Pennsylvania Narrative Report 2016-17

1. State Leadership Funds (AEFLA Section 223)

The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) Division of Adult Education used 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.

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. For example, in 2016-17, the project lead, working with the state director, provided support to teams of adult basic education programs and local workforce development board staff of three local areas as they developed integrated education and training activities with funding from an innovation grant from the Pennsylvania Department of Labor & Industry (L&I). The support was designed to help the teams understand the required components of integrated education and training activities, to understand and be able to create the required single set of learning objectives, and to ensure that activities function cooperatively and use occupationally relevant instructional materials. To that end, the technical assistance incorporated the *College and Career Readiness Standards for Adult Education (CCRS)* and *Foundation Skills Framework* to ensure that adult education standards and workforce preparation skills were integrated into the objectives.

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 2016-17 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 by providing support related to the creation of integrated education and training activities that meet the employment needs of the local area. These planning sessions involved local partners, including employers.

In addition to its work to help programs align adult education services with other workforce services, the Workforce Project also provides technical assistance and professional development to staff in local programs. In 2016-17, project staff designed and delivered *Developing Career Pathways for Adults Institute, a Virtual Learning Opportunity,* which included three days of online webinars designed for adult education practitioners, workforce development partners, and other interested professionals. More than 400 people from across the state and country attended webinars such as *Preparing Students to Transition to Postsecondary Education*, *Workforce Development Board Overview*, *Supporting Pathways to Employment*, and six more webinars with a focus on workforce and career pathways.

The project also developed several resources, such as the *PA Career Guide Companion*, *Foundation Skills Framework Guide*, and the *Role of the Navigator Companion Guide,* which programs use as standalone resources or as part of larger technical assistance offerings. Project staff developed and scripted virtual tours of resources on the Pennsylvania Adult

Education Resources website. These tours included resources addressing career awareness, case management, contextualized instruction, data, local labor market information, and partnerships.

Pennsylvania's Professional Development System (PDS) is comprised of four federally-funded projects and two state-funded projects. 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. 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 core of the PDS model is the Facilitation and Consultation Services Project. Project staff consists of the state consultant and three lead consultants. The project also contracts 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 implemented this new model for professional development.

The PDS worked closely with the CCRS team (described below), online course instructors, and other professional development facilitators to develop both online and face-to-face formal professional development activities. They offered two face-to-face sessions using the *Student Work Protocol*, one for adult basic education (ABE) teachers and one specifically designed for English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) teachers. In addition, the PDS developed an interactive CCRS foundational training, which was offered simultaneously at six locations across the state through the use of technology. Each location had a coach and was connected via video link to the other locations and to the presenters. In this way, the PDS reached a larger number of participants than would have been practical in a series of traditional face-to-face offerings.

The creation of online, on-demand, self-paced modules began in 2015-16; the PDS used a similar model to redesign the required assessment trainings in 2016-17. In prior years, scheduling for required assessment trainings had been problematic due to the need for new program staff to complete the training quickly. Synchronous offerings did not meet this need. The PDS began to offer several required assessment trainings using an on-demand model, which meant program staff could register at any time and have 30 days to complete the course. The use of facilitators to grade assignments and provide feedback ensures that these courses are rigorous in their requirement of best practices for assessment.

Another new delivery method, the customized-hybrid model, combined professional development components in different ways depending on individual program needs. This model was piloted in 2016-17 using the CCRS *Student Work Protocol*. Programs were assigned a coach to guide them through the process. Programs were then provided a combination of webinar and face-to-face coaching support as well as guided work in their professional learning communities using the previously described on-demand modules.

The shift to on-demand courses and the use of combined external/facilitated resources required sound instructional design to ensure that all offerings were of high quality. PDS projects worked together to create an instructional design plan for each course so that the instruction was engaging and tied to clear objectives, and the courses had assessments that allowed the participant to show achievement of the objectives in measurable ways. In order to support programs in utilizing these new professional learning opportunities, technology staff introduced a single streamlined learning management system (LMS). Prior to the introduction of the new LMS, the PDS used a variety of learning management platforms for courses and course record keeping was housed in a yet another separate web-based application. Using the single platform has made it easier for program staff to access professional learning opportunities and utilize their own course data.

