

## **Pennsylvania Narrative Report 2015-16**

### **1. State Leadership Funds (AEFLA Section 223)**

The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) Division of Adult Education uses federal section 223 state leadership funds, together with some state funds, to support a system of projects that provide services that address all of the activities required in section 223 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), plus several additional permissible activities.

The Pennsylvania Combined State Plan was not in place in 2015-16, so there were not yet any specific goals and strategies identified. However, one of the state leadership projects, the Workforce Development System Liaison Project, funded since 2011, assists staff in local adult basic education programs to connect services to the local, regional, and statewide workforce needs. The project also helps local programs to understand their role as partners in the workforce development system and one-stop centers and to develop relationships and partnerships with one-stop center staff, local workforce boards, training providers, employers, and other workforce partners to build a system that addresses both worker and employer needs. In Philadelphia, the project lead convened the division-funded adult education providers, one-stop operators, and representatives from other non-division funded adult education providers to plan for integration of services.

Staff members of the workforce project have been engaged in career pathways work since before the project received funding from the division and are viewed by the local boards as the experts on career pathways in the state. This expertise means that adult education providers in Pennsylvania have been working to identify local career pathways and provide services in support of those career pathways for years. That work continued and expanded in 2015-16 with the ongoing support of the workforce project. In several local areas, the workforce project worked with local boards as part of career pathways planning that involved local partners, including employers. The technical assistance focused on several key aspects of the development and implementation of successful locally relevant career pathways for adult learners: ongoing analysis of current labor market and workforce information to guide decision making; building and strengthening relationships among the stakeholders; and integrating career awareness and planning into adult education services. At the state level, the project lead and the state director of adult education met with executive director of the Pennsylvania Workforce Development Association to discuss adult education involvement in the development of career pathways. After that meeting, the project lead made several presentations to local boards on this topic. In response to questions during these presentations, the division created a WIOA webpage for our partners that focused on how adult education can participate in activities to build career pathways with the local boards.

In addition to its work to help align adult education services with other workforce services, the workforce project also provides technical assistance and professional development to staff in local programs. In 2015-16, project staff designed opportunities for case managers to learn about and implement strategies to help students explore career opportunities and plan for transition to postsecondary and employment. The project also provided customized technical assistance to over 30 local programs on topics such as integrated education and training, career pathways partnerships, and coalition/partnership building. Other technical assistance included facilitating three Communities of Practice (WIOA Referral Planning, Building Strategic Partnerships, and Planning for Integrated Education and Training) with over 100 participants

statewide. The project also developed a Sector Strategies Toolkit to assist agencies in working in the identified sectors in their local areas.

Finally, two staff members from the project participated in the Pennsylvania Workforce Development Board WIOA workgroups and were actively involved in the composition of the white papers for both the Career Pathways and the Serving Individuals with Barriers workgroups.

Pennsylvania's Professional Development System (PDS) is comprised of the federally-funded Facilitation and Consultation Services, Course Management, Management Information System (MIS) Support and Communications projects and the state-funded projects, Tutors of Literacy in the Commonwealth and Family Literacy Consultation Project. Together, the projects provide technical assistance and professional development opportunities in areas such as using data, improving instruction, and working with partners. In addition, the system disseminates relevant information about resources and promising practices to local programs.

Pennsylvania's PDS uses a process consultation model that emphasizes program improvement based on data and high-quality, research-based professional development opportunities to support that program improvement. This model emphasizes developing the skills of local program staff to use data to monitor and evaluate their own programs, identify program improvement and professional development needs, use new knowledge in their work, and evaluate and document change. The system supports relevant, job-embedded professional development that helps staff at local programs assume the responsibility for implementation and evaluation of program improvement and professional development at their agencies. The Program Improvement/Professional Development Worksheet, which agencies complete annually, is designed to capture all of the elements of program improvement implemented by agencies. The PDS uses the data from this worksheet to inform its work related to the needs, challenges, and trends in agencies' job-embedded professional development.

The core of the PDS model is the Facilitation and Consultation Services project. In 2015-16, project staff consisted of the project supervisor/state consultant and three lead consultants. In addition, the project contracted with local program practitioners who have demonstrated expertise in certain content areas to serve as coaches on an as-needed basis. Each consultant worked directly with staff at assigned agencies, who were led by an agency professional development team that consisted of the administrator and an in-house professional development specialist. Lead consultants provided program improvement and professional development support and guidance, focusing on helping agencies support high quality job-embedded professional development. Each program also had at least one Professional Learning Community that was focused on standards implementation. Lead consultants attended some of these Professional Learning Community meetings and provided feedback and support to the agency professional development teams as they implementing this new model for professional development.

