



**National Adult Education Professional Development Consortium, Inc.**

# **State Adult Education Management and Leadership Functions:**

## **A Self Assessment**

Dr. Lennox L. McLendon

© Copyright 2000 by the National Adult Education Professional Development Consortium, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system without permission in writing from the publisher.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The National Adult Education Professional Development Consortium (NAEPDC) was incorporated in 1990 to fulfill a desire of the state adult education staff to enhance their professional development. Organized by the state directors of adult education, NAEPDC has four main purposes:

- To coordinate, develop and conduct programs of professional development for state adult education staffs;
- To serve as a catalyst for public policy review and development related to adult education;
- To disseminate information on the field of adult education; and
- To maintain a visible presence for the state adult education program in our nation's capitol.

The Consortium is governed by an Executive Committee.

### **Executive Committee:**

Israel David Mendoza, Chair (WA),  
Mary Ann Jackson, Past Chair (WI), K Brisbane (DC),  
Garland Hankins (AR), Cheryl Keenan (PA), Roberta Pawloski (CT), Kathi Polis (WV), Sandra Robinson (VT), Linda Warner (IN), Randy Whitfield (NC), Leatrice Williams (FL)

The Self Assessment and its annual updating is the responsibility of the Professional Development Committee.

### **Professional Development Committee**

Kathi Polis (WV), Chair  
Patricia Bennett (MD), Becky Bird (MT), Mary Ann Jackson (WI), Roberta Pawloski (CT), Eloise Richardson (MS), Naomi Scales (AL), Sharlene Walker (OR),  
Linda Warner (IN)

The staff manages the work of the Consortium.

**Executive Director:** Dr. Lennox L. McLendon

**Policy Analyst:** Garrett Murphy

**Executive Assistant:** Brenda K. James

# Table of Contents

<b>Part I.</b>	<b>An Overview of the State Director's <i>Self Assessment</i></b>	<b>1-5</b>
	• <b>DON'T PANIC !!!!</b>	<b>1</b>
	• <b>The Purpose of the Self Assessment</b>	<b>1</b>
	• <b>How this Self Assessment will be used</b>	<b>2-3</b>
	• <b>The Rating System</b>	<b>4</b>
	• <b>A Fluid Document</b>	<b>5</b>
	• <b>A Flexible Document</b>	<b>5</b>
	• <b>Functions/Systems</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Part II.</b>	<b>The Self Assessment Locator</b>	<b>6-8</b>
<b>Part III.</b>	<b>The Program Functions Self Assessment</b>	<b>9-28</b>

## Part I. Overview

### Adult Education State Program Management and Leadership Functions Self Assessment

#### **DON'T PANIC !!! "You do not have to be perfect to be good."**

As this Self Assessment will attest, State Directors of Adult Education have very complex jobs. This document lists the major job functions you are to perform. Each function is accompanied by a number of elements. Few if any State Directors perform all functions and elements to the maximum. However, **THAT IS YOUR GOAL**. Therefore, as you read through the Self Assessment and evaluate your satisfaction with the various systems under your watch care, resist the urge to become overwhelmed. Repeat "You do not have to be perfect to be good." But you do have to strive for perfection.

Likewise, you cannot fix everything at once. By prioritizing and approaching program improvement ***strategically***, your program can evolve. At the conclusion of your Self Assessment, you will be asked to identify ***one or two program functions/systems*** that you want to improve. Our role at NAEPDC is to support you and your selected program improvement initiatives using a variety of resources. At the end of your tenure as State Director, you will leave a much-improved system as your legacy.

The State Director of Adult Education has an ever-changing job. Job functions evolve to meet changing federal and state legislation, state leadership needs, and student demographics. Thus, the attached listing of State Director's job functions is a ***slice in time*** and will change as the environment in which you work changes. Suggestions for updating the functions are expected and welcomed.

#### **The Purpose of the Self Assessment**

Using the Self Assessment, a State Director identifies program management and leadership needs in the state. The top ***two priorities*** are reported to NAEPDC. The Consortium matches states with similar needs creating a topical study group. Using the Fall NAEPDC Training Institute, NAEPDC supported conference calls, email, and other venues, the study group members investigate options and plans to implement state initiatives. The study group members support each other as consultants and fellow investigators. Each state director will develop a ***program improvement initiative unique to his/her state***, but colleagues who are focused on the same job function, can help:

- identify and consider options,
- react and respond to draft plans,
- consult via telephone or email throughout the development and implementation, and
- plan victory celebrations.

