



IOWA'S ADULT LITERACY PROGRAM

BENCHMARK PROJECTION REPORT

Iowa Department
of Education

**Program Year 2006
July 1, 2005– June 30, 2006**

IOWA'S
ADULT LITERACY PROGRAM

BENCHMARK
PROJECTION
REPORT

**Iowa Department of Education
Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Preparation**

**Program Year 2006
July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006**

The report was written and produced by the Iowa Department of Education. No official endorsement by any other agency or organization should be inferred. This document may be downloaded from the Iowa Literacy Resource Center's (ILRC) website located at <http://www.readiowa.org>. Proper credit for citation purposes should be given in accordance with accepted publishing standards.

State of Iowa
Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa
50319-0146

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Gene E. Vincent, President, Carroll
Sally J. Frudden, Vice President, Charles City
Jim Billings, West Des Moines
Charles C. Edwards, Jr. Des Moines
Sister Jude Fitzpatrick, Davenport
Rosie Hussey, Mason City
Wayne Kobberdahl, Council Bluffs
Gregory D. McClain, Cedar Falls
Mary Jean Montgomery, Spencer

ADMINISTRATION

Judy A. Jeffrey, Director and Executive Officer
of the State Board of Education
Gail Sullivan, Chief of Staff

**DIVISION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
AND WORKFORCE PREPARATION**

Janice Nahra Friedel, Ph.D., Administrator

Bureau of Community Colleges and Career and Technical Education

Beverly Bunker, Chief
John Hartwig, Consultant
Sally Schroeder, Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, disability, religion, creed, age or marital status in its programs or employment practices. If you have questions or grievances related to this policy, please contact Chief, Bureau of Administration and School Improvement Services, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146, (515) 281-5811.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
Benchmark Levels for Program Year 2006	
HISTORY AND OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL REPORTING SYSTEM.....	2
History of the NRS	2
OVERVIEW OF THE NRS MEASURES AND METHODS	2
NRS Measures.....	3
Core Outcome Measures.....	4
BENCHMARK PROJECTION ANALYSIS.....	6
OBSERVATIONS	29
APPENDIX A – ADULT LITERACY STAFF DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PROGRAM YEAR 2006	31

LIST OF EXHIBITS AND TABLES

Exhibits

Exhibit 1	Goals and Core Indicators of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act and NRS Core Outcome Measures	4
Exhibit 2	Relationship Among Instructional Programs and Educational Functioning Levels	5

Tables

Table 1	Comparison of Pre-Post Assessment Benchmark Percentage Levels for Iowa and Iowa's Community College Adult Literacy Program by Major Instructional Program and GED Pass Rate	6
Table 2	Comparison of National Reporting System Benchmark Percentage Levels for Iowa and Iowa's Community College Adult Literacy Program for the Educational Gains Core Measures by Educational Functioning Level and the Follow-Up Core Measures	7
Table 3	Comparison of Percentage Increase for Iowa's Basic Skills Certification Program for Iowa and Iowa's Community College Adult Literacy Program	8
Table 4	Analysis of Iowa's Community College Benchmark Projections Percentage Range for the Federal Core Performance Measures for Program Year 2006	9
Table 5	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for Pre-Post Assessment – Adult Basic Education	10
Table 6	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for Pre-Post Assessment – English Literacy	11
Table 7	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for Pre-Post Assessment – Adult Secondary Education	12
Table 8	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for the Education Gain Core Benchmarks – ABE Beginning Literacy.....	13
Table 9	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for the Education Gain Core Benchmarks – ABE Beginning Basic.....	14

Table 10	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for the Education Gain Core Benchmarks – ABE Intermed. Low	15
Table 11	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for the Education Gain Core Benchmarks – ABE Intermed. High	16
Table 12	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for the Education Gain Core Benchmarks – ASE Low.....	17
Table 13	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for the Education Gain Core Benchmarks – EL Beg. Literacy	18
Table 14	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for the Education Gain Core Benchmarks – EL Beginning.....	19
Table 15	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for the Education Gain Core Benchmarks – EL Intermed. Low	20
Table 16	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for the Education Gain Core Benchmarks – EL Intermed. High	21
Table 17	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for the Education Gain Core Benchmarks – EL Low Adv.	22
Table 18	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for the Follow-Up Benchmarks – Entered Employment	23
Table 19	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for the Follow-Up Benchmarks – Retained Employment.....	24
Table 20	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for the Follow-Up Benchmarks – Entered Postsecondary Education or Training	25
Table 21	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for the Follow-Up Benchmarks – Obtained a GED or Secondary School Diploma.....	26
Table 22	Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006 for Iowa’s GED Pass Rate	27

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The purpose of this publication is to present Iowa's adult literacy program approved projected benchmark percentage levels for Program Year 2006 (July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006). The passage of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998 [Public Law 105-220] by the 105th Congress has ushered in a new era of collaboration, coordination, cooperation and accountability. The overall goal of the Act is "to increase the employment, retention, and earnings of participants, and increase occupational skill attainment by participants, and, as a result improve the quality of the workforce, reduce welfare dependency, and enhance the productivity and competitiveness of the Nation." The key principles inculcated in the Act are:

- Streamlining services;
- Empowering individuals;
- Universal access;
- Increased accountability;
- New roles for local boards;
- State and local flexibility;
- Improved youth programs.

The purpose of Title II, The Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, is to create a partnership among the Federal government, states, and localities to provide, on a voluntary basis, adult basic education and literacy services in order to:

- Assist adults to become literate and obtain the knowledge and skills necessary for employment and self-sufficiency;
- Assist adults who are parents obtain the educational skills necessary to become full partners in the educational development of their children;
- Assist adults in the completion of a secondary school education.

One of the major intents of AEFLA was to establish performance measures and benchmarks to demonstrate increased accountability in line with the major goals and objectives of WIA. Section 212(2)(A) of the Act specifies that each eligible agency (i.e. The Iowa Department of Education and local grant recipients) is subject to certain core indicators of performance and has the authority to specify additional indicators. The core Federally mandated and Iowa indicators are:

- Demonstrated improvement in literacy skill levels in reading, writing, and speaking the English language, numeracy, problem solving, English language acquisition, and other literacy skills;
- Placement in, retention in, or completion of postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment or career advancement;
- Receipt of an [adult] secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent [Iowa High School Equivalency Diploma];
- Receipt of a basic literacy skills certificate in the subject areas of: (1) Reading, (2) Mathematics, and (3) Writing.

Benchmark Levels for Program Year 2006

The Iowa basic skills core benchmark percentage levels for Program Year 2006 were established: (1) utilizing the Adult Education Performance Review ACT (GPRA) indicator model disseminated by the U.S. Department of Education: Division of Adult Education and Literacy (USDE:DAEL), (2) an analysis of benchmark attainment for Program Years 2001 through 2004 (July 1, 2000 – June 30, 2004 and (3) benchmark projections for Program Year 2005 (July 1, 2004 - June 30, 2005).