The PDS worked closely with the College and Career Readiness Standards (CCRS) team (described below), online course instructors, and other facilitators of professional development to develop both online and face-to-face formal professional development activities. These activities included a course on planning standards-aligned lessons and a workshop on revising resources for reading, writing, and mathematics standards alignment. Based on needs identified from the work of the lead consultants with local agencies, PDS staff also integrated existing professional development activities offered through World Education/ProLiteracy, LINCS, CASAS, and Wonderlic into the professional development catalogue. They worked with the

facilitators of those courses to develop appropriate follow-up activities to help participants implement course content into their work. To further support implementation of skills and knowledge acquired from professional development, coaches assisted programs with their standards work in reading/writing/mathematics as well as with English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction, addressing students' learning differences, and using technology in instruction. Courses are continually evaluated and updated for improvement. Newly revamped content for 2015-16 focused on the basics of instruction, lesson planning, and CCRS-aligned resources for volunteer tutors.

In 2015-16, the PDS began using some new delivery methods for professional development. The lead consultants researched the concept of "Community of Practice," which is defined as a group of people who share a common concern or are interested in a common topic and who come together to share best practices and deepen knowledge and expertise in order to integrate the deeper knowledge into practice and generate change in practice. They then created communities of practice in the areas of case management, lesson study, and use of the classroom toolkit. These were small groups of instructors or case managers (8-10 members) who met over the course of the year to answer directed questions on their topic and then apply a problem solving approach to implement at their programs. The case management participants picked a topic relevant to their work, made a change at their programs, and then established a data collection and analysis procedure to determine if the chosen change brought about the anticipated outcomes. The classroom toolkit community of practice concentrated on the sequence of adult student learning and how breakdowns and gaps in this sequence can be addressed through the use of some basic tools to support learning. Participants each created, taught, and deconstructed a lesson, using concepts discussed during the community of practice. The lesson study protocol community of practice focused on following the protocol used in the CCRS implementation described in section 5 and how it can be adapted and used at the participants' programs. In addition to the communities of practice, the lead consultants also developed a persistence network, to discuss and share promising practices in the area of increasing persistence for adult education students.

Another new delivery method in 2015-16 was the creation of online on-demand, self-paced modules. Synchronous courses often do not fit the available schedule for program staff; many course evaluations reflected this problem. Having on-demand courses alleviates this scheduling difficulty and provides flexibility to programs in deciding which staff participate in which professional learning opportunities. The CCRS team, in conjunction with Pennsylvania's technology expert, created on-demand CCRS modules that program staff can use to learn about the instructional advances and complete a resource alignment and lesson revision. The modules followed the content of the 2015 Summer Institute and provided opportunities for guided practice. Programs were encouraged to use these modules in their professional learning communities and for introducing the standards to new staff. Initial feedback has been positive, and the PDS will continue to add to this library of on-demand resources.

PDE uses state leadership funds to maintain the Pennsylvania Adult Education Resources website ([www.paadultedresources.org](http://www.paadultedresources.org)), which houses information and resources from the various state leadership projects and the field of adult and family literacy education in general. In 2015-16, new sections were added on the CCRS, including the on-demand modules described above, and WIOA. When a new resource is created or identified, the resource is posted on the website and prominently marked as new. The PDS writes an article for the monthly newsletter or sends out an email through Constant Contact informing the field of that resource. The lead consultants and coaches incorporate these new resources into their meetings with programs as relevant opportunities arise. For example, the CCRS facilitator

guides were used at the face-to-face Summer Institute, linked on the website, and then used by the lead consultants when meeting with the program professional learning communities. The PDS also began the development of a lesson bank for CCRS-aligned lessons, which will be housed on the resources website.

Pennsylvania has invested in technology training for local programs and instructors. Leadership funds were used to provide technical assistance to programs on how to best utilize technology, both software and hardware, to support adult and family literacy instruction. The PDS also offered the LINCS course “Integrating Technology in the Adult Education Classroom” and provided wrap around support for the implementation of technology plans created during the course. The technology expert provided support to other members of the PDS, such as the lead consultants and coaches, to increase their knowledge of the use of technology in instruction. Instructional design assistance was given to PDS instructors/course facilitators so they could create and deliver online courses more effectively.

