**PART II: Narrative**

1. **(a). Describe how the State has used funds made available under section 223 (State Leadership activities) for each of the following required activities:**

**Alignment of adult education and literacy activities with other one-stop required partners to implement the strategies in the Unified State Plan as described in section 223(1)(a).**

The Governor and Workforce Development Agency’s central mission is to grow Michigan’s economy and lower the unemployment rate has remained a top priority. Michigan 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.

Another alignment of adult education and literacy activities involve the coordination of existing infrastructures for all Michigan residents (especially job seekers and employers) and the provision of convenient access to entry services from a wide array of programs. Education and employment services are provided by (1) electronic access to comprehensive web-based information at [www.MiTalent.org](http://www.MiTalent.org) or Pure Michigan Talent Connect; (2) a statewide network of certified Michigan Works! One Stop Service Centers; (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 Talent Investment Agency (TIA) oversees two agencies: Workforce Development Agency (WDA) and Unemployment Insurance Agency (UIA). Within WDA are the following federal programs: Carl Perkins Community College Services, Food Stamp Employment and Training, Veteran’s Education, Wagner-Peyser Employment Services, Partnership Accountability Training and Hope (PATH), WIOA Title I, Dislocated Worker and Youth, WIOA Title II Adult Education and Family Literacy, and WIOA Title IV. In addition, TIA works collaboratively with the BLS Labor Market Information. These multiple programs work collaboratively to provide almost seamless educational and workforce delivery services to adults in Michigan.

**Establishment or operation of a high quality professional development programs as described in section 223(1) (b):**

**Professional Development Activities**

National and state professional opportunities were provided to OAE staff such as OCTAE state directors’ workshop, the NTI, NRS, TESOL, MiTESOL, etc. In addition, state had the opportunity to attend various State of Michigan Civil Service professional development activities.

At the providers’ level, most adult educators and teachers were served through face-to-face professional development activities (workshops, statewide conferences, and sessions) conducted during 2015-2016, including: Michigan Association of Community and Adult Education (**MACAE) c**onference, multi-media presentations that focused on College and Career Readiness Standards and GED® testing for high school completion.

**Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) Certification training**—was provided on April 1st, 2016 (25 Participants). This training targeted programs that needed either a refresher on implementation of CASAS or those who had new staff members that required training. This training is required in order for local programs to use CASAS.

**(ESL) Advisory Council’s Fall Training Session**

The central focus of the workshop was “Pathways to Success”.  Break-Out presentation selections included: “Teaching Culture to your Students” with the MSU International Program; “How to Host a Workforce Symposium” with Sister Janice Brown of Dominican Literacy; “CASAS/ESL Assessments/In Depth State Update” with Brian Frazier, WDA State of Michigan; CCRS in the classroom-ESLPAC Committee; “Team Teaching in the classroom” with A+ English Language Program (125 participants).

**English as a Second Language (ESL) Advisory Council’s Spring Training Session**

The central focus of the workshop was facing challenges when identifying learning disabilities with the English as Second Language learner.  Participants were actively engaged in whole and small group activities to further develop their skills in teaching by creating an awareness of learning disabilities at all levels of ESL.  Rochelle Kenyon conducted the session that included instructional strategies, using informal screening to determine the primary cause of difficulty, dispelling commonly held beliefs, and utilizing assistive technology and resources.  The break-out sessions include: “Cultural Awareness and Diversity” with the experts from MSU Office of International Students; “Immigration 101” with Frank Castria from USCIS (120 participants).

**WIOA Title II Resources for Adult Educators**

* College and Career Readiness Standards (CCRS) for Adult Education – resources for the classroom.
* Career Pathways – Resource materials to assist adult education program directors and managers to work in collaboration with local business/industry to identify areas of need within the workforce and begin process of adapting programs to help adult learners meet the needs of job opportunities within the community.
* High School Equivalency – Resources to assist adult education teachers in meeting the higher standards within the GED® test and the College and Career Readiness Standards for Adult Education.