The Self Assessment also identifies those who have developed ***expertise***. Therein, directors and their staff members with specific expertise become mentors for other states and the study groups.

## How this Self Assessment will be used?

The Self Assessment is a ***reflective activity***--the State Director reflects upon the systems in place to determine if he/she is ***satisfied with each system's performance***. As the State Director reviews the list of program management and leadership functions, he/she places a check in the rating column to the right. By doing so, he/she rates his/her satisfaction with the performance of each function and its elements. The Self Assessment is designed for the State Director to complete on his/her own. However, it can be used with state staff members or with practitioner advisory committees if he/she would like. Here are your five steps:

Step 1. ***Prop up your Feet***: You probably have not taken much time to think about all the functions you perform and all the systems you manage in your job. So, your first step is to take about thirty to forty-five minutes -- when you can find some quiet time-- and read through the Self Assessment from cover to cover.

Step 2. ***The Self Assessment Locator***: A "Locator," found on page 6, is the starting place. This macro level assessment determines the systems that are working and those that need attention. You can also indicate the macro level functions in which you and your staff members have expertise by checking the "Mentor" column.

Step 3. ***Program Functions Self Assessment***: The Self Assessment Locator directs you to the Program Functions Self Assessment which enables you to do a ***more detailed assessment of the function(s) that need attention***. This detailed assessment helps pinpoint the elements of each system that needs attention.

Step 4. ***Telephone Survey***: You will receive a call from NAEPDC to identify the program management and leadership functions you feel need attention in your state. You can also report those functions for which you or your staff can be Mentors to others.

Step 5. ***Developing a Program Improvement Initiative***: When you have identified the program improvement priorities for your state, you can select a number of options for assistance (choose as many as you need).

### Options for Assistance with Program Improvement Initiatives:

Option 1. ***Peer Matching/Study Groups***: If there are a number of states that select the same program development initiative, NAEPDC can facilitate your forming a Study Group with your peers. In this Study Group, you will have peers with similar needs to discuss issues, options, and plans as you develop and implement your unique initiative.

NAEPDC will also identify state staff to serve as Mentors for you. If consultants/experts from outside our system are needed to help you plan, implement, and evaluate your initiative, NAEPDC will help locate those consultants and explore available funding to support their contributions to your initiative.

Option 2. ***Individual Mentoring and Support***. If you prefer to forge ahead on your program improvement initiative individually, without involvement in a Study Group, NAEPDC can be a resource by identifying possible Mentors, locating other resources, and providing staff consultations as you develop, implement, and evaluate your program improvement plan.

Option 3. ***Fall Training Institute***: At the NAEPDC Fall Training Institute, you and the members of your study group will have a chance to meet together and access experienced state directors and staff (Mentors) or consultants/experts to advise you. In consultation with these experts and your colleagues in the work group, you will develop a program improvement plan that meets your state's needs.

In addition, at the Institute experienced colleagues will conduct training sessions in "Going to Scale" which provides a system for taking a program improvement need and carrying it to state-wide implementation--Going to Scale.

Option 4. ***Ongoing Study Group Consultation***: In addition to individual consultation with mentors and study group members, NAEPDC will support regular conference calls between the study group members. These conference calls are a chance to seek advice on problems that have arisen and share successes as they occur.

Option 5. ***Optional CoABE Study Group Meeting***: It is always good to meet face-to-face with your study group using some concentrated time to update plans and problem solve. NAEPDC will facilitate study groups getting together at CoABE or USDOE sponsored spring meetings of State Directors.

Choose all options that will be helpful for you.

Some program improvement plans take two years to implement and should not be rushed. Some take less time. Each summer the Self Assessment will be reissued to State Directors to determine if additional program improvement initiatives are needed and appropriate.