Using data for decision-making and for continuous program improvement is an ongoing focus of state leadership activities. The PDS provided technical assistance, training, and support to local programs in the collection, reporting, use, and analysis of program data with the goals of ensuring accurate data and improving program services and student outcomes. To assist both the division and programs with monitoring and using data for decision making and program improvement, the MIS project created and annually updates an Access template, which is linked to the web-based data reporting system. The template contains many reports, including the National Reporting System (NRS) tables. The MIS project produced monthly agency data check reports for program staff and division advisors to alert them to potential data errors and also assisted agencies with preparing data for the end of the program year. Program staff can produce reports for individual teachers and classes to use to evaluate the impact of program improvement and professional development activities. The project also provided training and technical assistance for creating additional reports as well as more formal learning opportunities such as courses on using Access to help with data analysis. Using many of these tools, the lead consultants encouraged the use of data for decision making during their meetings with individual program professional development teams.

The leadership projects monitored and evaluated the effect that professional development and technical assistance had on local program activities through a continuous improvement model. Every formal professional learning opportunity had a required evaluation. Additionally, the use of individual reflection forms was encouraged for informal opportunities. All of these evaluations and reflections were used along with program improvement/professional development worksheets to give a full picture of program improvement and change. The PDS reviewed these evaluations and reflections to understand how agencies were changing practice. Project staff also produced reports from the online course management system for division and PDS staff to support ongoing monitoring and improvement of professional development services.

The collaboration and coordination of services among the various federal and state-funded state leadership projects strengthened the efforts of adult education and family literacy providers to integrate data-driven program improvement and professional development, as well as to begin evaluating the impact of that work on program services and student outcomes. As a team, the system worked to coordinate methods of documentation, data collection, and service delivery to ensure that programs receive collaborative, seamless support that ultimately benefits learners. Progress was made to create a truly integrated professional development system that supports high-quality, job-embedded professional development with the ultimate goal of improving student outcomes.

## 2. Performance Data Analysis

The performance of Pennsylvania's adult education and family literacy providers remained steady in 2015-16. The state achieved five of its performance targets. It matched or exceeded the target in two of 11 Educational Functioning Levels (EFL) and three of the four Follow-up Core Outcome Measures. The state set or matched top performance marks in six of the 15 performance categories. Three areas of success have been the steady improvement in employment outcomes, the increase in the number of students who attained a high school equivalency credential, and improvement in seven of the 11 educational functioning levels

Targets were met despite several challenges that programs faced. Pennsylvania's 2015-16 state budget was not enacted until March 2016; a stop gap budget in December 2015 allowed adult education and family literacy programs to receive a portion of both state and federal funds in late January 2016. As a result, many programs had to reduce services, and a few closed their doors completely for one or two months. In addition, programs continued to lose veteran instructional and support staff, including high turnover in leadership positions. Since the grant competition in 2011, 70 percent of the program administrators in the field have either retired or moved to other positions. Some programs have replaced administrators multiple times since 2011.

Some factors that likely contributed to meeting five performance targets are:

- Continued improvement of student barrier and transition support services;
- Continued use of professional learning communities in each program;
- Acknowledgement of high performing programs;
- Technical assistance for professional development from the lead consultants; and
- Four-and-a-half years of intensive program monitoring with follow up visits.

In addition, advisors annually review program performance with administrators. Advisors review student hours and posttest results as soon as data entry is completed for the program year. This information is reviewed with the program administrator for program improvement purposes. Some commonly identified issues include low scores at specific educational functioning levels; students who attended enough hours to be posttested but were not; and students who attended regularly but then dropped out before reaching the posttesting timeframes. Program administrators are encouraged to work with their program improvement teams to research these issues and to seek solutions to the problems. In addition, all programs receive a five-year program performance sheet that can be used to track long-term trends. Program administrators together with their staff are expected to review program and performance data on an ongoing basis and to base program improvement and professional development on that data.

Programs continue to work on transitioning exit-level ESL students into adult basic and secondary education classes and advancing more students into postsecondary education/training.