**Provision of technical assistance to funded eligible providers as described in section 223(1) (c):**

Michigan has dedicated professional staff charged with the responsibilities of reviewing grant applications for the three funding sources (Sections 231, 225 and 243), tracking and providing oversight throughout the year. On a weekly basis the financial analyst runs reports that track budgetary activities in the Michigan Electronic Grant System (MEGS) and the cash and reimbursements draw-downs from the Cash Management System (CMS) to ensure sub-recipients comply with the state cash management system regulations and policies. The Michigan Adult Education Reporting System (MAERS) team also meet at least twice month to review data reporting and collection methods. Michigan has MAERS Help Desk that allows sub-recipients to call anytime of the day with MAERS questions which the team addresses the next day or within 24 hours. In addition, on-site visits and regional meetings provide face-to-face opportunity to provide technical assistance. They (sub-recipients) also have 24-hour access to both the TIA and LINC websites for resources. They are invited or provided the opportunity to participate in webinars scheduled by OCTAE, LINCS, and DOL.

**Monitoring and evaluation of the quality and improvement of adult education activities as described in section 223(1) (d).**

As mentioned above, Michigan has the MAERS, Grants’ Review, and the Monitoring teams. Each team provides valuable data used in evaluating compliance risks, and developing appropriate monitoring tools for program evaluation. Michigan monitors 100% of all sub-recipients – covering grant activities, allowable costs, data collection, data reporting and data quality. In addition, we conducted on-site monitoring visits to compliment the 100% desk reviews and provided technical assistance during such visits. The results of the monitoring and evaluation are documented in the performance section below.

**1 (b).**  Michigan used leadership funds to upgrade our MAERS system to meet the new performance measures outlined in section 116. Notable accomplishments by the MAERS team are:

* The MAERS Team met weekly to review and discuss the necessary system changes needed to meet the new requirements under WIOA and to increase the overall functionality of MAERS.  This was an arduous process to review the new law, joint guidance released from OCTAE and USDOL, and the new reporting requirements, including the combined statewide report, updated NRS Tables, and the PIRL.
* The MAERS Team has created mock ups of the necessary screen changes, detailed the specifications, and created power point presentations to provide guidance to the field on the updates.
* The team also ensured the Adult Learning Plan (intake form) was updated to collect the required information at the start of the program year.

1. **Performance and Data Analysis. Describe any significant findings from the Eligible Agency’s evaluation of the effectiveness of the adult education and literacy activities based on the core indicators of performance.**

The NRS data tables 4, 4B, and 5 reflect the aggregate participants’ information gathered through 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 (participants with at least 12 hours of instruction) 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 A: Michigan Enrollment Trend Data

* Table A 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 2015-2016 30,051 adults registered for adult education programs, a small increase from the previous year and 27,483 received at least 12 hours of instruction (about 91% retention rate).The average pre-posttest rate was approximately 60%, a drop compared to the previous year (2014-2015) of 64% but within striking distance of the 65% posttest rate stated in the state policy.

* **Table A**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Year** | **Enrollment** |
| 1999/2000 | 86,218 |
| 2000/2001 | 56,096 |
| 2001/2002 | 75,988 |
| 2002/2003 | 70,893 |
| 2003/2004 | 48,237 |
| 2004/2005 | 34,768 |
| 2005/2006 | 32,024 |
| 2006/2007 | 32,856 |
| 2007-2008 | 30,571 |
| 2008-2009 | 28,243 |
| 2009-2010 | 31,106 |
| 2010-2011 | 32,840 |
| 2011-2012 | 34,220 |
| 2012-2013 | 29,533 |
| 2013-2014 | 28,625 |
| 2014-2015 | 27,443 |
| 2015-2016 | 30,051 |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The following are Michigan’s performance compared to the levels negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education.

