**Adult Education/GED Preparation Program**

**Program Review**

**Reporting Period: 2015-16, 2016-17, and 2017-18**

**Part 1: Review of Past 3 Years**

1. **Service Unit Outcomes Assessment**

A. **Summarize assessment results:**

Jefferson State Community College’s adult education service area includes Chilton, Jefferson, Shelby and St. Clair counties. The availability of campuses in Chilton, Jefferson, Shelby and St. Clair counties allowed the establishment of four comprehensive adult education and literacy service centers at College facilities. Partnerships with other agencies allowed for classes to be established based on the needs of communities. The program provided 30 basic adult education and GED classes at nine locations from 2015 through 2018. Additionally, the program provided four English literacy classes at two locations.

The program serves a diverse population. The four-county Birmingham-Hoover Metropolitan

Statistical Area (BHMSA) includes Jefferson, Shelby, Blount and St. Clair counties in north central Alabama. The total population of just over a million residents per the 2010 U.S. Census Report is concentrated in Jefferson, the largest county in the state, and in Shelby, the fastest growing county in the state. The most recent data show that over 13 percent of county residents and nearly 24 percent of Birmingham City residents are below the national poverty level. According to the Birmingham Business Alliance 2009 data, both are higher than the national figures.

Funding for adult education and GED preparation programs is provided through a competitive grant process administered by the Alabama Department of Postsecondary Education.

Fluctuations in Adult Education enrollment are attributed to economic conditions, number of available classes, and volume of inquiries for services.

Chart 1

The Alabama Department of Postsecondary Education established state performance goals in accordance with National Reporting System requirements. Jefferson State Community College met or made at least 60% or higher progress towards all outlined goals. Specific outcome data related to adult basic education (ABE), adult secondary education (ASE), and English literacy (ESL) for the reporting period are provided in Tables 1:

Table 1

Comparison of State Goals and JSCC’s Actual Performance

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016** | | |  |
| Entering Educational Functioning  Level | Alabama’s Goal | | Jefferson State’s Performance |
| ABE Beginning Literacy | 44% | | 40% |
| ABE Beginning Basic Education | 42% | | 46.39% |
| ABE Intermediate Low | 40% | | 36.86% |
| ABE Intermediate High | 34% | | 29.92% |
| ASE Low | 38% | | 35.92% |
| ASE High | Achieved by earning a GED | | 77 |
| Beginning ESL Literacy | 34 % | | 3.85% |
| Low Beginning ESL | 47 % | | 47.06 % |
| High Beginning ESL | 46 % | | 40.91 % |
| Low Intermediate ESL | 41 % | | 26.67 % |
| High Intermediate ESL | 38 % | | 29.03 % |
| Advanced ESL | 32 % | | 22.73 % |
| **July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017** | | |  |
| **Entering Educational Functioning**  **Level** | | **Alabama’s Goal** | **Jefferson State’s Performance** |
| ABE Beginning Literacy | | 44 % | 42.68% |
| ABE Beginning Basic Education | | 43% | 43.94% |
| ABE Intermediate Low | | 42% | 38.5% |
| ABE Intermediate High | | 37% | 27.75% |
| ASE Low | | 41% | 31.97% |
| ASE High | | Achieved by earning a GED | 125 |
| Beginning ESL Literacy | | 43% | 11.11% |
| Low Beginning ESL | | 51% | 30.77% |
| High Beginning ESL | | 51% | 23.53% |
| Low Intermediate ESL | | 45% | 26.47% |
| High Intermediate ESL | | 41% | 17.39% |
| Advanced ESL | | 24% | 6.25% |
| **July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018** | | | |
| **Entering Educational Functioning**  **Level** | | **Alabama’s Goal** | **Jefferson State’s Performance** |
| ABE Beginning Literacy | | 45% | 27.27% |
| ABE Beginning Basic Education | | 44% | 30.98% |
| ABE Intermediate Low | | 43% | 27.65% |
| ABE Intermediate High | | 38% | 23.72% |
| ASE Low | | 42% | 23.73% |
| ASE High | | Achieved by earning a GED | 143 |
| Beginning ESL Literacy | | 43% | 37.04% |
| Low Beginning ESL | | 52% | 66.67% |
| High Beginning ESL | | 51% | 46.15% |
| Low Intermediate ESL | | 45% | 24% |
| High Intermediate ESL | | 42% | 18.52% |
| Advanced ESL | | 25% | 11.11% |

In addition to collecting and reporting data related to enrollment and entering functioning levels, the program reports data related to academic advancements, entering employment, retaining employment, GED completion and entering postsecondary/training. In 2016, The Alabama Community College System updated the Alabama Adult Education System for Accountability and Performance (AAESAP) Database to include more data points germane to AE Performance for all Alabama Community Colleges with Adult Education Programs. The Table below includes data from 2016-2017 and 2017-2018, the data from 2015-2016 is still being gleaned for the AAESAP database.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| US Based Schooling | 07/01/2016-06/30/2017 | 07/01/2017-06/30/2018 |
| Employed | 495 | 545 |
| Unemployed | 478 | 501 |
| Not in Labor Force | 197 | 161 |
| No Schooling | 1 | 1 |
| No Diploma (less than 12th grade) | 825 | 893 |
| Secondary School Diploma | 63 | 58 |
| Secondary School Recognized Equivalent | 12 | 8 |
| Some Postsecondary Education | 53 | 40 |
| Postsecondary or Professional Degree | 24 | 21 |
| In Correctional Facility | 3 | 3 |
| In Community Correctional Program | 41 | 58 |
| In Other Institutional Setting | 4 | 8 |