HISTORY AND OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL REPORTING SYSTEM

The National Reporting System (NRS) is a project to develop an accountability system for the Federally funded adult literacy program. This system includes a set of student measures to allow assessment of the impact of adult basic education instruction, methodologies for collecting the measures, reporting forms and procedures, and training and technical assistance activities to assist states in collecting the measures.

History Of The NRS

The NRS was born in the 1990s, a decade known for its emphasis on accountability of Federal programs. During this time, all publicly funded programs and agencies faced increasing pressures to demonstrate that they have met their legislative goals and have an impact on their client populations. The requirement to demonstrate program impact was mandated in 1993 through the Government Performance and Review Act (GPRA). GPRA required all Federal agencies to develop strategic plans to ensure that services were delivered efficiently and in a manner that best suits client needs, and to develop indicators of performance to demonstrate their agency's impact.

In 1995, the U.S. Congress considered eliminating adult basic education as a separate delivery system by integrating the program into a general system of workforce development. Strong and convincing data on the impact of adult basic education at the state and federal levels were demanded to demonstrate its importance as a separate education program. Similar demands were raised at the state level. In response to these demands, the state directors of adult basic education asked the Division of Adult Education and Literacy (DAEL) to work toward developing a national system for collecting information on adult basic education student outcomes.

To meet this request, DAEL devoted its March 1996 national meeting of state directors of adult education to developing a framework for program accountability. This framework specified the purposes of the adult literacy program, the essential characteristics of an accountability system and identified seven categories of outcome measures. At the March 1997 DAEL national meeting, a broad group of adult basic education stakeholders validated the framework, identified outcome measures for a new national reporting system, and discussed possible methodologies for the system. Based on these decisions, the NRS was designed and formally began in October 1997.

The proposed voluntary nature of the NRS changed in August 1998, when the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act within the Workforce Investment Act became law. This Act established accountability requirements, including that states develop outcome-based performance standards for adult literacy programs, as one means of determining program effectiveness. The NRS mandate was then expanded to establish the measures and methods to conform to the Workforce Investment Act requirements.

OVERVIEW OF THE NRS MEASURES AND METHODS

The outcome from the first two phases of the NRS project was the development of measurement definitions, methodologies and reporting formats for the NRS, which become effective beginning with Program Year 2001. The pilot phase also produced an overall framework of NRS operation at the local, state and Federal levels.

NRS Measures

The *requirements of WIA, consensus* among the stakeholders and advisory board members, and the *need for uniform valid and reliable data* were major factors guiding development of NRS measures. Other factors affecting development of the measures included the need to *accommodate the diversity* of the adult basic education delivery system and the need for *compatibility of the definitions* with related adult literacy and training programs.

As a state-administered program, the nature of adult literacy service delivery varies widely across states in its goals, objectives and the resources available to states to collect and report data. It is especially important that the definitions for outcome measures be broad enough to accommodate these differences, yet concrete and standardized sufficiently to allow the NRS to establish a uniform, national database. Similarly, other adult education, employment and training programs with which adult literacy programs cooperate and coordinate have systems of accountability and outcome measures.

To ensure this accommodation to the diverse delivery system and compatibility with related systems, NRS staff conducted a thorough review of measure definitions planned or in use currently by all states and all Federal employment and training programs. To identify state measures used, for example, NRS staff conducted an evaluability assessment of all states in early 1998 and obtained copies of measure definitions from states that had their own measures. In addition, NRS staff reviewed the existing measure definitions used for DAEL's Annual Statistical Performance Report and measures and definitions utilized by the U. S. Department of Education for Title I of WIA.

The NRS includes two types of measures: (1) core, and (2) secondary. The core measures apply to all adult literacy students receiving 12 or more hours of service. There are three types of core measures:

- **Outcome measures**, which include educational gain, entered employment, retained employment, receipt of secondary school diploma or GED and placement in postsecondary education or training;
- **Descriptive measures**, which include student demographics, reasons for attending and student status; and
- **Participation measures**, which include instructional contact hours and enrollment in instructional programs for special populations or topics (such as family literacy or workplace literacy).

Performance standards required by WIA were then established for the core outcome measures and awarding of Federal incentive grants were tied to these performance standards.

The NRS secondary measures include additional outcome measures related to employment, family and community that adult literacy education stakeholders believe are important to understanding and evaluating adult literacy programs. States are not required to report on the secondary measures and there are no performance standards tied to them. The optional secondary measures will not be used as a basis for incentive grant awards. There are also secondary student status measures that define target populations identified in WIA. These measures are provided for states that want to report on the services provided to these populations.

Core Outcome Measures

The central measures of the NRS are the student *outcome* measures. While by no means the only measures that could be used to evaluate adult literacy programs, the outcome measures selected represent what a broad consensus of adult literacy educators believe are appropriate for providing a national picture of the performance of the program. The multi-year process employed by the NRS to identify and define the measures included input from state directors of adult education, Federal education officials, local education providers, representatives of volunteer literacy organizations and experts in performance accountability systems.

The five NRS core outcome measures were selected to address the requirements for core indicators of performance delineated in the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act. **Exhibit 1** shows how the measures relate to these requirements and goals for adult literacy programs stated in the legislation.

Exhibit 1

Goals and Core Indicators of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act and NRS Core Outcome Measures

Goals of Adult Basic Education Described in the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act of WIA	Core Indicators Required by the Adult Education and Family	Literacy Act of WIA National Reporting System Core Outcome Measures
Assist adults to become literate and obtain the knowledge and skills necessary for employment and self-sufficiency.	Improvements in literacy skill levels in reading, writing and speaking the English language, numeracy, problem-solving, English language acquisition, other literacy skills.	❖ Educational gains (achieve skills to advance educational functioning level)
Assist parents to obtain the skills necessary to be full partners in their children's educational development. Placement in, retention in, or completion of, postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment or career advancement.	Placement in, retention in, or completion of, postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment or career advancement.	❖ Entered employment ❖ Retained employment ❖ Placement in postsecondary education or training
Assist adults in the completion of secondary school education.	Receipt of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent.	❖ Receipt of a secondary school diploma or pass GED tests.

Educational gain, a key outcome in the NRS, provides a measure of student literacy gains resulting from instruction. This measure applies to all students in the program (except pre-designated "work-based project learners"). To determine this measure, local programs assess students on intake to determine their *educational functioning level*. There are four levels for adult basic education (ABE), two for adult secondary education (ASE) and six levels of English Literacy students (EL). Each level describes a set of skills and competencies that students entering at any given level can perform in the areas of reading, writing, numeracy, speaking, listening, functional and workplace areas. Using these descriptors as guidelines, programs determine the appropriate initial level in

which to place students using a standardized assessment procedure (a test or performance-based assessment). The program decides the skill areas in which to assess the student, based on the student's instructional needs and goals.

Exhibit 2 depicts the relationship among the three major instructional programs and the educational functioning levels within each major program. The educational functioning levels describe the learner's entry level ability in the areas of reading, writing, numeracy and functional workplace skills.