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***2015-2016 Benchmarks*** | ***Federal Target*** | ***State***  ***Actual*** |
| Beginning ABE Literacy | 44% | **45%** |
| Beginning ABE Education | 42% | **32%\*** |
| Low Intermediate Basic Education | 37% | **33%\*** |
| High Intermediate Basic Education | 31% | **29%\*** |
| Low Adult Secondary Education | 34% | **32%\*** |
| High Adult Secondary Education | N/A | **N/A** |
|  |  |  |
| Beginning ESL Literacy | 57% | **57%** |
| Low Beginning ESL | 65% | **68%** |
| High Beginning ESL | 60% | **60%** |
| Low Intermediate ESL | 47% | **51%** |
| High Intermediate ESL | 44% | **51%** |
| Advanced ESL | 20% | **31%** |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***2015-2016 Benchmarks*** | ***Federal Target*** | ***State***  ***Actual*** |
| Beginning ABE Literacy | 44% | **72%** |
| Beginning ABE Education | 42% | **51%** |
| Low Intermediate Basic Education | 37% | **55%** |
| High Intermediate Basic Education | 31% | **48%** |
| Low Adult Secondary Education | 34% | **50%** |
| High Adult Secondary Education | N/A | **N/A** |
|  |  |  |
| Beginning ESL Literacy | 57% | **74%** |
| Low Beginning ESL | 65% | **86%** |
| High Beginning ESL | 60% | **78%** |
| Low Intermediate ESL | 47% | **66%** |
| High Intermediate ESL | 44% | **66%** |
| Advanced ESL | 20% | **41%** |

* \* Indicates performance measures the state did not meet on Table B (or NRS Table 4).
* Table B (NRS Table 4) shows Michigan is still struggling with adult basic education but improved significantly with the beginning literacy compared to the previous year (2014-2015). In 2015-2016 Michigan met and exceeded all the performance measures for ESL participants. However, Table C (NRS Table 4B) shows a remarkable performance in all categories due to perfect pre and posttest rates compared to 60% on NRS Table 4. Throughout the reporting period, Michigan has continued to upgrade the MAERS data collection and reporting system to increase the flexibility of the system and the ability of running more on-time reports. In addition, there was the constant reminder of the importance of quality and on-time data reporting.
* NRS Table 4C performance report shows very few adults (about 400) 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.

**Table D: NRS Table 4C – Distance Learning and Educational Gains and Attendance by EFL**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***2015-2016 Benchmarks*** | ***Registered*** | ***Completion Percentage*** |
| Beginning ABE Literacy | 20 | **55%** |
| Beginning ABE Education | 59 | **32%** |
| Low Intermediate Basic Education | 104 | **30%** |
| High Intermediate Basic Education | 112 | **33%** |
| Low Adult Secondary Education | 51 | **31%** |
| High Adult Secondary Education | 36 | **N/A** |
|  |  |  |
| Beginning ESL Literacy | 1 | **100%** |
| Low Beginning ESL | 2 | **50%** |
| High Beginning ESL | 1 | **0%** |
| Low Intermediate ESL | 5 | **40%** |
| High Intermediate ESL | 6 | **67%** |
| Advanced ESL | 3 | **33%** |

* The Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) data collection and reporting improved compared to the recent past. 6,149 inmates passed GED subtests and 1,186 passed the full battery (obtained a GED).

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

* 19,640 out of 27,483 participants were in follow-up cohorts. This represents about 71% 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 about 77% due to the concerted efforts and technical assistance provided to local programs. In addition, the number that obtained HSD/GED continues to grow annually (3,487) with 91% response rate and 3,921 (1st & 2nd year combined) entered postsecondary/training with an average of 71% response rate. The first (1st) cohort met or exceeded performance the state negotiated performance measure but 2nd year participants were below the negotiated target level of 28%. The overall job-related numbers have continued to grow because of the capability of data-match.

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***2015-2016 Benchmarks*** | ***Federal Target*** | ***State Actual*** | ***Response Rate or % Available for Data Match*** |
| Pl Placement in Postsecondary/Training Year 1 | 29% | **28%\*** | **68%** |
| Placement in Postsecondary/Training Year 2 | 23% | **28%** | **74%** |
| Entered Employment | 26% | **35%** | **83%** |
| Retained or Improved Employment | 51% | **79%** | **69%** |

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***2015-2016 Benchmark*** | ***Federal Target*** | ***State Actual*** | ***Response Rate or % Available for Data Match*** |
| Obtained GED or High School Diploma | 78% | **75%\*** | **91%** |

1. **Integration with One-Stop Partners. 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. 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 Title II funds being used to support activities and services through the One-Stop delivery system.**

**One-Stop Core Services:** WIOA Title II requires AEFLA funding to support infrastructure costs at the Michigan Works! One-Stop Service Centers. However, the funding formula has not been fully worked out in all 10 prosperity regions and in 2015-2016 Michigan (State School Section 107) operated a decentralized education and workforce development system, and so many spending decisions were made at the 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 all participate in mutual delivery of services. In many one-stop regions adult education is a member of the local workforce investment board, and/or participated in the formation of new local plans under WIOA.

