**PART II: Narrative**

**State Leadership Funds**

1. **Describe major activities supported with State Leadership funds during the reporting period and the extent to which these activities helped in implementing the goals of the State Plan. Specifically describe activities related to the implementation of career pathways.**

The State Leadership funds is used primarily for professional activities and operational costs that support such professional activities and some of them are discussed below.

**Regionalization:** Pursuant to the Governor’s vision in moving State Of Michigan towards regionalization, the state legislation in 2013-2014 changed the State School Aid funding and distribution to align with the 10 Prosperity Regions. A small part of the state leadership fund was used to promote regionalization of adult education programs in the state starting with the distribution of state funds referred to as Section 107 funds. Below is a side-by-side comparison of the new and old statute (a full blown comparison may be provided if you requested).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Current | New |
| Recipient/Fiscal Agent | Current Local Education Agency (LEA)/Intermediate School District (ISD) receiving funds and operates either independently or as a consortium. | Eligible provider could be an LEA, ISD, consortium of districts, consortium of ISDs or consortium of districts and ISDsOne ISD will serve as the fiscal agent in each of the ten prosperity regions.An ISD serving as the fiscal agent can utilize 5% of the region’s funds for administrative costs associated with being the fiscal agent.Requires department to ensure that the number of individuals served in 2014-2015 (when it is fully implemented) is at least as many as in the previous year (2013-14) and it is the same requirement for each region.The ISD is required to collaborate with the Education Advisory Group (EAG) and Workforce Development Board (WDB) in their region to identify providers of services based upon regional need and performance, which requires WDA approval |
| Funding Distribution | Capped allowance based upon prior year cap (originating from 1995-96 data) | Allocations would be based upon current census data which would be phased in over a three-year period, allowing districts time to adjust.For the three-year phase-in period, allocations would be based upon the amount of funds received by the region in the prior year and also current census data for the region, as follows:Year 1 – 67% prior year/33% census dataYear 2 – 33% prior year/67% census dataYear 3 – 100% census dataDistribution of Census Data to be used:(60%) 18-24 year old non high school grads(35%) 25+ year old non high school grads(5%) 18+ lacking basic English proficiency |
| Determination of Payments | 90% for enrollment of eligible participants10% for achievement of specific performance criteria | 75% for enrollment of eligible participants25% for achievement of specific performance criteria |
| Performance Criteria | Grade level increase in reading or mathematics, achieve basic English proficiency, obtain GED, pass one or more individual GED test, attain HS Diploma, pass a course required to obtain a HS Diploma, or pass a course and demonstrate proficiency in the academic skills to be learned in the course. | Performance criteria changed to align with federal adult education funding.Educational gain as defined by National Reporting System levels,  achieve basic English proficiency, obtain GED, pass one or more individual GED test, attain HS Diploma, pass a course required to obtain a HS Diploma, enrollment in postsecondary, or enter/retain employment. |

**Other Activities supported by State Leadership Funds**

The Michigan Adult Education Professional Development (MAEPD) project achieved its goal for 2013-2014 of ensuring that adult educators within the state of Michigan had access to the knowledge, resources, and tools they need to enhance the quality of instruction in their programs thus enabling students to attain their educational and/or employment goals. The MAEPD project developed and delivered a number of professional development activities as well as provided support to adult educators in a variety of areas, including: preparation for transition to 2014 GED online testing, development of regional collaborative partnerships, and integrating career pathways into local providers’ curriculum.

A total of 29 workshops, institutes and conference sessions were conducted in 2013-14. Those included the following:

