necessary reports so that you can go into UTopia, and review your data periodically to assist you in assessing program successes and to assist you if you are falling behind in some areas. Items that we plan to use in desk monitoring are on the rubric (attachment A) of the handout. Remember this is a pilot and is not completed yet. The rubric for community-based programs is different from the one for school districts. We took out those items that directly reflected on a district, such as GED and diplomas. It was pointed out that even though the data will be evaluated quarterly points will not be awarded until the end of the year, when all of the data is available. Refer to the rubric for point values. Right now this is a pilot test program so there may to be adjustment because of individual program circumstances.

Rubric Summary: The *Student Outcomes Measures* consists of *Educational level completions* and *Employment goals*. These areas are monitored in UTopia and compared with what was written into the program's grant. If you did not receive the amount of funding that your program applied for then you needed to have adjusted the targets at the time you submitted a revised budget. Changes can still be made until December 14th. Look at what you were awarded and your predicted goals, if they can be reconciled then submit the revised changes. One way to do this is to review your previous URAED data reflective of what was previously accomplished. Other circumstances that affect your program could change this so be aware of what is happening in your community (example is the Carbon Mine disaster). Desk monitoring will be completed quarterly. Since the grant process is a competition and as such you are not allowed to change it, but certainly you could make changes in the second year of the grant.

In *Data Processing Measures*: UTopia reports the number of students who were tested in the first twelve hours and how many students completed the goal setting processes. UTopia can generate a percentage of students that were pre- and post-tested. These items can be checked quarterly and because of this, you can determine program progress.

In *Program Process Measures* Utopia will look at your total enrollment and compare it with what your grant said you could do (after you made adjustments) and what your program accomplished. The cost per student based on the funding you were given and

how many students you severed can be figured. If you have other money then that will be a factor in figuring this and it may need to be figured both ways (with the additional money and without it). Intensity, duration and retention of students will be reviewed. How long you kept the student in your class, how often they were in class and for how many hours. By reviewing the data you will be able to make program adjustments.

Sanctions: When a grant is accepted from OVAE, those accepting the grant are agreeing to help improve the literacy levels of adults. In the 2000 census there were 211,000 in Utah that did not have a high school diploma or a GED, which means that there are still many who have not been touched by our programs. Marty talked about employment and literacy and how they relate to each other, she indicated that literacy is necessary for employment. When you improve a person's English or math skills you are helping them to be more employable. Marty applauded the community-based programs for all they do to accommodate their students. She encouraged them to expand or modify their program hours in the evenings, on Saturdays and Sundays in addition to having year-round programs to meet the needs of the clients.

We have discussed with OVAE the consequences to a program which fails to move their program forward; we have worked with the attorneys (both theirs and ours) regarding this (see the desk monitoring handout page 2). As desk monitoring is implemented USOE staff will work closely with programs to ensure their performance successes. If there is a lack of performance then an agreed upon corrective actions will be developed that will include reasonable timeframes to meet performance standards and what sanctions may or may not occur if improvement and compliance with program standards are not met. This is individualized for each program. We will work to provide intense state technical assistance with further desk monitoring in addition to conference calls and on-site monitoring.

If here is a decision that your grant is not to be renewed the second year, the funds that you would have had will be re-allocated to other grantees who are having success as there will be no new competition. While all of the programs are great as a state office we are concerned when some programs are showing no students, some have eight and some have two-hundred twenty. UTopia is your funding so you will have to put the data in UTopia in order to be funded. What we do with federal money has to be reported to OVAE.

Generally you are all doing great work and we commend you. We encourage you to build consortiums and many of you have (examples were given). You are all accepting the funding to improve individuals literacy. You are now being asked to look at your programs differently. Marty requested feedback on the desk monitoring document.

Advisory Council/Consortium: The adult education advisory council has been redesigned. There is a Department of Workforce Services state council and Superintendent Harrington represents adult education on that council. We have changed our council to be an Adult Education Consortium. The two representatives for community-based programs are Kate Diggins (Guadalupe) and Katie Jensen (English Language Center of Cache Valley). Talk to them about this desk monitoring document

as they meet with us often. Extra money has been given to programs to help you input data into UTopia.

The UTopia system and data entry rules will be locked down on November 30, 2007. You should be entering your data at least weekly or bi-weekly. UTopia money is federal money but we are not requiring you to write a separate grant, however if you have not already submitted a budget sheet that includes that information, you need to do so. If you are going to include that on a revision for your budget then you need to include UTopia. Please do so in another color of ink so it will stand out. If you are going to re-address your grant do so by December 14, 2007 otherwise your grant will stands as it is.

Grant Assurances: The eligible activities for the AEFLA grant are outlined in the Adult Education Workplace Investment Act. Shauna participated in the process of obtaining the outcomes for the AEFLA grant. Outcomes were narrowed down after days of deliberation from representatives from all the states. She said that it would be to your advantage to read Part II of the act (WIA) as this applies to our AEFLA grants. If the content of WIA II as outlined does not match the outcome of the students your program serves, then perhaps, this grant is not for you.

Section "O" of the Assurances was read. AHSC, ABE and ESOL are the approved activities of this grant. If your program is preparing people to go to work, then it would need to be within the parameters of the AEFLA grant which focuses on reading, writing, listening and speaking.

Section "T" was read and it was explained that the skills listed there are to be within the guidelines of reading, writing, listening and speaking. When you do your projections it is ESOL 1, ESOL 2, ESOL 3 and the other core outcome stated in the AEFLA part of the grant. This is where you get your level gains and as such is the main part of our grant. Programs must to look at level gains as this is what is counted in order to obtain/maintain funding.

Section "V" regarding entering data into UTopia was read. The deadline for entering this data is June 30th , that is the cut off date. This will make or break whether or not you continue to receive this grant. You will have until July 15th to clean up your data. It is so important that you enter your data into UTopia.

Audit reports: The auditor reports next year will be different. Programs will need back-up data to support UTopia input. Transcripts, TABE, BEST or CASUS tests, or the refugees' card will be needed to support data in UTopia. USOE staff will distribute updated information that is needed for the audit prior to next year's audit. We are presently revising a tool with the state auditor's office for this purpose. Refer to Tab B of the policy manual for more thorough guidelines.

Marty commented regarding the discrepancies in the URAED data and how much nicer UTopia is. The data in URAED is often in error. For example a program had 40 participants and over a 1,000 contact hours (this cannot be). UTopia is a leveling of the

playing field. The survey information is currently being programmed into UTopia.
UTopia will generate a list of those to be surveyed in your program.

ESOL Civics Syllabus: A reminder was given to those who do not have the an EL/Civic grant, that on July 1, 2008 all programs will be required to use the ESOL Civics Syllabus for all their EL/Civic and ESOL students. You can obtain a copy of the syllabus by contacting (email) Sandi. Citizenship cannot be a class by itself, but it should be part of a class where English is taught (even if you are teaching primary citizenship) English is still a part of that class. You could call the class ESOL/Civic class.

Adjourn: A handout "Motivating and Retaining Adult Learners" (partial presentation) on intensity and duration was handed out.

Marty called for questions regarding UTopia and requested that if they had concerns/questions about UTopia to email the webmaster and not Toni directly. Marty thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the meeting.