**State Workforce Investment Board (referred to as the Governor’s Talent Investment Board (GTIB)):** The GTIB is the principal private-sector policy advisor on building a strong workforce system aligned with state education policies and economic development goals. Created by Executive Order 2015-11, GTIB is a business majority led board of industry executives, legislators, labor officials, education leaders, local elected officials, state agency directors and other representatives consistent with the provisions of the WIOA Section 101(b). The GTIB provides a vital role in bringing citizen involvement, engagement, and oversight to the state's talent enhancement effort, and serves as a catalyst for talent enhancement and economic development entities. The GTIB recommends policies to the Governor and state departments that guide workforce investment and training at both the state and local levels. The manager of GTIB is a staff of TIA and provides guidance to the adult education state director who is responsible for administering adult education and other educational programs and also responsible for the policies of the Talent District Career Council (TDCC) of the Workforce Development Board (WDB). The state director for adult education is a member of the GTIB and attends the meetings and 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 meeting.

**Career Pathways Initiative**

The Office of Adult Education’s participation in the *Moving Pathways Forward: Supporting Career Pathways Integration* project during program year 2014-2015 continued to drive the advancement of career pathway program development in the state. The intensive technical assistance provided through the initiative was incredibly valuable in order to conceptualize and document career pathway programs for adult learners at all levels, and identify the necessary components and elements. The technical assistance helped to provide both state staff as well as local program staff with tangible and actionable steps and program elements, not just research and buzzwords.

In the first year of the initiative, the Office of Adult Education convened the *Moving Pathways Forward* Steering Committee that had the important role of guiding the development of a career pathways framework to transition low-skilled adults to postsecondary education and employment in high-demand occupations.  The target for the initiative is low-skilled adults, but the committee was very clear in its belief that a comprehensive career pathway system will benefit all learners. The steering committee has representation from all the WIOA core programs including the Community College Services, other state departments (Education – CTE/Office of School Improvement and Corrections), Michigan Access Network, Bureau of Labor Market Information and Strategic Initiatives, LEAs, Michigan Works (One-Stop), President’s Council, State Universities of Michigan, Michigan Leagues for Public Policy, Workforce Intelligence Network, and Great Lakes Comprehensive Center.

Key accomplishments of the steering committee include but are not limited to:

* Creating a vision statement – “*Michigan’s career pathway system provides academic and industry-recognized credentials and skills needed for in-demand careers.”*
* Creating a mission statement – “*To develop and implement a high-quality, comprehensive career pathway system with multiple entry and exit points that meets learners where they are, provides education, training and support services needed for career advancement, and ensures a skilled workforce that meets Michigan’s talent needs.”*
* Defined partner agencies and potential role in the career pathway system
* Reviewed labor market information and sector partnerships in the state to identify key industries for career pathway programs
* Shared examples and best practices of employer engagement strategies

To conclude participation in the *Moving Pathways Forward* initiative, the Office of Adult Education sent a survey out to all providers in June 2016 to gather information on the activities being implemented at the local level in each of the seven key components of career pathways. Nineteen (19) programs responded to the survey, which is less than 20% of the adult education providers in Michigan. The highest rated component was Coordinating with Interagency Partners (29%), and the lowest rated component (2%) was Use Data to Monitor and Evaluate Performance. The other important take away from reviewing the survey results was that most programs rated themselves as having implemented a number of activities but in reading the description of the activities implemented, the identified activities did not meet the requirements. It was clear that there still is a lack of understanding of career pathways and many programs still have not discovered that developing career pathways for adult learners requires adult education services to be delivered differently at all levels. For example, the partnership required with postsecondary institutions and workforce development must go beyond referrals between agencies, and identify opportunities for dual enrollment, aligning entry and exit requirements, articulation agreements, and integrated education and training opportunities. Also, contextualizing curriculum for specific occupations is not simply offering soft skills and employability skills training. Although progress has been made and more programs are moving in the necessary direction, more professional development and technical assistance is needed to get all programs up to speed.