* **MACAE Conference** - *New Director's Training, Parts I & II* - a total of 4 face-to-face sessions and one online professional development session were conducted. The initial New Directors’ sessions were conducted on September 18, 2013 as part of the MACAE Conference with the follow-up sessions conducted at the Michigan Adult Education and Training Conference in April 2014. Three sessions (including one online session) were provided for new directors hired during the previous 12 months. There were twenty-two (22) new directors participating in the Year 1 sessions. Two sessions were provided for new directors who are in their second year of service as adult educators. Eight (8) new directors participated in Year 2 activities. *Total participants – 30.*
	+ Other sessions that were presented at the MACAE Conference delivered by adult education staff included MAERS training, College & Career Readiness Standards training, and a state update. *Total participants – 130*
* **CASAS Certification training** - was provided on November 22, 2013 (27 Participants) and then again on January 24, 2014 (11 Participants). This training was conducted for programs that needed either a refresher on the implementation of CASAS, or for those who had new staff members who required training. This training is required in order for local programs to use the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System. *Total participants – 38*
* **2014 MAETC** - The focus of the annual conference was more on instruction and the instructor. Teacher specific trainings were conducted in intensive sessions that included several sessions over a half day. A total of 413 adult educators, workforce development staff, and representatives from community based organizations attended the 2014 MAETC.
* At the state conference (2014 MAETC), 9 literacy-specific breakout sessions and many additional sessions for learning disabilities training, lower level ESL and ABE instruction were offered. 10 literacy tutors and administrators were able to attend the 2014 MAETC through a special project grant. In all, 1,008 adult educators were served through face-to-face professional development activities (workshops, statewide conferences and sessions) conducted during 2013-2014.
* The Fall ESL Workshop (2013) speaker was Gwen McIntyre, “Discovering Fun Activities to Use with Your ESL Students.”  Also featured were afternoon break-out sessions: “Navigating the Immigration Process” with Frank Castria, USCIS-Detroit, “Learning to Use the TABE CLAS-E” with Aaron Hartman, Representative, CTB/McGraw Hill and “Vocabulary Games” with Gwen McIntyre.  There were 110 participants.
* **ESL Advisory Council’s Spring Training Session** - The focus of the opening session was on exploring myths regarding Common Core State Standards as related to ESL students. Mary Ann Christison conducted the sessions. A total of 61 evaluations were submitted as part of the project. *Total participants – 61*
* The Spring Workshop (2014) keynote speaker was Dr. Michael Jones, Branch Chief for the U.S. Department of Education's Division of Adult Education.  His topic was "Exploring the Sounds of Language, “What They Mean, and How to Teach Them”- a workshop on pronunciation and accent for ESL Teachers.  There were 99 participants.

**Moving Pathways Forward**

* The Office of Adult Education is excited to be one of the states selected to participate in the *Moving Pathways Forward* initiative sponsored by the USDOE. The goal is to develop and implement a quality and comprehensive statewide career pathway system. Because Michigan is a decentralized state with an emphasis on local control, much of the activity to date around career pathways had been fragmented and happening in pockets around the state. Through this initiative, the conversation, planning, and action will be done cohesively at the state and regional levels.
* The lead coordinator and state director first began meeting with various entities and organizations around the state to learn about current career pathway efforts. It was encouraging to hear about the breadth of activities currently happening and shared support of the career pathway approach; however, connecting it all into one comprehensive system will be a large task.
* The full implementation of this project will be in 2014-2015.

**Program: Institutional**

In 2013-2014 Michigan allocated the maximum amount (10%) authorized by Section 225 to correctional education. Thirty two county jails and state correctional facilities received $984,650. State correctional facilities are operated by the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) for adults and the Michigan Department of Human Services (DHS) for youth. Other eligible institutions include reformatories, work farms, detention centers, halfway houses, boot camps, and similar institutions designed for the confinement or rehabilitation of criminal offenders.

**2013-2014 MDOC:** 12,607 inmates at the state correctional passed GED subtests during the program year. Of this number 7,836 were reported enrolled in MAERS. Final report obtained from the MDOC Offender Education Tracking System (OETS) shows **2,489 inmates obtained GED certificates in 2013-2014.**

**Performance Data Analyses**

1. **Describe any significant findings from the evaluation of your performance data for the reporting period and the efforts to improve outcomes for the core indicators of performance.**

The NRS data tables 4, 4B, and 5 reflect the aggregate participants’ information gathered through the Michigan Adult Education Reporting System (MAERS) that met and/or exceeded the negotiated performance measures per the National Reporting System (NRS) requirements. Data tables completed for this report contain information reported during the year of operation for the data system. In-depth data analysis will continue to identify specific system policies and areas that require technical assistance to program providers to improve data quality, reliability and validity.