Exhibit 2

Relationship Among Instructional Programs And Educational Functional Levels

Instructional Program	Educational Functioning Level	CASAS Level	CASAS Standard Score Range
Adult Basic Education (ABE)	ABE Beginning Literacy	Level A	Under 200
	ABE Beginning Basic Education	Level B	201 to 210
	ABE Intermediate Low	Level B	211 to 220
	ABE Intermediate High	Level C	221 to 235
Adult Secondary Education (ASE)	ASE Low	Level D	236 to 245
	ASE High	Level E	246 and Above
English Literacy: English Literacy Citizenship (EL)	EL Beginning Literacy	Level A	165 to 180
	EL Beginning	Level A	181 to 200
	EL Intermediate Low	Level B	201 to 210
	EL Intermediate High	Level B	211 to 220
	EL Advanced Low	Level C	221 to 235
	EL Advanced High	Level D, E	236 to 245

After a pre-determined amount of instruction or time period determined by each state, the program conducts follow-up assessments of students in the same skill areas and uses the functioning level descriptors to determine whether the student has advanced one or more levels or is progressing within the same level. The state has discretion to establish the student assessment method used within the state, as well as procedures for progress assessment. Iowa utilizes the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment (CASAS) as the statewide standardized assessment system. States may also use additional educational levels and skill area descriptors, as long as they are compatible with NRS levels and skills. **Tables 5-7** display the pre-post assessment approved benchmark levels for the three adult literacy instructional programs. **Tables 8-17** display the approved benchmark levels for the educational instructional gain categories. The tables reflect both the community college and state approved benchmark percentage levels.

The remaining core outcome measures are *follow-up* measures, reported some time after the student leaves the program. However, the follow-up measures apply only to students who enter the program with goals related to the measures. For unemployed students who enter the program with a goal of obtaining employment, there are two measures: (1) entered employment—whether the student obtained a job by the end of the first quarter after leaving; and (2) retained employment—

whether the student still has the job in the third quarter after exit. This measure also applies to employed students who have a goal of improved or retained employment. For students whose goal is to advance to further education or training, there is a measure of entry into another such program. For students who entered with a goal of obtaining a secondary school diploma or passing the GED tests, there is a measure of whether the student obtained the credential. **Tables 18-21** display the approved benchmark percentage levels for the program follow-up categories. The tables reflect both the community college and state approved benchmark percentage levels. **Table 22** displays the projected increase in the state GED percentage pass rate.

BENCHMARK PROJECTION ANALYSIS

The purpose of this section of the report is to present an analysis of the projected benchmark trends. Given that Program Year 2005 marks the third year that Iowa's adult basic education local programs projected benchmark percentage completion levels for the state and Federally mandated benchmarks, the analysis is designed to identify statistical trends that can be utilized to refine benchmark projections in succeeding years. The following factors were utilized in establishing Program Year 2005 benchmark projections: (1) benchmark attainment percentage levels for Program Years 2001-2003, (2) benchmark projection percentage levels for Program Year 2004 and (3) local adult literacy program goals and instructional strategies. Given the continuous improvement language contained in AEFLA, a general goal is to establish benchmark percentages at a higher level year each year. Therefore, **Tables 1 through 4** provide an overall analysis of the national, state and local ABE program benchmark projections for Program Year 2006.

Table 1 depicts a comparison of pre-post assessment percentage levels for the three major adult literacy instructional programs: (1) Adult Basic Education, (2) English Literacy, and (3) Adult Secondary Education. The benchmark percentages compare the relationship between the state projections vis-à-vis the mean community college projections. Table 1 also provides a comparison of Iowa's GED pass rate.

Table 1

Comparison of Pre-Post Assessment Benchmark Percentage Levels for Iowa and Iowa's Community College Adult Literacy Program by Major Instructional Program and GED Pass Rate

Instructional Program	State Projection	Community College Mean Projection	Difference
Adult Basic Education (ABE)	84%	83%	- 1
English Literacy (EL)	50%	49%	- 1
Adult Secondary Education (ASE)	86%	85%	- 1
GED Pass Rate	95%	94%	- 1

Table 2 displays a comparison of benchmark percentage levels for each one of the Federally mandated core measures. The benchmark percentage comparisons show the relationship between the state and local program projections. The Program Year 2006 projections for the community college based local programs represent a 3% plus or minus deviation range from the state projection. This range was successfully achieved for all federal benchmarks as reported in Column C.

Table 2

Comparison of National Reporting System Benchmark Percentage Levels for Iowa and Iowa's Community College Adult Literacy Program for the Educational Gains Core Measures by Educational Functioning Level and the Follow-Up Core Measures

Educational Gains Core Measures (Educational Functioning Level)	(A) * State Projection	(B) Community College Mean Projection	(C) Percent Difference from State Projection
Beg. Lit ABE	45%	46%	+ 1%
Beg ABE	47%	45%	- 2%
Low Int. ABE	50%	51%	+ 1%
High Int ABE	59%	57%	- 2%
Low ASE	75%	74%	- 1%
Beg Lit EL	47%	46%	- 1%
Beg EL	42%	41%	- 1%
Low Int. EL	42%	41%	- 1%
High Int EL	42%	41%	- 1%
Low Ad EL	40%	38%	- 2%
Follow-Up Core Measures			
Entered Empl.	77%	75%	- 2%
Job Retention	89%	87%	- 2%
Entered Post-Secondary Education or Training	48%	46%	- 2%
Earned GED or HS Comp.	76%	75%	- 1%

* **Source:** State Projections are based on negotiated benchmark levels with United States Department of Education: Division of Adult Education and Literacy (USDE:DAEL).

The following observation was extrapolated from the data presented in **Tables 1 and 2**:

- The community college mean projections are realistically aligned with the state projections for all benchmark categories.

Table 3 is designed to depict a projected state to local program level comparison of the percentage increase in the number of basic skill certificates issued from one program year to the succeeding program year. However, Program Year 2006 projections are not available due to the fact that the Program Year 2005 basic skills certificate count will be utilized as the base year for the Program Year 2007 projection. The Program Year 2005 basic skills certificate count will not be available until July 2005.¹

Table 3

**Comparison of Percentage Increase for Iowa's Basic Skills Certification Program
for Iowa and Iowa's Community College Adult Literacy Program**

State Projection	Total Community College Percentage Projection	Difference
NA	NA	NA

Table 4 presents an analysis of the range of benchmark percentage levels for each one of the State/Federally mandated core measures. The Table displays the lowest and highest percentage level and the percentage difference for each benchmark for the community college based benchmark projections for the following categories: (1) Pre-Post Assessment, (2) Educational Gains by Educational Functioning Level (EFL), (3) Follow-up Core Measures and (4) Other State Measures.

¹ The reader is referred to the publication titled *Iowa's Community College Basic Literacy Skills Credential Program Annual Report Program Year 2005* for a description of Iowa's Basic Literacy Skills Certification Program.