In 2015-16, state Act 143 funds enabled 20 agencies to operate programs to provide family literacy services in 32 of Pennsylvania's 67 counties. These programs provided services to 767 families, with 784 adults who were NRS eligible and 916 children. The family literacy programs provided a full range of services that resulted in overall educational level gains of 50 percent.

Distance learning continues to be an alternative delivery method for providing instruction to students who have barriers to attending face-to-face services or who wish to receive additional

services. Agencies use distance learning to serve students who are unable to participate in face-to-face instruction, to support students' persistence when situations arise that could potentially interrupt their participation, and to offer blended learning to increase the intensity of instruction.

The division contracts with Tuscarora Intermediate Unit 11 to administer the Distance Learning Project, which provides distance instruction for students and technical assistance to referral agencies. Distance learners participated in adult basic education, high school equivalency test preparation, and English language instruction. The Distance Learning Project offered classes using subject-specific managed enrollment classes. Students completed online lessons as well as projects that allowed them to customize and create their own learning experiences. English language learners used an online curriculum and also participated in synchronous webinars with a teacher and other students to practice their speaking and listening skills with others. While a majority of distance learning students participated in online classes, a print-based option was available for students who do not have regular access to the Internet. Referral agencies administered the necessary standardized assessments and provided additional educational and support services as needed.

### **3. Integration with One-stop Partners**

WIOA requirements for local funding agreements for one-stop infrastructure costs were not in place in 2015-16. Consequently, local adult basic education programs extended existing local one-stop agreements using the processes developed under the Workforce Investment Act; however, not all funded programs provided financial support to their local one-stop center. For centers receiving support, that support ranged from a minimal partner fee to covering a portion of all infrastructure costs. Generally, the latter option occurred when an adult education program was co-located at the one-stop or had permanent classroom space there. Programs reported spending \$174,467 in Title II funds and \$36,610 in state funds to cover infrastructure costs at 26 one-stop centers in Pennsylvania.

In 2015-16, 30 grantees offered some level of adult basic education services at 39 one-stop centers (36 comprehensive centers and 3 affiliate sites). This represents 57 percent of the funded adult basic education programs and 60 percent of the comprehensive one-stop centers in the state. Adult education programs provided a range of educational services at these one-stop centers, including high school equivalency test preparation, basic skills instruction, and preparation for postsecondary entrance exams. Services were available through classroom instruction, one-on-one tutoring, and/or drop-in centers. Program staff further supported one-stop activities by assisting with intake, orientation, assessment, career awareness and workforce preparation activities, case management, job fairs, and subject-specific workshops and clinics. At some one-stop centers, adult basic education program staff handled the administration of basic skills assessments for clients in all of the one-stop partner programs. At several of the one-stop centers with adult education presence, staff members from the adult education program participated in staff and/or operator consortium meetings, as well as provided input to business management teams and rapid response teams. A two-way referral process at the one-stop centers allowed students to access many workforce development services for which they met eligibility requirements. Providers estimated that the value of such services provided at the one-stops exceeded \$1.2 million.

PDE worked with colleagues from the Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry to ensure that each of the 22 local workforce development boards had at least one representative from an entity receiving Title II and/or matching state adult basic and family literacy funds. Half of those

representatives work directly with the adult education program in their agencies. The rest are higher level management at agencies receiving adult basic education funding. These representatives, along with other Title II providers, participated in the local boards' committee structure responsible for policy and procedure development. In addition to Title II representation on the local boards, adult basic education providers regularly reported to local boards on their programs, partnerships, and successes of students, particularly attainment of credentials, employment, and transition to postsecondary education and training.

#### **4. Integrated English Literacy and Civics Education (IELCE) Program (AEFLA Section 243)**

In 2015-16, PDE implemented services funded under Section 243 as indicated in the 2015-16 Pennsylvania Transition Year State Plan. PDE extended the 16 existing EL/Civics grantees for 2015-16, awarding a total of \$1,568,782. Those grantees were originally awarded grants through a competition for EL/Civics funds held in spring 2011. The grantees continued to provide integrated English literacy and civics instruction as described in those grants. The division extended its requirement that each program with EL/Civics funding have at least one current staff member who completed the EL/Civics online course. In 2015-16, eight staff members from EL/Civics programs completed the course. Participants reported that the course helped them better integrate the literacy and civics components of their lessons.