## The Rating System

The rating system is based on the State Director's satisfaction with the performance. The rating system is as follows:

- Mentor**      The State Director feels that this function works really well and either he/she, a staff member or contractor could serve as a mentor to other states in this area.
  
- Competent**    The State Director is satisfied with this function and feels it does not need attention at this time.
  
- Shaky**        The State Director is reasonably satisfied with this function but it is not working exceptionally well. It will need help in the near future or needs to have a preemptive program improvement effort.
  
- HELP!!!**      The State Director is not satisfied with this function. It needs immediate help.

This general rating system is meant to encourage State Directors to assess their management and leadership functions without a complicated assessment system. Because of the diversity among states, it is rare to find a rating system to objectively apply to all states. Thus, the option is to use the subjective rating of the State Director.

## **A Fluid Document**

Your suggestions for additions, deletions, and clarifications for the functions and elements in this Self Assessment are appreciated. The Adult Education State Director's job is a complex, ever-changing one. Thus, each iteration of this document will change to reflect the fluidity of the job.

## **A Flexible Document**

For each job function, a series of critical elements are listed. Elements that are not appropriate for a state can simply be crossed out. At the end of the lists are blanks for the State Director to add other elements that are used to fulfill that function. This is a private document for the State Director to use. It will not be collected or tabulated. Its intent is to stimulate thinking and, more importantly, to evoke questioning.

## **Functions/Systems**

Just a note about terminology. You will notice an almost interchangeable use of two words: functions and systems. A function of a State Director is to build systems, not isolated program components. For example, a function of the State Director is to build a professional development system. Thus, the Self Assessment uses "function" when looking from the State Director's perspective and "system" when looking at the program improvement perspective.



<h2 style="margin: 0;">Part II</h2> <h1 style="margin: 0;">The Self Assessment Locator</h1>	<i>M E N T O R</i>	<i>C O M P E T E N T *</i>	<i>S H A K Y ~ ~</i>	<i>H E L P ! ! !</i>
---	--	--	--	--

<p>The Assessment Locator allows a state director to determine which major job function needs attention.</p> <p>Step 1. Complete the Assessment Locator</p> <p>Step 2. Turn to the page identified to do a more diagnostic assessment of the functions that are "Shaky" or need "HELP!"</p>				
<b>I. Annual Program Planning Systems</b>				
<p>How do you feel about your history of including all stakeholders in identifying, updating, and prioritizing student, staff, and program needs? If you don't feel good, turn to page 10 for a more detailed analysis.</p>				
<b>II. Program Management Systems</b>				
<p>A. Program Accountability Systems: How do you feel about your data system's ability (and the staff's understanding and use of it) to get you, program managers, and teachers the information needed to make program improvements and complete required reports? If you are concerned about this system, turn to page 12 for a more detailed analysis.</p>				
<p>B. Professional Development Systems: How do you feel about your professional development system's ability to prepare new teachers and tutors early; meet the professional development needs of all teachers, program managers, and state staff; and give you the results you need? If you are concerned about this system, turn to page 14 for a more detailed analysis.</p>				
<p>C. Financial Systems: How do you feel about the way the budget system is working? Are you comfortable that the proper amount and percentages are in the correct categories and that carry-over monies are distributed properly? Are you satisfied with your funding formula or other system for allocation of funds? Do your financial reports work for you? If you are concerned about this system, turn to page 15 for a more detailed analysis.</p>				