The following are a few highlights of the findings based on Tables 4, 4B, and 5 respectively, the indicators of performance for the core measures:

##### Table C: Michigan Enrollment Trend Data

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Enrollment** | **Year**  | **Enrollment** |
| 1999/2000 | 86,218 | 2007-2008 | 30,571 |
| 2000/2001 | 56,096 | 2008-2009 | 28,243 |
| 2001/2002 | 75,988 | 2009-2010 | 31,106 |
| 2002/2003 | 70,893 | 2010-2011 | 32,840 |
| 2003/2004 | 48,237 | 2011-2012 | 34,220 |
| 2004/2005 | 34,768 | 2012-2013 | 29,933  |
| 2005/2006 | 32,024 | 2013-2014 | 28,625 |
| 2006/2007 | 32,856 |  |  |

* Table B and the corresponding graph illustrate the trend of enrollments (unduplicated) in Michigan since 1999/2000 as reported to NRS that received at least 12 instructional hours. However, in 2013-2014 40,631 (duplicated count) adults registered for adult education programs, 35,406 enrolled, and 36,468 pretested compared to 37,525 pretested last year (refer to appendix A).The average pre-posttest rate was approximately 54%.
* The following is Michigan’s performance compared to the levels negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education.

**Table D: NRS Table 4 - Educational Gains and Attendance by EFL**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***2013-2014 Benchmarks*** | ***Federal Target*** | ***State*** ***Actual*** |
| Beginning ABE Literacy | 42% | **37%\*** |
| Beginning ABE Education | 42% | **29%\*** |
| Low Intermediate Basic Education | 40% | **29%\*** |
| High Intermediate Basic Education | 35% | **25%\*** |
| Low Adult Secondary Education | 32% | **26%\*** |
| High Adult Secondary Education | N/A | **N/A** |
| Beginning ESL Literacy | 60% | **56%\*** |
| Low Beginning ESL  | 60% | **63%** |
| High Beginning ESL | 55% | **55%** |
| Low Intermediate ESL | 45% | **46%** |
| High Intermediate ESL | 48% | **43%\*** |
| Advanced ESL | 53% | **19%\*** |

**Table E: NRS Table 4B - Pre and Post tested Participants**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***2013-2014 Benchmarks*** | ***Federal Target*** | ***State*** ***Actual*** |
| Beginning ABE Literacy | 42% | **71%** |
| Beginning ABE Education | 42% | **53%** |
| Low Intermediate Basic Education | 40% | **54%** |
| High Intermediate Basic Education | 35% | **45%** |
| Low Adult Secondary Education | 32% | **43%** |
| High Adult Secondary Education | N/A | **N/A** |
| Beginning ESL Literacy | 50% | **74%** |
| Low Beginning ESL  | 60% | **83%** |
| High Beginning ESL | 55% | **72%** |
| Low Intermediate ESL | 45% | **60%** |
| High Intermediate ESL | 48% | **51%** |
| Advanced ESL | 53% | **26%\*** |

* \* Indicates performance measures the state did not meet.
* Table D (NRS Table 4) shows Michigan only met or exceeded three performance measures compared to NRS Table 4B, where the performance was nearly perfect. Table E (NRS Table 4B) shows a significant increase in performance in all categories due to higher pre and posttest rate of 61% compared to 53%. The persistent drop in performance is forcing **Michigan to request technical assistance from OCTAE-USDOE.** In addition, we will continue to upgrade MAERS, our data collection and reporting system, increase the flexibility of the system and the ability to run more on-time reports. These collective efforts should assist local providers to dig deeper into instructional information that may provide fact-based strategies that could assist them to improve their performance. In the recent past, Michigan has invested considerable resources into the data collection and reporting system and the MAERS team has been working tirelessly to make MAERS user-friendly, effective and efficient.
* NRS Table 4C performance report shows that very few adults, about 213, participated in distance learning, and they were mostly ABE and ASE participants. It is very likely that the low number of participants reported on Table 4C is based on Michigan’s narrow definition of distance learning. It is too soon to quantify any success or failure until we implement our newly approved distance learning policy.
* The Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) data collection and reporting improved, compared to the recent past. MDOC registered 9,283 inmates in educational programs, pre-tested 8,130 and post- tested 3,709 with about a 46% posttest-rate. On the other hand, the Department of Human Services (DHS) for Juvenile registered 42, pretested 40 and post-tested 32 with about 80% posttest rate.