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. In 2016-17, the Access template required extensive updates resulting from changes to the NRS tables and how they were organized. The MIS Project produced monthly agency data check reports for program staff and division advisors to alert them to potential data errors and assisted agencies with preparing data for the end of the program year. Program staff can produce reports for individual teachers and classes to evaluate the impact of program improvement and professional development activities. In 2016-17, reports were revised to provide new data checking features that allowed programs to track participation more closely. 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 included 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 plans 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

After several years of declining enrollment, Pennsylvania had a slight increase (2 percent) in participants in 2016-17. The trend in enrollment in program types over the last three program years shows a steady increase in the number of participants in ESL and a proportionate decrease in the number of participants at the ABE levels. The number of students at the adult secondary education (ASE) levels has remained relatively steady. Over the same period, the percentage of participants age 16-24 decreased from 31 to 28.4 percent, and the percentage and number of individuals age 60 and older increased. Unlike the distribution of participants in the other age groups, which is about two-thirds in ABE/ASE services to one-third in ESL services, more than half of participants age 60 and older are in ESL programs. These trends reflect state trends. Pennsylvania continues to be a key state for refugee resettlement, secondary migration, and family reunification. At the same time, the high school graduation rate is steadily improving, reducing the need among young people to earn a high school equivalency credential.

Pennsylvania's measurable skill gain (MSG) outcome was 45.63 percent, exceeding its target of 44 percent. Analysis of the data shows that this success is due to the expansion of MSG attainment to include "exit program and transition to postsecondary education" and "attainment of a secondary school diploma or equivalent" rather than to an increase in educational functioning level gains based on pre/post-testing. Table 4b trends show that post-testing rates have essentially remained level, and, in fact, dropped from 63 percent in 2015-16 to 61 percent in 2016-17. Furthermore, among post-tested participants over the last four program years, Pennsylvania's EFL gain rates have steadily improved in only two levels, ABE Level 4 and ESL Level 6, both of which had the greatest need for improvement. ABE Levels 1 and 3 show a slight upward trend; ESL Levels 1-5 fluctuated; and ABE Levels 2 and 5 decreased slightly. Interestingly, however, when the new MSG attainment options are included, ABE Level 5 increased from 42 percent in 2015-16 based on pre/post-testing alone to 51.99 percent in 2016-17. This increase was due almost exclusively to students earning a high school equivalency credential; 19.5 percent of participants enrolled at ABE Level 5 showed MSG by high school equivalency attainment versus 9 percent of participants in all of the ABE levels combined.

The introduction of periods of participation in 2016-17 had very little impact on MSG outcomes as a whole. In fact, the number of periods of participation was much lower than analysis of previous years had suggested it would be. The division would like to look more closely at the data to try to identify why; have more programs entered attendance by the week rather than by the month? Have investments in student support services improved student persistence?

As stated above, the overall MSG outcome was 45.63 percent. Breakouts by participant information in Table SPR show that the MSG outcome for participants who identified as Black or African American was 5.6, 2.8, and 6.2 percentage points lower that the MSG results for the other categories with a significant number of participants: White, Hispanic or Latino, and Asian, respectively. Division staff would like to analyze this more closely.

MSG attainment for all employment barrier groups except "English Language Learners, Low Levels of Literacy, Cultural Barriers" was below the overall MSG outcome. This result is not necessarily surprising since the services provided by adult education programs directly address the barriers related to English language and literacy, while they do not directly address the others.

Initial analysis of participant information and MSG outcomes seems to support the division's decision to invest state leadership resources in improving professional development opportunities for ESL teachers after several years of focusing on CCRS implementation.

3. Integration with One-stop Partners

In May 2017, in preparation for the implementation of WIOA one-stop requirements effective July 1, 2017, PDE delegated the required one-stop roles and responsibilities to local providers. All programs that receive federal Title II funds through an *Adult Basic Education Direct Service* grant from the Division of Adult Education are required to be one-stop partners and signatories to the memorandum of understanding (MOU) and must contribute to infrastructure and other costs. This decision was made because the division requires all funded programs to be full service providers, whose participants can benefit from the one-stop system.

In local areas with only one adult basic education provider, that provider is the sole Title II partner and must meet all the roles and responsibilities itself. In local areas with more than one adult basic education provider, providers must work together to agree on how each agency will be involved and to what extent. Involvement and contributions vary depending on the size of the program and its proximity to a one-stop center. The adult basic education programs must ensure that access to adult basic education services and the provision of career services are available at all comprehensive one-stop centers in the area. Not all providers have to participate in all comprehensive one-stop centers, but all comprehensive one-stop centers must have at least one Title II adult education partner providing access to services.

The division held a webinar to prepare providers for the negotiations around MOUs and infrastructure funding agreements (IFAs). The division described the key elements of the MOUs and IFAs and defined infrastructure costs, access to services, career services, proportionate use and relative benefit, and other key terms. The division provided examples of how local programs can contribute to the one-stop system and provide allowable career services, as well as examples of benefits that Title II programs and their participants can receive from the one-stop system. As a result of this webinar, several program administrators reported that they were able to approach the negotiations with confidence and knew more about the process and expectations than the other required partners. One program reported negotiating a decrease in contributions for infrastructure costs in 2017-18 based on documented proportionate use and relative benefit during 2016-17. Other programs were able to negotiate the use of their space for remote access for one-stop services in areas not served by a brick-and-mortar one-stop center.