## Part II The Self Assessment Locator

*M  
E  
N  
T  
O  
R*

*C  
O  
M  
P  
E  
T  
E  
N  
T  
\**

*S  
H  
A  
K  
Y  
~  
~*

*H  
E  
L  
P  
!  
!  
!*

<p>D. Staffing Your Office and Staffing at the Local/Regional Level: Do you have staff/contractors organized to meet the changing state needs? Do you have the local staffing to accomplish your goals? If you are concerned about this system, turn to page 16 for a more detailed analysis.</p>				
<p>E. Local Program Application System: How do you feel about the timeliness of getting applications out of and returned to your office? Are localities satisfied with the documents and the processes? If you are concerned about this system, turn to page 17 for a more detailed analysis.</p>				
<p>F. Marketing and Student Recruitment: How do you feel about your ability to carry out state level promotional efforts? If you are concerned about this system, turn to page 18 for a more detailed analysis.</p>				
<p>G. Instructional/Retention System: Good instruction means good retention. How do you feel about the instructional system's ability to meet adult needs and support them staying enrolled long enough to reach their goals? If you are concerned about this system, turn to page 19 for a more detailed analysis</p>				
<p><b>III. Program Leadership</b></p>				
<p>A. "Going to Scale:" How successful have you been in designing and implementing statewide initiatives to improve the quality of adult education services? If you are concerned about this system, turn to page 22 for a more detailed analysis.</p>				
<p>B. Coordinating Funding Streams and Supporting Services (e.g., Family Literacy, Workplace Education, and Corrections Education). How do you feel about your efforts in bringing together funding sources to the mutual benefit of students and the expectations of the other funding source? If you are concerned about this system, turn to page 24 for a more detailed analysis.</p>				
<p>C. State and Local Coordination in Support of Adult Education in One-Stop Services: How do you feel</p>				

## Part II

# The Self Assessment Locator

*M  
E  
N  
T  
O  
R*

*C  
O  
M  
P  
E  
T  
E  
N  
T  
\**

*S  
H  
A  
K  
Y  
~  
~*

*H  
E  
L  
P  
!  
!  
!*

<p>about your efforts to develop clear strategies with the one-stop partners at the state level and communicating those procedures to local program managers? If you are concerned about this system, turn to page 25 for a more detailed analysis.</p>				
<p>D. Leveraging Staff Expertise and Professional Development Resources through State Leadership Funds: How do you feel about opportunities to develop co-funded leadership activities with other states? If you are concerned about this system, turn to page 26 for a more detailed analysis.</p>				
<p>E. Developing a Performance Funding System: If you are interested in developing a performance-based funding system, how comfortable are you with developing that process? If you have developed a performance-based system, how do you feel about its efficiency and its efficacy? If you are concerned about this system, turn to page 27 for a more detailed analysis.</p>				
<p>F. Distance Learning/Non-Classroom Delivery: If you are contemplating the development of a distance learning system, how comfortable are you with developing that system? If you are concerned about this system, turn to page 28 for a more detailed analysis.</p>				

## **Part III**

# **The Program Functions Self Assessment**

This section is the detailed Self Assessment for each Program Management and Leadership Function. Feel free to strike any elements that do not fit your state system. Likewise, feel free to add elements that you have in place.

When you complete the Locator, you may have identified some of your systems that you feel are "Shaky" or need "Help." Part III contains a more detailed assessment of each.

<b><u>Function/System</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>I. Program Planning</b>	10-11
<b>II. Program Management</b>	12-21
A. Program Accountability Systems	12-13
B. Professional Development Systems	14
C. Financial Systems	15
D. Staffing Systems	16
E. Local Program Application Systems	17
F. Marketing and Student Recruitment Systems	18
G. Instructional/Retention Systems	19-21
<b>III. Program Leadership</b>	22-28
A. Going to Scale	22-23
B. Coordinating Funding Streams	24
C. State and Local Coordination in One-Stop Services	25
D. Leveraging Staff Expertise and Professional Development	26
E. Developing a Performance Funding System	27
F. Distance Learning/Non-Classroom Delivery Systems	28

<h2>Part III</h2> <h3>Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

<b>I. Annual Program Planning</b> (How satisfied are you with the periodic updates of your state plan?)				
<b>A. Needs Assessment</b> (How do I determine the student, staff, community needs in my state? Do I keep up with the "needs" of our funders including state and federal governments? How well do I use these sources to identify and clarify program needs?)				
1. Students (directly and indirectly)				
2. Teachers (paid and volunteer)				
3. Local Program Managers				
4. My Superiors				
5. Conferences				
6. Professional Organizations				
7. State/National Data and Research (e.g., USDOE, NIFL, NAEPDC)				
8. My Partner Agencies (e.g., Labor, Social Services, Literacy Coalition)				
9. My Partner Stakeholders (e.g., Business, Labor, Civic Organizations, Faith Organizations)				
10. Annual Performance Reports				
11. Formal Evaluations already completed				
12. State Staff Members				
13.				
14.				
15.				
<b>B. Setting Priorities</b> (How do I determine which needs to address? How well do I involve these stakeholders in analyzing the needs identified above and recommending priorities?)				
1. Students				
2. Teachers (paid and volunteer)				
3. Local Program Managers				
4. My Superiors				