##### NRS Table 5: Core Follow-up Outcome Achievement

* 26,628 out of 28,625 participants were in follow-up cohorts. This represents about 93% of the total population that received adult education services and with at least 12 instructional hours. Last year the average response rate for job-related goals was higher than 50% due to the concerted efforts and technical assistance provided at the local level. In addition, the number that obtained HSD/GED continues to grow yearly (5,087) with more than a 91% response rate (78% exceeding the negotiated performance) and 3,415 entered postsecondary/training with 63% response rate and 23% met or exceeded performance. The overall job-related numbers increased significantly because Michigan used data-match toward the end of year (October 2014), as mentioned in Table B above and that produced positive outcomes.

###### Table F: NRS Table 5 - Core Indicator #2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***2013-2014 Benchmarks*** |  ***Federal Target*** |  ***State Actual*** | ***Response Rate*** |
| Pl Placement in Postsecondary/Training | 48% | **23%\*** | **63%** |
|  Entered Employment | 25% | **36%** | **69%** |
|  Retained or Improved Employment | 50% | **78%** | **71%** |

**Table G: NRS Table 5 - Core Indicator #3**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***2013-2014 Benchmark*** | ***Federal Target*** | ***State Actual*** | ***Response Rate*** |
| Obtained GED or High School Diploma | 55% | **78%** | **91%** |

**Integration with Other Programs**

1. **Describe how the Eligible Agency has supported the integration of activities sponsored under Title II with other adult education, career development, and employment and training activities. Describe your efforts to develop or advance career pathway systems that include career and technical education, employers, and economic and workforce development. Include a description of how the eligible agency is being represented on the Local Workforce Investment Boards, adult education’s involvement on the State Workforce Investment Board, the provision of core and other services through the One-Stop system and an estimate of AEFLA funds being used to support activities and services through the One-Stop delivery system.**

The Governor and Workforce Development Agency have continued to support growing Michigan’s economy as a top priority. As espoused in the 10 Prosperity Region document mentioned in last year’s final report, the administration has continued to build a seamless and integrated service delivery system that includes academic instruction geared toward career interests, workforce services to help individuals find new or better jobs, and other wrap around services that help employers increase the skills of their workers. The Talent Map is one of the tools being developed to make all resources within each region readily accessible to all.

**Prosperity Regions Talent Map Overview:** <http://www.mitalent.org/prosperity-region-talent-map/>)

The Workforce Development Agency, State of Michigan and the Michigan Economic Development Corporation are pleased to introduce the Prosperity Regions Talent Map! The Prosperity Regions Talent Map is a web-based tool for talent system stakeholders to "collaborate, create, and connect" in an effort to better serve their employer customers.

This interactive mapping solution was developed, in part, to respond to feedback from attendees of the Governor’s 2013 summits on economic development and education who had expressed a vital need for more and better systems for locating and accessing people and resources that their business and industry need for success. Envisioned as a tool for promoting better connectivity amongst key stakeholders from the three domains of workforce development, economic development, and education/training that constitute the “supply side” of the system, the Prosperity Regions Talent Map is designed to be partner inclusive, enabling stakeholders to have a say in reinventing Michigan’s talent delivery system while continuing to be invested as “collaborators, creators, and connecters.” Promotion and continuous enhancement of the Prosperity Regions Talent Map could also become a meaningful strategic advantage for Michigan economic development to grow existing companies and attract new ones.

Rather than static information, this dynamic web-based resource encourages collaboration among stakeholders who may have similar needs or be good strategic partners; creates synergies among related services and resources that strengthen the overall talent system and how it is used; connects resources in ways that reduces duplication of services, wasteful spending, and frustration due to unmet needs and missed opportunities; and rapidly adapts and evolves to leverage new industry trends, technologies, federal opportunities, and more.

Although future phases call for other site features to be added and there are plans to eventually incorporate key industry and occupational data, the current version of the Prosperity Regions Talent Map is essentially an electronic directory of key talent system partners and resources. It’s important to understand that the Prosperity Regions Talent Map is intended to represent those key individual(s) who can serve as a single point-of-contact for their respective organizations, ultimately helping streamline access to information and resources while improving the user’s overall experience. The site is organized so that contacts can be filtered by domain, partner type, region and/or industry to allow users to quickly and easily locate the information they need.