Table 4

**Analysis of Iowa's Community College Benchmark Projections Percentage Range
for the Federal Core Performance Measures for Program Year 2006**

(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)

Pre-Post Assessment	Lowest Percentage Level	Highest Percentage Level	Percent Difference
Adult Basic Education	81%	87%	6%
English Literacy	47%	53%	6%
Adult Secondary Education	83%	89%	6%
Educational Gains Core Measures By Educational Functioning Level			
Beginning Literacy ABE	42%	48%	6%
Beginning ABE	44%	50%	6%
Low Intermediate ABE	47%	52%	5%
High Intermediate ABE	56%	61%	5%
Low ASE	72%	78%	6%
Beginning Literacy EL	44%	50%	6%
Beginning EL	39%	45%	6%
Low Intermediate. EL	39%	45%	6%
High Intermediate EL	39%	45%	6%
Low Advanced EL	37%	43%	6%
Follow-Up Core Measures			
Entered Employment	74%	80%	6%
Job Retention	86%	89%	3%
Entered Post-Secondary Education or Training	45%	50%	5%
GED or High School Completion	73%	80%	7%
Other State Measures			
Basic Skills Certificate Percentage Increase Over PY 06	NA	NA	NA
GED Pass Rate	92%	96%	4%

The following observations were noted from the data presented in **Table 4**:

- There is little variance among the lowest and highest projected benchmark percentage levels for a majority of the benchmark categories as noted in the 'Percent Difference' category. The variance ranges from 3% - 7%.

- The lowest variance (3%) was observed for the category titled “Job Retention”. The highest variance (7%) was observed for the follow-up core measure entitled “GED or High School Completion”.

Table 5

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For Pre-Post Assessment
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Program Type: Adult Basic Education (ABE)

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	81%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	84%
Iowa Lakes Community College	84%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	82%
Iowa Central Comm. College	81%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	84%
Hawkeye Comm. College	81%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	81%
Kirkwood Community College	81%
Des Moines Area Community College	87%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	84%
Iowa Western Comm. College	81%
Southwestern Comm. College	81%
Indian Hills Comm. College	84%
Southeastern Comm. College	85%
Iowa Department of Education	84%

Source: Iowa’s Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education’s amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 6

Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006

For Pre-Post Assessment

(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)

Program Type: English Literacy

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	47%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	47%
Iowa Lakes Community College	50%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	47%
Iowa Central Comm. College	47%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	52%
Hawkeye Comm. College	50%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	47%
Kirkwood Community College	47%
Des Moines Area Community College	53%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	50%
Iowa Western Comm. College	47%
Southwestern Comm. College	47%
Indian Hills Comm. College	50%
Southeastern Comm. College	50%
Iowa Department of Education	50%

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 7

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For Pre-Post Assessment
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Program Type: Adult Secondary Education (ASE)

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	83%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	86%
Iowa Lakes Community College	86%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	86%
Iowa Central Comm. College	83%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	86%
Hawkeye Comm. College	85%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	86%
Kirkwood Community College	83%
Des Moines Area Community College	89%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	86%
Iowa Western Comm. College	83%
Southwestern Comm. College	83%
Indian Hills Comm. College	86%
Southeastern Comm. College	88%
Iowa Department of Education	86%

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 8

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For the Education Gain Core Benchmarks**

(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)

Program Type: Adult Basic Education

Educational Functioning Level Category: ABE Beg. Literacy

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	43%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	43%
Iowa Lakes Community College	45%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	42%
Iowa Central Comm. College	42%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	45%
Hawkeye Comm. College	42%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	45%
Kirkwood Community College	42%
Des Moines Area Community College	42%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	45%
Iowa Western Comm. College	42%
Southwestern Comm. College	42%
Indian Hills Comm. College	45%
Southeastern Comm. College	48%
Iowa Department of Education	45%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 9

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For the Education Gain Core Benchmarks
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Program Type: Adult Basic Education

Educational Functioning Level Category: ABE Beg. Basic

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	44%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	45%
Iowa Lakes Community College	47%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	44%
Iowa Central Comm. College	44%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	47%
Hawkeye Comm. College	44%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	47%
Kirkwood Community College	44%
Des Moines Area Community College	44%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	44%
Iowa Western Comm. College	44%
Southwestern Comm. College	44%
Indian Hills Comm. College	47%
Southeastern Comm. College	50%
Iowa Department of Education	47%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 10

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For the Education Gain Core Benchmarks
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Program Type: Adult Basic Education

Educational Functioning Level Category: ABE Int. Low

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	47%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	50%
Iowa Lakes Community College	50%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	47%
Iowa Central Comm. College	47%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	50%
Hawkeye Comm. College	47%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	50%
Kirkwood Community College	47%
Des Moines Area Community College	47%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	47%
Iowa Western Comm. College	47%
Southwestern Comm. College	47%
Indian Hills Comm. College	50%
Southeastern Comm. College	52%
Iowa Department of Education	50%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 11

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For the Education Gain Core Benchmarks
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Program Type: Adult Basic Education

Educational Functioning Level Category: ABE Int. Hi.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	56%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	56%
Iowa Lakes Community College	59%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	56%
Iowa Central Comm. College	56%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	59%
Hawkeye Comm. College	56%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	59%
Kirkwood Community College	56%
Des Moines Area Community College	56%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	59%
Iowa Western Comm. College	56%
Southwestern Comm. College	56%
Indian Hills Comm. College	59%
Southeastern Comm. College	61%
Iowa Department of Education	59%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 12

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For the Education Gain Core Benchmarks
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Program Type: Adult Secondary Education

Educational Functioning Level Category: ASE Low

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	72%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	72%
Iowa Lakes Community College	75%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	72%
Iowa Central Comm. College	72%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	75%
Hawkeye Comm. College	72%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	75%
Kirkwood Community College	72%
Des Moines Area Community College	78%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	72%
Iowa Western Comm. College	72%
Southwestern Comm. College	72%
Indian Hills Comm. College	75%
Southeastern Comm. College	78%
Iowa Department of Education	75%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 13
Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For the Education Gain Core Benchmarks
 (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)

Program Type: English Literacy

Educational Functioning Level Category: EL Beg. Lit.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	44%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	44%
Iowa Lakes Community College	47%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	44%
Iowa Central Comm. College	44%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	47%
Hawkeye Comm. College	44%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	47%
Kirkwood Community College	44%
Des Moines Area Community College	50%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	50%
Iowa Western Comm. College	44%
Southwestern Comm. College	44%
Indian Hills Comm. College	47%
Southeastern Comm. College	49%
Iowa Department of Education	47%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 14

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For the Education Gain Core Benchmarks
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Program Type: English Literacy

Educational Functioning Level Category: EL Beg.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	39%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	40%
Iowa Lakes Community College	42%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	39%
Iowa Central Comm. College	39%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	42%
Hawkeye Comm. College	39%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	42%
Kirkwood Community College	39%
Des Moines Area Community College	45%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	45%
Iowa Western Comm. College	39%
Southwestern Comm. College	39%
Indian Hills Comm. College	42%
Southeastern Comm. College	44%
Iowa Department of Education	42%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 15

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For the Education Gain Core Benchmarks
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Program Type: English Literacy