In program year 2015-2016, the Office of Adult Education convened a focus group of adult education directors that are piloting or implementing one or more career pathway components. This focus group was pulled together to share and evaluate promising approaches to collaboration with Michigan Works!, contextualized curriculum for all levels of instruction, integrated education and training programs, a common intake process, and comprehensive career planning. The group provided valuable insight specifically around partnering with Michigan Works! And reinforced the fact that each region of the state varies in the depth and extent of the partnership. Some regions are co-located and one area has a common intake process, and these regions have a high percentage of adult learners co-enrolled in other core programs. In another area of the state, the Michigan Works! and adult education staff are in the third cycle of a workforce preparation program that rotates each week between the adult education program and the Michigan Works’ location. Other areas are trying to establish a relationship, so the information provided will be used to create a resource guide with examples and suggestions for initial conversations and starting blocks.

The Office of Adult Education has offered and will continue to offer professional development for career pathways for core partners as requested. In previous years, professional development has been provided to adult education providers, Michigan Works! Agencies, and community colleges on the career pathways model, key components, and resources to assist local providers in the development of career pathway programs. In PY 2015-16, technical assistance was provided regionally and was tailored based on the requests of each region. The majority of the regions requested a presentation on the key components of career pathways, while Region 9 brought together adult education providers, community colleges, Michigan Works!, and key employers in the region to begin discussion on specific programs to develop.

1. **Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) Program (AEFLA Section 243). Describe how the state is using funds under section 243 to support the following activities under IELCE program.**

**Describe when your state held a competition for IELCE program funds and the number of grants awarded by your state to support the following IELCE programs.**

In 2015-2016 program year no IELCE competitive grant was conducted for IELCE program.

**Describe your state efforts in meeting the requirement to provide IELCE services in combination with integrated education and training activities.**

Under the state transitional plan, most of the funds used for IELCE services were under section 231 and provided 43 local providers EL Civics funds to serve 8,543 (unduplicated) participants, including inmates in both state correctional facilities and community county jails that received at least 12 hours of instruction. A total of 16,193 (duplicated) participants were enrolled in ESL classes across local adult education programs, literacy councils, community-based organizations and state correctional facilities. The state met all the six negotiated EFL performance measures in ESL categories a significant improvement compared to the previous year. This achievement is attributed to more accurate performance measures negotiation with OCTAE. In spite of the progress made, Michigan still contends that ESL programs’ performance benchmarks are very high (4th quartile) and makes it difficult to meet all the target-levels. Various providers are at various stages of developing integrated education and training (IET) as they learn more of the components of IET.

This year (2016-2017) Michigan is going to conduct a competitive award process for both Instruction/ IET and IELCE programs.

**Describe how the state is progressing towards program goals of preparing and placing IELCE program participants in unsubsidized employment in in-demand industries and occupations that lead to economic self-sufficiency as described in section 243(c)(1) and discuss any performance results, challenges, and lessons learned from implementing those program goals.**

Michigan did not conduct or award any dedicated funds for IELCE program because the final rules were not available. However, sub-recipients especially in the Southeast region of the state where there is high concentration of immigrants have started collaborating with Michigan Works! (Title I), Career and Technical Centers and Community Colleges in developing the components of an IELCE program. Some of the challenges at this time but not limited are: developing a short and an effective IELCE with single objective for this transient population; cost of such programs; transportation to the IET centers; scheduling of staff (since Michigan is not college system); matching basic skills with the demanding technical skills of the IET program. One of the lessons learned is the participants are excited with the expanded opportunities and some employers are indicating interest in forging partnership with adult education programs.

**Describe how the state is progressing towards program goals of ensuring that IELCE program activities are integrated with the local workforce development system and its functions as described in section 243(c)(2) and discuss any performance results, challenges, and lessons learned from implementing those program goals.**

In 2015-2016 Michigan did not allocate AEFLA section 243 funds for an IELCE program, however, the state instituted a pilot program with all the elements of an IET (based on our understanding at the time) with state funds. In 2016-2017, the state is using the lessons learned to conduct a competitive funding for an IELCE program.