Because WIOA requirements for MOUs and IFAs were not in place for 2016-17, local 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 $209,999 in Title II funds and $80,671 in state funds to cover infrastructure costs at 27 one-stop centers in Pennsylvania.

In 2016-17, there were 31 grantees that offered some level of adult basic education services at 38 one-stop centers. This represents 57 percent of the funded adult basic education programs. 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 to transition to postsecondary education or training. Services were available through classroom

instruction, small group instruction, and one-on-one tutoring. Program staff further supported one-stop activities by assisting with intake, orientation, assessment, career awareness and workforce preparation activities, and case management support. At some one-stop centers, adult education program staff handled the administration of basic skills assessments for clients in all of the one-stop partner programs. At several 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 $1.05 million.

In addition to providing instructional and career services at brick-and-mortar one-stop centers, seven adult education providers report that they have partnered with local boards to serve as remote access sites, referred to as "Mobile PA CareerLink®" sites in some local areas. One program reported that this collaboration resulted in an additional 150 referrals to one-stop services during 2016-17. In another local area, the adult basic education provider is located more than one hour from the comprehensive one-stop center. The provider worked with the one-stop staff to have the one-stop's *Welcome Aboard Orientation* provided at all of its class sites.

During 2016, the Northwest Local Workforce Area experienced a series of layoffs precipitated by reduced production at and eventual closing of a major manufacturing site. Adult basic education providers in the area were essential to addressing the needs of the affected workers. The five programs in the area worked together to serve approximately 500 dislocated workers. They provided initial basic skills assessment and then enrolled the individuals who decided to participate in adult basic education classes.

Another example of close collaboration among adult basic education providers and local board and one-stop staff occurred under the umbrella of an innovation grant from L&I to a group of three local workforce boards to provide integrated education and training activities to dislocated workers. Teams worked together to identify appropriate training opportunities, research employment opportunities, and plan and develop integrated education and training activities. The L&I grant funds covered the costs of attending formal professional development for the teams regarding the development of integrated education and training activities, including staff time and travel costs for staff from the adult education programs, as well as planning time. The training portion of the integrated education and training activities was paid with L&I grant funds, while the adult basic education and workforce preparation components were provided by the programs with their regular grant funding. Two of the activities were provided during 2016-17; the rest are planned for 2017-18 or are still in development.

PDE continues to work with L&I to ensure that each of the 22 local workforce development boards have at least one representative from an entity receiving Title II and/or matching state adult basic and family literacy funds. Twelve of the 22 representatives work directly with the adult education program in their agencies. The rest are higher level management at agencies receiving adult basic education funding. Staff from adult basic education programs also serve on board committees and subcommittees for administration, programing, youth, and career pathways, among others. In addition to Title II representation on the local boards, adult basic education providers regularly report 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 2016-17, PDE continued to implement 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 2016-17, 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 provided 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 2016-17, eleven people completed the course. One participant reported gaining an understanding of the importance of teaching about pivotal moments in American history, rather than focusing on isolated historical events, and said that this shift made the content of the lessons more relevant to the students.

To improve understanding of the requirements of IELCE programs, the Division of Adult Education created a recorded module that explains the integrated English literacy and civics education activity and the integrated education and training activity individually and then explains how the two are combined in the IELCE program. The division also revised the *Integrated Education and Training (IET) Checklist* developed by OCTAE for Pennsylvania programs to use when planning integrated education and training activities. The *IET Checklist* was incorporated into the module.

One division staff member worked with the Workforce Development System Liaison Project, described above, to conduct a review of currently funded programs to identify any that had components of an ESL-based integrated education and training activity in place. After an initial survey, the team selected five programs for a case study. The team conducted focus groups and observations to determine if there were any best practices or possible models underway in Pennsylvania. They identified one program that was very close to meeting the requirement; that program's pilot is described below. The results of the case study also informed the division's decisions on professional development for section 243 programs in 2017-18 and clarified the need for more technical assistance in the development of integrated education and training activities, especially on the topic of employer engagement.

The Workforce Project also supported efforts to implement section 243 IELCE through several of its activities. Project staff provided agency-specific technical assistance on developing integrated education and training activities, working with workforce partners, and using local labor market data to programs. Thirteen of the 16 agencies that receive section 243 funds took advantage of this opportunity. Project staff also conducted a one-day face-to-face session called *Skilled Immigrants: The Role of English-as-a-Second-Language and Adult Basic Education Programs* to address the role of adult education programs in serving skilled immigrants. The session included a presentation on national trends for skilled immigrants, a panel of three programs that serve skilled immigrants using innovative models and support systems, and a presentation on best practices for accelerating English language skills. Participants then created action plans to pilot strategies to serve skilled immigrants in their programs. Staff from nine of the 16 agencies participated in that session.