Educational Functioning Level Category: EL Int. Low

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	39%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	39%
Iowa Lakes Community College	42%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	39%
Iowa Central Comm. College	39%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	42%
Hawkeye Comm. College	39%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	42%
Kirkwood Community College	39%
Des Moines Area Community College	45%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	45%
Iowa Western Comm. College	39%
Southwestern Comm. College	39%
Indian Hills Comm. College	42%
Southeastern Comm. College	44%
Iowa Department of Education	42%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 16

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For the Education Gain Core Benchmarks
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Program Type: English Literacy

Educational Functioning Level Category: EL Int. High

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	39%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	40%
Iowa Lakes Community College	42%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	39%
Iowa Central Comm. College	39%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	42%
Hawkeye Comm. College	39%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	42%
Kirkwood Community College	39%
Des Moines Area Community College	45%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	45%
Iowa Western Comm. College	39%
Southwestern Comm. College	39%
Indian Hills Comm. College	42%
Southeastern Comm. College	44%
Iowa Department of Education	42%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 17

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For the Education Gain Core Benchmarks
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Program Type: English Literacy

Educational Functioning Level Category: EL Low Adv.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	37%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	37%
Iowa Lakes Community College	42%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	37%
Iowa Central Comm. College	37%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	40%
Hawkeye Comm. College	37%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	40%
Kirkwood Community College	37%
Des Moines Area Community College	37%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	37%
Iowa Western Comm. College	37%
Southwestern Comm. College	37%
Indian Hills Comm. College	40%
Southeastern Comm. College	43%
Iowa Department of Education	40%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Educational Gains."

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 18

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For the Follow-Up Benchmarks
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Follow-Up Measure Category: Entered Employment

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	74%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	75%
Iowa Lakes Community College	77%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	74%
Iowa Central Comm. College	74%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	77%
Hawkeye Comm. College	74%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	77%
Kirkwood Community College	74%
Des Moines Area Community College	77%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	80%
Iowa Western Comm. College	74%
Southwestern Comm. College	74%
Indian Hills Comm. College	77%
Southeastern Comm. College	74%
Iowa Department of Education	77%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Entered Employment".

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 19

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For the Follow-Up Benchmarks
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Follow-Up Measure Category: Retained Employment

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	86%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	87%
Iowa Lakes Community College	89%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	86%
Iowa Central Comm. College	86%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	89%
Hawkeye Comm. College	86%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	89%
Kirkwood Community College	86%
Des Moines Area Community College	89%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	89%
Iowa Western Comm. College	86%
Southwestern Comm. College	86%
Indian Hills Comm. College	89%
Southeastern Comm. College	86%
Iowa Department of Education	89%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Retained Employment".

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 20

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For the Follow-Up Benchmarks
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Follow-Up Measure Category: Entered Postsecondary Education or Training

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	45%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	45%
Iowa Lakes Community College	48%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	45%
Iowa Central Comm. College	45%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	48%
Hawkeye Comm. College	45%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	48%
Kirkwood Community College	45%
Des Moines Area Community College	45%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	50%
Iowa Western Comm. College	45%
Southwestern Comm. College	45%
Indian Hills Comm. College	48%
Southeastern Comm. College	45%
Iowa Department of Education	48%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Entered Postsecondary Education or Training".

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 21

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For the Follow-Up Benchmarks
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Follow-Up Measure Category: Obtained a GED or Secondary School Diploma

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK PERCENTAGE LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	73%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	73%
Iowa Lakes Community College	76%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	73%
Iowa Central Comm. College	73%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	76%
Hawkeye Comm. College	73%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	76%
Kirkwood Community College	73%
Des Moines Area Community College	73%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	80%
Iowa Western Comm. College	73%
Southwestern Comm. College	73%
Indian Hills Comm. College	77%
Southeastern Comm. College	76%
Iowa Department of Education	76%

The data presented in this chart is a mandated benchmark of the National Reporting System's (NRS) core outcome measure of "Obtained a GED or Secondary School Diploma".

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

Table 22

**Approved Benchmark Percentage Level for Program Year 2006
For Iowa's GED Pass Rate
(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)**

Follow-Up Measure Category: GED Pass Rate

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NAME	APPROVED BENCHMARK NUMBER LEVEL
Northeast Iowa Comm. College	94%
North Iowa Area Comm. College	95%
Iowa Lakes Community College	95%
Northwest Iowa Comm. College	95%
Iowa Central Comm. College	94%
Iowa Valley Community College Dist.	95%
Hawkeye Comm. College	95%
Eastern Iowa Community College Dist.	95%
Kirkwood Community College	92%
Des Moines Area Community College	95%
Western Iowa Tech Comm. College	96%
Iowa Western Comm. College	93%
Southwestern Comm. College	92%
Indian Hills Comm. College	95%
Southeastern Comm. College	95%
Iowa Department of Education	95%

Source: Iowa's Community Colleges Adult Literacy Program Plans for Program Year 2006 and the Iowa Department of Education's amended State Plan for Program Year 2006.

OBSERVATIONS

The following observations for the establishment of benchmark projections for Program Year 2006 are:

- Program Year 2006 is the fourth year that Iowa's community colleges have established benchmark projections. The projections will assist the local programs to establish program priorities and strategies for benchmark attainment.
- The benchmark attainment for Program Years 2001-2004 and benchmark projections for Program Year 2005 will provide a database for Program Year 2006 benchmark projections.
- A series of special demonstration projects and research projects have been initiated in order to assist local program successfully achieve benchmark projections.
- The successful benchmark completion rate is viewed as the key indicator for measuring program accountability and continuous program improvement at the state and local level.
- The Program Year 2006 benchmark projections indicate that Iowa's community college based adult literacy programs are in close proximity to the state level negotiated benchmarks. This observation indicates that Iowa's adult basic education community college based delivery system is seamless, comprehensive, pro-active and united.

APPENDIX A

ADULT LITERACY STAFF DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PROGRAM YEAR 2006



STATE OF IOWA

THOMAS J. VILSACK, GOVERNOR
SALLY J. PEDERSON, LT. GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
JUDY A. JEFFREY, INTERIM DIRECTOR

DATE: January 3, 2005
TO: ABE Coordinators
FROM: Bureau of Community Colleges
SUBJECT: ABE Staff Development Plan for PY 2006

Attached is a copy of the guidelines for: 1) amending the FY 2000-2004 local ABE Program Plan, 2) submission of the staff development plan for PY 2006 (July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006), 3) Benchmark Projections, and 4) EL Civics Program. The local program plan amendment is optional but the submission of the PY 2006 staff development plan and benchmark projections are required. **Please submit three (3) copies of the amended plan and/or staff development to me by April 15, 2005.** You may submit an electronic draft copy to me prior to April 15, 2005. There is a checklist of all items required at the back of this document.

The "Certificate Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion Lower Tier Covered Transactions" page must be signed and included with the plan.

Section V is for those who would like to apply for an EL/Civics grant. The one year special allocation and guidelines for application are found in Section V.