The phase I of this project was on mapping statewide IT resources reflected the disproportionally high number of IT specific partners/resources compared to the other industries. However, the project team is transitioning and has started to collect data on the other priority industries of Agriculture, Energy, Healthcare, and Manufacturing. In the next phase, the project team plans to engage regional partners to explore what role they may be willing to play when it comes to helping collect/maintain information on the map, so whether you are a practitioner who specializes in workforce, economic development or education/training, an employer or job seeker, you will have an important role to play in helping evolve this tool to ensure that we are all contributing and adding value to Michigan’s talent system!

A User Guide that provides detailed instructions on using the map as well as how to report missing or inaccurate contact information is available directly from the web page.

Existing infrastructures for all Michigan residents to access convenient entry to services from a wide array of programs are still provided by (1) electronic access to comprehensive web-based information at [www.MiTalent.org](http://www.MiTalent.org); (2) a statewide network of 103 certified Michigan Works! One Stop Service Centers; and (3) a department telephone system that can automatically route callers to local services (telephone 1-800-285-WORKS); and (4) a sophisticated Talent Bank for employers and employees dedicated for hiring purposes.

The following federal programs, in addition to many state programs, are located within the MSF: Carl Perkins Vocational Education, Food Stamp Employment and Training, BLS Labor Market Information, Veteran’s Education, Wagner-Peyser Employment Services, Jobs Education and Training (JET) Program, WIA Title I, Dislocated Worker and Youth, WIA Title II Adult Education and Family Literacy, and WIA Title IV.

**STATE OFFICE COLLABORATION**

**Workforce Development Agency (WDA):** The Michigan Workforce Development Agency (Workforce Development Agency) has gone through reorganization to provide more effective and efficient services to job seekers, employers, and others who partner and participate with the workforce investment system.  A new approach will involve a demand model approach to workforce investment, which involves an industry driven effort that includes “smart” connections and “results” driven training, with a particular focus on industry clusters.

“Smart” Connections/Training means to provide the flexibility and tools to more effectively deliver the correct type of training or employer-employee connections, based on industry needs and participant capabilities and aspirations.  Some participants need job connections or minimal training, while others need (and have the skills to complete) more extensive training.  The state is working with federal and state partners to implement a more nimble, responsive and evaluative system that connects employers to employees, and still provide long-term training, where appropriate.  Efforts include better frontline training and oversight, talent acquisition and connection efforts and tools such as Talent Connect.

**State Workforce Investment Board:** The director of Division of Education & Career Success, who is responsible for administering Adult Education and other educational programs, attends the Governor’s Talent Investment Board (GTIB) and is responsible for the policies of the Education Advisory Group (EAG)/Talent District Career Council (TDCC) of the Workforce Development Board (WDB). The opportunity to present adult education program issues to the GTIB is always offered to the Director of Education and Career Success before each GTIB meetings. Michigan has implemented state initiatives that pioneered many aspects of WIA prior to enactment of legislation forming GTIB, and membership was “grandfathered,” so no adult education representation is required.

**Local Workforce Investment Boards:** The Director of Division of Education and Career Success is a member of MSF’s committee responsible for periodically reviewing and updating the “Michigan Works! System Governance and Minimum Standards.” These standards specify the minimum requirements for local governance systems as well as the services to be provided by the Michigan Works! One-Stop Service Centers. As described above for the GTIB, the structure of local Workforce Development Boards (WDBs) was also “grandfathered” in; therefore, no adult education representation is required. Also, Michigan’s local governance system has a non-conflict of interest requirement that stipulates that no board member may be employed by an organization that receives funds that are under the direct control of the board.

**One-Stop Core Services:** WIA II, Adult Education, and Literacy funding is not designated by MSF to support the Michigan Works! One-Stop Service Centers. Michigan operates a decentralized education and workforce development system, and many spending decisions are made at a local level. The considerable collaboration between Michigan’s adult education programs and the Michigan Works! One-Stop service system continues to expand. Local strategies for collaboration and program design vary considerably, but they participation in mutual services.