<b>Part III Functions/Systems</b>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
---------------------------------------	--	--	--	----------------------------------

5. My Partner Agencies (e.g., Labor, Social Services, Literacy Coalition)				
6. My Partner Stakeholders (e.g., Business, Labor, Civic Organizations, Faith Organizations)				
7. State Staff Members				
8.				
9.				
10.				
C. Collaboration with Title I Plan Development (How successful am I at getting to the table with Title I and other partners?)(See III G)				
1.				
2.				
3.				

<h2>Part III</h2> <h3>Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

<b>II. Program Management</b> (How satisfied am I with the results of these system components?)				
<b>A. Program Accountability System</b> (Does your accountability system use data from your performance indicators to improve the quality of your services? Are you pleased with the accuracy of the data you are getting? Are you pleased with how teachers and program managers are using data to make program improvements? How do you feel your accountability system fares on these criteria?)				
1. Your system ensures quality assessment procedures are used by all teachers that include strategies and instruments for:				
a. standardized testing				
b. performance-based assessment				
c. project learners				
d.				
e.				
f.				
2. Your system provides accurate data at the classroom, program, and state levels.				
3. Your system provides <b>teachers the support and time they need</b> to analyze the data and make program changes to improve performance.				
4. <b>Teachers use performance data</b> to improve their instructional services.				
5. Your system provides <b>local program managers the support they need</b> to analyze the data and make program changes to improve performance.				
6. <b>Local program managers use performance data</b> to improve program services.				
7. <b>State staff uses performance data</b> to recommend program changes to improve				

<b>Part III</b> <b>Functions/Systems</b>	<i>M</i> <i>E</i> <i>N</i> <i>T</i> <i>O</i> <i>R</i>	<i>C</i> <i>O</i> <i>M</i> <i>P</i> <i>E</i> <i>T</i> <i>E</i> <i>N</i> <i>T</i> <i>*</i>	<i>S</i> <i>H</i> <i>A</i> <i>K</i> <i>Y</i> ~ ~	<i>H</i> <i>E</i> <i>L</i> <i>P</i> ! !
---	--	--	--	--

performance.				
8. Your system provides the state staff with student follow-up data from data matching, student follow-up survey, or other methods.				
9. Your system provides necessary data for state and federal reports.				
10.				
11.				
12.				



<h2>Part III</h2> <h3>Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

B. Professional Development Systems (Does your professional development system prepare and update all staff? Does your system incorporate a variety of learning strategies and opportunities that accommodate the learning styles, differences, and preferences of your teachers and program managers? How do you feel your Professional Development System fares on these criteria?)				
1. Provides Preservice training for all new teachers.				
2. Provides training for all teachers in new accountability requirements.				
3. Provides Professional Development opportunities for all teachers that support other state needs, priorities, and initiatives.				
4. Provides Professional Development opportunities that <b>meet individual teacher's learning needs.</b>				
5. Provides Professional Development opportunities that meet <b>individual program manager's learning needs.</b>				
6. Engages all staff members in each program in an end-of-year evaluative staff meeting to recommend program improvements.				
7. Provides Professional Development opportunities that meet <b>individual state staff member's learning needs.</b>				
8. Collects, analyzes, and reports the impact of professional development activities.				
9.				
10.				
11.				

<h2>Part III</h2> <h3>Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

<p>C. Financial Systems: (Is all of your state and federal money in the right place? Are you pleased with your allocation system? Are your financial reports clean and on time? Do they give you information to help make financial decisions? How do you feel your financial system fares on these criteria?)</p>				
1. All funds are budgeted to the proper category (e.g., administration, state leadership).				
2. Carry-over money is allocated correctly.				
3. Your funding formula or other system of allocating funds to localities receives few complaints.				
4. Your financial reports balance with very little manipulation.				
5. You have the information you need to make good financial decisions.				
6.				
7.				
8.				