Section VI is the benchmark section and is included as an opportunity to measure your program's progress and set projections for 2006.

The incentive grant application is found in Section VII.

If there are questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Sally S. Schroeder
Adult Education Consultant
Iowa Department of Education
Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Preparation
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319
Phone: 515/281-3640
Fax: 515/281-6544
Email sally.schroeder@iowa.gov

State of Iowa
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Bureau of Community Colleges
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146

Proposal No. _____
(DE Use Only)

Guidelines for Grant-for Services

FIVE YEAR ADULT EDUCATION GRANT-FOR-SERVICES

The Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (Title II) of Workforce Investment Act of 1998.

COVER SHEET

- ☐ Amended Grant-for-Services for Adult Basic Education
☒ Staff Development Plan for PY 2006

Submitted by _____ in accordance with the Iowa State Program of Adult Basic Education for the period of **July 1, 2005** through **June 30, 2006**.

Signature of ABE Coordinator Date

Signature of Business Manager Date

Signature of Administrative Officer Date

.....
To be completed by the Iowa Department of Education

Date which plan or amendment is effective: July 1, 2005

Approved: _____
Signature of Consultant Date
Bureau of Community Colleges
and Workforce Preparation

GRANT FOR SERVICES VENDOR FACT SHEET

All blanks must be filled in. Put "N/A" if not applicable. Please type or print in black ink. Submit three copies of grant-for-services.

1. _____
Legal Name of Sponsor

Business Address Phone (area code)

Parent Organization (if applicable)

Parent Organization Business Address Phone (area code)

2. Check the Organization:
- ☐ a. Community College
 - ☐ b. Public School District
 - ☐ c. 4-Year College University
 - ☐ d. Other _____
(name of organization)

3. Person responsible for directing the program:

Name Title

Address Phone (area code)

4. Legal Fiscal Agent:

Name Title

Address Phone (area code)

SECTION I: LOCAL PLAN NARRATIVE GUIDELINES

(if you are not amending your Local Plan, skip Section I)

Section 231(a) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (The Adult Education and Family Literacy Act) indicates "from grant funds made available under Section 211(b), each eligible agency shall award multiyear grants or contracts, on a competitive basis, to eligible providers within the State or outlying area to enable eligible providers to develop, implement, and improve adult education and literacy activities within the state." Section 231(e) provides that the below listed twelve (12) criteria shall be utilized in the screening and selection of local provider proposals.

The listed (12) criteria provides the request for proposal (RFP) guidelines for grant consideration under the auspices of the title II of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998.

A. Integrated Programs

The following twelve (12) selection criteria will constitute the major portion of the RFP guidelines. The RFP guidelines will contain the following sections relative to the twelve selection criteria. The numbers in parentheses following each criteria statement reflects the number of possible points awarded for that section of the local proposal. Selection criteria numbers 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 11 are weighted due their increase priority to meet the mandates of the Act. The highest number of points an application could receive would be 100.

1. *The degree to which the eligible provider will establish measurable goals for participant outcomes. (14)*

This section should describe: 1) the process of establishing core performance indicators, 2) strategies for data collection on the core performance indicators, 3) process(es) for reporting progress on the achievement of core performance indicators.

The measurable goals center around three (3) different levels of core performance indicators.

- a. demonstrated improvements in literacy level skill levels in reading, writing, and speaking the English language, numeracy, problem-solving, English language acquisition, and other literacy skills;
 - b. placement in, retention in, or completion of postsecondary education, training, unsubsidized employment or career advancement;
 - c. receipt of a secondary school diploma [includes adult high school diploma] or its recognized equivalent [GED].
2. *The past effectiveness of an eligible provider in improving literacy skills of adult and families, and, after the one-year period beginning with the adoption of an eligible agency's performance measures, the success of an eligible provider receiving funds in meeting or exceeding such performance measures, especially with respect to those adults with the lowest levels of literacy. (10)*

The following areas should be addressed: 1) number of persons (16+) functioning at the National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS) Levels 1 and 2 by city, county, Congressional district, or community college district, 2) the strategies that will be utilized to meet or exceed the

core performance indicator standards within one year after adoption commencing on July 1, 1999, especially with respect to those adults with the lowest levels of literacy (i.e. NALS Levels 1 and 2), 3) the past effectiveness of the provider in meeting the literacy needs of the adult population including the number of years the provider has rendered basic skills education and services.

3. *The commitment of the eligible provider to serve individuals in the community who are most in need of literacy services, including individuals who are low income or have minimal literacy skills. (5)*

This section should include: 1) a description of a profile of adults functioning at NALS Levels 1 and 2, 2) a strategy for serving the state's priority target populations, 3) the number of low income adults residing in the geographical area served by the local provider and specific strategies for meeting their literacy needs.

The priority target populations are as follows:

- **able-bodied** welfare recipients (AWR). Persons who received AFDC or food stamps and who did not have disabilities which prevented them from working. Able-bodied welfare recipients, including women caring for young children, represent about 7.4 percent of the Iowa adult population and about three-quarters of the Iowa adult population receiving welfare;
- **low-wage** earners who were not recipients of public assistance (LWW). Adults who did not receive AFDC or food stamps and were employed full-time at, or below, the minimum wage. This population constitutes about 8.4 percent of the Iowa adult population;
- **at-risk** youth (ARY). Persons age 16 to 21 who had not completed high school and were not currently enrolled in school. At-risk youth comprises approximately .6 percent of the Iowa population age 16 and over;
- **persons** for whom English was their second language (ESL). Persons who indicated on the IASALS that they would not speak or write in English. The ESL population constitutes about 1.4 percent of the Iowa adult population;
- **dropouts** with relatively high educational attainment (HiDrp). Persons who dropped out of high school during eleventh grade. This population makes up about 3.1 percent of the Iowa adult population;
- **least** educated school dropouts (LoDrp). Persons whose educational attainment was grade ten or less. LoDrp comprises about 1.7 percent of the Iowa adult population;
- **other** eligible populations (i.e. minorities, corrections, institutionalized, etc.)

4. *Whether or not the program: (a) is of sufficient intensity and duration for participants to achieve substantial learning gains, (b) uses instructional practices such as phonemic awareness, systematic phonics, fluency, and reading comprehension that research has proven to be effective in teaching individuals to read. (10)*

The criteria "of sufficient intensity and duration" can be quantified and reported by: 1) the Iowa Basic Skills Certification Program, or 2) the attainment of individual student goals in relation to specific competencies and clusters of competencies in which the adult learner has demonstrated mastery.

This section should describe the strategies the eligible provider will adopt to demonstrate the criteria "of sufficient and duration" in relation to the implementation of the Iowa Basic Skills Certification Program and/or student goal attainment accomplishments in relation to specific competencies achieved or student goal attainment.

This section should also describe current and future instructional strategies, practices and methodologies that have proven effective in teaching individuals to read.