During 2015-16, EL/Civics programs were required to begin planning and preparing to be able to provide IELCE with integrated education and training (IET) as required under section 243. Programs reviewed their existing services to identify aspects of their current EL/Civics program that support readiness to implement IELCE programs. They also identified deficiencies in their current programming and activities that they need to add in order to offer a compliant program. As part of this work, several programs began incorporating workforce preparation activities into EL/Civics classes in a more deliberate and transparent manner. One program incorporated a "self-introduction" project, which was leveled for a range of English proficiency levels so all students were able to participate. Students learned to present their education, skills, and work history, both orally and in writing. Students also discussed their career and education goals with a career coach and incorporated this information into their documents. The students used these documents on job interviews and for job searches. Another program organized an on-site employer panel, comprised of four employers from different workforce occupations. Students attended in interview attire and were able to ask questions of the panelists.

In addition to adjusting instruction to more closely align with the goals of section 243, staff in EL/Civics programs began evaluating the need and opportunities for section 243 IELCE programs in their service areas. They looked at workforce data and employment trends to identify potential occupational training appropriate for the target population that also addresses the workforce needs of businesses likely to employ those individuals. Program staff also met with members of the local workforce boards, employers, economic development organizations, vocational training providers, postsecondary institutions, and other workforce development partners to discuss workforce needs. One program has partnered with a hospital to offer its students opportunities to volunteer and learn about jobs in the healthcare industry. Another program has been helping its local board conduct outreach workshops with immigrants, beginning with skilled immigrants with college degrees. The information collected will be used to inform decisions on possible integrated education and training opportunities.

Professional development opportunities provided by state leadership projects also supported progress towards meeting the goals of section 243. Teachers in many EL/Civics and other ESL

programs have participated in the overall implementation of CCRS but have expressed frustration at trying to make standards for English Language Arts and mathematics useful in the ESL classroom. In response, the CCRS team developed and delivered training on using the CCRS in the ESL classroom. This face-to-face training was further supported with a webinar “Revising the CCRS Tools for ESL Materials.” Based on this professional development, EL/Civics teachers began reviewing their instructional materials for alignment with the CCRS and incorporating the standards into their lessons. Several administrators from programs with EL/Civics funding participated in a community of practice on planning for integrated education and training. Several agencies also participated on the “Career Pathways for ESL” working group, which focused on working with highly skilled immigrants.

To inform its decisions on how to implement IELCE under section 243, the Division of Adult Education reviewed data related to immigration trends, refugee resettlement trends, and individuals who speak a language other than English at home. The division’s research showed that Pennsylvania has several regions with large populations of immigrants, many with credentials in their home countries, who could potentially benefit from section 243 programming as laid out in statute. Based on the information, the division decided that it will compete section 243 IELCE funds separately from Section 231 funds. Grantees will be required to provide IET programming with the expectation that many participants in the IELCE component of section 243 will also participate in the IET portion.

## **5. Adult Education Standards**

The Pennsylvania State Board of Education adopted the Pennsylvania Core Standards in November 2013. The standards went into effect March 1, 2014. PDE’s Division of Adult Education began formal statewide implementation of the College and Career Readiness Standards for Adult Education (CCRS) during 2014–15. Prior to implementation of the CCRS, Division of Adult Education staff completed a crosswalk of the CCRS to the Pennsylvania Core Standards. All items included in the CCRS are also in the Pennsylvania Core Standards; in many cases, the wording of the standards is identical.

Implementation of the CCRS has been greatly enhanced by Pennsylvania’s participation in the College and Career Readiness-Standards-in-Action (CCR-SIA) technical assistance project. Following the CCR-SIA process, teams from local programs initially focused on understanding the standards through the unpacking process. Next, teams focused on lesson revision and resource alignment. As implementation progresses, programs will focus on the evaluation of student work to determine the quality of assignments and then on the observation/program evaluation process. By the end of 2017-18, the division wants to ensure that adult education students in all components of its funded programs, including ESL and tutoring, are receiving standards-based instruction.

The process of implementing the standards statewide began with a team attending the CCRS Implementation Institute in Washington, D.C., in June 2014. The PDS then used the CCR-SIA process and the materials from the D.C. institute to create a two-day Summer Institute in August 2014 that introduced the instructional advances and started the process of understanding the standards by unpacking, creating activities, and aligning resources. The division required each funded program to send a team comprised of the administrator, the in-house professional development specialist, and at least two teachers. Program staff completed hands-on activities and left the institute with an outline of their annual program improvement/professional development worksheet.