<h2>Part III</h2> <h3>Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

D. Staffing your Office and Staffing at the Regional and/or Local Levels. (Do you have the staff/contractors organized to meet the state's needs? Do you have local staff to meet legislative requirements and opportunities and to carry out statewide initiatives? How do you feel your staffing system fares on these criteria?)				
1. State staff members are up-to-date on adult education issues and trends.				
2. State staff members have expertise in their areas of responsibility.				
3. State staff assignments are targeted to the major needs in the state.				
4. State staff members have a thorough understanding of adult education systems enabling you to reassign them as the needs change.				
5. Staffing structure for program administration (management) is effective at the:				
a) state level				
b) regional level				
6. Staffing structure for instructional personnel is adequate at the local level.				
7. An effective system exists for attracting, retaining, and certifying qualified adult education instructional personnel.				
8.				
9.				
10.				

<h2 style="margin: 0;">Part III</h2> <h3 style="margin: 0;">Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

E. Local Program Application System (Are you satisfied with the timeliness and responsiveness of local applications? How does your local program application system fare on these criteria?)				
1. Local application materials get out of our office in a timely manner each funding cycle.				
2. Local applications are tied to performance measures and reinforce performance evaluation.				
3. Local applications are returned with few errors.				
4. Staff/Reviewers find the local applications easy to review.				
5. Approved applications are returned to localities in a timely manner.				
6.				
7.				
8.				

<h2>Part III</h2> <h3>Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

<p>F. Marketing and Student Recruitment (Adult Education is different from K-12 because you have to market your services.) If you feel it is the state's role to market and recruit, how do you feel about your promotional efforts? How successful have you been at these targeted efforts?</p>				
<p>2. Potential Students: Recruitment strategies targeted at potential students increase enrollment.</p>				
<p>3. Referral Agencies: Information and referral agencies (e.g., social services, public health) show how adult education can help them meet their objectives and as a result they refer students to your services.</p>				
<p>4. Captive Audiences: Strategies customized to groups of potential students with common situations or interest such as jails, prisons, group homes, churches, and businesses result in collaborative classes.</p>				
<p>5. General Population: Because "word of mouth" is a reliable source of students, strategies targeted at the general population to inform them of the need and the benefits and generate enrollment.</p>				
<p>6. Decision/Policy Makers: Strategies targeted at those who control the public funds to inform them of the need and benefits of adult education services yield increased resources and support for adult education services.</p>				
<p>7.</p>				
<p>8.</p>				
<p>9.</p>				

<h2>Part III</h2> <h3>Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

<p>G. Instructional/Retention System: Good instruction means good retention. How do you feel about the instructional system that you have in place that ensures that adults are treated like adults, their needs are addressed, and they proceed toward their short term and long-term goals? How do you feel about these pieces of your Instructional/Retention System?</p> <p>Perhaps you should do this section four (4) times. One for each of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic Skills</li> <li>ESL</li> <li>Family Literacy</li> <li>Workplace Education:</li> </ul>				
<b>1. Student Intake:</b>				
<b>a. Initial Interview:</b> Your instructional system has time for the initial interview to (1) determine the learner's reason for coming and (2) describe the expectations and how adult education is different from K-12.				
<b>b. Assessment:</b> Your instructional system has clear directions for use of locator, placement, diagnostic and learning style strategies and instruments.				
<b>c. Curriculum Framework:</b> Your system has a curriculum and scope and sequence resources for teachers to draw on to help students structure their individual learning plans.				
<b>d. Post Assessment/Plan Development:</b> Your instructional system has clear guidance for reviewing assessment results with the learner and mutually developing a plan of work.				