5. *Whether the activities effectively employ advances in technology is appropriate, including the use of computers. (5)*

The section should include a description of the current and future strategies the eligible provider will utilize with the use of instructional technology. This description should detail: 1) the type of instructional software utilized, 2) the number of computers available, 3) the different types (i.e. brands) of computers utilized, 4) the number of instructional sites utilizing instructional technology strategies, 5) the number of projected sites to utilize instructional technology in the next five (5) years.

6. *Whether the activities are built on a strong foundation of research and effective educational practice. (12)*

This section should describe the specific Iowa research studies including practitioner studies, conducted during the last 5-8 years, which have led to improvement in current or projected instructional activities or led to innovative new approaches in curriculum development, competency based education, accountability, identification of target populations, etc. Describe other studies which have assisted in program improvement and accountability.

This section should include a description of how the Iowa Basic Skills Certification Program will be integrated into the basic skills programs over the next 3 years beginning July 1, 1999. This description should include: 1) the number and types of instructional sites (i.e. workforce development centers, corrections, community action centers, institutions, libraries, etc.), 2) the number of potential students who will be served by the basic skills certification program, 3) the projected number of certificates to be issued over the next 3 years beginning July 1, 1999.

7. *Whether the activities provide learning in real life contexts to ensure that an individual has the skills needed to compete in the workplace and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. (10)*

Describe the strategies utilized to incorporate the priority competency areas, delineated in the Iowa Adult Basic Skills Survey (IABSS) study, into student, instructional and program outcomes. Include a description of how priority competencies are taught in a real life context to assist the learner in meeting employability and/or life skills goals.

8. *Whether the activities are staffed by well-trained instructors, counselors and administrators. (5)*

Describe the qualifications which the instructional staff, counselors and administrators possess. This section should include the annual staff development plan for state fiscal year 2000 (July 1, 1999-June 30, 2000). The staff development plan should include goals,

objectives and specific activities along with an estimate of the amount of dollars needed to fund staff development activities.

9. *Whether the activities coordinate with other available resources in the community, such as by establishing strong links with elementary schools and secondary schools, postsecondary educational institutions, one-stop centers, job training centers, and social service agencies. (5)*

This section should include: 1) the number and types of agencies, organizations, institutions, etc. with whom the eligible provider currently collaborates, coordinates and cooperates, 2) the number and types of entities represented on the participatory planning committee, 3) the role, scope and function of the participatory planning committee in formulating policy, establishing strategic planning activities, and providing over all guidance and direction for the basic skills program.

This section should also describe the process the local provider has initiated to implement the memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the local Workforce Development Center. The most common literacy services provided are: 1) initial assessment utilizing the CASAS ECS 130 appraisal, 2) referral to literacy classes, 3) providing adult learner progress reports utilizing the TOPSpro software. This section should also describe any negotiated financial arrangements to provide basic literacy services.

10. *Whether the activities offer flexible schedules and support service (such as child care and transportation) that are necessary to enable individuals, including individuals with disabilities or special needs, to attend and complete programs. (5)*

This section should describe: 1) support services (i.e. child care, transportation, etc.) currently available, 2) cooperative agreements with other agencies (i.e. vocational rehabilitation, Department of Human Services, etc.) designed to assist in providing ancillary services, 3) types of class scheduling strategies to assist individuals with disabilities or special needs.

11. *Whether the activities maintain a high-quality information management system that has the capacity to report participant outcomes and to monitor program performance against the eligible agency performance measures. (14)*

This section should include: 1) a description of how the statewide basic skills information system (i.e. TOPSpro) will be integrated and utilized for reporting student outcomes, program outcomes, and core performance indicators, 2) future plans for expansion of the TOPSpro system and for reporting and accountability purposes during the next three years beginning July 1, 1999.

12. *Whether the local communities have demonstrated a need for additional English literacy [ESL] programs. (5)*

This section should describe: 1) the current and projected number of students enrolled in English literacy (ESL) programs, 2) a description of English literacy target population(s) located within the geographical area served by the eligible provider, 3) projected number of adults in need of English literacy services.

B. Family Literacy Component

The following four (4) additional screening criteria will be used as an additional evaluation tool for any local grant proposal containing a family literacy component. The number in parentheses following each selection criteria statement reflects the number of possible points awarded to that section of the local proposal. The total number of possible additional points for the family literacy section is 40.

1. *Interactive literacy activities between parents and their children. (10)*

This section should describe the strategies to ensure that instructional activities encourage an active interchange between the parents and their children (i.e. reading and reflection activities, innovative methods of communication among family members, etc.)

2. *Training for parents regarding how to be the primary teacher for their children and full partners in the education of their children. (10)*

This section should delineate instructional activities and strategies designed to instruct parents how to teach their children the value of education and the encouragement of children to value the educational process.

3. *Parent literacy training that leads to economic self-sufficiency. (10)*

This section should detail educational experiences and activities which will give parents the literacy skills necessary to effectively function in the workplace. These activities could lead to the granting of basic skills certificates, adult high school diploma or attainment of the GED diploma.

4. *An age-appropriate education to prepare children for success in school and life experiences. (10)*

This section should describe educational methodologies, strategies and outcomes to ensure that age-appropriate instruction will successfully prepare children for potential success in future educational experiences.

SECTION II: COMPLIANCES

1. The grantee will submit annually the prorate sheet containing statistics on number of classes and enrollment, contact hours, and reimbursable hours, and ABE-9 financial form outlining federal and local expenditures.
2. The ATT-1/ATT-2 forms must be submitted to request approval and reimbursement for teacher training activities and to following progress in the completion of the indicated activities.

SECTION III: ASSURANCE PROCEDURES

The following criteria for assurance procedures must be included in all local program plans.

1. Procedure for determining that no more than 10% of federal funds are expended for corrections or institutionalized programs.
2. Procedure of policy for serving adult populations in NALS Levels 1 and 2.
3. Federal funds used for local ABE programs are on a 75% basis, providing adequate funds are available, with remaining 25% or more provided by grantee.
4. Certification that the governing board of grantee has approved participation in the Adult Basic Education Program of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.
5. Certification that the Adult Basic Education Program will be conducted in compliance with regulations as stated in the Iowa State Plan for Adult Basic Education, Department of Education; fiscal, program and class enrollment reports will be submitted as requested by the State Department of Education.
6. Certification that Adult Basic Education Program will comply with all relevant provisions of the Iowa Civil Rights Act of 1965 as amended, Iowa Executive Order #15 of 1973, Federal Executive Order 11246 of 1965 as amended by Federal Executive Order 11275 of 1967, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, and all provisions relevant to fair employment.
7. Certification that no more than 5% of the federal allocation will be expended on administrative salaries and benefits.
8. Certification that all students, faculty and other program beneficiaries will have equal access to program services regardless of gender, race, color, national origin, disability, or age.
9. Certification that the special needs of student, faculty and other program beneficiaries will be addressed.

SECTION IV: STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Describe the methods by which the staff development plan will provide professional growth for program personnel (supervisory, teachers, aides, counseling and clerical). Discussion should include, but not be limited to, areas of orientation, pre-service and inservice at local, quadrant and state levels. Consider how technology will affect the local plan. Is the state plan reflected in the local plan? Are the state initiatives such as GED 2002, family literacy, content standards and ESL addressed? List the priority areas in Program Year 2006.