# EL Civics: A Program that Integrates Civics Education into English Literacy

1. **Describe successful activities and services supported with EL Civics funds, including the number of program receiving EL Civics grants and an estimate of the number of adult learners served.**

In 2013-2014 program year, 46 local providers received $1,033,860 EL Civics funds to serve 8,770 (unduplicated) participants including inmates in both state and community correctional facilities. A total of 10,248 (duplicated) enrolled in ESL classes and across local adult education programs, few literacy councils, community-based organizations and state correctional facilities. The state met three of the six negotiated EFL (performance measures) in ESL categories. Michigan still contends that ESL programs’ performance benchmarks are very high (4th quartile) and makes it difficult to meet all the target-levels.

Michigan will continue to provide professional development opportunities to ESL teachers and explore other effective strategies to improve performance. The ESL advisory group has been running two workshops for ESL teachers annually – spring and fall (the workshops were mentioned above under professional development). For example, a team of three members of the advisory group attended the TESOL conference, two attended the MiTESOL and two participated in the Naturalization workshop organized by US Department of Homeland Security. The workshops have offered brain- based teaching strategies, Toolkits for Persistence and Retention, citizenship and six other ESL specific sessions during the conference for their ESL adult learners.

**Secondary School Credentials and Equivalencies**

**5. Describe your state’s policies related to how it awards a secondary school diploma or its equivalent to individuals who are no longer enrolled or required to be enrolled in secondary school under state law. Include state recognized tests that are used to award the diploma as well as other criteria that may be recognized, such as competency-based or credit-based methods.**

In Michigan, local education agencies are autonomous and locally controlled and they’re by constitution authorized to issue a high school diploma. All high schools are under the supervision of the state department of education (MDE) and the state superintendent is responsible to the day-to-day administration of programs.However, Michigan recognizes the general educational development (GED) as a high school equivalent.

**GED® Testing and Test Delivery Technology Upgrade**

Other performance related information: Each year in Michigan, adults and youth who do not possess a high school diploma take the GED® exam. The GED® is a second chance for individuals to obtain a high school equivalency credential, which is critically needed to pursue additional career and college opportunities. In FY14 Michigan improved its GED® passing rate by nearly 6 percentage points. Michigan’s pass rate of 75.7 is very competitive compared to states of similar size:

* Over 22,000 individuals tested in the Michigan GED® testing program
* Over 18,000 people completed all of the required exams
* Over 13,000 passed and earned the GED certificates

Michigan also successfully implemented GED® Computer-Based-Testing (CBT) with over 90 CBT centers opening statewide. The Detroit Public Library implemented CBT, making it one of only a few public libraries in the country offering the GED® exam via computer.

**National Career Readiness Certificate (NCRC)**

Another credential Michigan has recognized is the National Career Readiness Certificate. The Workforce Development Agency (WDA) has continued to address the work readiness job skills of adults using the Nation Career Readiness Certificate (NCRC). In the 2014 program year, through Michigan’s federally funded programs (Michigan Works!®), 6,810 individuals earned the NCRC.  Additionally, 165 individuals received *Employability Skills* training, which focuses on critical workplace interpersonal skills such as: *Team Building, Conflict Resolution, and Communications*.

**Adult Education Standards**

**Describe your state’s progress toward implementation of adult education college and career readiness (CCR) standards, including whether your state has formally adopted a validated set of CCR standards. Describe how the state has determined the standards to be representative of CCR and the timeline by which such standards will be or have been implemented by all local programs. Describe how this is supporting the use of standards by local programs and state leadership funds that are being used to support implementation.**

Michigan has formally adopted OCTAE’s College and Career Readiness Standards (CCRS).  This determination was made after a review of our previous content standards by OCTAE consultants at the June 1014 CCRS Training held in Washington, DC. Michigan has aligned the CCRS with the Common Core Standards. Michigan has been offering regional training opportunities to locals programs to align their curriculums (or curricula) to CCRS for the past 3 years, first with the GED content standards and currently at all levels.  Few local programs have started using the CCRS, and hopefully it will be fully implemented in 2016-2017 by all local programs. We have held multiple sessions on how to integrate CCRS to the classroom at our annual Michigan Adult Education and Training Conferences.