<h2>Part III</h2> <h3>Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

e. WIA Goals: Your system has clear guidance for teachers to identify the WIA performance indicator-related goal (e.g. educational gains, postsecondary, job attainment or retention, training, secondary credential) for each student.				
f. Climate Setting: Your instructional system has clear guidance for establishing a comfortable physical and psychological climate for adult learners.				
g. Curriculum Crosswalks: Your system has crosswalks to curriculum frameworks in K-12 standards, SCANS, EFF, GED, High School Assessments and other curricula with which your program interacts.				
h.				
i.				
j.				
2. Instruction: Your instructional systems involve staff and students in evaluating success and making program improvements based on that evaluation.				
a. Benchmarks: Your instructional system has clear guidance for teachers and students to meet individually every "x" hours of instruction to evaluate the materials used and reevaluate and redesign the student's study plan.				
b. Teacher Time Out: Your instructional system has scheduled time for teachers and tutors to analyze program/classroom performance data to determine what is working and what is not				

<h2>Part III</h2> <h3>Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

and make mid-program adjustments.				
c. LD support: Your instructional system has a support system for teachers and tutors to help them accommodate adults with learning disabilities.				
d.				
e.				
f.				
<b>3. Instructional Evaluation:</b>				
a. Program Manager's Role: Your instructional system has clear guidance and expectations for the Program Manager's role as instructional leader that includes class visitation and observation (peers or program manager), monthly review of performance indicator reports and print outs, intervention strategies for teachers in need, and an Evaluative Staff Meeting at the end of the year that involves all staff in evaluating services and recommending program improvements.				
b. Continuous Improvement: Your instructional system has clear guidance and expectations developed with the Program Managers that contain the structural support from your office to support continuous improvement.				
c.				
d.				



<h2>Part III</h2> <h3>Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

<p>III. <b>Program Leadership</b> (Staying ahead of the curve is difficult. Leadership denotes being knowledgeable of upcoming needs, seeking and adapting options to meet those needs, and taking them "to scale" throughout the state. How satisfied are you with these current leadership functions?)</p>				
<p><b>(Functions A-E are based on the work of the NAEPDC National Programs Workgroup as synthesized by Judy Alamprese)</b></p>				
<p>A. "Going to Scale" (How successful are you at designing and implementing statewide initiatives to improve the quality of adult education services? How satisfied are you with your project management system that monitors and supports the steps below? How have you fared in these steps?)</p>				
<p>1. engaging practitioners and partners in identifying and clarifying the program areas that need improvement and prioritizing and selecting the need to address</p>				
<p>2. setting goals, outcomes, and expectations for a program improvement initiative</p>				
<p>3. costing and budgeting the program improvement initiative</p>				
<p>4. setting six month bench marks</p>				
<p>5. gathering and selecting promising alternatives and/or options for addressing the need</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• other State Directors and state staff members</li> <li>• state resource centers</li> <li>• the National Center for the Study of Adult Literacy and Learning</li> <li>• the National Institute for Literacy and their LINC's Hubs</li> <li>• the National Center for Adult Literacy</li> </ul>				

<h2>Part III</h2> <h3>Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the National Center for Family Literacy</li> <li>• the National Center for Learning Disabilities</li> <li>• ERIC</li> <li>• Other national resources</li> </ul>				
6. piloting and adapting those alternatives and/or options to fit the state and its systems				
7. linking the initiative to other state initiatives to gain political support				
8. designing and placing the staff development requirements				
9. designing and placing the support and resource requirements				
10. bringing on the first wave of programs				
11. measuring impact based on established goals and tweaking the system				
12. bringing on subsequent waves of programs				
13. measuring impact based on established goals and tweaking the system				
14. fully integrating the initiative--"Go to Scale"				
15. measuring impact based to established goals, and celebrating success				
16.				
17.				
18.				

<h2 style="margin: 0;">Part III</h2> <h3 style="margin: 0;">Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

<p>B. Coordinating Funding Streams and Supporting Services (e.g., Family Literacy, Workplace Literacy, Corrections Education) Adult learning happens in a context. Other funding sources either support adult education services or collaborative services that make learning more meaningful to the learner. How satisfied are you with your success in identifying those other funding streams and integrating them with yours? How well do you work with other partner agencies and organizations? How satisfied are you with these elements of your system?</p>				
1. Identifying other funding streams that complement adult education services.				
2. Learning the priorities of each and where those priorities match with yours.				
3. Learning the "language" and limitations of the funding stream.				
4. Identifying the key person in the funding stream management; the most approachable, the most informed about adult education, the risk taker who has enough authority to commit and act.				
5. Developing common purposes and compatible expectations and committing them to a memorandum of agreement.				
6. Negotiating with Budget and Finance to coordinate intra-agency or inter-agency funding.				
7. Monitoring and reporting success to satisfy each partner.				
8. Celebrating success involving the CEOs of each partner.				
9.				
10.				
11.				