This section should contain goal statements, objectives, and activities for the goals and objectives established in Part II.2. Project same level funding as last year in your budget. Include a proposed one-year itemized budget following the guidelines listed below:

A. Non-Allowable Costs

- 1) Stipends will not be paid to workshop participants out of state teacher training monies.
- 2) Lodging will not be paid out of state teacher training monies without prior approval from the Adult Education Section.
- 3) Expenses for out-of-state travel (e.g. ABE Commission, AAACE) will not be paid out of teacher training monies without prior approval from the Adult Education Section.

B. Allowable Costs

- 1) In-state travel will be reimbursed at the institutional rate, not to exceed 29 cents per mile.
- 2) Meals will be reimbursed in accordance with the state guidelines, not to exceed:
 - a) breakfast \$5.00
 - b) lunch \$6.00
 - c) dinner \$12.00
- 3) State-wide conferences may be included in this plan.
- 4) State adult education teacher training monies may be used to send additional participants to a state leadership teacher training workshop. The project director must approve the additional participants. Only expenses for mileage and meals may be provided.
- 5) ABE teacher training funds may be used for fees, honorariums, and materials necessary for teacher training activities.

C. Sample Outline for Adult Education Program/Teacher Training Plan

Adult Education Program Plan

Priority Area I

Goal I

Objective 1.

Activity 1.

Activity 2.

Objective 2.

Activity 1.

Activity 2.

Goal II

Priority Area II

ADULT EDUCATION TEACHER TRAINING						
				Projected	Total	Costs
Dates	Activity Title and Objectives	Number of Participants	Projected Breakdown of Costs	State	Local	Combined
			(As applicable to each activity)			
			Travel			
			Meals			
			Fees			
			Honorariums			
			Materials			
			Other			

Total State Reimbursement Requested _____

SECTION V: ENGLISH LITERACY AND CIVICS EDUCATION

A one year special allocation will be available for the purpose of expanding and enhancing English Literacy and Civics Education programs. To qualify for the allocations, the following must be submitted:

A. Define the EL population

- Specify ethnic groups
- Approximate number served
- Number of current EL classes/location

B. Describe the services provided

- Include potential for expanded services
- Instructional method description

C. Plan

- Include goals/objectives for the project
- Time lines
- Outcomes

SECTION VI: BENCHMARKS

The purpose of the Benchmark section is to make reasonable benchmark projections for local program attainment for PY 2006. List specific steps to achieve projected benchmarks. Strategies may include orientation, staff development, coding, etc. Refer to the following four reports: 1) *Iowa's Adult Basic Education Program Benchmark Projections for PY 2005*, 2) *Iowa's Community College Basic Literacy Skills Credential Program Year 2004*, 3) *Iowa's Adult Basic Education Program Annual Benchmark Report Program Year 2004* and 4) *Iowa's NRS Benchmark CQI Model*.

1. Basic Skills Certification

- Program Year 2005 will be the base year for Basic Skills Certification.

2. Pre/Post Assessment

- Using the Table, insert your college's projections in 2006.
- Refer to the sources listed. See Page 12.
- Include a narrative for benchmark attainment.
- Benchmark projections should be 3% points + or – the state negotiated benchmark. If there is a reason a program is not in the 3% range + or -, please state the reason.

3. Educational Gains/Follow-up Measures

- Insert Projections for 2006 into Table.
- Benchmark projections should be 3% points + or – the state negotiated benchmark. If there is a reason a program is not in the 3% range + or -, please state the reason.
- Include a narrative for benchmark attainment.
- Utilize the CQI model for achieving benchmark attainment.

Analysis of Benchmark Projections for Program Year 2006

(July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)

STATE BENCHMARKS PRE/POST ASSESSMENT INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM	PY 06 STATE Percent Projection	PY 06 Local Percent Projection
ADULT BASIC EDUCATION (ABE)	84%	
ENGLISH LITERACY (EL)	50%	
ADULT SECONDARY EDUCATION (ASE)	86%	
Other State Benchmarks		
GED PASS RATE	95%	
BASIC SKILL CREDENTIAL INCREASE FROM PY 05 to PY 06	NA	NA
FEDERAL BENCHMARKS EDUCATIONAL GAINS CORE MEASURES – NRS (EDUCATIONAL FUNCTIONING LEVEL)		
BEGINNING LITERACY ABE	45%	
BEGINNING ABE	47%	
LOW INTERMEDIATE ABE	50%	
HIGH INTERMEDIATE ABE	59%	
LOW ASE	75%	
BEGINNING LITERACY EL	47%	
BEGINNING EL	42%	
LOW INTERMEDIATE EL	42%	
HIGH INTERMEDIATE EL	42%	
LOW ADVANCED EL	40%	
Follow-Up Core Measures - NRS		
ENTERED EMPLOYMENT	77%	
JOB RETENTION	89%	
EARNED GED OR HS COMPLETION	76%	
ENTERED POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION OR TRAINING	48%	

SECTION VII: INCENTIVE GRANT APPLICATION - (This section should only be completed by a local provider who met the eligibility criteria for an incentive grant).

- A. Describe the planned activities. This information should include a description of how the activities are innovative, comprehensive and coordinated, and targeted to improve program performance. Include information on how services build on, rather than duplicate, existing literacy program services mandated by the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA).
- B. Describe ways in which the activities are related to improving local program benchmark performance levels on the state and federal mandated benchmarks for each different activity planned. For example, describe how the activities will strengthen the local program's ability to improve literacy levels, increase employment, increase transitions to further education and training, and/or improve technical and employability skills.
- C. Describe collaborative efforts with stakeholder groups, participating literacy partners and the general public on the use of incentive award funds. Local programs are encouraged to seek public input on the use of state incentive funding, including representatives of vocational education programs, other workforce partners and cooperating literacy partners.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEPARTMENT, SUSPENSION, INELIGIBILITY AND VOLUNTARY EXCLUSION LOWER TIER COVERED TRANSACTIONS

This certification is required by the regulations implementing Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, 34 CFR Part 85, Section 85.510, Participants' responsibilities. The regulations were published as Part VII of the May 26, 1988 *Federal Register* (pages 19160-19211). Copies of the regulations may be obtained by contacting the person to which the proposal is submitted.

- (1) The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.
- (2) Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

Name and Title of Authorized Representative

Signature

Date

Staff Development Plan Checklist

- Cover sheet signatures
- Certification signature
- Section I – Local Plan
 - Skip if not amending
- Section II – Compliances
 - ATTs
 - ABE-9s
- Section III – Assurances
- Section IV – Staff Development
 - Budget
 - Plan
- Section V – EL/Civics
 - Population
 - Services Provided
 - Plan
- Section VI – Benchmarks
 - Basic Skills Certification
 - Pre/Post
 - Educational Gains
 - Follow-up Measures
- Section VII – Incentive Grant Application (for qualified programs)
 - Planned Activity
 - Description
 - Collaboration