EL/Civics programs continued to evaluate the need and opportunities for section 243 IELCE programs in their service areas and to plan and prepare to be able to provide IELCE with integrated education and training. Programs reviewed their services to identify aspects of their current program that support readiness to implement IELCE programs. They also identified deficiencies in their current programing and activities that they need to add in order to offer a

compliant program. Several programs incorporated workforce preparation activities into EL/Civics classes in a more deliberate and transparent manner. One program had IELCE students research and select potential career pathways, identify steps necessary to achieve those paths, and research postsecondary education and training programs related to those career pathways. 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. Programs are working to better connect ESL students to the local one-stop centers; however, they report challenges in this area, because many one-stop center staff are inexperienced at working with individuals who do not speak English fluently. This is an area for future cross training.

Several programs have taken greater steps toward developing integrated education and training activities. They have met with employers and/or local board staff to identify employment opportunities appropriate for the IELCE target population that could be supported by an IELCE program with an integrated education and training activity. One program worked closely with its local board and identified Microsoft Office certification as a training option. The local board noted an increase in the need for office support staff in the local workforce area, which has branches of several international companies. The program applied for and received a grant requesting funding to support a Microsoft Office certification course and began developing an integrated education and training activity to support participants in the IELCE program. The division has since approved the plan for the activity.

Another program piloted an integrated occupational and ESL curriculum with ESL students seeking employment and training as home health aides. The program blended vocational ESL instruction, civics, occupational training, and workforce preparation. Participants who completed the program received the Home Health Aide Certificate of Completion and CPR/First Aid Certification and were able to function as home health aides by demonstrating appropriate and effective communication skills and applying basic principles of infection control and assisting with basic emergency procedures. Students also participated in mock job interviews prior to completing the course. Taught by a vocational ESL instructor and a registered nurse/Home Health Aide instructor, the course included home health aide health care and services theory, hands-on caregiving skills in a lab setting, and ESL instruction to support vocabulary acquisition and communication skills. The pilot program has since been reviewed and revised with support from the Workforce Project using the *IET Checklist*. The Division of Adult Education approved the revised framework, which officially launched in 2017-18.

One of the greatest challenges to creating viable IELCE programs across the state has been the variation in the strength of the relationships between the adult basic education programs and their local workforce boards and other workforce partners. Greater progress is being made in areas with strong relationships. In those areas, the adult education programs work with local board staff and employers to identify realistic employment opportunities that serve as the starting point for planning for integrated education and training activities. In areas with weak or nonexistent relationships, the adult education programs are not successfully identifying relevant employment or training. This observation informed the development of the professional development that EL/Civics programs are required to participate in during 2017-18.

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. and 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 first workshop the pilot team attended focused on lesson revision, alignment of resources, and completing the lesson study process. Based on their experiences using the materials at their local programs, 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. The CCRS implementation work formed the basis of the program improvement/professional development activities for the year, as it had in the prior year.

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

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 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)

Pennsylvania uses both federal section 225 funds and state Act 143 funds to provide adult basic education services in correctional facilities and other institutions. In 2016-17, there were 19 agencies that provided adult education and literacy activities in 23 county jails through 42 ABE/ASE/HSE prep classes and six ESL classes plus some small group and one-on-one tutoring instruction. One program provided ABE services in a community-based class to individuals on work release.

PDE was not able to calculate the relative rate of recidivism for 2016-17. There is no common definition or standardized data collection or reporting on recidivism across counties. Some counties in which services are provided, such as Allegheny County, have begun collecting some recidivism data for adults; the division anticipates building on those processes. Other county jails do not currently report any such data. Another challenge to reporting recidivism data is the time period used. Generally, the initial reporting period is no earlier than six months after release. As a result, PDE will not be able to report recidivism data on all individuals served and released in a given program year.

During 2016-17, division staff identified a unique identifier to use for data matching at the state level to determine the recidivism rate. The State Identification (SID) Number is assigned the first time an individual is arrested and fingerprinted and remains with the individual. A database tracks individuals based on that identifier. PDE will need to identify a state agency with access to that database to conduct the data matching on behalf of PDE.

To support the division's work in determining the relative rate of recidivism, PDE established additional requirements for agencies providing corrections education services. Agencies must enter into a signed MOU with each correctional facility in which they provide services. In the MOUs, the correctional facility must agree to allow services to be provided per division policy; to provide the agency with SID numbers for all participants in the corrections education program; and to support the agency to meet any other requirements related to reporting on recidivism rates. The e-Data v2 system, the NRS data collection system for Pennsylvania, has been adapted to allow for the collection of SID numbers.