<h2 style="margin: 0;">Part III</h2> <h3 style="margin: 0;">Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

<p>C. State and Local Coordination in Support of Adult Education in One-Stop Services (Have you developed clear strategies with the One-Stop partners at the state level and communicated those procedures to local ABE program managers? How satisfied are you with the collaboration with your partners? Have you communicated clear guidance to your local program managers? How satisfied are you with your progress in the following areas?)</p>				
1. Established, ongoing communications with the Title I managers.				
2. Avenues to influence key decisions makers.				
3. Memoranda of Understanding at the state level that specifies expectations and roles of the state partners.				
4. State level strategies regarding how One-Stop services will be coordinated.				
5. State level strategies regarding how One-Stop services will be paid for.				
6. State level strategies regarding how One-Stop administration will be paid for.				
7. Clear communication of these strategies from your office to the local adult education program manager.				
8. Clear guidance for local programs for their roles and responsibilities in the One-Stop.				
9. Integrated planning, training, and implementation strategies to support continuous collaboration.				
10. Feedback loops to keep partners and stakeholders advised of successes and trouble spots.				
11. Process to monitor local integration of services by the One-Stop.				
12.				
13.				

<h2>Part III</h2> <h3>Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

<p>D. Leveraging Staff Expertise and Professional Development Resources through State Leadership Funds. (Because of the reduction of 353/Ancillary funds [now known as State Leadership], have you explored working with other states or USDOE to fund program development initiatives? Have you pondered how the 20 states interested in web-based data systems have worked together to accomplish that task; with the support of USDOE and NAEPCD? How do you feel about using some of the strategies below?)</p>				
<p>1. Rather than tackling program development/improvement initiatives alone, joining a workgroup with other states who have the same program development interests to share insights, resources, and plans.</p>				
<p>2. Leveraging USDOE National Technical Assistance funds and state leadership funds to support your program development/improvement work.</p>				
<p>3. If state law allows it, develop with your budget/finance office means to jointly fund development projects with other states.</p>				
<p>4. Use the "Going to Scale" strategies above (III A) to develop and design a program development/improvement effort.</p>				
<p>5. Within your state, exchange professional development expertise in other partner and stakeholder systems.</p>				
<p>6.</p>				
<p>7.</p>				
<p>8.</p>				

<h2>Part III</h2> <h3>Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

<p>E. Developing a Performance Funding System (How do you go about developing a funding system for local programs that is based on performance? At least one state already has it in place. Are you interested in going there? What are the pros and cons of a performance based system? How do you keep services in the rural, poorer, part-time areas of the state and not end up funding only the urban/suburban sophisticated programs?)</p>				
1. Have you defined what the critical elements of performance are?				
2. Do you have an accurate, valid, reliable way to assess those elements in each program?				
3. Do you have a process for gaining support from local providers?				
4. Do you have a responsive technical assistance system to help deficient programs use data to improve performance?				
5. Do you have a "grand fathering" procedure or "safety nets" for low performers, especially the first year?				
6.				
7.				
8.				

<h2>Part III</h2> <h3>Functions/Systems</h3>	<b>M E N T O R</b>	<b>C O M P E T E N T *</b>	<b>S H A K Y ~ ~</b>	<b>H E L P !</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

F. Distance Learning/Non-Classroom Delivery: At most, we reach 10% of the adults who could benefit from improved foundation skills. If you have ventured into distance learning options, how do you feel about these system elements?				
1. Recruiting learners who can benefit from distance/non-classroom delivery systems.				
2. Assessing learner needs at a distance.				
3. Selecting the appropriate distance learning option for non-classroom learners.				
4. Mutually developing an individualized learning plan for distance/non-classroom learners.				
5. Providing support (e.g., teacher on the phone, roving tutors) for distance learners.				
6. Preparing teachers/tutors to support distance/non-classroom learners.				
7. Counting and reporting distant/non classroom learner hours.				
8. Linking existing non-classroom delivery systems.				
9. Using learner and stakeholder feedback to evaluate and modify system components.				
10.				
11.				
12.				