Below is a summary report of the pilot called “Linked Muskegon County”:

Linked Muskegon County (Linked) is a collaboration between Adult Education (AE) programs within Muskegon County, West Michigan Works! (WMW), the Muskegon Area Career/Tech Center (MACTC), and local employers. Cohorts of adult education students are dually enrolled in adult education programming along with a technical training course at the MACTC. Through coursework in both programs, and with the help of WMW!, these students will complete their high school diploma requirements or receive a GED, gain specific manufacturing skills being sought by local employers, and increase their employability skills. Successful students will receive internship or employment opportunities through locally identified employers that will provide on the job training to further enhance skills and better prepare our workforce to meet local demand. To help recruit and retain successful student participants, an Adult Education Navigator serves as a caseworker for each student. This Navigator works with adult education staff, MACTC staff, local human service agencies, and potential employers to design an educational program best suited to the personal and employment needs of the student, and also helps identify and address individual barriers to each student’s success. The Navigator keeps students on his/her caseload through successful completion of the academic program and helps with their transition to employment.

In 2015-2016, the State School Aid Act, Section 107 maintained the regional funding structure that goes directly to local education agencies (LEA) to regions, based on Michigan’s ten prosperity regions.  The creation of the 10 Prosperity Regions in 2012 has facilitated stronger relationships among local and regional partners and has also allowed the state to recognize local efforts, align services and collaborative efforts of regional stakeholders and decision makers. The goal is to support regional economic activities and prosperity.

1. **Adult Education Standards**

All Michigan local educations agencies that are recipients of AEFLA funds and operate high school completion program and some other providers use the Michigan K12 standards for the high school program. Michigan adult education also adopted the College and Career Readiness Standards (CCRC) disseminated by the OCTAE and has continued to roll out the standards and how to use them in the classroom throughout the state, through regional training institutes and conference venues. One of the lessons learned is the constant question/concern of doing more with less and the challenges of dealing with the very low level learners and the rigorous curriculum.

**GED®**

For period covering July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016 Michigan’s GED® testers pass rate was 81% compared to the national pass rate of 82%:

* 7,774 individuals tested in Michigan
* 5,071 people completed all of the required exams
* 4,122 people earned the high school equivalency credential

The *GED® To School* program, which was mentioned in the previous report, was implemented during the reporting period.  The *GED® To School* program is an effort to incent Michigan residents to pursue post-secondary education and career focused training after earning a high school equivalency credential.

The program launch in June of 2016, covering only one month of the reporting period below.

GED-To-School June 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016:

* 119 participants approved for at least one subject testing voucher
* Of these 119 participants, 45 have received their high school equivalency credential in 2016

**New/Alternative High School Equivalency Assessments**

New alternative high school equivalency assessments in addition to the *GED®* were approved to be recognized by the state of Michigan during the reporting period by the legislature and governor. Implementation of the new assessments is in process. Progress and outcome data will be reported in the next report.

1. **Programs for Correction Education and the Education of Other Institutionalized Individuals (AEFLA Section 225).**

**State Correctional Facilities (Michigan Department of Correction – MDOC)**

In 2015-2016, the State Adult Education Office has not developed a mechanism of tracking recidivism for criminal offenders served with AEFLA funds at the county and local correctional institutions. However, MDOC has its own tracking system funded with state funds that calculates recidivism rate. Any prisoner that is enrolled in educational program in April of 2016 and paroles in May has a month or so to fail before they stop looking and the time at risk will be different for the prisoner that paroles in July 2015 and gives inaccurate and/or meaningless result. This means MDOC tries to sift through the data for more accurate information that is factored in the calculation of recidivism rate.

In 2010, the monthly recidivism rate at the twelve-month mark was 14.5%.  MDOC overall 3-year recidivism has been fairly stable for the last few years so this is still probably about the same. The 3-year recidivism for the 2012 parole releases to Michigan counties the most recent data at this time.  The next update will be at the end of March 2017.

Since it is a new requirement, TIA is working closely with MDOC to coordinate and leverage resources towards this goal.

**Institutional Programs**

In 2015-2016 Michigan allocated the maximum amount (10%) authorized by Section 225 to correctional education. Twenty nine county jails and state correctional facilities received $1,020,783. MDOC is the only state agency that operated state correctional facilities. 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.

The MDOC Offender Education Tracking System (OETS) reported 6,149 passed GED subtests during the program year. Of this number 8,221 were enrolled in MAERS and 1,612 inmates obtained GED certificates in 2015-2016.