Since early 2015, implementation of the standards has been led by the team that represented Pennsylvania in the CCR-SIA technical assistance project. Team members attended CCR-SIA workshops held in Washington, D.C. They then returned to their local programs to pilot the techniques and activities they learned. The experience and knowledge gleaned during their pilots informed the statewide rollout of the standards-based initiative.

The focus of the first workshop that the pilot team attended was lesson revision, alignment of resources, and completing the lesson study process. Based on their experiences using the materials at their local programs, the pilot team members developed and presented the content for the 2015 Summer Institute in August 2015. Teams from each funded program learned the processes and were charged with returning to their agencies to build capacity to complete this work. As with the previous year, the CCRS implementation work formed the basis of the program improvement/professional development activities for the year.

The pilot team attended the second workshop, which focused on student work protocol and observation and aggregation of data to assess use of standards. Team members piloted the activities and then developed the content for regional trainings on the student work protocol to be held in 2016-17. Pilot team members also trained practitioners at other agencies to expand capacity across the state. In 2015-16, 50 coaches were trained to work with the CCRS protocols. These coaches provide leadership for CCRS implementation at their own agencies and will assist at other CCRS trainings in the future.

The success of CCRS implementation has been supported by structures and systems that the division has put in place since 2011. The PDS includes lead consultants who work with program teams to identify program improvement and professional development needs and write action plans. Programs have created internal support structures for managing their own job-embedded professional development efforts, including an in-house professional development specialist, who works closely with program staff to align and support professional development needs and help with implementation of new knowledge and skills. The expanding cadre of teacher coaches in several content areas provides targeted assistance to programs as needs are identified.

The greatest challenges programs have faced in implementing the CCRS are the conditions that are common in adult basic education programs: a predominantly part-time workforce with high staff turnover, lack of sufficient protected time for preparation and professional development, and limited funds. In response, the pilot team members, together with the PDS, are converting the content of the CCRS trainings to online on-demand professional development modules. These modules are on the Pennsylvania Adult Education Resources website and are available to anyone. In addition, the division is using technology to offer training at a distance with additional support from the CCRS coaches. Other challenges include the need for more expertise in math instruction, especially individuals with expertise in math practices, algebraic reasoning, and high school level math, and using the CCRS in ESL instruction. The division is working to increase capacity in both areas.

## **6. Programs for Corrections Education and the Education of Other Institutionalized Individuals (AEFLA Section 225)**

PDE was not able to calculate the relative rate of recidivism for 2015-16. In Pennsylvania, corrections education programming with Title II and matching state funds occurs primarily in county jails. There is no standardized data collection or reporting on recidivism across counties. Some counties in which we provided services, for example Allegheny County, have begun collecting some recidivism data for adults, and we anticipate building on those processes. Other

county jails do not currently report any such data. Furthermore, in counties where recidivism rates are calculated, the initial period is no earlier than six months after release. As a result, PDE will not be able to report recidivism data on individuals served in a given program year until the following calendar year, after the narrative report is due.

The Pennsylvania Department of Corrections (DOC), which oversees the system of 26 state correctional institutions (SCI) in the commonwealth, released a Recidivism Report in 2013. This report provides a comprehensive analysis of recidivism trends among individuals released from the SCIs. PDE will use this data as a general starting point, although the population incarcerated in the SCIs has significant differences to that in county jails. According to the report, the overall recidivism rates for individuals released from SCIs from 2006-2010 are steady. The six-month recidivism rate ranged from 19.9 percent to 20.8 percent. The one-year recidivism rate during the same period ranged from 35 to 37 percent. Overall, “[s]lightly more than half of those who recidivated (rearrested or reincarcerated) within three years actually recidivated within the first year.” (p. 10)

The DOC report measures recidivism rates using three different methods:

- Rearrest is measured as the first instance of arrest after inmates are released from state prison. (p. 4)
- Reincarceration is measured as the first instance of returning to state prison after inmates are released from state prison. (p. 4)
- Overall recidivism is measured as the first instance of any type of rearrest or reincarceration after inmates are released from state prison. (p. 4)

PDE will explore the feasibility of using similar methods for calculating recidivism rates for individuals who participated in section 225 corrections education programming while serving in county jails.