Overall, the Jefferson State Community College Adult Education/GED Preparation has a demonstrated track record of meeting or exceeding prior performance goals established by the Alabama Community College System. However, due to recent changes with the transition to Performance Based Funding and Exceptional Performance Indicators, some areas of improvement were noted. These areas related to assisting learners with limited reading skills, protocols for collecting and reporting data, and professional development. Emphasis continues to be placed on identifying those learners with reading skills below the sixth -grade level. The implementation of a reading-intensive program allowed these learners to engage in specific activities to improve their reading skills. Quarterly in-service meetings were provided that supported the development of protocols for collecting and reporting data, as well as professional development.

B. **If applicable, identify the data regularly collected and or reported as part of program compliance.**

The program utilized the Alabama Adult Education System for Accountability and Performance (AAESAP) database to report participant outcomes and monitor performance. Outcomes were identified by the Alabama Department of Postsecondary Education in according with the National Reporting System requirements. The program utilized the enrollment, update and separation forms provided by the Department of Postsecondary Education. Instructors collected data and maintained a file for each learner. Instructors submitted copies of completed enrollment, update and separation forms to the data manager who loaded the data in AAESAP.

Daily sign-in sheets were utilized to document time of arrival and departure for each learner.

Instructors calculated attendance hours and reported hours to the data manager using the Monthly Contact Hour Report (MCHR), an Excel spreadsheet. The data manager verified the hours being reported by comparing the original sign-in sheet with the MCHR. Discrepancies were corrected prior to loading the data in AAESAP.

Instructors maintained a status report for each learner. This report detailed pre-test scores, entering functioning level, attendance hours, post-test scores, and academic gain status. Instructors monitored the performance of each learner to identify potential problem areas.

**2. Analysis (as it relates to progress in achieving unit goals)**

1. External Conditions that impacted the unit included state and federal requirements. The National Reporting System (NRS) is an outcome-based reporting system for the State-administered, federally funded adult education program. NRS Implementation Guidelines were developed by the U.S. Department of Education's Division of Adult Education and Literacy (DAEL). These guidelines governed data integrity. The Alabama Community College System developed the Alabama Adult Education Policy & Procedure Manual, Alabama Adult Education and Family Literacy Plan, and the Alabama Adult Education Assessment Policy. These documents provided a state-specific protocol for implementing NRS Implementation Guidelines. These conditions provided the framework for implementation of services and did not impose undue issues. An additional condition that impacted the unit was enactment of the Beason-Hammon Alabama Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act in June 2011. This Act resulted in decreased enrollment of learners in English as a Second Language classes. Program staff members were provided information regarding the specifics of the Act in an effort to respond to inquiries from learners.
2. Presently there are Adult Education Classes at all four Campuses of Jefferson State Community College and there are 9 offsite locations. The offsite locations are provided at no cost to the offsite organization and have strengthened Jefferson State Community College’s and the AE Program’s ties to the larger community. The program participated in campus and community activities sponsored by various agencies. Staff members made presentations to civic, community, governmental and educational audiences. Staff members also participated in the network of literacy service providers in the area. The program worked closely with the GED Network, The Literacy Council of Central Alabama, United Way of Central Alabama, M-Power, local one Stop Career Centers and Alabama Department of Rehabilitation Services. These relationships allowed the program to promote access to services residents of the communities served by the program.
3. Internal Conditions that impacted the unit related to outdated technology in some of the classrooms. Present AE funding did allow for the replaced of outdated computers and the purchase of smartboards and projectors in AE classrooms.
4. Communication within the program was structured to flow from Director to faculty/staff and to students. A policy and procedures manual is provided to each staff member and a policy and procedures manual is onsite in all AE classes. The Director completed quarterly classroom visits with

each instructor. Printed “discussion points” were distributed during these visits to ensure consistency of information provided to each instructor. Email was used to communicate with faculty and staff at the various sites. A link to Jefferson State’s website provided detailed information regarding available services.

**3. Primary Functions/Primary Purpose/Unit Mission**

1. No changes in the unit’s primary functions occurred since the beginning of the review cycle.
2. The program implemented a reading-intensive program to assist low level learners in the past three years. This program allowed these learners to improve their reading skills which supported their success in adult basic education instruction. The program implemented an organized orientation program at the Shelby Campus and Pell City Center. This program supported a quicker transition into classes. This effort resulted in few learners becoming discouraged before getting started.

**4. Goal Progress**

1. During the three years covered in this review, the AE Program had an average of 1,279 participants enrolled and 378 students obtained a GED or Secondary School Credential. The Alabama Community College System revamped its goals for AE Programs and added in a new set of Exceptional Performance Indicators as the Program shifted to a more performance- based funding measure. The AE Program also experienced a change in leadership with the AE Director retiring and a new AE Director and AE Coordinator being hired. While the AE Program made significant progress toward it’s Performance Goals, the AE Program did not meet all goals as the goals were revised during the course of the Program Year. The new AE Director is developing strategies to address new Performance Goals and Exceptional Performance Indicators.
2. Adequate resources were provided by the College for AE operational purposes.
3. The impact of resource allocations allowed the program to continue viable classes as well as expanding AE services to our Chilton Campus.

**Part 2: Implications of Program Review for Developing 3 Year Plan**

**1. Vision and Direction of Unit**

1. An evaluation of the unit results in an understanding of the critical components that support the program’s effectiveness. Future actions will relate to a continuation of best practices. These practices include structured orientation program at three locations, quarterly in-service meetings with all instructional staff, quarterly visits to each classroom, collaboration with literacy agencies, and written procedures to support consistency of strategies and data collection.
2. The previously used GED test was replaced in January 2014. The 2014 GED Test is aligned with the Common Core Standards in an attempt to focus on knowledge and skills most strongly correlated with success in career and college. The Common Core Standards are being implemented throughout K-12 across the nation. The change that might be most difficult for candidates to prepare for is that prior knowledge will be required. The previous GED Test did not ask candidates to possess prior knowledge to complete and pass the test. However, the new test will require that candidates use prior knowledge to successfully complete the test. This means that the GED Test is no longer “just a reading comprehension test.” Candidates must now possess background information in a variety of content areas.
3. In 2016, ACCS and Secondary Schools collaborated on a new initiative, the Non-Traditional High School Diploma Option. The Non-Traditional High School Diploma (HSDO) is an option for individuals aged 17 or older that did not graduate secondary school because they did not pass all sections of the Alabama High School Exit Exam and/or did not obtain the required number of credits to graduate from secondary school. New training was conducted with AE staff, as well as outreach conducted to secondary school administration and counselors to assist with recruitment of that might qualify for the HSDO.
4. The AE Program Director conducted professional development for all AE instructors and paraprofessionals regarding the 2014 GED test and new strategies to equip learners with background information in relevant content areas.
5. The unit has effective communication practices, so no changes are warranted.
6. The current plan involves a continuation of best practices as well as development of new practices. Resources have been requested from the Department of Postsecondary to support attendance at the Commission on Adult Basic Education (COABE) professional development conference. Specific workshops will be attended by five instructors. These AE Director, AE Coordinator, and attending instructors will conduct content-specific workshops for the instructors who do not attend the conference.

**Part 3: Evidence of Staff Participation in Program Review**

1. The AE Program Director meets on a quarterly basis with each instructor. Program performance as well as individual class performance is discussed during these meetings. Quarterly in-service meetings encourage discussion of key components of this review. Discussion is encouraged regarding issues facing the unit and strategies for addresses these issues. Documentation of these meetings is available in the director’s office. Feedback from instructors and staff members is solicited on a regular basis regarding components identified in the program review. A draft of the program review document was provided to all faculty and staff in January 2017. Feedback was solicited.
2. The unit does not have a singular advisory committee. Rather, faculty and staff solicit feedback from

College representatives, professional development association members, Department of Postsecondary Education representatives, and community literacy providers.

1. List names and titles of all participants in this program review.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Faculty |  |
| Arrowsmith, Janice | Badio, Jessical | Blair, Micheal |
| Brand, Charlotte | Callins, Lillian | Coleman, Henry |
| Cook, Kimberly | Davis, Jeff | Eichhorn, Rhonda |
| Derrick, Mona | Gross, Montez | Holland, Rebecca |
| Jett, Mary Jo | Latham, Shane | Lewis, Ingrid |
| McGowan, Elsie | Merritt, Adrienne | Miner, Rebecca |
| Montgomery, Helen | Moore, Cindy | Morgan, Mary |
| Noyes, Sara | Oberneder, Connie | Porter, Nancy |
| Rea, Patricia | Roberts, Barbara | Rudd, Julia |
| Scott, Angela | Sheffield, Virgina | Sheikh, Linda |
| Skalac, Robin | Smith, Adrienne | Smith, Paula |
| Snider, Charles | Sprayberry, Mollie | Stanley, Nathaniel |
| Sweatt, Helen | Vinson, Allen, | Vinson, Phyllis |
| Ware, Donna | Wigington, Beverly | Wood, Barbara |
| Wood, Gayle | Wood, Teresa | Young, Katherine |
|  |  |  |
| Brice, Sallie | Chambers, Lynn | Geralds, Jackie |
| Hawkins, Felita | Mathis, Kassie | McRae, Ken |
| Parris, Cathrne | Payne, Tamara | Pearson, Regina |
| Rowland, Adrienne | Springfield, John | Ware, Brad |
| Wright, Tierra |  |  |